

Money in Oregon Politics: History, Trends, and Reform



Janice Thompson
April 2009



Democracy Reform Oregon

P.O. Box 2723, Portland, OR 97208-2723
503/283-1922 * 503/283-1877(fax)
office@democracyreform.org
www.democracyreform.org

Accessible politics, accountable government

Democracy Reform Oregon is a non-partisan, not-for-profit group working to increase accountability and opportunities for participation in politics and governmental decision-making. Democracy Reform Oregon has been working on democracy reform issues since 1999 and was formerly the Money in Politics Research Action Project.

Table of Contents

Page 1	Key Findings
Page 1	Purpose
Page 2	Fundraising Increasing
Page 3	Learning from 1996 Elections Under Measure 9
Page 4	Size Analysis – Big Contributions Overshadow Small Donations
Page 6	How Many Contributors?
Page 7	Who is Giving? Sector Analysis
Page 8	Not All PACs Are Created Equal
Page 9	Double Giving to Leadership PACs
Page 12	Hedged Bets, Wait and See, and “Oops, the Other Guy Won” Contributions
Page 12	Top Legislative Fundraising
Page 15	Top Fundraiser Typically Wins
Page 16	Competition Analysis
Page 17	Who is Giving in Major Contested Races?
Page 22	Who is Giving to the Major Donors to Legislative Candidates?

Appendix 1 – Size of Contributions Analysis – Additional Tables

Appendix 2 – Double Giving to Leadership PACs – Additional Tables

Appendix 3 – Campaign Contributions About Access, Not Agreement: Analysis of November Post-Election Campaign Contributions and Hedged Bets in Oregon’s 2006 Legislative Elections

Appendix 4 – Competition Analysis – Additional Tables

Thanks to Charles Buttermore for technical and graphic design assistance

Money in Oregon Politics: History, Trends, and Reform

KEY FINDINGS

- Fundraising totals continue to climb at a rate higher than inflation, a trend that is likely to intimidate potential candidates.
- Large contributions dominate fundraising, a trend that undermines public trust. For example, a four-election cycle analysis of legislative contributions shows that 71 percent of general election fundraising came in contributions of \$1,001 or more.
- Large contributions that comprise large percentages of total fundraising undermine public confidence and raise the possibility of perceived corruption. For example, a member of the House received one contribution that comprised 53 percent of total fundraising.
- Donations of \$100 or less are overshadowed by big contributions.
- The number of Oregonians who contribute to candidates in state races is estimated to be no more than 0.8 percent of the almost 2.8 million eligible voters in our state.
- The role of leadership PACs in legislative fundraising is increasing and contributes to the need for pass through restrictions
- Not all PACs are created equal and encouragement of fundraising targeted to small donors and provisions to encourage volunteer campaign activity is appropriate
- “Double giving” donations to leadership PACs of both parties account for 30 percent of total fundraising by these four groups from 2000 through 2008. This indicates that a significant number of donors make contributions that appear more about ensuring access than ideological commitment.
- The top fundraiser typically wins and money in politics is one element in uncompetitive elections. For example, the top fundraiser in 2008 legislative general races won 92 percent of the elections.

PURPOSE

Oregon is one of only four states without limits on the size or source of campaign contributions to candidates. Conventional wisdom is that elected officials won't take action on campaign finance reform. The New Mexico legislature, however, adopted contribution limits during its 2009 session that adjourned in early April. This leaves Oregon, Utah, Virginia, and Illinois as the only states without any contribution limits.

The contribution limits legislation in New Mexico was one bill in a wave of ethics reforms adopted in 2008 and 2009 after numerous political scandals including a former Senate President Pro Tem pleading guilty to a federal corruption charge. The reform debate in Illinois has also been accelerated due to the indictment of former Governor Rod Blagojevich on corruption charges and his subsequent impeachment. A link between scandal and taking reform steps is typical and critical press coverage played a role in Oregon legislative action resulting in electronic campaign finance reporting with online public access and a major overhaul of ethics law including stronger gift limits. Oregonians should be pleased that the scale of scandal in our state is not at the level seen elsewhere. However, this does not mean that campaign finance

reform isn't needed here and Democracy Reform Oregon calls on the legislature to get ahead of the curve and take action without the prod of a scandal. Proactive action will enhance public trust in politics and government.

This report provides an overview of money in politics data to inform legislative debate on campaign finance reform in Oregon. Indeed, this data shaped Democracy Reform Oregon's development of HB 3009, in particular that bill's inclusion of pass-through restrictions as well as provisions to encourage volunteer and small donor participation in electoral contests.

This overview, and its more detailed appendices, indicates that both contributors and candidates are stuck in a broken system illustrating the need for comprehensive campaign finance reform. In our state this means both contribution limits and public financing reform that empowers small donors such as the recently introduced Fair Elections Now Act introduced with bipartisan co-sponsorship in the U.S. Congress. A past co-sponsor of the Senate bill is President Obama. In seven states public financing programs have been adopted for legislative or certain statewide offices. The Connecticut legislature passed the Citizens' Election Act that went into effect for the 2008 elections with high levels of participation resulting in 80 percent of its General Assembly elected using this reform option. The Voter-Owned Election program in Portland added diversity to the city hall with Commissioner Amanda Fritz becoming only the seventh woman to serve on the City Council.

In Oregon the first step is adoption of a contribution limits package that, pending voter approval of an enabling constitutional amendment, is designed to withstand federal legal challenges.

Money in politics data included in this report illustrates fundraising trends from early this decade through the 2008 elections. Contributions to ballot measures are not discussed and HB 3009 focuses on candidate campaigns because federal courts have consistently rejected limits on contributions to the initiative process. This analysis focuses on legislative fundraising because the consistent number of races in each election cycle provides greater opportunities to identify contribution patterns. Some analysis 2006 gubernatorial races and 2008 statewide contests, however, is provided and contributions to some local races are also discussed.

Not included in this report is analysis of how campaign contributions may affect legislative actions or executive decisions. This aspect of the role of money in politics is often found in media coverage. Its exclusion in this report is a reflection that quid pro quo politics are less a concern in Oregon compared to other states. Oregonians should be pleased that this is the case but not rest on their laurels and think that campaign contributions have no influence. As a legislator said in a 2003 legislative hearing in support of a contribution limits bill, "I won't insult your intelligence by claiming that votes are bought or sold, but don't insult my intelligence by saying that money has no influence in policy making." A former elected official has linked money in politics to legislative gridlock and lack of innovation in policy decisions.

FUNDRAISING INCREASING

Gubernatorial fundraising records were set in both 2002 and 2006 with all indications that this trend will continue with the 2010 open seat contest. Legislative fundraising provides a better opportunity, however, to see the upward trend in fundraising through the last nine election

cycles. (See table 1.) This increase in fundraising over time is almost three times more than the rate of inflation over the last eighteen years.

From 1992 through the 2008 total primary and general election fundraising has almost doubled with an increase from \$11.5 million to \$20.3 million in inflation-adjusted dollars. The only election years that fundraising levels didn't increase were 1996 and 2004. The dip in 2004 fundraising is only evident when reviewing inflation adjusted data (see second row in table 1) and has been attributed to fundraising demands related to the competitive nature of that year's presidential race in Oregon. The more significant fundraising decline in 1996 occurred due to the contribution limits imposed by Measure 9 adopted by voters in 1994 as will be discussed in the next section.

Table 1- Fundraising Totals - Oregon Legislative Fundraising - 1992-2008

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008**
Total Legislative Fundraising - Primary and General Elections (in millions of dollars)	\$8.2	\$11.0	\$3.4 \$2.6* \$6.0	\$12.4	\$16.0	\$16.9	\$17.4	\$20.1	\$20.3
Inflation adjusted figures	\$11.5	\$15.0	\$4.4 \$3.3 \$7.7	\$15.4	\$18.7	\$18.9	\$18.3	\$20.1	\$20.3

**The 1996 elections occurred with contribution limits that increased Independent expenditures and other avoidance techniques and added \$2.6 million dollars to overall campaign spending during that election. This level of independent expenditures was not seen before or after the 1996 election.*
 **2008 figures reflect fundraising through the November general election while other years as retrieved from ORESTAR while figures from other years are from the six reports, three filed for the primary and three for the general election, with the final general election report including dollars raised after election day.

LEARNING FROM 1996 ELECTIONS UNDER MEASURE 9

The 1996 elections occurred under the contribution limits imposed by Measure 9 enacted by voters in 1994. Contributions per election from individuals and political committees were limited to \$100 to legislative candidates and \$500 to statewide candidates. There was a \$1,000 annual limit on individual contributions to political party committees. Party committees could give \$5,000 to legislative candidates, \$25,000 to gubernatorial candidates, and \$10,000 to other statewide candidates per election. Pass-through contributions between candidate committees were banned, as were contributions from union or corporate treasury dollars.

These limits were overturned by the Oregon Supreme Court in February of 1997. This means that enacting contribution limits in our state requires an enabling constitutional amendment. Measure 47, adopted by voters in 2006, is in Oregon statute but not considered enforceable because its enabling amendment, Measure 46, did not pass.

As show above in table 1, data from the 1996 election indicates that independent expenditures will increase when limits are placed on what can be given directly to candidates. Independent expenditures are understandably frustrating to candidates who lose control over their campaign messages and to political players who would rather coordinate their activities with candidates.

A few independent expenditures occurred in our state before and after the 1996 elections. For example, political consultant Gregg Clapper formed a political committee with contributions from Loren Parks to run advertising against Craig Berkman in the 1996 Republican gubernatorial

primary linked to Berkman's position on Measure 5 cutting property taxes. The Clapper-Parks team also ran independent expenditures targeting Rob Saxton in Republican gubernatorial primaries in 2002 and 2006. The accuracy and independence of these ads were criticized in the press. Another example of an independent expenditure is a mailing regarding a 2000 judicial race sent by the Oregon League of Conservation Voters. This example illustrates an independent message from group likely to be a valued messenger to the targeted set of voters.

Regardless of one's views on whether independent expenditures detract or contribute to political discourse they have been found constitutional under the federal First Amendment. Bans on use of corporate and union treasury dollars for independent ads, however, have been upheld and such a ban is in HB 3009.

During the 1996 elections there were also some issue ads that didn't include so-called "magic words" such as "vote for" or "oppose" and, therefore, the source and amount of money spent on their production and distribution was not reported. This set the stage for a lawsuit that resulted in Oregon expanding its definition of independent expenditure so that there is, in effect, no distinction between issue ads and independent expenditures or need for reliance on the "magic words" test. Instead, a "reasonable person" test applies, which means that if the independent expenditure looks like a campaign ad, then that it is how it is treated in terms of reporting the amount and source of its financial support.

One legal "red flag" in Measure 47 was the imposition of limits on some independent expenditures that would have increased the likelihood of a successful challenge in federal court. One goal of HB 3009 is to be within the paradigm of what is considered legal under the federal First Amendment that, after all, still applies even if the Oregon Constitution is amended to enable contribution limits.

House Bill 3009 addresses independent expenditures by ensuring that all independent expenditures are promptly accessible to the public online in ORESTAR. Reporting within seven days is required with one day reporting during the six weeks before each election.

House Bill 3009 does not attempt to regulate or influence self-financing, another legal "red flag" found in Measure 47. There is some indication that self-financing played a greater role in some campaigns during 1996 but not to a significant extent. Self-financing does occur in Oregon politics but not at a level seen elsewhere with millionaires such as Michael Bloomberg and Jon Corzine covering their own campaign costs. Indeed analysis by political scientist Jennifer Steen writes that "self-financed candidates have a spectacularly unimpressive batting average: the vast majority of candidates who rely on personal funds to pay for congressional campaigns strike out at the polls" in her book, *Money Isn't Everything: Self-Financed Candidates in Congressional Elections*.

SIZE ANALYSIS – BIG CONTRIBUTIONS OVERSHADOW SMALL DONATIONS

As a percentage of total fundraising, contributions of \$100 or less have little impact and are overshadowed by the role of contributions that are greater than \$1,000. Analysis of the size of legislative contributions in primary and general elections from 2002 through 2008 are summarized in tables 2 and 3 below with more detailed information provided in Appendix 1.

Tables 4 and 5 summarize contribution size data for the 2006 gubernatorial elections and for statewide contests during 2008; additional information for those races is also in Appendix 1. These tables summarize per election contributions and each size category may include contributions to different candidates from the same donor. Before the 2006 election cycle small contributions that could be reported as an aggregate without an itemized listing of each contributor were \$50 or less. The threshold for itemized reporting increased to \$100 as reflected below for data from the 2006 and 2008 elections.

The level of domination of fundraising by large contributions is much greater in general elections compared to primary contests. Presumably this is because “the race” is the general election and many big money political players don’t get involved in primary races. The 2002-2008 average of legislative contributions of \$1,001 and higher comprises 50 percent of total fundraising during primary elections but increases to 70.8 percent of total contributions during general elections.

Table 2 - Primary Election Legislative Contributions By Size – 2002 through 2008

Contribution size categories	% of total contributions by size categories				
	2002	2004	2006	2008	2002-2008 Average
\$1,001 and up	49.4%	43.9%	52.8%	52.4%	50.0%
\$501-\$1,000	16.7%	19.9%	14.6%	19.3%	17.6%
\$251-500	13.2%	15.6%	12.7%	13.4%	13.6%
\$101-250	7.4%	7.9%	6.6%	5.9%	6.9%
\$51-\$100	6.6%	7.2%	\$100 or less		
\$50 or less	6.7%	4.5%	13.3%	9.0%	11.9%
Primary total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3 - General Election Legislative Contributions By Size – 2002 through 2008

Contribution size categories	% of total contributions by size categories				
	2002	2004	2006	2008	2002-2008 Average
\$1,001 and up	68.7%	70.5%	71.7%	71.9%	70.8%
\$501-\$1,000	11.3%	10.9%	11.2%	13.4%	11.7%
\$251-500	10.6%	10.1%	9.3%	8.8%	9.7%
\$101-250	4.7%	4.4%	3.5%	2.9%	3.8%
\$51-\$100	2.4%	2.2%	\$100 or less		\$100 or less
\$50 or less	2.2%	1.9%	4.1%	3.0%	3.9%
Primary total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gubernatorial fundraising in 2006 was even more dominated by large contributions with 83.7 percent of primary contributions comprised of donations that came in amounts of \$1,001 and more. During the general election the domination of total fundraising by these contributions of more than \$1,000 increased to comprise 89.7 percent.

Contributions of \$1,001 and up also dominated fundraising in statewide races during 2008 representing 61.1 percent of total contributions in the primary and 76.5 percent of fundraising in the general election.

Table 4 - Primary Election Statewide Contributions By Size – 2006 and 2008

Contribution size categories	% of total contributions by size categories	
	2006 Gubernatorial	2008 Secretary of State, Attorney General, Treasurer, Labor Commissioner
\$1,001 and up	83.7%	61.1%
\$501-\$1,000	6.3%	13.2%
\$251-500	3.9%	10.8%
\$101-250	2.0%	7.6%
\$100 or less	4.1%	7.3%
Primary total	100%	100%

Table 5 – General Election Statewide Contributions By Size – 2006 and 2008

Contribution size categories	% of total contributions by size categories	
	2006 Gubernatorial	2008 Secretary of State, Attorney General, Treasurer, Labor Commissioner
\$1,001 and up	89.7%	76.5%
\$501-\$1,000	3.7%	9.8%
\$251-500	2.2%	6.4%
\$101-250	1.6%	4.1%
\$100 or less	2.8%	3.1%
Primary total	100%	100%

The extent of fundraising arriving as small dollar donations is overshadowed by the large contributions, especially during general elections. Relatively speaking, contributions of \$100 or less (or \$50 or less in 2002 and 2004) comprise a larger component of primary fundraising but far more money is still being raised in larger dollar contributions even in those May contests.

This pattern indicates that large contributions dominate fundraising, a troubling trend in terms of public confidence in the independence of elected officials. This speaks to the value of contribution limits in putting the brakes on these large contributions.

HOW MANY CONTRIBUTORS?

During the 2008 primary an estimated 22,000 donors gave to statewide and legislative candidates. Only an estimate can be provided because small contributions of \$100 or less are not itemized and the number of small dollar donors is estimated by dividing total fundraising in this category by an assumed average contribution of \$50. Many of these donors are not individuals since unions, businesses, trade groups, and a wide range of political committees give to candidates and are typically the source of the largest contributions. However, assuming that each of these 22,000 contributors were actually people they would represent only 0.8 percent of the 2,796,210 that is the voting eligible population of Oregon.

During the 2008 general elections of statewide and legislative candidates the estimated donors declined to only 13,000. Since more money went to these candidates this means that donors were giving larger contributions during the general election, a trend documented above in the size of contributions analysis. The estimation method is as outlined above and assuming that these 13,000 donors were individuals their percentage of Oregon's voting eligible population of 2,796,210 declines to 0.5 percent.

If anything these estimates of numbers of contributors are high because some donors give to candidates during both the primary and general election. These figures, though, do not include estimated numbers of contributors to political committees that, in turn, give to candidates. But even if these estimates were tripled they still represent a tiny portion of Oregon’s population of potential voters.

To increase the clout of contributors who can only afford small donations HB 3009 includes a small donor committee option. HB 3009 also increases the limits for in-kind contributions with the goal of encouraging contributions to candidates involving volunteer engagement such as door knocking. Following procedures already in place in regard to reporting of in-kind contributions, the volunteer time itself is not factored into contribution limits, but what would be limited, though at a higher level, is group’s staff and overhead involved in organizing such volunteer efforts.

WHO IS GIVING? SECTOR ANALYSIS

Table 6 breaks down legislative fundraising by different sectors based on analysis protocols developed by the Center for Responsive Politics and Institute for Money in State Politics. Assigning an economic or ideological interest to each contribution is based on job and employer data provided by individual contributors and analysis of contributions by businesses, associations, unions, and other groups based on standard industrial codes.

Table 6- Oregon Legislative Fundraising Sector Analysis - 1992-2006

		1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	1992-2006**
Sector* Analysis as %s of total primary and general contributions	Business	54%	56%	45%	55%	48%	52%	49%	49%	51%
	Ideology	3%	3%	1%	2%	2%	4%	5%	5%	3%
	Labor	12%	15%	3%	12%	11%	11%	12%	11%	11%
	Other/ Unknown	19%	11%	31%	11%	10%	10%	9%	11%	14%
	Party	12%	15%	20%	20%	29%	23%	26%	25%	21%
*Sector Breakdowns Business - agriculture and related industries; communication and electronics; construction; FIRE = finance, insurance, and real estate; health; lawyers and lobbyists; transportation; resource industries Ideology - Groups focused on single issue - includes gun control, abortion rights, environmental interests Labor - Unions Other/Unknown - other includes non-business interests such as clergy, military, retirees; unknown includes small contributions of \$50 or less (\$100 or less in 2006) that aren't itemized and contributors whose economic interests couldn't be identified Party - Leadership PACs, candidate committees, and candidate self-financing **Coding of each contribution to conduct this analysis is very labor intensive and will not be done for 2008 due to resource constraints.										

Though there are several labor unions that contribute extensively to Oregon candidates as a percentage of total fundraising their dollars are overshadowed by contributions linked to a business-related economic interest. All union money ultimately comes from individual members while contributions in the business sector are a combination of money from individuals, trade associations and other business groups, political committees affiliated with a business or trade group, and direct contributions from a business.

Labor contributions as a percentage of total fundraising also declined disproportionately in the 1996 elections that occurred under Measure 9 contribution limits. The other/unknown sector in 1996 also increased since contributions of \$50 or less (that are not itemized with the job and employer information needed to identify an economic or social interest) represented a greater

percentage of total fundraising. In absolute numbers, however, the 1996 races did not involve more contributors than earlier elections.

Another trend seen in Table 6 is an increase over time in contributions from the party sector that is primarily due to an increase in pass through contributions to legislative candidates from the candidate committees of fellow candidates, particularly incumbents in noncompetitive races, as well as contributions from leadership PACs. These trends indicate the need for pass through restrictions in a contribution limits proposal. While Measure 47 banned all pass through contributions between political committees, HB 3009 takes a more legally defensible approach of limiting pass through contributions between candidate PACs and other political committees.

NOT ALL PACS ARE CREATED EQUAL

Political committees, often called PACs, are sometimes targeted as having negative or inappropriate influences on campaign fundraising. Democracy Reform Oregon does not share this view and sees PACs as a demonstration of freedom of association and people with common interests adding contributions together to increase their clout.

At the same time it is important to realize that not all PACs are alike. As Table 7 outlines there are three main categories of PACs.

At one end of the PAC spectrum are small donor PACs that get essentially all their contributions from individuals giving small contributions of \$100 or less. Two major examples are Oregon Right To Life PAC and Oregon Education Association’s People for Improvement of Education PAC.

At the other end of the spectrum are large donor PACs that raise significant amounts of money from relatively few individuals. The example in Table 7 is the Oregon Forest Industries Council that raised \$384,350 from 40 individuals in average contributions greater than \$8,000.

The Oregon Realtors Association is an example of a mixed size of donation PAC in the middle of the spectrum between small and large donor political committees.

Especially given how few Oregonians participate as illustrated in the How Many Contributors? discussion on page 6, HB 3009 seeks to facilitate affordable campaign contributions of \$100 or less by allowing for small donor PACs.

Table 7 - Examples of Three Main Categories of PACs

PAC	Fundraising Totals -2006 primary and general election	Primary Election		General Election	
		Number of Contributors to PAC	Average Contribution to PAC	Number of Contributors to PAC	Average Contribution to PAC
Oregon Education Association - People for Improvement of Education "small donor PAC"	\$541,397 primary - \$359,669 (98.3 percent from donors giving \$100 or less.) general - \$181,728 (99.9 percent from donors giving \$100 or less.)	7085 (estimate)	\$50.76 (estimate)	3632 (estimate)	\$50.04 (estimate)

PAC	Fundraising Totals -2006 primary and general election	Primary Election		General Election	
		Number of Contributors to PAC	Average Contribution to PAC	Number of Contributors to PAC	Average Contribution to PAC
Oregon Right to Life PAC "small donor PAC"	\$1,062,193 primary - \$454,771 (98.3 percent from donors giving \$100 or less.) general - \$607,422 (9.7 percent from donors giving \$100 or less*.)	8950 (estimate)	\$50.81 (estimate)	1194 (estimate)	\$508.61 (estimate)
Oregon Association of Realtors Political Action Committee "mixed size of donation PAC"	\$385,266 primary - \$254,324 (82 percent from donors giving \$100 or less) general - \$130,943 (42 percent from donors giving \$100 or less)	4235 (estimate)	\$60.06 (estimate)	1142 (estimate)	\$114.64 (estimate)
Oregon Forest Industries Council Represents major timber owners - total of 40 contributors "large donor PAC"	\$384,350 primary - \$304,350 (0 percent from donors giving \$100 or less) general - \$80,000 (0 percent from donors giving \$100 or less)	36	\$8,454	9 (only 4 new donors - 5 donors also gave in primary)	\$8,889

*Historically, Oregon Right to Life PAC raises 90+ percent of total from small-dollar donors; in 2006, it was active in a ballot measure campaign in the general election and received several large contributions. Estimates of the number of contributors and average contribution assume that non-itemized contributions of \$100 or less are \$50.

DOUBLE GIVING TO LEADERSHIP PACS

“Double giver” contributors that give to both Republican and Democratic leadership committees account for almost one of every three dollars given to these caucus PACs between 2000 and 2008. This indicates that a significant number of campaign donors are making contributions to ensure access to both sides of the political aisle in Salem and not due to ideological commitment to any one political party. This trend along with the increased role of leadership PACs described above regarding Table 6 and contributes to the rationale behind pass through restrictions in HB 3009.

Each of the legislative caucuses has a political committee, typically called a PAC, that works to elect a majority of their party’s candidates to either the Oregon House or Senate. The Senate leadership committees are the Senate Democratic Leadership Fund and The Leadership Fund that supports Republican candidates. Promote Oregon Leadership supports Republican candidates to the Oregon House while Future PAC, House Builders works to elect Democrats. Prior to the 2008 election season, the Republican House leadership committee was called Majority PAC.

From 2000 through 2008, four Oregon Republican and Democratic political leadership PACs raised nearly \$21 million. Many assume that contributions to political parties are for the purpose of supporting an ideological platform and spreading those respective ideas to gain momentum among voters. (See table 8.)

Table 8 - Leadership PAC Contribution Totals- 2000 through 2008

	PAC	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	Total
Dem	Senate Democratic Leadership Fund	\$824,130	\$970,871	\$1,576,895	\$749,717	\$625,351	\$12,747,348
	Future PAC, House Builders	\$926,769	\$1,190,840	\$1,384,535	\$1,752,944	\$2,745,296	
Rep	The Leadership Fund	\$661,448	\$734,709	\$852,201	\$851,570	\$547,949	\$8,992,742
	Majority 2000-2006/Promote Oregon Leadership PAC	\$808,375	\$969,129	\$1,002,514	\$1,220,159	\$1,344,687	
	Total	\$3,220,723	\$3,865,548	\$4,816,146	\$4,574,390	\$5,263,284	\$21,740,090

Approximately one third of the total dollars raised by the Senate Democratic Leadership Fund, Future PAC (House Builders), Promote Oregon Leadership/Majority PACs, and The Leadership Fund over the previous five election cycles came from contributors who gave to both Democratic and Republican leadership committees. Democracy Reform Oregon’s analysis of this trend refers to these particular contributors as “double givers.” (See table 9.)

Table 9 - Double Giving as a Percentage of Total Contributions to Four Leadership PACs

	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	Cumulative
Total Contributions	\$3,220,723	\$3,865,548	\$4,816,146	\$4,574,390	\$5,263,284	\$21,740,090
\$ from Double Givers	\$1,036,652	\$1,342,983	\$1,181,450	\$1,299,385	\$1,586,995	\$6,447,465
% from Double Givers	32%	35%	25%	28%	30%	30%

The dollar amount contributed by double givers increased between 2000 and 2002, then dipped in 2004, followed by increases in both 2006 and 2008. However, as a percentage of total fundraising by the four leadership PACs, double giving declined after 2002 with subsequent percentage increases in 2006 and 2008, but not to the almost 35 percent of total contributions in 2002. This is because total fundraising has increased steadily from 2000 through 2008. In other words though double giving dollars are increasing the growth of total contributions to the four leadership PACs is occurring at a higher rate. This growth in fundraising is particularly evident in the Democratic leadership committees, especially Senate Democratic Leadership Fund in 2004 and steady gains in total contributions to Future PAC.

One reason for the increase in double giving dollars between 2000 and 2002 may have been recognition that Democrats had a chance of reclaiming control of the Oregon Senate. That didn’t quite happen, instead there was a 15-15 deadlock during the 2003 legislative session. However, Democrats achieved a majority of 18 Senate seats after the 2004 election. Double giving as a percentage of total fundraising declined between 2002 and 2004 in large part because overall fundraising by leadership PACs, especially the Senate Democratic Leadership Fund, increased in 2004 presumably a factor in their achieving control of the Senate.

In 2006 the Democrats won control of the Oregon House. This was not as widely expected as the earlier shift in control of the Senate but could be indicated by an increase in double giving

dollars in 2006 both in absolute terms and as a percentage of total fundraising by the four leadership PACs. This trend continued in 2008 as Future PAC sought to increase their margin of control of the Oregon House.

The top ten double givers for 2000 through 2008 election cycles are listed in Appendix 2, with highlights described below. Many of the top ten double givers are consistently in this category. For example, the political committees of the Oregon Health Care Association and Oregon Restaurant Association were in the top ten double giver category in each of the 5 election seasons reviewed. Phillip Morris was a top ten double giver in 4 out of the 5 election seasons from 2000 through 2008.

Most of these large double givers tend to give more financial support to the Republican leadership PACs. Exceptions, however, include the Oregon Nurse and Oregon Trial Lawyers Association committees that gave more support to Democratic leadership PACs.

A handful of the top ten double givers are fairly even handed in their support for the leadership PACs from both sides of the political aisle. For example, in 2000 the IBEW Educational Committee gave \$20,000 to Democratic leadership PACs and \$22,500 to their Republican counterparts. In 2004 the Portland General Electric Employee PAC gave almost \$19,000 to Democratic caucus committees and just more than \$22,000 to the Republican leadership PACs. An almost even split between Democratic and Republican leadership committees contributions were made by the Credit Union Legislative Action Fund in 2006 giving \$20,780 and \$21,350 respectively to these groups.

Many of the top double givers also make major contributions directly to legislative candidates. For example in 2000 the Oregon Forest Industries Council PAC gave almost \$350,000 to Republican candidates and \$11,000 to Democratic candidates in addition to \$70,040 to the leadership committees. The Oregon Restaurant Association PAC gave over \$220,000 to Republican candidates and almost \$15,000 to Democrats running for the legislature in 2000 while also giving \$58,124 to the leadership PACs.

However, another top double giver in 2000, Phillip Morris, gave more money to the leadership PACs, \$78,700, than the almost \$18,000 they gave directly to candidates that year. This could be because it is easier for an out-of-state donor like Phillip Morris to give to the leadership PACs than deciding which candidates to support. Another factor regarding Phillip Morris's leadership PAC donations is that individual candidates may not be interested in having contributions from a tobacco company appear on their campaign finance reports.

A significant number of double givers split their contributions between Democratic and Republican leadership PACs almost equally as described below with a detailed chart summarizing the "60-40 club" in Appendix 2. In each election season there are a significant number of double givers that give 50-50 to Republican and Democratic leadership committees. In 2000 there were 31 members of the 60-40 club with 9 of them giving the same amount to leadership PACs from each party. In 2002 almost half, 22, members of the 60-40 club made equal contributions. In 2004 the 60-40 group included 36 double givers with 7 of them splitting their contributions to leadership PACs from each party down the middle. In 2006, 10 out of the 32 members of the 60-40 club made equal contributions.

In some cases these are small, almost token contributions to all the four leadership PACs while also making major contributions directly to legislative candidates. For example, Anheuser Busch gave \$1,000 each to leadership PACs of both parties, but gave \$54,000 directly to Republican candidates and \$17,100 to Democratic legislative aspirants.

In other cases, even double giving to leadership PACs were matched with almost equal contributions directly to Republican and Democratic candidates. For example, in 2000 the Bank of America gave \$1,000 each to leadership PACs of both parties and gave \$1,500 to Republican candidates and \$500 to Democratic candidates. In 2004 Microsoft gave \$3,000 to Democratic candidates and \$2,000 to Republican candidates while giving \$3,500 each to leadership PACs of both political persuasions.

Two 50-50 double givers in 2002, Ater Wynne law firm and Alaska Airlines only gave to both Republican and Democratic leadership PACs and made no direct contributions to legislative candidates, though Ater Wynne gave to judicial and gubernatorial candidates that election. In 2006 Bradwood Landing, the company that wants to put a liquefied natural gas facility on the Columbia River, made equal contributions of \$5,000 each to the four leadership PACs and made no direct contributions to legislative or other candidates.

In general this pattern of double giving illustrates that our current campaign finance system is broken with these contributions appearing to be more about access than ideological commitment. These contributions to leadership PACs, in turn, allow those committees to be major campaign contributors and hold sway over their respective caucuses in Salem.

“HEDGED BETS”, “WAIT AND SEE”, and “OOPS, THE OTHER GUY WON”

Other contribution patterns also illustrate that some donations seem to be more about access than agreement on issues or interest in a particular candidate. A detailed analysis of “hedged bet” contributions to both candidates in a race, “wait and see” donations only given to the winner after Election Day, and “oops, the other guy won” contributions from a donor who during the campaign gave to one candidate but then makes a post-election contribution to the opponent in that race after having won the election. This analysis focuses on 2006 post-election analysis and was released in 2008. It is provided here in Appendix 3.

TOP LEGISLATIVE FUNDRAISING

For a relatively poor paying part-time job legislative fundraising has reached levels that appear to be far higher than what is required to effectively get out a campaign message. One reason for contribution limits reform is that it will reduce the “arms race” aspect of fundraising, especially in contested general election races.

Contributions in a senate general election broke the half-million dollar mark in the 2000 race between Eileen Qutub and Ryan Deckert. This trend continued with fundraising over \$500,000 in 2002 by Charlie Ringo and Richard Devlin and in 2004 by Joanne Verger and in the contest that year between Ron Sunseri and Laurie Monnes Anderson. In 2006 the biggest buck race was between Jim Torrey and Vicki Walker. (See table 10 below.)

Table 10 – Senate General Elections – Top Fundraising in Contested Races – 2002-2006*

2000 General Senate							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Eileen Qutub	l	\$566,201	Ryan Deckert	w	\$514,297	\$1,080,498	4
Gary George	w	\$468,156	Terry Thompson	l	\$430,661	\$898,817	2
Ken Messerle	w	\$335,696	Roger McCorkle	l	\$476,363	\$812,059	24
2002 General Senate							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Bill Witt	l	\$466,538	Charlie Ringo	w	\$613,421	\$1,079,959	17
Bob Tiernan	l	\$484,529	Richard Devlin	w	\$501,408	\$985,937	19
Frank Morse	w	\$425,085	Barbara Ross	l	\$284,025	\$709,110	8
Jackie Winters	w	\$320,835	Bryan Johnston	l	\$380,093	\$700,928	10
Randy Franke	l	\$261,918	Peter Courtney	w	\$268,677	\$530,595	11
Bob Montgomery	l	\$242,593	Rick Metsger	w	\$250,742	\$493,335	26
2004 General Senate							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Jim Wright	l	\$548,237	Alan Bates	w	\$493,616	\$1,041,853	3
Al Pearn	l	\$497,180	Joanne Verger	w	\$613,341	\$1,110,521	5
Ron Sunseri	l	\$546,370	Laurie Monnes Anderson	w	\$642,616	\$1,188,986	25
2006 General Senate							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Jim Torrey	l	\$657,039	Vicki Walker	w	\$580,689	\$1,237,728	7
Carol York	l	\$421,024	Rick Metsger	w	\$464,243	\$885,267	26
Jackie Winters	w	\$295,830	Paul Evans	l	\$299,487	\$595,317	10
T.J. Reilly	l	\$327,807	Rod Monroe	w	\$116,105	\$443,912	24

*These figures include cash and in-kind contributions as well as any loans received during the general election plus cash carried over from the primary election.

Karen Minnis broke the \$500,000 mark in her 2006 general election race against Rob Brading as shown below in table 11. This trend has continued in 2008 races as described below and summarized in table 12.

Table 11 – House General Elections – Top Fundraising in Contested Races – 2002-2006*

2000 General House							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Alan Brown	w	\$224,543	Sharon Branstiter	l	\$213,717	\$438,260	4
Janet Carlson	w	\$216,478	George Bell	l	\$190,904	\$407,382	32
Edwin Golobay	l	\$212,331	Laurie M Anderson	w	\$195,020	\$407,351	22
Jeff Miller	l	\$218,147	Vicki Walker	w	\$173,753	\$391,900	41
Jan Lee	w	\$185,049	Mike Smith	l	\$183,220	\$368,269	10
Debra Ringold	l	\$231,077	Kelley Wirth	w	\$131,396	\$362,473	35
Wayne Krieger	w	\$183,331	Barbara Dodrill	l	\$169,847	\$353,178	48
Jim Hansen	l	\$163,498	Richard Devlin	w	\$183,690	\$347,188	24
Jane Hunts	l	\$159,655	Alan Bates	w	\$161,839	\$321,494	52
2002 General House							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Jim Zupanic	l	\$323,267	Greg Macpherson	w	\$260,000	\$583,267	38
Linda Flores	w	\$261,396	Jan Lee	l	\$244,206	\$505,602	51
Keith Parker	l	\$257,372	Jeff Barker	w	\$224,105	\$481,477	28

Pat Farr	w	\$236,780	Arminita Hawkins	l	\$221,815	\$458,595	14
Alan Brown	w	\$214,034	Marcia Thompson	l	\$217,472	\$431,506	10
Wayne Scott	w	\$242,380	Martha Schrader	l	\$172,671	\$415,051	39
Mary Gallegos	l	\$205,840	Chuck Riley	w	\$201,621	\$407,461	29
Derrick Kitts	w	\$214,549	Aron Carleson	l	\$183,490	\$398,039	30
Billy Dalto	w	\$211,002	Mike Swaim	l	\$133,464	\$344,466	21
Cliff Zaumer	w	\$132,857	Betty Komp	l	\$175,175	\$308,032	22
John Scruggs	l	\$124,552	Brad Avakian	w	\$181,477	\$306,029	34
2004 General House							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Chuck Burley	w	\$301,226	Judy Stiegler	l	\$224,942	\$526,169	54
Alan Brown	w	\$260,138	Jean Cowan	l	\$244,289	\$504,427	10
Douglas Olson	l	\$249,139	Deborah Boone	w	\$220,275	\$469,414	32
Linda Flores	w	\$262,917	Kathryn Firestore	l	\$183,508	\$446,425	51
Suzanne Gallagher	l	\$231,711	Larry Galizio	w	\$190,375	\$422,086	35
John Lim	w	\$209,755	Jim Buck	l	\$185,172	\$394,927	50
Debi Farr	w	\$233,327	Bev Ficek	l	\$125,972	\$359,299	14
Al Shannon	l	\$192,161	Betty Komp	w	\$140,258	\$332,419	22
Mary Gallegos	l	\$190,076	Chuck Riley	w	\$131,592	\$321,668	29
2006 General House							
R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Karen Minnis	w	\$883,818	Rob Brading	l	\$425,802	\$1,309,620	49
Alan Brown	w	\$469,608	Jean Cowan	l	\$397,969	\$867,577	10
Debi Farr	l	\$419,122	Chris Edwards	w	\$329,232	\$748,354	14
Evertt Curry	l	\$390,433	David Edwards	w	\$355,028	\$745,461	30
Shirley Parsons	l	\$428,144	Larry Galizio	w	\$311,109	\$739,253	35
Billy Dalto	l	\$320,179	Brian Clem	w	\$378,573	\$698,752	21
Terry Rilling	l	\$318,469	Chuck Riley	w	\$249,450	\$567,919	29

*These figures include cash and in-kind contributions as well as any loans received during the general election plus cash carried over from the primary election.

Figures for 2008 general election fundraising reflect ORESTAR transactions after the primary through election day. Earlier procedures included reporting contributions after election day and the tables above include carry over cash from the primary to better reflect resources available during the general election. ORESTAR, however, does not readily provide beginning cash balances to know how much money from the primary is available for general election activities. For these reasons it is difficult to make apple-to-apple comparisons between 2008 and past contribution figures on a per election cycle basis.

The top ten general election fundraisers in 2008 house races are summarized below in table 12 while Senate top fundraisers are in table 13. Three house races topped the \$500,000 mark.

Table 12 – Top 10 House 2008 General Election Fundraisers

District #	Candidate	Contributions	Status
39	Toby Forsberg	\$567,924.30	L
54	Judy Stieger	\$531,860.97	W
37	Michele Eberle	\$519,699.95	L
54	Chuck Burley	\$460,726.27	L

49	Nick Kahl	\$439,498.52	W
51	Linda Flores	\$438,458.75	L
52	Suzanne VanOrman	\$437,132.89	W
50	Greg Matthews	\$433,386.28	W
26	Jessica Adamson	\$432,072.25	L
51	Brent Barton	\$375,406.87	W

Table 13– Top 5 Senate 2008 General Election Fundraisers

District #	Candidate	Contributions	Status
25	Laurie Monnes Anderson	\$429,945	W
27	Chris Telfer	\$274,519	W
30	Ted Ferrioli	\$189,072	W
25	Dave Kim	\$124,592	L
14	Mark Hass	\$96,289	W

While this section focuses on legislative fundraising it is also important to note that large contribution totals can be seen in local government races. For example, Eugene’s mayoral candidates raised \$258,635 and \$288,757 with top contributions of \$15,000 and \$19,000 during the 2008 general election. That local governments aren’t exempt from major fundraising and large contributions is why local government contribution limits are included in HB 3009.

TOP FUNDRAISER TYPICALLY WINS

A consistent trend in legislative races as outlined below in table 14 is that the fundraising winner is more often than not wins the election. In both 2002 and 2004 the top fundraiser won 90 percent of legislative races. This figure declined to 82 percent in 2006 but increased to 92 percent for the 2008 legislative general elections.

Table 14 – 2002-2008 General Elections – Assessment of Electoral Success by Top Fundraiser

Year	Senate House Legislature	# of Districts	# of Contested Races	% Winners Raised More \$	% Winners Raised Less \$	% Winners with Less \$ were Incumbents or Previous Office Holders
2002	Senate	15	14	79%	21%	100%
	House	60	54	93%	7%	50%
	Legislature	75	68	90%	10%	71%
2004	Senate	17	13	92%	8%	100%
	House	60	54	89%	11%	33%
	Legislature	77	67	90%	10%	43%
2006	Senate	15	14	79%	21%	100%
	House	60	53	83%	17%	33%
	Legislature	75	67	82%	18%	50%
2008	Senate	16	8	100%	0%	n/a
	House	60	41	90%	10%	75%
	Legislature	76	49	92%	8%	75%

As noted in the right hand column in table 14, very often candidates that win with less money were incumbents or previous office holders, frequently members of the House of Representatives shifting to run for a Senate seat. In general, when a financial underdog wins a race their contribution total is on par with the loser and certainly enough to get out an effective campaign message.

COMPETITION ANALYSIS

Most of the high legislative contribution totals summarized in tables 10 through 13 occur in contested races. In reality, however, many of Oregon’s legislative races are contested as defined by having two names on the ballot, but the race is actually not competitive. There are many reasons influencing electoral competitiveness and it is important to realize that money isn’t the sole factor in such competition analysis. Nevertheless financial capacity is used to evaluate the level of competition for both primary and general elections is summarized in the following tables for 2002 through 2008.

Table 15 – 2002-2008 Legislative Primary Elections Competition Analysis

Competitiveness		2002		2004		2006		2008	
		# of Races	% of 150	# of Races	% of 154	# of Races	% of 150	# of Races	% of 150
Not Contested	No candidate	19	13%	21	14%	13	9%	28	19%
	Unopposed	101	67%	102	66%	123	82%	103	69%
Contested	Drowned Out	12	8%	15	10%	6	4%	11	7%
	Lopsided	6	4%	5	3%	3	2%	1	1%
	Struggle	4	3%	4	3%	2	1%	5	3%
	Equal Opportunity	8	5%	7	4%	3	2%	2	1%

Table 16 – 2002-2008 Legislative General Elections Competition Analysis

Competitiveness		2002		2004		2006		2008	
		# of Races	% of 75	# of Races	% of 77	# of Races	% of 75	# of Races	% of 76
Not Contested	Unopposed	7	9%	10	13%	8	11%	27	36%
Contested	Drowned Out	41	55%	42	55%	43	57%	32	42%
	Lopsided	3	4%	7	9%	5	7%	5	7%
	Struggle	9	12%	10	13%	5	7%	6	8%
	Equal Opportunity	15	20%	8	10%	14	19%	6	8%

The labels used in these tables are:

Unopposed – Only one candidate on the ballot

Drowned Out – Financial underdog has 25 % or less in contributions as opponent

Lopsided – Financial underdog has 25% to 50% in contributions as opponent

Struggle to Keep Up – Financial underdog has 50% to 75% in contributions as opponent

Equal Opportunity – Financial underdog has 75% or more in contributions as opponent

From a money in politics perspective this analysis considers “drowned out” contests as not contested because even though there are two names on the ballot one of them has essentially no money compared to his or her opponent. During both primary and general elections there are a number of unopposed candidates while in the primary there are districts where one of the major

parties don't field a candidate. In those districts whoever wins the other party's primary has won in November since no minor party or nonaffiliated candidates were successful in any of these elections.

WHO IS GIVING IN MAJOR CONTESTED RACES?

Contributors to contested statewide and legislative races reveal our state's political powerhouses giving to both Democratic and Republican candidates. The size of the largest contributions in these races is troubling for two reasons. One is that many of these donations are mind-bogglingly large, especially in contrast to the relatively small contributions that typical Oregonians can afford. The second reason is the extent to which a small number of top donors comprise significant proportions of total fundraising. This increases opportunities for corruption as well as setting the stage for the perception of corruption. This undermines public trust because of questions about whether policy decisions are truly being decided based solely on their merits. The contribution figures in the tables in this section reflect cash and in-kind contributions as well as any loans received.

In the 2006 general election for governor the single largest contribution was slightly more than \$2 million from the Republican Governors' Association to Ron Saxton. Six individuals gave contributions of \$100,000 or more, far more than is affordable to most of our state's residents. Money from Saxton's top 20 donors comprised 64 percent of his total fundraising. (See table 18.)

Ted Kulongoski's largest contribution was \$450,000 from the Democratic Governors Association. Public employee unions were other top donors with the Oregon Education Association's PAC giving \$215,000. Only one individual gave \$100,000 in this race. A political committee organized by environmental activists that raises money at house parties was another major donor to the Kulongoski campaign. Money from Kulongoski's top donors comprised 45 percent of his total fundraising. (See table 17.)

Table 17 – 2006 General Election Top 20 Contributors to Gubernatorial Candidate Ted Kulongoski
Contributions from top 20 general election contributors totaled \$1,842,376, which comprised 45% of total Democratic gubernatorial fundraising.

Contributor	Total \$
DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION	\$450,000
OREGON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION - PEOPLE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION	\$215,000
SERVICE EMPLOYEES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE II	\$200,000
DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF OREGON	\$140,853
OREGON AFSCME COUNCIL 75 and KNIGHT, PHILIP	\$100,000 each
UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS NW FEDERAL CREDIT UNION	\$60,000
13 ENVIROS PAC	\$55,963
LABORERS' POLITICAL LEAGUE EDUCATION FUND; AFSCME INTERNATIONAL; IBEW 48 ELECTRICIANS' PAC; AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS; and OREGON HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATION PAC	\$50,000 each
SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION LOCAL 49	\$44,842
NIKE INC AND AFFILIATES; RB PAMPLIN CORPORATION; COLEMAN, DEBI; and MCCORMACK, WIN	\$40,000 each
MACHINISTS NON-PARTISAN POLITICAL LEAGUE OF OREGON	\$37,000
OCEAN CHAMPIONS VOTER FUND	\$28,718

Table 18 – 2006 General Election Top 20 Contributors to Gubernatorial Candidate Ron Saxton

Contributions from top 20 general election contributors totaled \$4,406,229, which comprised 64% of total Republican gubernatorial fundraising.

Contributor	Total \$
REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION	\$2,053,242
COLSON, WILLIAM E	\$350,000
SWINDELLS, WILLIAM and WENDT, RODERICK C	\$250,000 each
OREGON REPUBLICAN PARTY, VICTORY 2004	\$179,880
BRENDEN, NORMAN L	\$150,000
DR JOHNSON LUMBER COMPANY	\$110,000
LEMATTA, WES	\$101,235
OREGON AUTO DEALERS ASSOCIATION; SHELK, JOHN (STUART, JR); and STIMSON LUMBER COMPANY	\$100,000 each
ROSEBURG FOREST PRODUCTS and OREGON RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION PAC	\$75,000
STOTT, PETER	\$60,325
DEBOER, SIDNEY B	\$51,000
SENECA JONES TIMBER/SAWMILL COMPANY	\$50,547
WING RIDGE CONSTRUCTION LLC; DON MORISSETTE HOMES, INC; AUSTIN, JOAN D; AUSTIN, GEORGE K (JR); HAMPTON LUMBER SALES COMPANY; FRERES LUMBER COMPANY, INC.; and AVAMERE HEALTH SERVICES, INC.	\$50,000 each

During the 2008 general election the Secretary of State's race was overshadowed by the U.S. Senate and ballot measure campaigns but was still a higher profile race than other state level candidate races. The Democratic candidate Kate Brown's largest contribution was \$85,000 from the Oregon Education Association's PAC while her Republican opponent Rick Dancer received a \$185,672 contribution from the Conservative Majority Project PAC. (See tables 19 and 20.)

As discussed on page 8 the Oregon Education Association is a small donor PAC with contributions primarily coming in small amounts of \$100 or less from thousands of teacher members of the Association. Each year teachers are asked if they want to make a contribution to the Association's People for the Improvement of Education PAC and these contributions are separate from union dues and used to support candidates based on a vote of members.

The Conservative Majority Project PAC, formed to support conservative candidates, received five contributions during the 2008 general election season with 96 percent of its money coming from Loren Parks who gave \$350,000 to this committee.

Table 19 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Secretary of State Candidate Kate Brown

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Oregon Education Association - People for Improvement of Education	\$85,000	14.3%
Secretary of State Project	\$65,000	11.0%
Citizen Action for Political Education	\$25,000	4.2%
Basic Rights Oregon Equality PAC	\$12,500	2.1%
C&E Systems	\$11,500	1.9%
Democratic Party of Oregon	\$10,250	1.7%
Oregon AFSCME Council 75, Eric Lemelson, Holding Onto Oregon's Priorities (HOOPS) PAC	\$10,000 each	1.7% each
Oregon Nurses Political Action Committee	\$8,000	1.3%
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$247,250	41.7%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$35,141	5.9%
Remaining Contributions	\$310,333	52.4%
Total	\$592,724	

Table 20 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Secretary of State Candidate Rick Dancer

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Conservative Majority Project PAC	\$185,672	26.4%
Oregon Victory Political Action Committee	\$50,000	7.1%
Seneca Jones Timber Co.	\$45,000	6.4%
Swanson Group, Inc.	\$40,000	5.7%
Hire Calling Public Affairs	\$30,000	4.3%
Columbia Helicopters Inc	\$28,000	4.0%
Oregon Citizens for a Sound Economy PAC	\$27,500	3.9%
Freres Lumber Co. Inc.	\$26,000	3.7%
Giustina Land & Timber Co., A-Dec	\$20,000 each	2.8% each
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$472,172	67.1%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$14,067	2.0%
Remaining Contributions	\$217,765	30.9%
Total	\$704,003	

The Attorney General’s race was decided during the primary between two Democratic candidates, John Kroger and Greg Macpherson, because there were no participants in the Republican primary. Though Kroger was opposed by minor party candidates in the November general election “the race” was effectively won during the primary. The contributions between these two candidates are outlined below in tables 21 and 22 with Kroger receiving major support from public employee unions with top contributions of \$162,500 and \$150,000 from two political committees affiliated with different branches of the Service Employees International Union. Greg Macpherson was his own top donor and also received more business community contributions.

Table 21 – 2008 Primary Election Top 10 Contributors to Attorney General Candidate John Kroger

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Service Employees Political Action Committee	\$162,500	19.1%
Citizen Action for Political Education	\$150,000	17.7%
Oregon Education Association - People for Improvement of Education	\$50,000	5.9%
Linda Kroger, Rudy Kroger	\$22,000 each	2.6% each
The Bill Naito Co.	\$19,712	2.3%
Georges C St. Laurent, Jr.	\$15,000	1.8%
Linda Love	\$10,144	1.2%
Michael Williams	\$10,000	1.2%
IBEW Educational Committee	\$8,000	0.9%
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$469,356	55.3%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$61,004	7.2%
Remaining Contributions	\$318,715	37.5%
Total	\$849,075	

Table 22– 2008 Primary Election Top 10 Contributors to AG Candidate Greg Macpherson

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Greg Macpherson	\$69,570	8.6%
Natural Gas Political Action Committee, Portland General Electric Employee Candidate Assistance Fund, PacifiCorp	\$17,500	2.2%
Stoel Rives LLP	\$12,787	1.6%
Phil Walsh	\$11,500	1.4%
Oregon Health Care Association PAC, Debi Coleman, Opportunity PAC, Freres Lumber Co. Inc., Edmund Hayes, Jr., Richard Parker, Hector Macpherson	\$10,000 each	1.2% each
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$216,357	26.8%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$46,313	5.7%
Remaining Contributions	\$545,401	67.5%
Total	\$808,072	

In 2008 the mostly hotly contested legislative general election contests were in the House as the Democrats sought to increase their majority in Salem. In terms of combined general election fundraising by each opponent, the top three races were in House districts 54, 39, and 51 as summarized below in table 23.

Table 22– 2008 General Election House Districts With Top Fundraising

R Candidate	Status	Contributions	D Candidate	Status	Contributions	combined \$	district #
Chuck Burley	L	\$460,726	Judy Stiegler	W	\$531,861	\$992,587	54
Bill Kenemer	W	\$313,083	Toby Forsberg	L	\$567,924	\$881,007	39
Linda Flores	L	\$438,459	Brent Barton	W	\$375,407	\$813,866	51

The top donors to these fiercely fought races are summarized below in tables 24 through 29. In each of these contests the top donor was each candidate’s leadership PAC, Promote Oregon Leadership committee to Republican candidates and Future PAC, House Builders to Democratic contestants. Particularly striking is the 52.6 percent of total fundraising by Judy Stiegler that came from Future PAC. Future PAC was also the top donor to two other winners in tight races, Greg Matthews and Suzanne VanOrman, giving 43.2 and 43.1 percent of total fundraising by those candidates. In general, most of the top donors in these contested races were political committee and not individuals. This illustrates why HB 3009 includes restrictions on pass through contributions between principal campaign committees and other PACs.

Table 24 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Chuck Burley – HD 54

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Promote Oregon Leadership PAC	\$146,893	31.9%
Oregon Forest Industries Council Political Action Committee	\$32,500	7.1%
Oregon Association of Realtors	\$15,215	3.3%
Ag-PAC	\$10,000	2.2%
The Leadership Fund	\$9,992	2.2%
Oregon Local Grocery Committee	\$9,000	2.0%
Oregon Beverage PAC	\$8,000	1.7%
Friends of Bruce Hanna	\$7,700	1.7%
Oregon Realtors Political Action Committee	\$7,500	1.6%
Ferrioli, Friends of Ted	\$6,654	1.4%

Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$253,454	55.0%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$8,626	1.9%
Remaining Contributions	\$198,646	43.1%
Total	\$460,726	

Table 25 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Judy Stiegler – HD 54

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Future PAC, House Builders	\$279,837	52.6%
Citizen Action for Political Education	\$57,080	10.7%
Oregon Climate PAC	\$48,890	9.2%
Oregon League of Conservation Voters PAC	\$25,481	4.8%
Oregon Trial Lawyers Association PAC	\$15,000	2.8%
Oregon Nurses Political Action Committee	\$14,908	2.8%
Stand for Children PAC	\$9,563	1.8%
AFSCME COUNCIL 75, Steve Munson, Eric Lemelson, Women's WIN PAC	\$5,000 each	0.9% each
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$470,760	88.5%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$15,545	2.9%
Remaining Contributions	\$45,555	8.6%
Total	\$531,861	

Table 26 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Bill Kenemer – HD 39

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Promote Oregon Leadership PAC	\$57,565	18.4%
Oregon Victory Political Action Committee	\$40,000	12.8%
Scott, Wayne, Friends of	\$16,987	5.4%
Oregon Forest Industries Council Political Action Committee	\$15,000	4.8%
Oregon Restaurant PAC	\$12,800	4.1%
Associated Oregon Industries PAC	\$12,000	3.8%
Orloggers PAC	\$7,500	2.4%
Oregon Beverage PAC	\$7,402	2.4%
Friends of Andy Olson	\$6,000	1.9%
Ag-PAC	\$5,500	1.8%
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$180,755	57.7%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$3,833	1.2%
Remaining Contributions	\$128,495	41.0%
Total	\$313,083	

Table 27 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Toby Forsberg – HD 39

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Future PAC, House Builders	\$329,037	57.9%
Citizen Action for Political Education	\$49,825	8.8%
Oregon Education Association - People for Improvement of Education	\$45,626	8.0%
Oregon Nurses Political Action Committee	\$17,356	3.1%
Oregon Trial Lawyers Association PAC	\$12,608	2.2%
Schaufler, Mike, for State Representative	\$10,940	1.9%
Stand for Children, Inc.	\$10,389	1.8%
David Forsberg	\$10,000	1.8%
Basic Rights Oregon Equality PAC	\$6,855	1.2%

Oregon AFSCME Council 75	\$6,000	1.1%
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$498,636	87.8%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$9,744	1.7%
Remaining Contributions	\$59,545	10.5%
Total	\$567,924	

Table 28 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Linda Flores – HD 51

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Promote Oregon Leadership PAC	\$63,266	14.4%
Oregon Victory Political Action Committee	\$50,000	11.4%
Oregon Realtors Political Action Committee	\$20,815	4.7%
Associated Oregon Industries PAC, Oregon Restaurant PAC, Oregon Local Grocery Committee	\$15,000 each	3.4% each
CommonSense for Oregon PAC	\$11,350	2.6%
Reynolds American, Ag-PAC, Oregon Forest Industries Council PAC	\$10,000 each	2.3% each
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$220,431	50.3%
Miscellaneous Contributions \$100 or Less	\$9,152	2.1%
Remaining Contributions	\$208,876	47.6%
Total	\$438,459	

Table 29 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Brent Barton – HD 51

Contributor	Contribution	Percentage
Future PAC, House Builders	\$49,424	13.2%
Oregon Climate PAC	\$45,918	12.2%
Oregon Education Association - People for Improvement of Education	\$44,837	11.9%
Citizen Action for Political Education	\$37,883	10.1%
Planned Parenthood PAC of Oregon	\$33,293	8.9%
Oregon Trial Lawyers Association PAC	\$30,000	8.0%
William Barton	\$20,500	5.5%
Schaufler, Mike, for State Representative	\$16,781	4.5%
Oregon League of Conservation Voters PAC	\$12,509	3.3%
Oregon AFSCME Council 75, Eric Lemelson	\$5,000 each	1.3% each
Top 10 Contributors Sub-total	\$301,144	80.2%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$12,582	3.4%
Remaining Contributions	\$61,681	16.4%
Total	\$375,407	

WHO IS GIVING TO THE MAJOR DONORS TO LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES?

This section begins by summarizing in tables 30 through 33 the top ten general election contributors to the four leadership PACs. The Republican committees are Promote Oregon Leadership PAC focusing on electing members to the House and The Leadership Fund supporting Senate candidates. The Democratic committees are the Senate Democratic Leadership Fund and Future PAC, House Builders focused on election members to the House.

Table 30 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Future PAC, House Builders

Contributor	Amount	%
Hunt, Dave, Friends of	\$312,000	17.1%
Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee	\$200,000	11.0%
Friends of Phil Barnhart	\$82,000	4.5%
Mary Nolan for State Representative	\$72,000	4.0%
RE-ELECT ARNIE ROBLAN	\$70,000	3.8%
Friends of Tobias Read	\$54,500	3.0%
Elect Betty Komp	\$42,250	2.3%
Sara Gelser for State Representative	\$39,000	2.1%
Holding Onto Oregon's Priorities PAC Federal	\$35,000	1.9%
Friends of Terry Beyer	\$30,500	1.7%
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$937,250	51.4%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$5,173	0.3%
Total Contributions	\$1,821,915	

Table 31 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Promote Oregon Leadership PAC

Contributor	Amount	%
Friends of Bruce Hanna	\$185,000	20.3%
Reynolds American	\$100,378	11.0%
Orloggers PAC	\$45,000	4.9%
Philip Morris USA	\$40,000	4.4%
Oregon Restaurant PAC	\$36,400	4.0%
Friends of Andy Olson, Oregon Forest Industries Council PAC	\$30,000 each	3.3% each
Committee to Re-Elect Bob Jenson	\$22,000	2.4%
Committee to Elect Ron Maurer	\$21,000	2.3%
Coca-Cola Ent Inc Employee Non-Part Comm	\$20,000	2.2%
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$529,778	58.2%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$1,350	0.1%
Total Contributions	\$910,130	

Table 32 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to Senate Democratic Leadership Fund

Contributor	Amount	%
Peter Courtney for State Senate	\$25,236	10.0%
Friends of Richard Devlin	\$20,000	7.9%
Friends of Margaret Carter	\$15,250	6.0%
AGC Committee for Action, Committee to Elect Dr. Alan Bates, Kurt Schrader for State Senate	\$10,000 each	4.0% each
Phillip Morris USA, Inc.	\$8,500	3.4%
Oregon Restaurant PAC	\$7,000	2.8%
Friends of Suzanne Bonamici	\$6,000	2.4%
Bradwood Landing LLC	\$5,000	2.0%
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$116,986	46.4%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$535	0.2%
Total Contributions	\$252,346	

Table 33 – 2008 General Election Top 10 Contributors to The Leadership Fund

Contributor	Amount	%
Friends of Ted Ferrioli	\$30,000	15.7%
R.B Pamplin Corporation	\$15,000	7.9%
Central Oregonians for Affordable Housing, Impact America	\$10,000 each	5.2% each
AGC Committee for Action, Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde, Health Services Group, Friends of Randy Miller, Oregon Bankers PAC, Oregon Nurseries PAC, Oregon Realtors PAC, Oregon Restaurant PAC, Oregonians in Action PAC	\$5,000 each	2.6% each
Top Contributors Subtotal	\$110,000	57.6%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$1,250	0.7%
Total Contributions	\$190,975	

Not surprisingly top donors to the leadership PACs are other political committees, particularly the campaign committees of legislative leaders and candidates facing nominal electoral competition. This speaks to why HB 3009 includes pass through restrictions between political committees in general, but particularly limits on money transfers between candidate committees.

A sampling of top donors to Democratic candidates are provided below in tables 34 through 37.

Table 34 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Citizen Action for Political Education

Contributor	Amount	%
SEIU Local 503, OPEU	\$168,821	38.3%
Service Employees International Union (Wash. DC)	\$82,685	18.8%
Arthur Towers	\$600	0.1%
Arthur Lewis	\$250	0.1%
Melissa Unger	\$180	0.0%
Kevin Trautman	\$150	0.0%
Edna Dunton	\$125	0.0%
Lea Spencer, Michael Powers, Victoria Palmer	\$120 each	0.0% each
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$253,171	57.5%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$187,174	42.5%
Total Contributions	\$440,345	

Table 35 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Oregon Education Association

Contributor	Amount	%
Patricia Faris	\$148	0.1%
Jefferson Moore	\$125	0.1%
Robert Clore	\$110	0.1%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$149,038	99.7%
Total Contributions	\$149,420	

Table 36 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Oregon Climate PAC

Contributor	Amount	%
Eric Lemelson	\$235,000	92.2%
John Hunting	\$20,000	7.8%
Total Contributions	\$255,000	

Table 37 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Oregon League of Conservation Voters PAC

Contributor	Amount	%
Conservation Strategies	\$95,000	31.6%
Eric Lemelson	\$55,000	18.3%
League of Conservation Voters SSF	\$45,000	15.0%
John Gray	\$6,000	2.0%
Walter Gorman	\$3,000	1.0%
Deborah Noble, Friends of Jackie Dingfelder	\$2,500 each	0.8% each
Walter W McMonies, Jr	\$2,000	0.7%
Casey Shaar	\$1,800	0.6%
Mary Scurlock	\$1,100	0.4%
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$213,900	71.2%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$44,723	14.9%
Total Contributions	\$300,621	

A sampling of top donors to Republican candidates are provided below in tables 38 through 40

Table 38 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Oregon Forest Industries Council PAC

Contributor	Amount	%
Weyerhaeuser Company	\$55,000	49.4%
Plum Creek	\$15,000	13.5%
Longview Timber, Corp.	\$10,000	6.1% each
Lone Rock Timber Management Co.	\$8,000	7.2%
Starker Forests, Inc.	\$7,000	6.3%
Giustina Land & Timber Co.	\$6,250	4.6% each
Giustina Resources	\$5,000	4.5%
David Rumker, Gary Combs, Jerry Brodie, John Gilleland, Stanley Renecker	\$1,000 each	0.9% each
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$111,250	100.0%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$0	0.0%
Total Contributions	\$111,250	

Table 39 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Oregon Realtors PAC

Contributor	Amount	%
Rogue Valley Association of REALTORS, Southern Oregon Multiple Listing Service	\$2,500 each	10.7% each
Rogue Valley Association of Realtors PAC	\$2,000	8.6%
Commercial Association of Realtors PAC	\$1,221	5.2%
Committee to Elect Bill Garrard	\$1,000	4.3%
Andrea Bushnell, Paul Tuttle, Rick Harris	\$700 each	3.0% each
David J Hemenway	\$630	2.7%
Lee L Dunn, Ned Baker Real Estate Inc, Pat K Kaplan	\$350 each	1.5% each
Top 12 Contributors Subtotal	\$13,001	55.8%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$9,196	39.5%
Total Contributions	\$23,283	

Table 40 – 2008 General Election Top Contributions to Oregon Victory PAC

Contributor	Amount	%
Nancy Lematta	\$30,000	8.7%
A-Dec, Carolyn S. Chambers Trust, Frederick D. Jubitz, Harry A. Merlo, Henry T. Swigert, Seneca Jones Timber Co., Stimson Lumber Company, Swanson Group, Inc.	\$25,000 each	7.3% each
Carlton Woodard Trust, Halton Co., United Finance Co.	\$20,000 each	5.8% each
Top 10 Contributors Subtotal	\$290,000	84.5%
Miscellaneous Contributions of \$100 or Less	\$135	0.0%
Total Contributions	\$343,103	