



**NO SMALL CHANGE**  
UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS  
ADD LITTLE TO CAMPAIGN COFFERS

By  
MEGAN MOORE

JULY 14, 2008

This publication was made possible by grants from:

JEHT Foundation  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
Carnegie Corporation of New York  
Ford Foundation  
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

The statements made and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the  
Institute.

At the same time that Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama is garnering attention for raising large sums in relatively small amounts from online donors,<sup>1</sup> state-level candidate, party and ballot measure committees are reporting a small percentage of their donations as unitemized lump sums.

A review of unitemized contributions — those that fall below a state's threshold for reporting contributor name or other identifying information — given to state-level committees in 2005 and 2006 reveals:

- Candidate and state party committees reported 3.8 percent of contributions as lump sums. The 2006 share of unitemized contributions is less than the 2004 percentage for candidate committees but slightly higher for state party committees.
- States where candidates raised 10 percent or more of contributions from unitemized contributions had itemization thresholds of \$100 or less or higher. However, candidates in some states with relatively high thresholds reported small amounts of contributions in lump sums. Candidates in states with thresholds of \$50 or less reported the least in unitemized contributions.
- Democratic and Republican candidates raised nearly the same amount in unitemized contributions: 3.7 percent of contributions compared with 3.6 percent, respectively. Third-party, nonpartisan and independent candidates, however, reported a share of unitemized donations that was at least twice the percentage raised by candidates in the two-party system.
- Candidates raised less in unitemized donations in 2006 than they did in 2004 when grouped by party affiliation, office sought, win-loss status or type of candidate (incumbent, challenger, etc.).
- Republican state party committees reported 4.9 percent in unitemized donations compared with 2.7 percent for Democratic state party committees. However, five Democratic state party committees itemized all receipts but just three Republican committees reported all donors' names.
- Ballot measure committees reported just 0.5 percent of their more than \$1 billion in contributions as unitemized donations in 2006. The 2006 share is half the 1 percent ballot measure committees raised from unitemized sources in the 2004 election cycle.
- Candidates in states holding elections in 2007 raised a higher percentage of unitemized contributions overall than did candidates in 2005 and 2006. When compared state-by-state, however, candidates reported a larger share of unitemized contributions in 2005 than in 2007.

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Luo, "Small Online Contributions Add Up to Huge Fund-Raising Edge for Obama," *New York Times*, Feb. 20, 2008, available from [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/us/politics/20obama.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/us/politics/20obama.html?_r=1&oref=slogin), accessed July 3, 2008.

## **ABOUT UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS**

Requirements for reporting campaign contributions for state-level candidates, political parties and ballot measure committees differ from state to state, but a majority of states allow candidates to report some contributions without identifying information about the contributor, such as name, address, occupation and employer. These contributions fall below a monetary level set on a state-by-state basis for reporting detailed contributor information. In states holding elections in 2005 or 2006, the threshold amount ranged from \$25 to \$700. In addition, four states required candidates to itemize all receipts, and four others allowed grouping of small contributions from fund-raiser tickets or merchandise sales only.

When setting thresholds for requiring itemization of campaign receipts, many states stipulate that the threshold is an aggregate for the election cycle, meaning that contributions from the same contributor within the election cycle are totaled and must be reported with the contributor's name once they exceed the threshold. In some states, contributions aggregate over the calendar year rather than the election cycle, while in others, only contributions within the reporting period are combined towards the itemization threshold.

For the purposes of analyzing unitemized contributions, states that base the threshold on the calendar year or reporting period have been adjusted to indicate how much contributors could give over the election cycle before their contributions were itemized. For example, in states where the itemization threshold is based on the calendar year, that amount has been doubled because contributors could give under the limit in the year preceding the election as well as in the election year itself and still remain unidentified. For states that base their thresholds on the reporting period, the threshold has been multiplied by the number of reports generally filed.

Though many states allow candidates to group together contributions under a certain amount, some candidates and committees choose to report all contributions, no matter how small the amount. This occurs in some instances because committees typically must keep records of identifying information, though they do not have to report it, in case a contributor exceeds the aggregate and itemization is required. Some committees also choose to itemize all receipts as the movement towards more openness in government gains steam. And others report all their contributions as a way of indicating they are receiving a broad level of support from people throughout their states, because including all the contributions boosts the total number of contributions they have received.

## **UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

Candidates and incumbents not up for re-election in 2005 and 2006 reported almost 4 percent of their contributions as lump sum amounts, or \$72 million of the nearly \$2 billion they raised. The percentage of unitemized contributions ranged from a low of 0.1 percent in Wyoming, where the threshold for itemizing contributions is just \$25, to a high of 34.5 percent in Minnesota. Minnesota, with a \$100 itemization threshold for each year of the two-year election cycle, prohibits candidates from itemizing contributions that fall below the threshold amount.

Overall, candidates in 2005 and 2006 reported a smaller percentage of unitemized contributions than did candidates in the previous 2003-2004 election cycle: 3.8 percent compared with 5.1 percent.

When grouped by itemization threshold, unitemized contributions accounted for slightly less than 1 percent to 5.3 percent of contributions. For the most part, the percentage of unitemized contributions increased as did the itemization threshold, with unitemized contributions comprising

4 percent or more of contributions when the threshold was greater than \$100 but less than 2 percent when the threshold was \$50 or less. The one exception to this was the four states with thresholds between \$350 and \$400. In those states, unitemized contributions made up just 1.4 percent of contributions.

The two states with the highest itemization thresholds also had the highest percentage of unitemized contributions. Candidates in Illinois and Tennessee, with thresholds of \$600 and \$700 respectively, reported 5.3 percent of their contribution as unitemized lump sums.

Candidates in the four states with thresholds from \$350 to \$400 were an anomaly among states with high itemization thresholds; just 1.4 percent of their contributions were unitemized. Texas candidates raised more than twice as much as those in the other three states combined so the percentage of unitemized contributions is based largely on the 1.3 percent of unitemized contributions reported there. In Mississippi, candidates actually listed 15.6 percent of contributions in a lump sum but candidates there raised only \$3.9 million. Unitemized contributions accounted for less than 1 percent of contributions in the other two states: Colorado and Nevada.

Unitemized contributions made up 4.8 percent of contributions in states with itemization thresholds between \$200 and \$300. The percentage of unitemized contributions varied considerably among the 10 states from 1.3 percent in California to 34.5 percent in Minnesota. Candidates in Minnesota, Nebraska and North Dakota<sup>2</sup> reported more than 20 percent of contributions as unitemized but these states had relatively low fund-raising totals.

The most common itemization threshold for candidates was \$100 or less over the two-year election cycle, which was the limit set by 14 states. Taken together, 4.4 percent of candidate contributions were unitemized in these states. Candidates in Vermont listed more than 20 percent of contributions as lump sums while those in Hawaii, Maine and New York each reported about 1 percent of contributions as unitemized.

Unitemized contributions made up 1.8 percent of candidate contributions in the five states with a \$50 itemization threshold. Candidates in Arkansas and Pennsylvania reported more than 2 percent of contributions as unitemized. In Iowa, Oklahoma and Utah, unitemized contributions accounted for less than 1 percent of candidate contributions in each state.

As might be expected, the states with the lowest itemization thresholds had the smallest percentage of unitemized contributions. Candidates in the seven states with threshold of \$40 or less reported 0.9 percent of contributions as a lump sum. Wyoming candidates had just 0.1 percent unitemized contributions while their Montana counterparts listed 9.1 percent.

#### *How Big Are These Unitemized Contributions?*

Unitemized contributions, by their very nature, do not indicate the amount of the contributions being given or the number of contributors. A look at the averages behind the lump sums shows not only that unitemized contributions come in smaller amounts, but that they likely come from a smaller number of contributors.

In states with reporting thresholds of \$100, unitemized contributions totaled nearly \$26 million. If all of the contributions making up that total came in at \$100, that would amount to 259,635

---

<sup>2</sup> Figures for North Dakota exclude candidates for state legislature, who do not report contributions that fall below the \$200 threshold.

contributors giving at the threshold level. If the contributions were all \$50, that would amount to more than 519,271 contributions.

In those same states, candidates raised \$460 million in itemized contributions — money from individuals, businesses and special interests but excluding funds that candidates gave themselves or that political parties gave to candidates. A total of 807,372 contributions made up the \$460 million for an average contribution of about \$570, more than five times greater than the \$100 itemization threshold.

For states with thresholds from \$200 to \$300, unitemized contributions added up to nearly \$30 million. If all contributions came in at \$200, that would amount to 148,094 contributions; if all gave \$100, there would have been 296,190 contributions.

Candidates in states with those thresholds raised more than \$399 million in itemized contributions that did not include party or candidate self-finance contributions. A total of 557,129 contributions made up the total, for an average contribution of almost \$717 — more than twice the itemization threshold.

The table below details the amount candidates in each state reported as unitemized contributions. Alaska, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio and West Virginia are not included because they either do not allow unitemized contributions or only allow them on a very limited basis at fund-raisers or for sales of campaign merchandise.

#### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES, 2005-2006

STATE	ITEMIZATION THRESHOLD	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	PERCENT
Illinois	\$600 or less	\$7,238,201	\$136,725,290	5.3%
Tennessee	\$700 or less	\$1,173,665	\$21,224,859	5.5%
	<b>UP TO \$700</b>	<b>\$8,411,866</b>	<b>\$157,950,149</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
Colorado	\$359.82 or less	\$165,582	\$19,363,656	0.9%
Mississippi*	\$400 or less	\$609,810	\$3,896,830	15.6%
Nevada	\$400 or less	\$358,074	\$42,890,213	0.8%
Texas	\$400 or less	\$2,130,184	\$163,957,351	1.3%
	<b>UP TO \$400</b>	<b>\$3,263,650</b>	<b>\$230,108,050</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
California	Under \$200	\$4,090,131	\$319,370,928	1.3%
Georgia	Under \$202	\$4,134,366	\$80,702,125	5.1%
Indiana	\$200 or less	\$723,742	\$30,591,190	2.4%
Kansas	\$200 or less	\$371,723	\$18,473,728	2.0%
Minnesota	\$200 or less	\$8,519,803	\$24,692,449	34.5%
Nebraska	\$250 or less	\$3,668,291	\$12,026,618	30.5%
New Jersey*	\$300 or less	\$5,081,414	\$113,909,041	4.5%
North Dakota	\$200 or less**	\$563,245	\$2,480,702	22.7%
Rhode Island	\$200 or less	\$1,637,906	\$12,768,567	12.8%
South Dakota	\$200 or less	\$828,357	\$6,721,571	12.3%
	<b>UP TO \$300</b>	<b>\$29,618,978</b>	<b>\$621,736,919</b>	<b>4.8%</b>
Alabama	\$100 or less	\$1,288,216	\$88,871,184	1.4%
Delaware	\$100 or less	\$576,739	\$7,398,221	7.8%
Hawaii	\$100 or less	\$1,114,622	\$10,287,124	1.1%
Idaho	\$100 or less	\$356,176	\$8,930,290	4.0%

Kentucky*	\$100 or less	\$824,607	\$12,136,004	6.8%
Massachusetts	\$100 or less	\$8,602,323	\$87,061,332	9.9%
Maine	\$100 or less	\$101,793	\$9,210,783	1.1%
Missouri	\$100 or less	\$2,155,281	\$28,560,797	7.5%
North Carolina	\$100 or less***	\$1,778,091	\$39,377,264	4.5%
New York	\$99 or less	\$1,325,824	\$126,929,031	1.0%
Oregon	\$100 or less	\$2,020,836	\$41,621,833	4.9%
South Carolina	\$100 or less	\$983,655	\$33,733,678	2.9%
Virginia*	\$100 or less	\$4,045,660	\$86,581,768	4.7%
Vermont	\$100 or less	\$789,734	\$3,800,032	20.8%
<b>UP TO \$100</b>		<b>\$25,963,557</b>	<b>\$584,499,341</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
Arkansas	\$50 or less	\$492,425	\$23,717,841	2.1%
Iowa	\$50 or less	\$129,919	\$39,889,915	0.3%
Oklahoma	\$50 or less	\$327,056	\$38,329,708	0.9%
Pennsylvania	\$50 or less	\$3,062,152	\$113,502,517	2.7%
Utah	\$50 or less	\$58,117	\$6,359,497	0.9%
<b>UP TO \$50</b>		<b>\$4,069,670</b>	<b>\$221,799,478</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Arizona	\$25 or less	\$26,039	\$12,721,556	0.2%
Connecticut	\$30 or less	\$228,012	\$22,205,309	1.0%
Montana	\$35 or less	\$249,643	\$2,754,791	9.1%
New Hampshire	Under \$25	\$39,946	\$6,735,063	0.6%
Washington	\$25 or less	\$346,814	\$24,198,760	1.4%
Wisconsin	\$40 or less	\$59,970	\$29,883,080	0.2%
Wyoming	Under \$25	\$3,746	\$3,265,835	0.1%
<b>UP TO \$40</b>		<b>\$954,171</b>	<b>\$101,764,392</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$72,281,892</b>	<b>\$1,917,858,329</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

\*Elections were held in 2005. Kentucky held elections in 2005 and 2006.

\*\*State legislative candidates in North Dakota do not report money raised in aggregate amounts less than \$200. The figures in the table are only for statewide candidates, who report aggregate contributions of less than \$200 as a lump sum.

\*\*\*This only applies to contributions from North Carolina residents. Each contribution must be reported separately by amount and type (cash, check, etc.), but other identifying information does not have to be reported.

## TYPES OF CANDIDATES

### *Unitemized Contributions by Office Sought*

Legislative candidates reported the largest percentage of unitemized contributions among candidates for different offices but they accounted for less than 5 percent of contributions. House and assembly candidates had more unitemized contributions than did senate candidates: 5.2 percent compared with 4 percent.

Gubernatorial and lieutenant gubernatorial candidates listed slightly less than 3 percent of contributions as lump sums. Candidates for statewide office other than governor, such as attorney general and secretary of states, raised 3.4 percent of contributions from undisclosed donors.

Judicial candidates had the smallest percentage of unitemized contributions: 2.2 percent.

## UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS BY OFFICE SOUGHT, 2005-2006

OFFICE	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS*	PERCENT
Legislature**	\$41,024,839	\$860,476,150	4.8%
Other Statewide	\$7,900,650	\$235,336,071	3.4%
Governor/Lt. Governor	\$22,673,488	\$791,467,068	2.9%
Judicial	\$682,913	\$30,579,041	2.2%

\*Totals do not include contributions in states where unitemized contributions are not permitted or where they are allowed only for fund-raisers or merchandise sales.

\*\*Figures exclude North Dakota, where legislative candidates do not report money raised in contributions under \$200.

When sorted by office sought, candidates for every office listed a smaller percentage of unitemized contributions in 2006 than in 2004. Statewide candidates saw the biggest change: from 6.5 percent in 2004 to 3.4 percent in 2006. Legislative, gubernatorial and supreme court candidates' share of unitemized contributions all decreased by less than one percent.

### *Unitemized Contributions by Party Affiliation*

Democratic and Republican candidates reported almost the same percentage of itemized funds: 3.7 percent and 3.6 percent, respectively. Candidates not affiliated with either the Democratic or Republican Party reported nearly twice as much or more in unitemized contributions than those who were part of the two-party system.

Those seeking nonpartisan offices such as supreme court, board of education or Nebraska's unicameral Legislature listed more than 10 percent of contributions as unitemized, the largest of any party affiliation. Third-party candidates, including members of the Green and Libertarian Parties, had 8.7 percent in unitemized contributions and Independent candidates raised 6.6 percent of funds from lump sums. Independent and third-party campaigns tend to be more grassroots, which may account for the larger percentage of unitemized contributions to those candidates.

Democratic, Republican and Independent candidates had a smaller percentage of unitemized contributions in 2006 than in 2004, while third-party candidates and those running for nonpartisan offices reported more in lump sums. Democratic and Republican candidates' unitemized contributions decreased by more than one percent but Independent candidates' nonitemized donations dropped by more than half: from 14.3 percent in 2004 to 6.6 percent in 2006. Candidates for nonpartisan offices listed 1.7 percent more in unitemized contributions in 2006 than they did in 2004 while third-party candidates reported 0.2 percent more.

### *Unitemized Contributions by Win-Loss Status*

Candidates' win-loss status did not have a great influence on the percentage of unitemized contributions reported, which only varied within 1 percent of one another.

Incumbents who were not up for re-election listed 4.3 percent of contributions as lumps sums followed closely by candidates who lost in the general election, who had unitemized contributions accounting for 4.2 percent of donations. Winning candidates had the third lowest percentage of unitemized contributions, 3.6 percent, and primary losers did not disclose identifying information for 3.3 percent of contributions.

The percentage of unitemized contributions that went to general-election losers may have been slightly higher than those for other candidates up for election in 2006 because candidates outside of the two-party system often lose in the general election.

In 2006, winners, general-election and primary-election losers and incumbents who were not up for re-election all reported smaller percentages of unitemized contributions than did 2004 candidates. General-election losers listed 0.6 percent less in unitemized contributions, primary-election losers 1.2 percent less, winners 1.4 percent less and incumbents not up for re-election 2.7 percent less.

#### *Unitemized Contributions by Type of Candidate*

When sorted by candidate type — incumbent, challenger, etc. — challengers raised the largest share of unitemized contributions: 5.2 percent. Given that third-party and independent candidates raise a larger percentage of unitemized contributions, it follows that challengers also had the highest percentages of unitemized contributions since independent and third-party candidates are often challengers and challengers' campaigns are sometimes grassroots efforts.

Incumbents had the second-highest percentage of unitemized contributions at 3.7 percent, or \$41.8 million of the \$1.1 billion they raised. Candidates for open seats reported 3.1 percent in unitemized donations.

All candidate types reported a smaller share of unitemized contributions in 2006 than they did in 2004. Incumbents saw the largest drop: from 5.5 percent of contributions in 2004 to 3.7 percent in 2006. Candidates for open seats raised 0.6 percent less in unitemized donations in 2006 and challengers 0.3 percent less.

### **UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE PARTY COMMITTEES**

Democratic and Republican state party committees reported 3.8 percent of contributions in lump sum amounts — the same percentage that candidates reported. Unitemized contributions accounted for 28.8 percent of North Dakota party committees' total fund raising, the largest share of any state. Seventeen states listed unitemized contributions of less than 1 percent of contributions and in six states either the Democratic or Republican state party committee did not report any unitemized donations.

The percentage of unitemized contributions for party committees in 2006 was slightly higher than the 2004 share: 3.8 percent compared with 3.4 percent. State party committees had \$12 million that was not itemized in the 2006 election cycle while party committees reported lump sums amounts of nearly \$7.8 million of the more than \$231 million they raised in 2004.

As a group, the three states with the highest reporting thresholds and the six states with the lowest thresholds reported the smallest percentage of unitemized contributions: 0.9 percent and 0.7 percent, respectively. In the low-threshold group, one of the two state party committees itemized all receipts in three states. And in Arizona both party committees itemized nearly all receipts; the Arizona Republican Party received just \$9 in unitemized contributions.

Party committees in states with itemization thresholds from \$320 to \$400 had almost \$1.3 million in unitemized contributions, accounting for 3.7 percent of their total contributions. In Mississippi and Texas, party committees reported more than 15 percent of contributions as lump sums. The Indiana Democratic Party itemized all of its receipts, a factor contributing to the just 0.2 percent itemized contributions.

The eight states with thresholds in the \$200 or less range had the highest percentage of unitemized contributions at 6.1 percent. California and Kansas state party committees reported less than 1 percent of contributions as unitemized while the other states listed 6 percent to nearly 29 percent in itemized contributions. The Kansas Republican Party itemized all receipts while the Minnesota party committees are prohibited from itemizing receipts that fall under the itemization threshold.

States with thresholds of \$100 or less and \$50 or less had almost the same percentage of unitemized contributions: 1.6 percent and 1.3 percent, respectively. Among the \$100 threshold states, Oklahoma party committees reported the highest — 17.5 percent — and New York the lowest — just 0.005 percent. The New York Democratic Party itemized all its receipts. Unitemized contributions accounted for 0.02 percent to 3 percent of contributions for state party committees with \$50 thresholds.

The table below details the amount the Democratic and Republican state party committees in each state reported as unitemized contributions. Alaska, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio and West Virginia are not included because they either do not allow unitemized contributions or only allow them on a very limited basis at fund-raisers or for sales of campaign merchandise. Also, Nebraska party committees are not required to report aggregate contributions of less than \$250 in a calendar year.

#### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE PARTY COMMITTEES, 2005-2006

STATE	ITEMIZATION THRESHOLD	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	PERCENT
Illinois	\$600 or less	\$52,204	\$9,014,788	0.6%
New Jersey	\$600 or less	\$273,230	\$23,571,571	1.2%
Tennessee	\$1,000 or less	\$9,142	\$4,301,464	0.2%
	<b>UP TO \$1000</b>	<b>\$334,576</b>	<b>\$36,887,823</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
Colorado	\$319.84 or less	\$21,304	\$1,316,167	1.6%
Iowa	\$400 or less	\$43,684	\$12,867,336	0.3%
Indiana	\$400 or less	\$22,088	\$11,062,175	0.2%
Mississippi	\$400 or less	\$95,888	\$626,162	15.3%
Nevada	\$400 or less	\$143,424	\$2,804,476	5.1%
Texas	\$350 or less	\$957,301	\$5,668,748	16.9%
	<b>UP TO \$400</b>	<b>\$1,283,689</b>	<b>\$34,345,064</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
California	Under \$200	\$178,588	\$101,495,238	0.2%
Georgia	Under \$202	\$3,561,751	\$22,461,345	15.9%
Kansas	\$200 or less	\$3,214	\$2,069,658	0.2%
Maine	\$200 or less	\$225,780	\$3,754,521	6.0%
Minnesota	\$200 or less	\$4,497,290	\$19,746,166	22.8%
North Dakota	\$200 or less	\$742,191	\$2,574,849	28.8%
Rhode Island	\$200 or less	\$81,631	\$886,639	9.2%
South Dakota	\$200 or less	\$43,366	\$399,838	10.8%
	<b>UP TO \$202</b>	<b>\$9,333,811</b>	<b>\$153,388,254</b>	<b>6.1%</b>
Alabama	\$100 or less	\$15,126	\$6,544,091	0.2%
Delaware	\$100 or less	\$61,469	\$3,756,832	1.6%
Hawaii	\$100 or less	\$45,091	\$1,590,130	2.8%
Idaho	\$100 or less	\$3,651	\$790,595	0.5%
Kentucky	\$100 or less	\$2,194	\$1,276,228	0.2%

Massachusetts	\$100 or less	\$355,454	\$6,074,004	5.9%
Missouri	\$100 or less	\$26,254	\$8,746,468	0.3%
North Carolina	\$100 or less*	\$165,670	\$9,042,406	1.8%
New York	\$99 or less	\$600	\$12,066,816	0.005%
Oklahoma	\$100 or less	\$145,044	\$829,523	17.5%
Oregon	\$100 or less	\$15,379	\$1,744,772	0.9%
South Carolina	\$100 or less	\$19,462	\$2,015,489	1.0%
Virginia	\$100 or less	\$87,819	\$5,565,439	1.6%
Vermont	\$100 or less	\$23,533	\$228,438	10.3%
<b>UP TO \$100</b>		<b>\$966,746</b>	<b>\$60,271,231</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
Arkansas	\$50 or less	\$233,543	\$7,660,132	3.0%
Pennsylvania	\$50 or less	\$2,519	\$14,934,002	0.02%
Utah	\$50 or less	\$21,094	\$1,921,834	1.1%
Washington	\$50 or less	\$159,026	\$8,244,200	1.9%
<b>UP TO \$50</b>		<b>\$416,182</b>	<b>\$32,760,168</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
Arizona	\$25 or less	\$9	\$7,229,616	0%
Connecticut	\$30 or less	\$59,353	\$1,538,432	3.9%
Montana	\$35 or less	\$20,663	\$889,244	2.3%
<b>New</b>				
Hampshire	Under \$5	\$2,549	\$1,256,147	0.2%
Wisconsin	\$40 or less	\$3,269	\$1,144,941	0.3%
Wyoming	Under \$25	\$735	\$972,524	0.08%
<b>UP TO \$40</b>		<b>\$86,578</b>	<b>\$13,030,904</b>	<b>0.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$12,421,582</b>	<b>\$330,683,444</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

\*This only applies to contributions from North Carolina residents. Each contribution must be reported separately by amount and type (cash, check, etc.), but other identifying information does not have to be reported.

#### *Unitemized Contributions by Party Affiliation*

Republican state party committees reported a larger percentage of unitemized contributions than did their Democratic counterparts: 4.9 percent compared with 2.7 percent. Of the \$163.8 million collected by Republican committees, nearly \$8 million was reported in lump sums. Democratic committees raised \$166.9 million and did not itemize \$4.5 million. State Democratic parties in four states — that raised \$18 million — itemized all receipts, while only two Republican state party committees — which collected \$1.45 million — listed all contributors.

#### **UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO BALLOT MEASURE COMMITTEES**

Ballot measure committees reported less in unitemized contributions than candidate and state party committees. The almost \$5 million in unitemized donations was 0.5 percent of the more than \$1 billion raised by ballot committees in 2005 and 2006. Unitemized contributions reported by ballot measure committees in 2006 were also lower than the 1 percent reported in the 2004 election cycle.

Kansas ballot measure committees listed 13.8 percent of contributions as lump sums, the most in any state. The Kansas committees were raising money around a 2005 constitutional amendment to ban same-sex marriage. Fourteen of the 27 states that allow unitemized contributions and had

measures on the 2005 or 2006 ballot raised less than 1 percent in unitemized donations. Ballot measure committees are often funded by a small number of donors who give large contributions.<sup>3</sup>

#### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO BALLOT MEASURE COMMITTEES, 2005-2006<sup>4</sup>

STATE	REPORTING THRESHOLD	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	PERCENT
Colorado	\$319.84 or less	\$559,618	\$27,824,310	2.0%
Nebraska	\$250 or less	\$82,991	\$6,003,722	1.4%
Nevada	\$400 or less	\$50,713	\$9,427,235	0.5%
Tennessee	\$600 or less	\$46,838	\$458,094	10.2%
Texas	\$150-\$300 or less*	\$52,790	\$2,420,851	2.2%
<b>UP TO \$600</b>		<b>\$792,950</b>	<b>\$46,134,212</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
California	Under \$200	\$1,228,255	\$768,532,971	0.2%
Georgia	Under \$202	\$0	\$15,874	0%
Kansas	\$150 or less	\$35,855	\$259,247	13.8%
Minnesota	\$200 or less	\$207,773	\$6,433,295	3.2%
North Dakota	\$200 or less	\$3,398	\$54,189	6.3%
Rhode Island	\$200 or less	\$137,685	\$23,312,791	0.6%
South Dakota	\$200 or less	\$1,226,884	\$12,878,394	9.5%
<b>UP TO \$202</b>		<b>\$2,839,850</b>	<b>\$811,486,761</b>	<b>0.3%</b>
Idaho	\$100 or less	\$13,714	\$4,103,034	0.3%
Maine	\$100 or less	\$213,140	\$4,373,956	4.9%
Massachusetts	\$100 or less	\$4,272	\$15,786,105	.03%
Missouri	\$100 or less	\$54,814	\$51,919,474	0.1%
New York	\$99 or less	\$17	\$3,794,103	0.0%
Oklahoma	\$100 or less	\$0	\$2,259,042	0.0%
Oregon	\$100 or less	\$699,943	\$18,353,324	3.8%
South Carolina	\$100 or less	\$22,229	\$478,972	4.6%
Virginia	\$100 or less	\$162,874	\$1,958,747	8.3%
<b>UP TO \$100</b>		<b>\$1,171,003</b>	<b>\$103,026,757</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
Arkansas	\$50 or less	\$275	\$12,916	2.1%
<b>UP TO \$50</b>		<b>\$275</b>	<b>\$12,916</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
Arizona	\$25 or less	\$76,261	\$32,475,103	0.2%
Montana	\$35 or less	\$2,044	\$363,108	0.6%
New Hampshire	Under \$25	\$539	\$46,101	0.2%
Washington	\$25 or less	\$107,396	\$32,645,029	0.3%
Wisconsin	\$40 or less	\$6,197	\$4,996,381	0.1%
<b>UP TO \$40</b>		<b>\$192,437</b>	<b>\$70,525,722</b>	<b>0.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$4,996,515</b>	<b>\$1,031,186,368</b>	<b>0.5%</b>

\*Ballot initiative committees in Texas file reports based on their fund-raising activity. In 2005 and 2006, most committees filed three to six reports.

<sup>3</sup> National Institute on Money in State Politics, "2006 Ballot Measure Overview," Nov. 5, 2007, available from <http://www.followthemoney.org/press/ReportView.phtml?r=346>.

<sup>4</sup> States where unitemized contributions are not allowed or where they are only permitted on a very limited basis are excluded as are states without ballot measures or where the Institute did not identify any ballot measure committees.

## UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS IN 2007

### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Candidates in five states that held elections in 2007<sup>5</sup> reported 4.9 percent of contributions as unitemized donations, 1.1 percent more than candidates elected in 2005 and 2006. The three states with itemization thresholds of \$100 or higher had a much larger share of unitemized contributions than the two states with thresholds of \$50 or less: 13.2 percent compared with 0.3 percent.

New Jersey candidates listed 4 percent more in unitemized contributions in 2007, when the governor was not up for election, than they did in 2005, when that office was elected. When just contributions to legislative candidates are examined, however, those candidates raised 15.7 percent of contributions in lump sums in 2005 but just 9.6 percent in 2007.

Candidates in both Kentucky and Virginia raised smaller percentages of unitemized contributions in 2007 than in 2005. With the governor and legislative races on the Virginia 2005 ballot, candidates reported 4.7 percent in unitemized contributions, 0.8 percent more than they listed in 2007, when there were only legislative races. Kentucky's governor and constitutional officers who held office in 2005 but were not up for re-election collected 3.7 percent more in unitemized contributions than did candidates for those same offices in 2007.

In 2007, Pennsylvania court candidates raised 0.2 percent<sup>6</sup> of contributions as lump sums compared with 0.03 percent for 2005 candidates. Wisconsin Supreme Court and Superintendent of Public Instruction candidates raised 0.2 percent in unitemized donations in 2005. Lump sum contributions accounted for 0.6 percent of contributions to Supreme Court candidates and to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (who was not up for re-election) in 2007.

### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES, 2007

STATE	ITEMIZATION THRESHOLD	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	PERCENT
New Jersey	\$300 or less	\$4,258,451	\$45,005,006	9.5%
	<b>UP TO \$300</b>	<b>\$4,258,451</b>	<b>\$45,005,006</b>	<b>9.5%</b>
Kentucky	\$100 or less	\$1,289,500	\$41,772,108	3.1%
Virginia	\$100 or less	\$2,515,604	\$64,126,161	3.9%
	<b>UP TO \$100</b>	<b>\$3,805,104</b>	<b>\$105,898,269</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Pennsylvania*	\$50 or less	\$29,284	\$13,442,490	0.2%
Wisconsin	\$40 or less	\$15,836	\$2,676,414	0.6%
	<b>UP TO \$50</b>	<b>\$45,120</b>	<b>\$16,118,904</b>	<b>0.3%</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$8,108,675</b>	<b>\$167,022,179</b>	<b>4.9%</b>

\*Judicial races only.

Among states with 2007 elections, legislative candidates raised the largest percentage of unitemized contributions, 6.3 percent, followed closely by candidates for statewide constitutional offices, 6.1 percent. Gubernatorial and lieutenant gubernatorial candidates' share of unitemized

<sup>5</sup> Mississippi also held 2007 elections but the Institute has not completed collection of campaign-finance data for candidates as of this writing.

<sup>6</sup> In 2007, the Institute collected campaign-finance data for Court of Appeals candidates as well as Supreme Court candidates. Court of Appeals candidates' campaign finances were not collected in 2005.

contributions was 2.6 percent and judicial candidates raised only 0.3 percent of contributions in lump sums.

#### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS BY OFFICE SOUGHT, 2007

OFFICE	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	PERCENT
Legislature	\$6,774,054	\$108,369,917	6.3%
Other Statewide	\$296,774	\$4,842,228	6.1%
Governor/Lt. Governor	\$992,726	\$37,687,171	2.6%
Judicial	\$45,120	\$16,122,861	0.3%

#### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO BALLOT MEASURE COMMITTEES

In five states where money was raised around 2007 ballot measures,<sup>7</sup> committees organized to support or oppose the measures reported 1 percent of contributions as unitemized donations. The percentage of unitemized contributions received by 2007 ballot measure committees is twice the share reported by 2005 and 2006 ballot measure committees.

Oregon ballot measure committees listed 2.5 percent of contributions as nonitemized lump sums, the most in any state with 2007 ballot measures. Utah and Washington ballot committees, which had a lower itemization threshold than Oregon's, reported less than 1 percent of contributions as unitemized. Committees in Texas and Maine did not report any unitemized contributions.

#### UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS TO BALLOT MEASURE COMMITTEES, 2007

STATE	ITEMIZATION THRESHOLD	UNITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	PERCENT
Texas	\$150-\$300 or less*	\$0	\$2,739,981	0%
	<b>UP TO \$300</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,739,981</b>	<b>0%</b>
Maine	\$100 or less	\$0	\$1,320,341	0%
Oregon	\$100 or less	\$535,555	\$21,113,850	2.5%
	<b>UP TO \$100</b>	<b>\$535,555</b>	<b>\$22,434,191</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
Utah	\$50 or less	\$6,522	\$8,917,452	0.07%
Washington	\$25 or less	\$21,652	\$21,000,031	0.1%
	<b>UP TO \$50</b>	<b>\$28,174</b>	<b>\$29,917,483</b>	<b>0.09%</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$563,729</b>	<b>\$55,091,655</b>	<b>1.0%</b>

\*Ballot initiative committees in Texas file reports based on their fund-raising activity. In 2005 and 2006, most committees filed three to six reports.

<sup>7</sup>An Alaska ballot measure is excluded because the state only allows unitemized contributions on a limited basis.