

Remote Control

California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds
from outside their districts

May 18, 2010



Daniel Newman, Executive Director

2223 Shattuck Ave., Berkeley, CA 94704

(510) 868-0894 / info@maplight.org

maplight.org/remotecontrol10

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Remote Control	3
Methodology.....	5
Funding	6
Acknowledgements	7
Credits.....	7
Tables	8

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts.
Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to "MAPLight.org."
To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomrol10

Remote Control

MAPLight.org is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research group illuminating the connection between money and politics. In this study, we examined all campaign contributions given to members of the California Assembly and Senate since January 2007 to determine the geographic sources of contributions to each legislator. We found that 79% of campaign contributions came from outside of members' districts. In other words, California lawmakers raised almost four out of every five dollars in campaign funds from outside of where their constituents live.

In generating this report, MAPLight.org analyzed contribution data provided by the National Institute on Money in State Politics.

Funds Raised from Out-of-District

California legislators raised \$97.9 million in campaign funds during this three year time period. \$77.5 million of these funds, or 79%, came from out-of-district. \$11.9 million, or 12%, came from in-district. The remaining \$8.5 million of campaign funds (9%) could not be definitively located as in-district or out-of-district.

This study includes reported contributions from January 1, 2007 through March 17, 2010 to campaign committees for Assembly and state Senate, excluding contributions to campaigns to other offices (e.g., Lieutenant Governor, U.S. House) and also excluding contributions from political parties and candidates.

To our knowledge, this study is the first ever to examine the geographic sources of campaign funds for California legislators using street-address level of detail to determine whether contributions originated from in-district or out-of-district.

Out-of-District	In-District	Undetermined Location	TOTAL
\$77,504,989 (79.2%)	\$11,874,326 (12.1%)	\$8,493,551 (8.7%)	\$97,872,866 (100%)

We examined contributions given to 79 Assembly members and 40 Senators: all legislators who were serving as of August 31, 2009. Assembly District 51 was vacant on that date. (Two of these Senators, Denise Moreno Ducheny and Roy Ashburn, who are both now term-limited, did not raise any money after 2006.)

More than half of the lawmakers (58%) raised 80% or more of their campaign funds from outside their districts (68 out of the 117 members that raised money during this time period). Nineteen lawmakers raised 90% or more of their campaign funds from outside their districts.

Every lawmaker raised more than half of their funds from out-of-district. In other words, no lawmakers raised most of their money from in-district, where their constituents live.

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts.
*Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to "MAPLight.org."
To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomrol10*

The average percentage of funds each lawmaker raised from out-of-district is 79.2% and the median percentage is 82.5%. For out-of-district contributions figures for each lawmaker, see Table 1.

Top ZIP Codes

This table shows the top 20 ZIP codes of contributions to legislators.

Rank	City	Contributions (\$)	% of Total
1	Sacramento, CA 95814	\$23,149,034	23.66%
2	San Francisco, CA 94105	\$2,034,877	2.08%
3	Sacramento, CA 95833	\$1,408,211	1.44%
4	Los Angeles, CA 90020	\$1,395,635	1.43%
5	Burlingame CA, 94010	\$1,280,137	1.31%
6	Los Angeles, CA 90071	\$1,054,345	1.08%
7	Newport Beach, CA 92660	\$972,717	0.99%
8	Sacramento, CA 95811	\$843,928	0.86%
9	Sacramento, CA 95816	\$839,730	0.86%
10	Los Angeles, CA 90017	\$741,449	0.76%
11	Oakland, CA 94612	\$698,200	0.71%
12	Sacramento, CA 95834	\$669,150	0.68%
13	Pasadena, CA 91101	\$625,373	0.64%
14	Los Angeles, CA 90010	\$621,677	0.64%
15	San Francisco, CA 94111	\$583,888	0.60%
16	San Diego, CA 92101	\$569,376	0.58%
17	West Sacramento, CA 95691	\$569,168	0.58%
18	Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730	\$477,438	0.49%
19	Napa, CA 94558	\$447,622	0.46%
20	Fort Worth, TX 76131	\$437,100	0.45%

For a list of the top 100 ZIP codes and their contribution amounts, see Table 7. The top 100 ZIP codes made up 59.2% of total contributions from all ZIP codes.

All 117 lawmakers had at least one Sacramento ZIP code among their top 10 contributing ZIP codes. For the top 10 ZIP codes for each lawmaker, see Table 8.

Individuals and Organizations

Lawmakers received most of their money from organizations: businesses (ranging from corporations to sole proprietorships), trade associations, political action committees (PACs), and unions. 85.1% of contributions from organizations came from out-of-district.

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts.
 Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to "MAPLight.org."
 To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomtrol10

Less than 20% of contributions came from individuals. 51.8% of contributions from individuals came from out-of-district. Table 4 shows, for each legislator, the breakdown of out-of-district contributions from individuals and organizations.

Campaign contribution reports filed with the Secretary State indicate whether a contributor came from an individual's personal funds or is "other," defined as "business entities and other contributions." We interpreted this "other" category as organizations.

Methodology

This study includes reported contributions from January 1, 2007 through March 17, 2010 to campaign committees for Assembly and state Senate, excluding contributions to campaigns to other offices (e.g., Lieutenant Governor, U.S. House) and also excluding contributions from political parties and candidates. We used campaign contribution data from the National Institute on Money in State Politics as of April 29, 2010, whose data is based on reports that candidates and contributors are required to file with the California Secretary of State.

We examined contributions given to 79 Assembly members and 40 Senators: all legislators who were serving as of August 31, 2009. Some notes about how this date range affects certain legislators:

- Asm. Felipe Fuentes, who took office May 25, 2007, is included.
- Asm. Warren T. Furutani, who took office February 7, 2008, is included.
- Sen. Curren D. Price, Jr., who represented AD-51 until moving to the Senate on June 8, 2009, is included.
- Asm. Michael Duvall, who left office September 9, 2009, is included.
- Asm. Steven Bradford, who took office September 10, 2009, is excluded.
- Sen. John J. Benoit, who left office November 30, 2009, is included.
- Asm. Paul Krekorian, who left office January 5, 2010, is included.
- Asm. Chris Norby, who took office January 29, 2010, is excluded.
- Sen. Abel Maldonado, who left office April 27, 2010, is included.
- Sen. Denise Moreno Ducheny, who is term-limited, did not raise money after 2006 and is excluded from calculating percentages.
- Sen. Roy Ashburn, who is term-limited, did not raise money after 2006 and is excluded from calculating percentages.

We determine whether the contributor was out of district based on whether the address of the contributor was in the district for which the candidate was running. For example, if an Assemblymember was running for re-election, we analyzed the boundaries of the Assembly district for all contributions to their campaigns. If a 2009 Assemblymember was running for Senate in the 2010 cycle, we analyzed the boundaries of the Assembly district for their Assembly campaign (contributions for 2007-2008 election cycle) and the boundaries of the Senate district for their Senate campaign (contributions for 2009-2010 election cycle).

Address Geolocation

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts.
Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to "MAPLight.org."
To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomtrol10

Candidates are required to report to the California Secretary of State the address for each contributor who donates \$100 or more. For amounts under \$100, campaigns often report these contributions grouped together as “unitemized,” with no addresses reported (Campaigns do sometimes report the address for some under-\$100 contributions). We used the available address data to determine the state Assembly and state Senate district of each contributor. To geographically locate each of the contributions, we used the services of Azavea Inc., a software development firm specializing in mapping solutions that employ Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

To our knowledge, this study is the first ever to examine the geographic sources of campaign funds for California legislators using street-address level of detail to determine whether contributions originated from in-district or out-of-district.

For 91.3% of total dollars contributed, the address information reported was sufficient to determine whether the contribution was in-district or out-of-district. For the remaining 8.7%, we could not determine the exact district location. These cases occurred because of one or both of these reasons:

- The address reported by the candidate campaign committee was not a valid address.
- Azavea’s street address mapping system was not 100% certain the location was within a particular district. For these cases, if the address was reported to be outside of California, we assigned these as out-of-district. Otherwise, we assigned these contributions the “district unknown” category.

Contributions Excluded

We intentionally excluded contributions from political parties because these contributions do not have a clear location of origin – it would not make sense to allocate them to a particular geographic place. We similarly excluded contributions from candidates because they do not come from a clear geographic place.

The data set we used, from the National Institute on Money in State Politics, omits a small portion of contributions which candidate committees report to the Secretary of State, specifically:

- Contributions to campaign committees for races where the candidates hasn’t officially registered to run. For example, Assemblymembers who have received contributions in 2009 and early 2010 in preparation for a 2012 state Senate campaign are not included since it is not yet possible to officially register for a 2012 campaign.
- Contributions to campaigns run during a special election.
- Contributions not filed electronically (for the 2010 cycle).

Funding

MAPLight.org, a nonpartisan, 501(c)(3) nonprofit research group, is funded by the following foundations, and by individual donors:

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts. Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to “MAPLight.org.” To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomrol10

Sunlight Foundation
Open Society Institute
JEHT Foundation
Rockefeller Brothers Fund
John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation
Columbia Foundation
Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation
Threshold Foundation
Rockefeller Family Fund
Arkay Foundation
NetSquared Innovation Award
William B. Wiener Foundation
New Progressive Coalition

MAPLight.org is solely responsible for the content of this report, and this report does not necessarily represent the views of our funders, partners, or affiliates.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge Edwin Bender and the National Institute on Money in State Politics for providing the contribution data used in this report. We offer special thanks to Robert Cheetham of Azavea, Inc. for locating each contribution within an Assembly and Senate district. MAPLight.org is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Credits

This report was produced by the MAPLight.org team: Eric Braswell, Emily Calhoun, DeAnna Dalton, Jeffrey Friedman, Michele Horaney, Daniel Newman, Kent Richards, Steve Toub, and Mike Wooldridge.

About the National Institute on Money in State Politics

The National Institute on Money in State Politics is the only nonpartisan, nonprofit organization revealing the influence of campaign money on state-level elections and public policy in all 50 states. The Institute's comprehensive and verifiable campaign-finance database and relevant issue analyses are available for free through their website FollowTheMoney.org. The group encourages transparency and promotes independent investigation of state-level campaign contributions by journalists, academic researchers, public-interest groups, government agencies, policymakers, students and the public at large.

About Azavea

Azavea, formerly Avencia, is an award-winning software development firm that specializes in design and development of web-based mapping solutions that employ Geographic Information

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts. Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to "MAPLight.org." To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecontrol10

Systems (GIS). The firm was incorporated in 2000 to design and develop technologically advanced solutions to meet challenges best addressed through geospatial analytic approaches.

About MAPLight.org

MAPLight.org is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, 501(c)(3) organization based in Berkeley, California. Its search engine at MAPLight.org illuminates the connection between Money And Politics (MAP) via a database of campaign contributions and legislative outcomes. Data sources include: GovTrack.us; Center for Responsive Politics (OpenSecrets.org); Federal Election Commission; and the National Institute on Money in State Politics. To learn more visit maplight.org.

In 2009 MAPLight.org settled a freedom of information lawsuit against the state of California, winning public access to the state's database of how lawmakers vote. In May 2010, the group launched MAPLight.org California, a new website tracking campaign contributions to all California lawmakers. Later in 2010, MAPLight.org will launch a new state site connecting campaign contributions, interest groups, and votes in the California legislature.

Tables

Table 1: Out-of-District Contributions for each Legislator (sorted by % out-of-district)

Table 2: same as Table 1, for Assemblymembers only

Table 3: same as Table 1, for Senators only

Table 4: Out-of-District Contributions from organizations and from individuals, for each Legislator

Table 5: same as Table 4, for Assemblymembers only

Table 6: same as Table 5, for Senators only

Table 7: Top 100 ZIP Codes

Table 8: Top 10 ZIP codes for each Legislator

All Tables are available for download at maplight.org/remotcontrol10. In addition, Table 1 and Table 7 are printed below.

Remote Control: California state lawmakers raise 79% of campaign funds from outside their districts.
Any information in this document may be freely reproduced provided credit is given to "MAPLight.org."
To download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotcontrol10

Table 1: Contributions to California Assemblymembers and State Senators, sorted by percentage of money received from out-of-district contributors

Includes reported contributions from 1/1/2007 through 3/17/ 2010 to Assemblymembers and Senators in office as of August 31, 2009.

Rank by OOD %	State Legislator	Total \$	Out-of-District \$	%	In-District \$	%	Dist. Unknown \$	%
	ASSEMBLYMEMBERS AND SENATORS	\$97,872,866	\$77,504,989	79.2%	\$11,874,326	12.1%	\$8,493,551	8.7%
1	Calderon, Charles M. D Asm	\$1,116,396	\$1,056,644	94.6%	\$3,250	0.3%	\$56,502	5.1%
2	Block, Martin D Asm	\$890,847	\$842,611	94.6%	\$28,936	3.2%	\$19,300	2.2%
3	De La Torre, Hector D Asm	\$832,821	\$783,850	94.1%	\$9,900	1.2%	\$39,071	4.7%
4	Wright, Roderick D Sen	\$949,412	\$893,360	94.1%	\$18,300	1.9%	\$37,752	4.0%
5	Coto, Joe D Asm	\$862,104	\$810,274	94.0%	\$16,850	2.0%	\$34,980	4.1%
6	de Leon, Kevin D Asm	\$1,248,735	\$1,173,185	93.9%	\$25,050	2.0%	\$50,500	4.0%
7	Calderon, Ron D Sen	\$1,090,179	\$1,020,929	93.6%	\$20,550	1.9%	\$48,700	4.5%
8	Padilla, Alex D Sen	\$1,329,743	\$1,241,468	93.4%	\$21,225	1.6%	\$67,050	5.0%
9	Blumenfield, Bob D Asm	\$968,378	\$903,005	93.2%	\$16,224	1.7%	\$49,149	5.1%
10	Hayashi, Mary D Asm	\$1,228,779	\$1,139,359	92.7%	\$38,920	3.2%	\$50,500	4.1%
11	Furutani, Warren T. D Asm	\$518,200	\$479,782	92.6%	\$5,717	1.1%	\$32,700	6.3%
12	Bass, Karen D Asm	\$1,692,556	\$1,551,219	91.6%	\$52,794	3.1%	\$88,543	5.2%
13	Fuentes, Felipe D Asm	\$1,172,669	\$1,071,744	91.4%	\$8,500	0.7%	\$92,425	7.9%
14	Davis, Mike D Asm	\$269,005	\$245,755	91.4%	\$6,150	2.3%	\$17,100	6.4%
15	Salas, Mary D Asm	\$758,294	\$692,319	91.3%	\$41,600	5.5%	\$24,375	3.2%
16	Lowenthal, Alan D Sen	\$610,891	\$556,978	91.2%	\$35,763	5.9%	\$18,150	3.0%
17	Cedillo, Gilbert D Sen	\$105,750	\$95,950	90.7%	\$2,250	2.1%	\$7,550	7.1%
18	Huber, Alyson D Asm	\$591,408	\$535,110	90.5%	\$18,580	3.1%	\$37,719	6.4%
19	Hall, III, Isadore D Asm	\$1,273,971	\$1,146,271	90.0%	\$55,150	4.3%	\$72,550	5.7%
20	Correa, Lou D Sen	\$1,204,393	\$1,076,443	89.4%	\$29,800	2.5%	\$98,150	8.1%
21	Corbett, Ellen D Sen	\$657,075	\$585,158	89.1%	\$46,807	7.1%	\$25,110	3.8%
22	Smyth, Cameron R Asm	\$801,249	\$710,886	88.7%	\$46,263	5.8%	\$44,100	5.5%
23	Galgiani, Cathleen D Asm	\$1,229,398	\$1,088,066	88.5%	\$48,083	3.9%	\$93,249	7.6%

Table 1 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecontrol10

24	Mendoza, Tony	D	Asm	\$980,914	\$868,045	88.5%	\$56,744	5.8%	\$56,125	5.7%
25	Torres, Norma	D	Asm	\$921,904	\$815,054	88.4%	\$40,100	4.3%	\$66,750	7.2%
26	Arambula, Juan	I	Asm	\$212,830	\$188,080	88.4%	\$100	0.0%	\$24,650	11.6%
27	Romero, Gloria	D	Sen	\$244,161	\$215,063	88.1%	\$17,798	7.3%	\$11,300	4.6%
28	Pérez, John	D	Asm	\$1,594,823	\$1,400,934	87.8%	\$92,274	5.8%	\$101,615	6.4%
29	Ma, Fiona	D	Asm	\$1,919,031	\$1,684,144	87.8%	\$89,138	4.6%	\$145,749	7.6%
30	Oropeza, Jenny	D	Sen	\$401,697	\$352,457	87.7%	\$19,210	4.8%	\$30,030	7.5%
31	Negrete McLeod, Glori	D	Sen	\$1,067,924	\$936,669	87.7%	\$39,780	3.7%	\$91,475	8.6%
32	Caballero, Anna M.	D	Asm	\$639,373	\$560,324	87.6%	\$13,582	2.1%	\$65,467	10.2%
33	Torrico, Alberto	D	Asm	\$1,207,992	\$1,057,464	87.5%	\$15,800	1.3%	\$134,728	11.2%
34	Krekorian, Paul	D	Asm	\$362,419	\$317,126	87.5%	\$18,493	5.1%	\$26,800	7.4%
35	Wyland, Mark	R	Sen	\$464,029	\$403,410	86.9%	\$18,169	3.9%	\$42,450	9.1%
36	Garrick, Martin	R	Asm	\$685,426	\$593,531	86.6%	\$23,200	3.4%	\$68,695	10.0%
37	Hernandez, Edward P.	D	Asm	\$605,802	\$523,451	86.4%	\$37,202	6.1%	\$45,148	7.5%
38	Hollingsworth, Dennis	R	Sen	\$164,337	\$141,690	86.2%	\$799	0.5%	\$21,848	13.3%
39	Saldaña, Lori	D	Asm	\$331,877	\$284,916	85.8%	\$22,711	6.8%	\$24,250	7.3%
40	Yee, Leland	D	Sen	\$1,356,438	\$1,159,883	85.5%	\$138,505	10.2%	\$58,050	4.3%
41	Pérez, V. Manuel	D	Asm	\$792,829	\$677,371	85.4%	\$49,534	6.2%	\$65,924	8.3%
42	Price, Jr., Curren D.	D	Sen	\$769,376	\$657,231	85.4%	\$36,785	4.8%	\$75,360	9.8%
43	Alquist, Elaine	D	Sen	\$404,374	\$345,418	85.4%	\$28,025	6.9%	\$30,930	7.6%
44	Aanestad, Sam	R	Sen	\$263,296	\$224,696	85.3%	\$4,000	1.5%	\$34,600	13.1%
45	Solorio, Jose	D	Asm	\$1,357,328	\$1,153,938	85.0%	\$108,378	8.0%	\$95,012	7.0%
46	Duvall, Michael	R	Asm	\$404,421	\$342,957	84.8%	\$27,814	6.9%	\$33,650	8.3%
47	Nava, Pedro	D	Asm	\$526,476	\$444,676	84.5%	\$39,375	7.5%	\$42,425	8.1%
48	Cogdill, Dave	R	Sen	\$1,162,291	\$980,373	84.3%	\$68,700	5.9%	\$113,218	9.7%
49	Florez, Dean	D	Sen	\$99,900	\$83,900	84.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$16,000	16.0%
50	Lieu, Ted W.	D	Asm	\$1,081,653	\$907,978	83.9%	\$96,175	8.9%	\$77,500	7.2%
51	Adams, Anthony	R	Asm	\$363,005	\$304,155	83.8%	\$18,300	5.0%	\$40,550	11.2%
52	Carter, Wilmer Amina	D	Asm	\$564,835	\$470,738	83.3%	\$16,348	2.9%	\$77,749	13.8%
53	Gaines, Ted	R	Asm	\$878,654	\$731,343	83.2%	\$80,179	9.1%	\$67,132	7.6%
54	Ruskin, Ira	D	Asm	\$467,161	\$388,449	83.2%	\$41,332	8.8%	\$37,380	8.0%
55	Chesbro, Wesley	D	Asm	\$519,853	\$431,619	83.0%	\$31,701	6.1%	\$56,533	10.9%
56	Torlakson, Tom	D	Asm	\$558,265	\$463,034	82.9%	\$37,790	6.8%	\$57,441	10.3%
57	Jeffries, Kevin	R	Asm	\$346,431	\$286,152	82.6%	\$18,204	5.3%	\$42,075	12.1%

Table 1 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecontrol10

58	Tran, Van	R	Asm	\$524,064	\$432,614	82.5%	\$35,200	6.7%	\$56,250	10.7%
59	Beall, Jr., Jim	D	Asm	\$502,291	\$414,549	82.5%	\$51,937	10.3%	\$35,805	7.1%
60	Cox, Dave	R	Sen	\$438,107	\$357,157	81.5%	\$59,000	13.5%	\$21,950	5.0%
61	Villines, Mike	R	Asm	\$1,814,202	\$1,468,787	81.0%	\$113,075	6.2%	\$232,340	12.8%
62	Kehoe, Christine	D	Sen	\$687,699	\$556,369	80.9%	\$90,230	13.1%	\$41,100	6.0%
63	Miller, Jeff	R	Asm	\$825,812	\$664,402	80.5%	\$106,780	12.9%	\$54,630	6.6%
64	Swanson, Sandré R.	D	Asm	\$833,351	\$670,174	80.4%	\$91,427	11.0%	\$71,750	8.6%
65	Wolk, Lois	D	Sen	\$1,133,987	\$911,257	80.4%	\$147,082	13.0%	\$75,648	6.7%
66	Blakeslee, Sam	R	Asm	\$532,040	\$427,440	80.3%	\$66,850	12.6%	\$37,750	7.1%
67	Strickland, Audra	R	Asm	\$625,217	\$500,570	80.1%	\$42,610	6.8%	\$82,037	13.1%
68	Fong, Paul	D	Asm	\$741,111	\$592,579	80.0%	\$111,133	15.0%	\$37,399	5.0%
69	Liu, Carol	D	Sen	\$767,242	\$612,587	79.8%	\$81,229	10.6%	\$73,426	9.6%
70	Silva, Jim	R	Asm	\$680,975	\$540,250	79.3%	\$43,725	6.4%	\$97,000	14.2%
71	Hagman, Curt	R	Asm	\$769,051	\$608,921	79.2%	\$46,602	6.1%	\$113,527	14.8%
72	Buchanan, Joan	D	Asm	\$1,141,504	\$903,568	79.2%	\$143,248	12.5%	\$94,688	8.3%
73	Eng, Mike	D	Asm	\$1,150,097	\$909,284	79.1%	\$185,668	16.1%	\$55,145	4.8%
74	Emmerson, Bill	R	Asm	\$705,224	\$556,815	79.0%	\$61,971	8.8%	\$86,438	12.3%
75	Walters, Mimi	R	Sen	\$1,204,840	\$950,371	78.9%	\$161,844	13.4%	\$92,625	7.7%
76	Portantino, Anthony J.	D	Asm	\$1,682,969	\$1,320,606	78.5%	\$268,774	16.0%	\$93,589	5.6%
77	Huff, Bob	R	Sen	\$1,126,042	\$874,497	77.7%	\$130,651	11.6%	\$120,895	10.7%
78	Fletcher, Nathan	R	Asm	\$1,475,460	\$1,138,582	77.2%	\$150,674	10.2%	\$186,203	12.6%
79	Yamada, Mariko	D	Asm	\$549,354	\$422,286	76.9%	\$72,939	13.3%	\$54,129	9.9%
80	Anderson, Joel	R	Asm	\$871,923	\$666,863	76.5%	\$98,116	11.3%	\$106,944	12.3%
81	Niello, Roger	R	Asm	\$500,556	\$379,032	75.7%	\$56,199	11.2%	\$65,325	13.1%
82	Nielsen, Jim	R	Asm	\$932,939	\$704,870	75.6%	\$87,343	9.4%	\$140,725	15.1%
83	Runner, George	R	Sen	\$553,120	\$415,975	75.2%	\$68,970	12.5%	\$68,175	12.3%
84	Cook, Paul	R	Asm	\$617,091	\$462,055	74.9%	\$75,737	12.3%	\$79,299	12.9%
85	Evans, Noreen	D	Asm	\$765,807	\$572,426	74.7%	\$116,799	15.3%	\$76,582	10.0%
86	Dutton, Robert	R	Sen	\$649,789	\$484,901	74.6%	\$95,505	14.7%	\$69,383	10.7%
87	DeSaulnier, Mark	D	Sen	\$1,165,025	\$868,186	74.5%	\$198,228	17.0%	\$98,611	8.5%
88	Wiggins, Patricia	D	Sen	\$372,917	\$274,670	73.7%	\$64,209	17.2%	\$34,038	9.1%
89	Benoit, John J.	R	Sen	\$1,031,934	\$758,915	73.5%	\$145,820	14.1%	\$127,199	12.3%
90	Fuller, Jean	R	Asm	\$478,016	\$349,963	73.2%	\$43,778	9.2%	\$84,275	17.6%
91	Huffman, Jared	D	Asm	\$735,503	\$533,007	72.5%	\$137,953	18.8%	\$64,542	8.8%
92	Brownley, Julia	D	Asm	\$486,667	\$350,272	72.0%	\$111,020	22.8%	\$25,375	5.2%
93	Strickland, Tony	R	Sen	\$1,625,905	\$1,166,215	71.7%	\$245,317	15.1%	\$214,373	13.2%

Table 1 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecontrol10

94	Harman, Tom	R	Sen	\$1,360,262	\$972,719	71.5%	\$233,034	17.1%	\$154,508	11.4%
95	Berryhill, Tom	R	Asm	\$675,246	\$474,744	70.3%	\$65,820	9.7%	\$134,682	19.9%
96	Lowenthal, Bonnie	D	Asm	\$1,123,382	\$764,400	68.0%	\$285,083	25.4%	\$73,899	6.6%
97	Nestande, Brian	R	Asm	\$447,137	\$304,015	68.0%	\$61,950	13.9%	\$81,172	18.2%
98	Harkey, Diane	R	Asm	\$617,095	\$418,923	67.9%	\$137,299	22.2%	\$60,874	9.9%
99	Feuer, Mike	D	Asm	\$897,543	\$606,618	67.6%	\$229,675	25.6%	\$61,250	6.8%
100	Skinner, Nancy	D	Asm	\$929,774	\$626,640	67.4%	\$233,857	25.2%	\$69,276	7.5%
101	Knight, Steve	R	Asm	\$349,950	\$227,360	65.0%	\$64,603	18.5%	\$57,987	16.6%
102	Simitian, Joe	D	Sen	\$1,029,469	\$652,794	63.4%	\$303,125	29.4%	\$73,550	7.1%
103	Steinberg, Darrell	D	Sen	\$2,328,008	\$1,462,007	62.8%	\$697,435	30.0%	\$168,566	7.2%
104	Gilmore, Danny	R	Asm	\$672,111	\$419,207	62.4%	\$155,687	23.2%	\$97,217	14.5%
105	Ammiano, Tom	D	Asm	\$645,647	\$400,849	62.1%	\$209,724	32.5%	\$35,074	5.4%
106	Hill, Jerry	D	Asm	\$1,328,254	\$823,249	62.0%	\$401,039	30.2%	\$103,967	7.8%
107	DeVore, Chuck	R	Asm	\$87,500	\$53,950	61.7%	\$29,450	33.7%	\$4,100	4.7%
108	Pavley, Fran	D	Sen	\$1,138,753	\$685,118	60.2%	\$405,437	35.6%	\$48,199	4.2%
109	Berryhill, Bill	R	Asm	\$1,073,666	\$636,818	59.3%	\$217,744	20.3%	\$219,105	20.4%
110	Leno, Mark	D	Sen	\$1,723,923	\$1,014,593	58.9%	\$591,695	34.3%	\$117,634	6.8%
111	Monning, William	D	Asm	\$797,466	\$462,014	57.9%	\$236,174	29.6%	\$99,277	12.4%
112	Hancock, Loni	D	Sen	\$1,130,586	\$654,399	57.9%	\$383,770	33.9%	\$92,416	8.2%
113	Logue, Dan	R	Asm	\$512,859	\$286,550	55.9%	\$53,762	10.5%	\$172,547	33.6%
114	Maldonado, Abel	R	Sen	\$1,049,665	\$560,829	53.4%	\$366,710	34.9%	\$122,126	11.6%
115	Denham, Jeff	R	Sen	\$365,048	\$186,998	51.2%	\$92,500	25.3%	\$85,550	23.4%
116	Jones, Dave	D	Asm	\$1,149,786	\$580,718	50.5%	\$464,274	40.4%	\$104,795	9.1%
117	Conway, Connie	R	Asm	\$619,127	\$312,424	50.5%	\$203,927	32.9%	\$102,776	16.6%
118	Ashburn, Roy	R	Sen	\$0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a
119	Ducheny, Denise Morel	D	Sen	-\$600	-\$600	n/a	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a

Table 1 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecontrol10

Table 7: Top 100 ZIP codes sorted by amount contributed from each ZIP code

Includes reported contributions from 1/1/2007 through 3/17/ 2010 to Assemblymembers and Senators in office as of August 31, 2009. This table excludes contributions that do not have a U.S. ZIP code.

Rank	City	State	Zip	Total	Percent of contributions (that have a ZIP code)
1	Sacramento	CA	95814	\$23,149,034	23.66%
2	San Francisco	CA	94105	\$2,034,877	2.08%
3	Sacramento	CA	95833	\$1,408,211	1.44%
4	Los Angeles	CA	90020	\$1,395,635	1.43%
5	Burlingame	CA	94010	\$1,280,137	1.31%
6	Los Angeles	CA	90071	\$1,054,345	1.08%
7	Newport Beach	CA	92660	\$972,717	0.99%
8	Sacramento	CA	95811	\$843,928	0.86%
9	Sacramento	CA	95816	\$839,730	0.86%
10	Los Angeles	CA	90017	\$741,449	0.76%
11	Oakland	CA	94612	\$698,200	0.71%
12	Sacramento	CA	95834	\$669,150	0.68%
13	Pasadena	CA	91101	\$625,373	0.64%
14	Los Angeles	CA	90010	\$621,677	0.64%
15	San Francisco	CA	94111	\$583,888	0.60%
16	San Diego	CA	92101	\$569,376	0.58%
17	West Sacramento	CA	95691	\$569,168	0.58%
18	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	91730	\$477,438	0.49%
19	Napa	CA	94558	\$447,622	0.46%
20	Fort Worth	TX	76131	\$437,100	0.45%
21	Temecula	CA	92593	\$436,700	0.45%
22	Mill Valley	CA	94941	\$417,180	0.43%
23	Sacramento	CA	95815	\$413,095	0.42%
24	Sacramento	CA	95818	\$411,300	0.42%
25	Oakland	CA	94621	\$406,838	0.42%
26	Oakland	CA	94611	\$387,236	0.40%
27	Alameda	CA	94502	\$372,318	0.38%
28	Washington	DC	20001	\$347,788	0.36%
29	Washington	DC	20004	\$340,149	0.35%
30	Deerfield	IL	60015	\$335,900	0.34%
31	Los Angeles	CA	90024	\$311,950	0.32%
32	Los Angeles	CA	90064	\$306,856	0.31%
33	Oakland	CA	94610	\$300,935	0.31%
34	Palm Springs	CA	92262	\$287,174	0.29%
35	Palm Springs	CA	92264	\$285,275	0.29%
36	Granite Bay	CA	95746	\$276,050	0.28%
37	Washington	DC	20005	\$274,356	0.28%
38	Irvine	CA	92618	\$271,895	0.28%
39	San Francisco	CA	94107	\$270,460	0.28%
40	Atlanta	GA	30308	\$267,800	0.27%
41	New York	NY	10017	\$260,082	0.27%

Table 7 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecontrol10

42	Highland	CA	92346	\$258,249	0.26%
43	Los Angeles	CA	90040	\$256,140	0.26%
44	Atlanta	GA	30328	\$253,800	0.26%
45	Sacramento	CA	95819	\$253,300	0.26%
46	Alpine	CA	91901	\$249,034	0.25%
47	Temecula	CA	92592	\$248,962	0.25%
48	Burbank	CA	91505	\$243,180	0.25%
49	Los Angeles	CA	90005	\$238,894	0.24%
50	Long Beach	CA	90802	\$237,941	0.24%
51	Modesto	CA	95354	\$236,728	0.24%
52	Santa Monica	CA	90401	\$234,575	0.24%
53	Arcadia	CA	91007	\$234,352	0.24%
54	San Diego	CA	92121	\$230,400	0.24%
55	Washington	DC	20036	\$226,953	0.23%
56	Sacramento	CA	95864	\$226,953	0.23%
57	Pleasanton	CA	94588	\$226,661	0.23%
58	Rosemead	CA	91770	\$220,243	0.23%
59	Los Angeles	CA	90067	\$218,470	0.22%
60	Del Mar	CA	92014	\$218,370	0.22%
61	Pinole	CA	94564	\$215,400	0.22%
62	Los Angeles	CA	90015	\$209,405	0.21%
63	San Ramon	CA	94583	\$209,140	0.21%
64	Irvine	CA	92614	\$206,722	0.21%
65	San Francisco	CA	94104	\$202,242	0.21%
66	San Francisco	CA	94103	\$196,613	0.20%
67	Charlotte	NC	28217	\$195,900	0.20%
68	Washington	DC	20006	\$193,324	0.20%
69	La Canada Flintridge	CA	91011	\$190,694	0.19%
70	Los Angeles	CA	90049	\$188,055	0.19%
71	San Francisco	CA	94114	\$187,923	0.19%
72	Sacramento	CA	95826	\$181,138	0.19%
73	San Diego	CA	92122	\$179,325	0.18%
74	Rancho Santa Margarita	CA	92688	\$178,775	0.18%
75	Brooks	CA	95606	\$178,510	0.18%
76	Martinez	CA	94553	\$177,402	0.18%
77	San Francisco	CA	94102	\$176,234	0.18%
78	Newbury Park	CA	91320	\$175,250	0.18%
79	El Cajon	CA	92019	\$175,170	0.18%
80	Santa Clara	CA	95054	\$173,779	0.18%
81	Beverly Hills	CA	90210	\$173,333	0.18%
82	Pasadena	CA	91103	\$172,665	0.18%
83	Fresno	CA	93726	\$168,425	0.17%
84	Orange	CA	92865	\$166,200	0.17%
85	La Jolla	CA	92037	\$164,810	0.17%
86	Hollywood	FL	33027	\$164,600	0.17%
87	Los Angeles	CA	90025	\$163,525	0.17%
88	West Hollywood	CA	90069	\$162,375	0.17%
89	Cincinnati	OH	45206	\$160,200	0.16%
90	Thousand Oaks	CA	91362	\$159,577	0.16%

Table 7 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomtrol10

91	Englewood	CO	80112	\$158,673	0.16%
92	Santa Ana	CA	92705	\$155,638	0.16%
93	San Mateo	CA	94402	\$154,246	0.16%
94	Los Angeles	CA	90057	\$154,070	0.16%
95	La Puente	CA	91746	\$153,541	0.16%
96	Monterey Park	CA	91754	\$153,244	0.16%
97	North Chicago	IL	60064	\$152,850	0.16%
98	Sacramento	CA	95825	\$152,553	0.16%
99	Sacramento	CA	95821	\$152,250	0.16%
100	Pacific Palisades	CA	90272	\$148,429	0.15%

Table 7 - Remote Control - MAPLight.org - May 18, 2010

For details of data and methodology, or to download the data tables in this report, visit maplight.org/remotecomtrol10