

Empowering Small Donors in DC Elections

The case for fair elections
reform

May 2016



U.S. PIRG
Education Fund

Empowering Small Donors in DC Elections

The case for fair elections reform

May, 2016

Zach Weinstein
U.S. PIRG Education Fund

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Tam Doan, Research & Policy Director at Every Voice, Ericka Taylor, Executive Director of DC Fair Budget Coalition, Aquene Freechild, Co-Director of Democracy is For People Campaign at Public Citizen, and Dan Smith, Democracy Campaign Director at US PIRG for reviewing the first edition of this report and providing thoughtful and informed comments.

The author also thanks Julien Rouge for his extensive research and editorial assistance.

© 2016 U.S. PIRG Education Fund. Some Rights Reserved. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives 3.0 Unported License. To view the terms of this license, visit www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0.

With public debate around important issues often dominated by special interests pursuing their own narrow agendas, U.S. PIRG Education Fund offers an independent voice that works on behalf of the public interest. U.S. PIRG Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) organization, works to protect consumers and promote good government. We investigate problems, craft solutions, educate the public, and offer Americans meaningful opportunities for civic participation.

Design and layout: Chris MacKenzie

Introduction

While campaign finance scandals in DC have made headlines in recent years, the problem with the way elections in the District are funded runs much deeper than any one scandal or particular candidate. Of greater concern is that in a system where candidates depend on large and corporate – often outside the District – donors to win elected office, the voices of everyday DC residents are drowned out. This study, which examines the effects of a proposed small donor empowerment program for DC elections, found that less than 40% of the funds for recent competitive local races came from DC residents.

There are powerful solutions available that would reshape this broken campaign finance system by limiting the influence of corporations and big donors and putting DC residents at the center of our democracy. From New York City and Maine to Seattle and Montgomery County, MD, legislators and voters are creating and strengthening programs to amplify the voices of small donors.

This report examines how a small donor matching program, like the one proposed in the Citizens Fair Election Act introduced in the DC Council in December 2015, would have reshaped the fundraising of competitive candidates for DC Council, Mayor, and Attorney General during their most recent campaigns.¹ This report demonstrates that a small donor matching system would enable candidates to rely on small contributions from their constituents to fund their campaigns rather than large donations from corporations and big donors. A recent poll found that 80% of District residents favor such a system.²



Key Insights

Special interests and donors from outside DC dominate local elections:

In total, competitive candidates in the 2012 and 2014 election cycles for Council, Mayor, and Attorney General relied on corporations and individuals from outside DC for more than 60% of their fundraising.

Candidates for elected office in DC rely on big donors:

In those same cycles, winning candidates for DC Council, Mayor, and Attorney General received less than 5% of their total funds from DC residents giving less than \$100. DC residents giving more than \$100 accounted for seven times the funds raised from their small donor counterparts. The average contribution of these large donors was \$516, enough to feed a family of four for two weeks,³ making these contributions much more than the average DC resident can afford.

The Citizens Fair Elections Act (CFEA) would amplify the voices of everyday people:

If the CFEA had been in place in 2012 and 2014, DC residents giving less than \$100, and the corresponding public matching funds proposed in the legislation, would have accounted for 64% of fundraising for competitive candidates to DC elected offices. That is a thirteen-fold increase in the percentage of funds coming from small donors. These findings assume that all candidates would have opted to participate in the voluntary program. Corporate and non-resident fundraising would have accounted for only 9% under the program.

The CFEA would be a viable alternative to the current campaign finance system:

While the sources of candidate fundraising would change drastically, participating candidates would still be able to raise the necessary funds to run a viable campaign. Only seven of the twenty-four candidates included in this study were projected to raise less if Fair Elections legislation had been in place when they ran for office, even without any change in their fundraising strategy to focus more on small donors.

Big donors dominate DC elections

The Supreme Court's misguided Citizens United decision in 2010 allowed corporations and special interests to spend unlimited amounts of money to influence the outcome of elections.⁴ While the results of this ruling have made the problem of big money dominance of elections more apparent than ever, the campaign finance system favored a small set of wealthy donors with the resources to write large checks long before 2010.

While democracy should give an equal voice to every voter, our current campaign finance system makes it nearly impossible for candidates to run for office without relying on big checks from wealthy donors and outside interests, providing an advantage to candidates with access to a network of wealthy donors or a message that appeals to those donors. Under this system, the most efficient use of candidate fundraising time is raising the maximum allowable contribution from the small set of donors who can afford it, leaving most DC residents on the sidelines. When candidates spend their time fundraising from wealthy individuals, that is who they hear from on the campaign trail, rather than the people they are running to represent. In such a system, the voices and concerns of ordinary people are not prioritized.

The undemocratic role of big money is especially exclusionary for people of color, who are severely underrepresented in the overwhelmingly white and male "donor class." A 2013 report from Demos found that 90% of donations made during the 2012 presidential campaign came from majority white neighborhoods, with less than 8% coming from Latino, African American and Asian neighborhoods.⁵

The wealthiest Americans also tend to have demonstrably different policy preferences than the vast majority of the public, making their dominance of the campaign finance system even more problematic.⁶ Candidates who do not appeal to or have access to a network of wealthy donors are far less likely to raise the necessary funds to run a viable campaign under the current campaign finance system, from the local to national level. Solutions are available that advance racial equity in our democracy and promote a government of, by, and for the people where everyone has an equal voice.

Introducing people-powered campaign finance

While the Supreme Court has ruled that we cannot limit the amount of money individuals and corporations can spend to influence elections,⁷ it is possible to create a system that incentivizes candidates to voluntarily reject large donations and rely instead on small contributions to fund their campaigns.

Small donor matching programs are a proven solution to limit the influence of big money in politics while putting voters back in the driver's seat of our elections. They are designed to increase civic participation throughout the electoral process, starting with campaign fundraising, by changing the candidates' incentives so that it is just as effective, if not more so, to spend time courting average voters as it is dialing for \$500 contributions. Such a program would create a more inclusive and representative democracy by empowering DC residents, reducing the influence of outside interests and developers, and promoting racial equity.

How do small donor matching programs work?

Small donor empowerment programs provide limited public matching funds to candidates who forego large campaign contributions. In return, small contributions raised by these participating candidates are matched with limited public funds to boost the impact of small donors. For example, if the ratio is 5:1 (as in the Citizens Fair Election Act), then every donation smaller than the voluntary contribution limit is matched with public funds by a factor of five.

Small donor matching systems have a strong track record. For example, New York City's program allowed participating candidates in the 2013 city council race to raise 61% of their contributions from small contributions and corresponding matching funds. By contrast, candidates who chose not to participate in the program raised only 19% of their money from contributions smaller than \$250.⁸ That year, 92% of candidates running in the primary participated in the program.⁹

The adoption and strengthening of New York City's small donor program not only increased the share of campaign funds accounted for by small donors, but increased the number of small donors participating as well, bringing more people into the process. Between 1997 (when the match was only 1:1) and 2009 (when it increased to 6:1), the small donor pool increased by 40%.⁷

In addition to promoting civic participation, these programs can increase the racial and socioeconomic diversity of the small donor pool. A Campaign Finance Institute study compared the fundraising of



Councilmember Brianna Nadeau speaks in favor of fair elections legislation

New York state assembly candidates, who are not eligible for public matching funds, to City Council candidates.¹⁰ The study found that Bedford-Stuyvesant, Chinatown, Upper Manhattan, and the South Bronx each had between 12 and 24 times more small donors for City Council races than state races, which do not have the benefit of a small donor matching program. Each of these neighborhoods have large communities of color and, without matching funds, are less likely than more affluent neighborhoods to contribute to candidate campaigns. Bedford-Stuyvesant and Chinatown contributed 11 and 7 times more, respectively, to city races than to assembly races in the election cycle the study examined. Programs like New York City's help advance racial equity by amplifying the voices of communities of color, who are often excluded by a campaign finance system that incentivizes candidates to collect big checks from a narrow set of overwhelmingly white wealthy donors.

The proven impact of such programs is one reason that states and localities across the nation are adopting them. Last November, voters in Maine and Seattle passed clean election ballot initiatives with strong support, creating and strengthening their own small donor empowerment programs. In 2014, Montgomery County, Maryland enacted legislation creating a small donor program similar to the one in New York City. Howard County, Maryland will vote on a ballot measure to create a small donor system this year.

The DC Citizens Fair Election Act

Introduced on December 1, 2015 by Councilmember David Grosso, and co-introduced by Councilmembers Nadeau, Allen, Cheh, Silverman, and Chairman Mendelson, the Citizens Fair Election Act (CFEA) would create a program that matches, at a ratio of 5:1, contributions up to \$100 made by DC residents¹¹ to qualifying candidates. In a 2016 poll conducted by Washington City Paper, 80% of DC residents expressed support for such a system in DC.¹²

Upon qualifying, each participating candidate would receive a public grant equal to 20% of the average cost of running a winning campaign for a particular office. Candidates would receive 60% of the grant during the primary season and 40% during the general. The goal of these grants is to help ensure that candidates accepting only small contributions can run viable campaigns by providing "startup" funds to cover some of the early costs of running for office. Estimates of the size of these public grants are available in Table 1.

In order to participate in this program, candidates would have to accept a contribution limit of \$100 and receive a certain number of small contributions from DC residents before qualifying for matching funds. Corporate and out-of-district contributions would also be capped at \$100 and would not be eligible for public matching funds. To prove their viability, candidates seeking to participate in the program would have to hit a threshold number of contributions and total fundraising before receiving public funds. The minimum number of contributions from DC residents required to qualify are listed in Table 1.

These thresholds will ensure that each candidate's public funding is directly tied to their ability to convince ordinary citizens to support them. The thresholds would help control the cost of the program by excluding non-viable candidates.

Table 1: Public Grants and Contribution Thresholds for Participating Candidates

Office	Public grant (estimate)	Min. fundraising threshold	Min. donor # threshold
Ward seat	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,000	150
At-Large seat	\$ 80,000	\$ 15,000	500
Attorney General and Council Chair	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,000	700
Mayor	\$ 640,000	\$ 50,000	1,500

Our findings illustrate how this system would work in DC by examining how the fundraising of competitive candidates would have looked had Fair Elections been in effect during their most recent election. This study looks at the aggregate fundraising of all current members of the Council in their most recent election, as well as the fundraising of the Mayor and Attorney General, and that of their closest viable competitors. We looked at campaign finance reports and applied the rules of the CFEA to them retroactively, making no assumptions about how behavior might have changed had the proposed program been in place (see Methodology notes).

We found that the proposed small donor program would raise the percentage of funds coming from small donors from 4.8% to 64% -- a thirteen-fold increase. Not only would Fair Elections dramatically increase the influence of small donors, it would also increase the share of funds coming from District residents. When matching funds are included, individuals from DC would have represented 64% of funds raised by DC candidates in the most recent election cycles, whereas they only accounted for 38.5% without the CFEA (see Table 2).

Table 2: DC Elected Officials' (and their Closest Challengers) Fundraising with and without the CFEA

■ *Without small donor matching program* ■ *Projected under the CFEA*

Origin of contributions	Number of donations	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising
DC residents	13,574	\$3,677,222	38.5%	\$6,345,287	64.1%
-More than \$100	6,241	\$3,218,883	33.7%	\$0 ¹³	0.00%
-\$100 or less (including matching funds)	7,333	\$458,339	4.8%	\$6,345,287	64.1%
Public grants		N/A	N/A	\$2,661,022	26.9%
Out of state individuals	5,767	\$2,411,810	25.2%	\$494,251	5%
Corporations	4,077	\$3,466,824	36.3%	\$399,426	4.0%
Total	23,418	\$9,555,856	100%	\$9,899,986	100%

**Additional information on fundraising broken down by office available in Appendix*

As a result, the CFEA would boost considerably the collective fundraising impact of everyday DC residents. Without the CFEA, DC elected officials and their closest competitors raised more than 60% of their money from corporations and individual donations from outside of DC during their last campaigns. Although a slight majority (54%) of individual DC donors gave \$100 or less, an overwhelming majority (87.5%) of the overall money raised from DC residents came from donations larger than \$100.

These findings reflect the reality of our current system; running a campaign in today’s political environment requires a lot of money, and large donations are the most efficient way for candidates to raise enough funds to support their campaigns and broadcast their message to voters. The ultimate goal of small donor programs is to turn this dynamic on its head.

One key benefit of small donor empowerment programs is the likelihood that candidates would change their fundraising strategy if given the option of participating in a small donor campaign financing system. Right now, candidates for DC offices are incentivized to focus their fundraising on a narrow set of corporations and individuals who can afford to give several hundred dollars or more. The CFEA would blunt the impact of large, corporate, and out of district contributions, which dwarf what an average DC resident is able to give (see Table 3).

Table 3: Average Contributions

Origin of Contributions	Avg. w/o small donor matching program	Avg. projected under the CFEA
DC residents	\$271	\$81
Out of district individuals	\$378	\$86
Corporations	\$850	\$98

The proposed 5:1 matching system incentivizes candidates to seek smaller donations by offering matching funds that make a \$100 contribution more valuable than a maximum donation of \$500. Not only does this provide candidates with a viable alternative to the current fundraising system, it does so in a way that encourages increased contact and engagement with constituents. This strategy would allow candidates to combine fundraising with volunteer recruitment and voter engagement, making it easier to prioritize grassroots tactics such as knocking on doors and phonebanking voters.

One important aspect of building a successful small donor program is making sure that participating candidates can raise enough money to compete with nonparticipating candidates. This consideration must be balanced with limits on the amount of funding available to each participating candidate. Even with reduced corporate and outside contributions, the CFEA would not decrease the collective amount of money raised by competitive candidates (see Table 2), because participating candidates would see their fundraising from DC residents bolstered by the 5:1 matching funds and the public grant. Additionally, our findings indicate only seven of the 24 candidates included in this study would have seen a decrease in their fundraising. This demonstrates how the Citizens Fair Election Act would allow candidates to raise the funds needed to run a viable campaign without relying on large donors.

New Fundraising Incentives that Put Small Donors at Center Stage

The envisioned thirteen-fold increase in the impact of small donors on the collective campaign fundraising of candidates to DC elections is likely underestimated. This report calculates potential fundraising performances under the proposed small donor empowerment program by assuming that candidates' fundraising strategy would have stayed the same. However, the findings of this study demonstrate that candidates would have a very strong incentive to turn away from corporate and out-of-DC donations (which would be capped at \$100 and not be matched for participating candidates) toward small, individual donations. Such a change in their fundraising strategies would be in their interest, as matching funds would make small donations from DC worth five times as much as corporate and out-of-state contributions.

This report also does not account for the potential of a small donor empowerment program to encourage more DC residents to make small contributions, knowing that their contributions will no longer be dwarfed by those of wealthy donors. The experience of New York City's small donor program bears this out. After strengthening its program by increasing the public matching ratio from one-to-one to six-to-one, the number of New Yorkers contributing less than \$250 increased by close to 30% on average for candidates in competitive races.¹³

A Small Price to Pay for Good Government

While some may fear that a public matching fund program such as the CFEA would cost a lot of taxpayer money, the program includes tight cost controls.

Only candidates who demonstrate a robust level of public support would be able to qualify. Participating candidates would have to demonstrate the viability of their campaign by raising a certain amount of money from a threshold number of DC residents, depending on which office they run for, as shown in Table 1. Such a provision would make sure that candidates who lack public support do not receive public funding.

Additionally, the total matching funds a candidate can receive would be capped based on the average cost of recent winning campaigns in the District of Columbia. An overall cap on public funding available to each candidate would rein in program costs while ensuring that participating candidates can be competitive. Total available public funding would be capped at 160% of the average cost of running a winning campaign. Any candidates who hit the cap can continue raising unmatched small contributions, without being subject to a spending limit, to stay competitive with non-participating big money candidates. Candidates are also only eligible to receive the full grant if they win the primary, with 60% of the grant disbursed during the primary and 40% during the general election.

The total cost of the Fair Elections program would be negligible in the context of the overall DC budget. In New York City, the cost for the 2013 city council elections, in which 92% of candidates on the primary ballot opted in to the matching program,¹⁴ was .06% of the city budget.¹⁵ Furthermore, all

taxpayers benefit when candidates are paying attention to their constituents instead of a small cadre of special interests and mega-donors. Increased accountability to taxpayers will encourage fiscal responsibility, and make candidates and elected officials more likely to share the same budget priorities as their constituents, making special interest tax breaks and wasteful government contracts less frequent. For example, decisions around issues like affordable housing and major developments seeking millions in city funding might be weighted more towards every day resident interests and needs. In this way, small donor matching programs have the potential to pay for themselves. The CFEA represents a modest investment in our democracy, helping to ensure that the people elected to disburse billions of dollars in taxpayer funds feel accountable to the people who paid those taxes.

The actual cost of the CFEA depends on the number of candidates that participate and on the additional number of small donors that would contribute to DC electoral campaigns. However, assuming the participation of 80% of viable candidates and a 20% increase in small donors, the estimated cost of the CFEA is between \$4 and \$5 million a year. DC's approved operating budget for 2016 is \$11.23 billion, meaning that the CFEA would account for less than .05% of the budget, even with robust participation and an increase in small contributions. If funding were allocated from the general fund, which is \$7.97 billion in 2016, the CFEA would account for .06% of that fund.¹⁶

Conclusion

A small donor empowerment program like the Citizens Fair Elections Act would enable candidates who raise most of their campaign money from small contributors to match, or even exceed, the fundraising of candidates who focus on large donors. The current system is problematic because wealthy donors and corporations, who currently provide the majority of funds for DC elections, tend to have different priorities and concerns than everyday DC residents. When nearly 20% of DC residents live below the poverty line, it is essential that we have a campaign finance system that does not only work for those who can afford to write \$500 or \$1,000 checks.¹⁷

Compounding this problem is the fact that poverty is unevenly distributed along racial lines. Currently, 26% of black District residents and 22% of Hispanic residents live below the poverty line, compared to only 7% of White non-Hispanic residents.¹⁸ A campaign finance system that prioritizes the voices of wealthy donors drowns out the voices of people of color.

The Citizens Fair Election Act would fundamentally change this dynamic by amplifying the voices of everyday DC residents, advancing racial equity, and creating a more accountable and representative government. Under a small donor matching system, candidates would have a powerful incentive to change their fundraising strategy to focus on everyday DC residents. Under our current campaign finance system, it is rational for a candidate to fundraise primarily from big donors and corporations, no matter where they are from. A small donor matching system like the Citizens Fair Elections Act would make it rational to prioritize small contributions from regular DC residents. With the CFEA in place, it would make more sense for a candidate for Mayor or Council to spend time at a picnic or house party, collecting dozens of \$20 or \$30 contributions from their prospective constituents, than to host a \$500 fundraiser or dial for dollars from outside interests. Such a world is much closer than the current system to the basic democratic ideal of one person, one vote.

The rationale for a system like the CFEA isn't to create different winners and losers from those we see today but to encourage more robust participation in our democracy from a more diverse and representative pool of DC residents. By empowering everyday people, the CFEA would help build a better democracy in DC.

Methodology

Source of the data:

The source of all fundraising numbers in this report comes from the most recent campaign filings of each viable candidate to DC elected offices with the District of Columbia Office of Campaign Finance.

This report uses fundraising numbers from the following sitting Councilmembers' most recent campaigns:

2012: Councilmember Yvette Alexander, Councilmember Jack Evans, Councilmember David Grosso, and Councilmember Vincent Orange.

2014: Councilmember Charles Allen, Councilmember Anita Bonds, Councilmember Cheh, Councilmember McDuffie, Council Chair Phil Mendelson, Councilmember Brianne Nadeau, Councilmember Elissa Silverman, and Councilmember Brandon Todd.

2015: Councilmember LaRuby May

The report also includes fundraising numbers from candidates for Ward seats on the DC Council who raised at least \$5,000 from 100 individuals, and candidates for At-Large seats who raised at least \$15,000 from 300 individuals. This includes Trayon White's 2015 campaign, Robert White's 2014 campaign, Michael Brown's 2012 campaign, Tom Brown's 2012 campaign, Renee Bowser's 2015 campaign, Jim Graham's 2014 campaign and Darrel Thompson's 2014 campaign.

This report also uses fundraising numbers from Mayor Bowser's and David Catania's 2014 mayoral campaigns, and from Attorney General Karl Racine's and Edward Smith's 2014 campaigns for Attorney General.

Each candidate's contributions, as reported by the DC Office of Campaign Finance, were used to calculate their predicted fundraising under the small donor matching program proposed by the Citizens Fair Election Act.

This report does not take into account contributions made to candidates after the date of the general election (or after the primary election if they did not win the nomination).

Assumptions:

The Citizens Fair Election Act requires participating candidates to voluntarily accept a \$100 contribution limit. For the purposes of this study, we assumed that any donor giving more to a candidate participating in the CFEA would reduce their contribution to \$100 – the maximum allowed.

The CFEA requires candidates for DC elected offices to raise a certain number and total dollar amount of contributions from small donors, depending on the office they seek. For the purposes of this study,

we assumed that all current elected officials would have qualified. We further assumed that Ward candidates to the DC Council who raised more than \$5,000 from at least 100 DC residents, and At-Large candidates who raised at least \$15,000 from 300 residents, would have been able to adjust their strategy and qualify for the program.

We further assumed that all qualifying candidates would have opted into the program, though the legislation creates a voluntary opt-in program, which would not be mandatory.

The study also did not take into account the timing of candidate fundraising. The CFEA currently requires candidates to raise the qualifying funds and contributions within 120 days of filing their candidacy; the report did not consider whether the qualifying thresholds were reached in that timeframe.

Calculations:

Determining how much each DC elected official would have raised if the CFEA matching fund program had been in force during their last campaign required five calculations:

- 1) Multiplying all contributions of \$100 or less made by DC residents by six to account for both the original contributions and public funds matched to those contributions at a five-to-one ratio.

- 2) Multiplying the number of large DC individual donors (those contributing more than \$100) by \$100, effectively reducing each donation to fit within the contribution limit of the small donor matching program. That total was then multiplied by six to account for both the original itemized contributions and public matching funds, which the reduced contributions would be eligible for.

Whenever a candidate would have exceeded the cap for public matching funds, their fundraising was recalculated by adding the maximum allowed amount of public matching funds to the amount coming from capped, itemized DC resident contributions.

- 3) Multiplying the number of corporate and out of state contributions larger than \$100 by \$100, effectively reducing each donation to fit within the contribution limit of the CFEA. Such contributions are not matched by the CFEA.

- 4) Adding the amounts collected from corporate and out of state donations equal to \$100 or smaller to the previous totals. Such contributions are not matched by the CFEA.

- 5) Adding together the calculated totals from steps 1 to 4, we arrived at our estimate for how much each candidate would raise under the CFEA small donor matching system.

Appendix

Appendix 1: DC Council fundraising with and without the CFEA (2012 and 2014)

■ Without small donor matching program

■ Projected under the CFEA

Origin of contributions	Number of donations	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising
DC residents	6,360	\$1,296,853	41.3%	\$2,857,972	70.9%
-More than \$100	2,818	\$1,077,433	34.3%	\$0 ²⁰	0%
-\$100 or less (including matching funds)	3,542	\$219,420	7.0%	\$2,857,972	70.9%
Public grants		N/A	N/A	\$805,723	20.0%
Out of state individuals	1,956	\$546,486	17.4%	\$164,544	4.1%
Corporations	2,052	\$1,296,432	41.3%	\$200,435	5.0 %
Total	10,368	\$3,139,771	100%	\$4,028,675	100%

Appendix 2: Mayoral candidates' fundraising with and without the CFEA (2014)

■ Without small donor matching program

■ Projected under the CFEA

Origin of contributions	Number of donations	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising
DC residents	4,947	\$1,715,160	35.6%	\$2,374,661	60%
-More than \$100	2,347	\$1,554,083	32.2%	\$0 ²¹	0%
-\$100 or less (including matching funds)	2,600	\$161,077	3.3%	\$2,374,661	60.0%
Public grants		N/A	N/A	\$1,274,828	32.2%
Out of state individuals	1,946	\$1,304,519	27.0%	\$173,101	4.4%
Corporations	1,407	\$1,805,626	37.4%	\$138,020	3.5%
Total	8,300	\$4,825,304	100%	\$3,960,610	100%

Appendix 3: Attorney General candidates' fundraising with and without the CFEA (2014)

■ *Without small donor matching program*

■ *Projected under the CFEA*

Origin of contributions	Number of donations	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising	Amount raised	Share of total fundraising
DC residents	775	\$347,609	46.10%	\$401,898	51.4%
-More than \$100	434	\$324,026	42.98%	\$0 ²²	0%
-\$100 or less (including matching funds)	341	\$23,583	3.13%	\$401,898	51.4%
Public grants		N/A	N/A	\$293,534	37.6%
Out of state individuals	847	\$326,189	43.26%	\$76,348	9.8%
Corporations	99	\$80,166	10.63%	\$9,610	1.2%
Total	1,721	\$753,964	100%	\$781,390	100%

References

- ¹ This report examines fundraising numbers from the current Councilmembers' most recent campaign, as well as from Mayor Bowser's and Attorney General Racine's most recent campaign and that of their closest competitors, respectively David Catania and Edward Smith. It also examines fundraising numbers from the most recent campaign of Council candidates who raised at least \$5,000 from 100 individuals for Ward candidates, and at least \$15,000 from 300 individuals for At-Large candidates.
- ² Steve Cavendish, "The D.C. Poll: District Voters on Pot, Minimum Wage, Football, and More", Washington City Paper, January 28, 2016. <http://www.washingtoncitypaper.com/blogs/citydesk/2016/01/28/the-d-c-poll-district-voters-on-pot-minimum-wage-football-and-more/>
- ³ U.S. Department of Agriculture, "Official USDA Food Plans: Cost of Food at Home at Four Levels, U.S. Average", February 2016. <http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/sites/default/files/CostofFoodFeb2016.pdf>
- ⁴ Supreme Court of the United States, *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).
- ⁵ David Callahan and J. Mijin Cha, "Stacked Deck. How the Dominance of Politics by the Affluent & Business Undermines Economic Mobility in America," Demos.org, February 2013, p.18.
- ⁶ Benjamin Page, Larry Bartels, and Jason Seawright, "Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans," *Perspectives on Politics* 11, no.1 (2013): 51-73. <http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/~jnd260/cab/CAB2012%20-%20Page1.pdf>
- ⁷ Supreme Court of the United States, *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).
- ⁸ Michael Malbin, Testimony before the New York City Campaign Finance Board, Campaign Finance Institute, February 13, 2013. http://www.cfinst.org/press/releases_tags/14-02-13/Testimony_before_the_New_York_City_Campaign_Finance_Board_Says_Small_Donor_Matching_Funds_a_Success_but_the_City_Should_Look_at_Changes_Moving_Forward.aspx
- ⁹ Matt Sollars et al., "By the People: The New York City Campaign Finance Program in the 2013 Elections" New York City Campaign Finance Board, 2013 Post-Election Report, p.45. http://www.nycffb.info/PDF/per/2013_PER/2013_PER.pdf
- ¹⁰ Elizabeth Genn, Brendan Glavin, Sundeep Iyer, Michael Malbin. "Donor Diversity through Public Matching Funds", The Campaign Finance Institute and Brennan Center for Justice, 2012. <http://www.cfinst.org/pdf/state/NY/DonorDiversity.pdf>
- ¹¹ Council of the District of Columbia, "Citizens Fair Election Program Amendment Act of 2015," December 1, 2015. <http://lims.dccouncil.us/Download/34949/B21-0509-Introduction.pdf>
- ¹² Steve Cavendish, "The D.C. Poll: District Voters on Pot, Minimum Wage, Football, and More", Washington City Paper, January 28, 2016. <http://www.washingtoncitypaper.com/blogs/citydesk/2016/01/28/the-d-c-poll-district-voters-on-pot-minimum-wage-football-and-more/>
- ¹³ Michael Malbin, Peter Brusoe, Brendan Glavin. "Small Donors, Big Democracy: New York City's Matching Funds as a Model for the Nation and States," *Election Law Journal* 11, no.1 (2012): 3-20. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwiH1KWqkIfMAhWhzoMKHsk-AXUQFggdMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cfinst.org%2Fpdf%2Fstate%2FNYC-as-a-Model_ELJ_As-Published_March2012.pdf&usq=AFQjCNFmivRzKda6DL0wln4itiqLnusNU-A&sig2=bviFf5sKbDOc27mfXDzKdQ&cad=rja
- ¹⁴ Michael Malbin, Testimony before the New York City Campaign Finance Board, Campaign Finance Institute, February 13, 2013. http://www.cfinst.org/Press/PReleases/14-02-13/Testimony_before_the_New_York_City_Campaign_Finance_Board_Says_Small_Donor_Matching_Funds_a_Success_but_the_City_Should_Look_at_Changes_Moving_Forward.aspx
- ¹⁵ A total of \$38.2 million in public funds were spent for the 2013 New York City elections under the city's public financing program. See Matt Sollars et al., "By the People: The New York City Campaign Finance Program in the 2013 Elections" New York City Campaign Finance Board, 2013 Post-Election Report, p.45. http://www.nycffb.info/PDF/per/2013_PER/2013_PER.pdf The total city budget for FY13 was \$68.5 billion. See Office of Management and Budget of the City of New York, "Schedules A and B to the Fiscal Year 2013, Expense and Contract Budget Resolutions," released June 29, 2012. http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/html/publications/finplan06_12.shtml
- ¹⁶ Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, "Operating Budgets." <http://cfoinfo.dc.gov/>
- ¹⁷ DC Fiscal Policy Institute, "DC Poverty Demographics," April 9, 2014. <http://www.dcfpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/DC-Poverty-Demographics.pdf>
- ¹⁸ Ibid.