



OUTSIDE INFLUENCE:

OUT-OF-STATE MONEY IN THE 2016
SENATE ELECTIONS Oct. 2016

Outside Influence: Out-of-State Money in the 2016 Senate Elections

Chris MacKenzie
U.S. PIRG Education Fund
October 24, 2016

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Tyler Creighton of ReThink Media and Fred Wertheimer of Democracy 21 for reviewing the first draft of this report and providing thoughtful and informed comments.

The author also thanks Julian Notaro for his research and editorial assistance.

The author bears any responsibility for factual errors. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders or those who provided review.

© 2016 U.S. PIRG Education Fund. Some Rights Reserved. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons.

Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives 3.0 Unported License. To view the terms of this license, visit www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0.

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

Design and layout: Buddy Simpson

Introduction

Control of the United States Senate is at stake in the 2016 elections. Out of 34 senate races nationally, the outcome could be decided by just several swing states and a few key constituencies.¹ But there is another deciding factor in this year's race for the senate: money.

Voters are not the only ones who will determine control of the Senate. Big donors are also weighing in, often pouring money into elections held in states where they do not reside.

That money doesn't just give wealthy interests a seat at the table, it also influences who runs and who wins elections. In this year's primaries, better-funded congressional candidates won their race 82 percent of the time.²

As a result, qualified potential candidates without ties to wealthy donors are discouraged from even running and the candidates who do run are forced to compete in a race for cash, one which often takes them outside of their state to raise money from donors outside of their constituency.

This study examines what portion of money in this year's senate races was raised from out-of-state sources. Both candidate campaign fundraising and fundraising by external groups, including PACs, super PACs, and party committees, are included in this study, which relies on candidate and committee filings with the Federal Election Commission (FEC). Money from unitemized campaign donors, 501(c) organizations, and other secret-money groups are not included due to a lack of information on donor origins.

This report paints a clear picture of where money is coming from in senate races from New Hampshire to Nevada and raises serious questions about to whom elected officials are accountable: voters or wealthy special interests from out-of-state?

Report findings show that 77 percent of the disclosed contributions in this year's 34 senate races came from donors who live outside the state they are targeting. In the case of swing state races and in the case of spending by external groups in particular, this analysis shows that out-of-state money makes up a larger share of campaign spending.

This election cycle, Americans have made the issue of money in politics a top concern. In addition to highlighting out-of-state spending as a component of that issue, this report reviews solutions for empowering everyday voters and local contributors over wealthy out-of-state interests.



By the Numbers




85%

Average share of money in swing senate races coming from out-of-state.




\$468 million

Total disclosed out-of-state spending in senate races this cycle.



77%

Share of money in senate races nationwide coming from out-of-state.



88%

Share of spending by external groups, including PACs, super PACs, and party committees, coming from out-of-state.



95%

Percent of money in New Hampshire senate race coming from out-of-state, the highest among senate battleground states.

Background

Six years ago, the Supreme Court opened the door to unlimited spending by large donors and outside groups in its Citizens United decision. Since then, campaign mega-donors, secret-money groups, and super PACs have raised record amounts of money, refocusing our elections on wealthy interests rather than everyday voters.

The 2016 election has already broken previous fundraising records.³ More important than the amount of money spent is where that money is coming from.

If campaigns relied on everyday constituents for financing, candidates would be encouraged to engage a large number of voters in the political process and would focus on appealing to a broad swath of the population they seek to represent.

Instead, reports this election cycle show that campaigns frequently rely on wealthy donors and super PACs to fund election spending.⁴

In addition to the influence of large donors, constituents voting in a senate election this cycle should be aware that much of the money spent in their area comes from out-of-state. This report examines the impact and influence of out-of-state donors in the 2016 senate elections, highlighting their contributions in swing states that will determine which party controls the Senate.

The following analysis takes place in the context of an election year in which Americans have made money in politics a top national concern. Seventy-eight percent of Americans, including a wide majority of both Republicans and Democrats, believe that Citizens United should be overturned.⁵ Polling also shows that a large majority Americans believe that fundamental changes are needed in our campaign finance system to empower voters over wealthy interests.⁶

This report, which exposes a large influx of out-of-state money in U.S. senate races, supports the consensus that the voices of everyday constituents are being overshadowed by those of wealthy outside interests.

While today's campaign finance landscape is troubling, solutions that give everyone an equal voice in our democracy are already under consideration by members of Congress and lawmakers across the country at the state and local level. The following analysis highlights two of those solutions, including an amendment overturning Citizens United and programs that use public matching funds to encourage small donor fundraising.



Spending in Senate Races

So far this election, major party candidates and external groups that disclose their spending have funneled \$607 million in disclosed itemized contributions to senate elections. Nationally, \$467 million of that sum comes from donors contributing to a race in a state where they do not reside, accounting for over 77 percent of the total.

Oklahoma's senate race featured the least out-of-state fundraising, with only 19 percent of money coming from out-of-state donors. Oklahoma's senate race is one of only five races nationally in which the majority of disclosed and itemized contributions came from in-state sources.

New Hampshire's senate race featured a higher share of out-of-state spending than any other senate election in the country. Of the \$81 million in disclosed contributions which candidates and external groups are using to fund the race, only \$4 million came from within New Hampshire. Ninety-five percent of disclosed and itemized contributions spent in the state came from outside New Hampshire.

On average, a senate race this election cycle receives 77 percent of election funding from out-of-state sources.

Figure 1:
State-by-State: Percent disclosed senate funding from out-of-state




Figure 2:
State ranking, share out-of-state funding

State	In-State Funding	Itemized Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
New Hampshire	\$4,387,587	\$81,033,296	94.59%
Alabama	\$171,435	\$2,177,418	92.13%
Indiana	\$2,366,540	\$27,278,526	91.32%
Utah	\$262,834	\$2,853,135	90.79%
Vermont	\$257,341	\$2,312,113	88.87%
Pennsylvania	\$11,292,119	\$88,150,714	87.19%
North Carolina	\$4,869,239	\$33,553,809	85.49%
Alaska	\$370,364	\$2,218,698	83.31%
Idaho	\$349,034	\$2,000,426	82.55%
Nevada	\$12,314,210	\$69,219,902	82.21%
Ohio	\$10,023,927	\$55,672,078	81.99%
Arizona	\$3,075,983	\$15,138,678	79.68%
South Carolina	\$645,602	\$3,081,892	79.05%
Missouri	\$6,981,026	\$32,705,206	78.65%
South Dakota	\$445,052	\$2,000,644	77.75%
Kansas	\$502,879	\$1,927,158	73.91%
North Dakota	\$314,035	\$1,128,689	72.18%
Oregon	\$1,502,375	\$5,321,214	71.77%
Colorado	\$3,932,548	\$12,316,729	68.07%
Connecticut	\$1,603,930	\$4,922,090	67.41%
Florida	\$15,806,389	\$43,632,027	63.77%

 Races in swing states which could determine party control of the Senate

Figure 2:
State ranking, share out-of-state funding (cntd.)

State	In-State Funding	Itemized Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
Illinois	\$4,945,078	\$13,557,069	63.52%
Wisconsin	\$10,837,118	\$27,492,733	60.58%
Kentucky	\$1,558,368	\$3,909,466	60.14%
Iowa	\$1,717,194	\$4,282,317	59.90%
Maryland	\$5,554,113	\$13,569,786	59.07%
Hawaii	\$913,930	\$1,969,958	53.61%
Georgia	\$3,113,847	\$6,584,532	52.71%
Washington	\$2,406,200	\$5,078,002	52.62%
Louisiana	\$4,980,883	\$9,267,029	46.25%
Arkansas	\$1,790,835	\$3,291,996	45.60%
New York	\$7,218,970	\$13,024,157	44.57%
California	\$11,184,415	\$14,742,278	24.13%
Oklahoma	\$945,433	\$1,169,688	19.17%

Swing Races


Experts predict that senate races in Florida, Indiana, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina and Pennsylvania will decide which party controls the U.S. Senate in the 115th Congress.⁷ Together, candidates and external groups in those seven swing states raised 84.5 percent of their disclosed contributions from out-of-state sources. Campaigns, PACs, super PACs, and party committees spent a total of \$376 million in disclosed, itemized contributions, of which \$318 million came from out-of-state.

New Hampshire features the most out-of-state spending among swing senate races, with 95 percent of its funding coming from out-of-state. Florida features the least out-of-state spending for a senate swing race, with only 64 percent of election money coming from out-of-state donors.

FLORIDA

64% Out-of-State Spending

This year, Florida's senate race is one of the most expensive elections in the country, featuring nearly \$44 million in disclosed contributions from campaigns and external groups and over \$9 million in secret spending by 501(c) organizations. According to FEC filings, candidates and external groups have raised \$28 million for the race in disclosed contributions from out-of-state sources. That compares to the \$15.8 million they have raised from in-state contributors.



The race between Sen. Marco Rubio and Rep. Patrick Murphy features a lower share of out-of-state spending than any other swing senate race in the country.

Of the seven swing senate races occurring this year, Florida is generally considered the least competitive, with Sen. Marco Rubio leading reliably in the polls.

INDIANA

91% Out-of-State Spending

Journalists and pollsters report Indiana's senate race as a dead-heat between former Sen. Evan Bayh and Rep. Todd Young. In this race, four out of every five traceable dollars raised this cycle have come from outside Indiana.

The biggest spenders in Indiana this year are not candidates but super PACs and national party committees. Top funders include the Senate Leadership Fund, a super PAC that is part of the American Crossroads suite of GOP big-money groups, as well as the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC), Senate Majority PAC, and the National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC). All of these outside groups have spent over \$2 million on the senate race, with each raising over 90 percent of their funds from out-of-state.


The race between Bayh and Young is unique because Bayh has yet to disclose any contributions made to his campaign. Bayh entered the race in July, fairly late in the election cycle, with \$10 million already in his campaign account from previous congressional races. The numbers highlighted in this report include only campaign contributions made this election cycle.

MISSOURI

79% Out-of-State Spending

Polling over the last month shows the race between candidates Roy Blunt and Jason Kander has tightened to a dead heat, making Missouri a swing state that has drawn national attention as well political campaign dollars from across the country.⁸

Blunt and Kander have together raised nearly \$12 million in disclosed, itemized contributions for their campaigns, with \$8 million of that total coming from outside Missouri. Both candidates raised the majority of their disclosed contributions from out-of-state.



External groups which disclose their donors have poured over \$20 million into the Missouri senate race, 85 percent of which has come from out-of-state. The highest spending outside groups in the state include the Senate Leadership Fund, the NRSC, and the DSCC, all of which have spent over \$3 million in Missouri, with over 80% of their funding coming from out-of-state.

NEVADA

82% Out-of-State Spending

Nevada's senate race features \$55.7 million in external group spending by super PACs, PACs and party committees, with \$13.5 million in fundraising by candidate campaigns. Less than one-fifth of that money comes from within Nevada.

Candidates Joe Heck and Catherine Cortez Masto each raised more than two-thirds of their disclosed contributions from out-of-state sources. Together, more than 80 percent of candidate campaign contributions come from outside Nevada.

External groups spending on the Nevada senate race raised more than 82 percent of funds spent from out-of-state. Super PACs, PACs, and party committees raised \$55.7 million for the Nevada race, with only \$9.9 million of that total coming from Nevada donors.


NEW HAMPSHIRE

95% Out-of-State Spending

The senate race between candidates Kelly Ayotte and Maggie Hassan features a higher share of out-of-state spending than any other swing senate race in the country. Of the \$81 million in disclosed contributions raised for the New Hampshire senate race, 95 percent of that cash comes from out-of-state.

Perhaps the most shocking numbers in New Hampshire come from external groups, which raised more than 99 percent of their total disclosed spending from outside New Hampshire. Emblematic

of fundraising efforts in the Ayotte-Hassan race is Granite State Solutions, a super PAC using New Hampshire's nickname in its moniker. Granite State Solutions has spent more than \$18 million on the New Hampshire race, with all of its money coming from out-of-state.



NORTH CAROLINA

85% Out-of-State Spending

North Carolina candidates Richard Burr and Deborah Ross have raised a higher share of direct campaign contributions from out-of-state sources than candidates in any other swing state race. Burr and Ross have together raised \$10.9 million in itemized contributions to their campaigns, 70 percent of which has come from outside North Carolina.

North Carolina PACs, super PACs, and party committees have raised over \$22 million with less than two million dollars coming from North Carolina donors.

Over 85 percent of all disclosed and itemized money in the North Carolina senate race comes from out-of-state.

PENNSYLVANIA

87% Out-of-State Spending

Candidates and external groups in Pennsylvania raised more than \$88 million in disclosed contributions for the election. Of that total, \$77 million, or over 87 percent, came from out-of-state.

Candidates Pat Toomey and Katie McGinty both raised the majority of their disclosed, itemized contributions from out-of-state donors.

Super PACs, PACs, and party committees have spent over \$72 million on the Pennsylvania senate election, but have raised less than \$6 million of that total from in-state donors.

Path to Reform

There is no single solution for turning our elections into a democracy where all voices are heard. Instead, effective campaign finance reform requires a multipronged approach including reforms that allow for commonsense limits on big money, amplify the voices of everyday voters in elections, require robust disclosure of contributions, and strengthen enforcement of campaign finance laws.

The first reform necessary to building the power of in-state constituents is passing an amendment that would overturn Citizens United. Spending by external groups in senate elections is notably more reliant on out-of-state fundraising than candidate campaigns. In addition to enabling wealthy interests to spend unlimited amounts of money on our elections, external groups weighing in on this year's senate races raised nine out of every ten dollars from out-of-state donors. Overturning Citizens United would allow Congress to enact limits on super PAC fundraising, capping the amount that a single out-of-state donor is able to pour into a senate race through external groups.

Since 2010, more than 5 million people have signed petitions urging Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United. Seventeen states, the District of Columbia, more than 680 cities and towns, and a majority of the U.S. Senate in 2014 have called for an amendment.¹⁰

The second necessary reform to amplify the voice of in-state constituents in our senate races is the creation of a small donor empowerment program. Under that kind of system, candidates who voluntarily opt into the program and agree to turn down large contributions receive limited public matching funds for each small contribution they secure. Combined with refundable tax credits for small contributions or vouchers, these programs can encourage candidates to raise funds from a broad swath of their constituents and increase civic participation.

The Government by the People Act (Congressman Sarbanes, H.R. 20, 161 cosponsors) would create this type of system for House elections. The bill would encourage more Americans to participate in the process with a \$25 refundable tax credit for small donations and would match contributions of \$150 or less with limited public funds at a six-to-one ratio. To participate in the small donor matching program, candidates would have to limit contributions to \$1,000 or less.

Under the Government by the People Act, candidates relying on small donors could compete with candidates supported by wealthy donors. The Fair Elections Now Act (Senator Durbin, S.1538, 27 cosponsors) would create a similar system for Senate elections.

Small donor systems have proven effective. For example, New York City's program allowed participating candidates in the 2013 city council race to raise 61 percent of their contributions from small donations and matching funds.⁹ That year, 92 percent of candidates running in the primary participated in the program, and 46 of the 51 winning candidates in the race relied on it.¹¹

The proven impact of such programs is a reason why other states and localities have started adopting them. Last November, voters in Maine and Seattle passed clean election ballot initiatives with strong support, creating and strengthening their own small donor empowerment programs. In 2014, Montgomery County, Maryland, enacted legislation creating a small donor program similar to what New York has in place.

Methodology

Source of the data:

Data used in this report reflects candidate, PAC, super PAC, and party committee filings up through October 21, 2016.

The source of all fundraising numbers in this report, including both contributions raised and contributions raised by donor state, comes from candidate and committee filings with the Federal Election Commission, available at <http://fec.gov/fecviewer/CandidateCommitteeDetail.do>.

Data on spending by PACs, super PACs, and party committees in specific senate elections is sourced from the Center for Responsive Politics' website OpenSecrets.org.

This report examines disclosed election money coming through candidate campaigns, and external groups, including PACs, super PACs and party committees. Money from unitemized campaign donors, 501(c) organizations, and other secret-money groups are not included due to a lack of information on donor origins.

Candidate Campaign Fundraising:

For candidate campaign fundraising, this report tracks itemized individual contributions, which can be traced to a donor's home state. Loans, committee transfers, and self-funding contributions are not factored into this report.

To calculate the share of money a candidate has received from out-of-state, in-state itemized contributions (ISIC) were subtracted from a candidate's total itemized contributions (TIC), and that number was divided by a candidate's total itemized contributions.

$$(TIC - ISIC) / TIC = \text{Percent Candidate Contributions from Out-of-State}$$

Super PAC and PAC spending:

Most super PACs and PACs and many party committees spend on multiple elections, so examining total itemized fundraising by these external groups does not reflect their spending on a single senate race. Instead, this report examines external group spending in each state (EGS) through tools provided by OpenSecrets.org.

When examining external group spending, this report assumes that an external group will earmark as much as possible from in-state itemized contributions (ISIC) for spending on a senate election.

For example, Senate Majority PAC is one of the highest spending external groups this election cycle, and has spent money in senate races across the country. In Nevada, Senate Majority PAC spent \$6.5 million, and over the course of this cycle raised \$50,000 from Nevada donors. Money is fungible, and it is possible that the \$50,000 which Senate Majority Pac raised from Nevada donors went to other states the super PAC is spending on. For the purposes of this study, we assume that all \$50,000 were part of the \$6.5 million that Senate Majority PAC spent on the Nevada senate race.

Based on that assumption, this report takes external group spending in a senate race, subtracts total in-state itemized contributions, and that number is divided by the external group's spending on that race.

$$(EGS - ISIC)/EGS = \text{Percent PAC Contributions from Out-of-State}$$

Calculating out-of-state funding statewide and nationwide

This report highlights a single percentile for each state as the share of money in that state's senate election which comes from out-of-state.

To calculate that share for a specific state or a nationwide figure, we add all in-state itemized contributions (ISIC) for candidates and external groups and subtract that number from the sum of external group spending (EGS) and total itemized candidate contributions (TIC). This report then divides that figure by the sum of external group spending and total itemized candidate contributions.

$$(EGS+TIC-ISIC)/(TS+TIC) = \text{Percent Out-of-State Spending}$$

References

1. Harry Enten, "6 Really Important Races Are Really Close," FiveThirtyEight, October 6, 2016.
<http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/senate-update-6-really-important-races-are-really-close/>
2. Chris MacKenzie, "Better-Funded Candidates Sweep Congressional Primaries," U.S. PIRG Education Fund, September 14, 2016.
<http://www.uspirgedfund.org/news/usp/better-funded-candidates-sweep-congressional-primaries>
3. Fredreka Schouten and Christopher Schnaars, "Super PAC donations surge past \$1 billion," USA Today, September 21, 2016.
<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/2016/09/21/usa-today-analysis-super-pac-donations-surge-past-1-billion/90790546/>
4. Paul Blumenthal, "See The Amazing Campaign Contortionists Twist The Finance Rules," Huffington Post, October 3, 2016.
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/campaign-finance-clinton-trump-bush-rubio_us_57f2c63be4b0d0e1a9a9360c
5. Greg Stohr, "Americans Want Supreme Court to Turn Off Political Spending Spigot," Bloomberg Politics, September 28, 2015.
<http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-09-28/bloomberg-poll-americans-want-supreme-court-to-turn-off-political-spending-spigot>
6. "Americans' Views on Money in Politics," New York Times, June 2, 2015.
http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/06/02/us/politics/money-in-politics-poll.html?_r=0
7. Harry Enten, "6 Really Important Races Are Really Close," FiveThirtyEight, October 6, 2016.
<http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/senate-update-6-really-important-races-are-really-close/>
8. Kevin McDermott, "Monmouth poll finds statistical ties in Missouri's Senate & governor races; Trump leads Clinton," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 12, 2016.
http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/govt-and-politics/monmouth-poll-finds-statistical-tie-in-missouri-s-senate-race/article_d28646f3-f2d4-5448-a337-0bcf3a17a9c7.html
9. Michael Malbin, Testimony before the New York City Campaign Finance Board, Campaign Finance Institute, February 13, 2013.
http://www.cfinst.org/Press/PReleases/14-02-13/Testimony_before_the_New_York_City_Campaign_Finance_Board_Says_Small_Donor_Matching_Funds_a_Success_but_the_City_Should_Look_at_Changes_Moving_Forward.aspx
10. Jay Riestenberg, "Our Voices Our Democracy," Common Cause, February 2016.
<http://uspig.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/Our%20Voices%20Our%20Democracy.pdf>
11. "2013 Post-Election Report," New York City Campaign Finance Board, September 1, 2014.
http://www.nycfb.info/PDF/per/2013_PER/2013_PER.pdf

Appendix

Alabama	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Richard Shelby	\$104,100	\$1,634,086	93.63%
	Candidate	Ron Crumpton	\$10,715	\$12,989	17.51%
	Candidate Total		\$114,815	\$1,647,075	93.03%
	Super PAC	CITIZEN SUPER PAC	\$20,000	\$358,540	94.42%
	Super PAC	of Realtors Congressional Fund	\$2,500	\$32,830	92.39%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$31,335	\$135,606	76.89%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Patriots Citizens Fund	\$2,785	\$3,367	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$56,620	\$530,343	89.32%
	Total		\$171,435	\$2,177,418	92.13%
Alaska	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Lisa Murkowski	\$370,364	\$2,198,250	83.15%
	Candidate Total		\$370,364	\$2,198,250	83.15%
	Super PAC	Faith Family Freedom Fund	\$0	\$4,448	0.00%
	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$16,000	
	Outside Total		\$0	\$20,448	0.00%
	Total		\$370,364	\$2,218,698	83.31%

Arizona	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	John McCain	\$1,317,456	\$6,901,491	80.91%
	Candidate	Ann Kirkpatrick	\$1,424,630	\$3,118,971	54.32%
	Candidate Total		\$2,742,086	\$10,020,462	72.64%
	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$20,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Arizona Grassroots Action	\$271,249	\$4,180,064	93.51%
	Super PAC	Courageous Conservatives PAC	\$0	\$12,538	100.00%
	Super PAC	KelliPAC	\$3,750	\$730,223	99.49%
	PAC	National Assn for Gun Rights	\$500	\$82,513	99.39%
	Super PAC	Restore American Freedom & Liberty	\$2,115	\$12,538	83.13%
	Super PAC	Restore the Constitution Coalition	\$250	\$10,000	97.50%
	Super PAC	USA Business Freedom PAC	\$0	\$10,237	100.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$40,000	\$40,000	0.00%
	PAC	MoveOn	\$7,229	\$7,229	0.00%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$2,200	\$2,200	0.00%
	PAC	Senate Conservatives	\$5,000	\$5,000	0.00%
	Super PAC	Revive America PAC	\$930	\$5,000	81.40%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$674	\$674	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$333,897	\$5,118,216	93.48%
	Total		\$3,075,983	\$15,138,678	79.68%
Arkansas	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State

	Candidate	John Boozman	\$840,497	\$1,875,167	55.18%
	Candidate	Conner Eldridge	\$770,245	\$1,236,736	37.72%
	Candidate Total		\$1,610,742	\$3,111,903	48.24%
	Super PAC	America Ascendant PAC	\$180,093	\$180,093	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$180,093	\$180,093	0.00%
	Total		\$1,790,835	\$3,291,996	45.60%
California	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Kamala Harris	\$7,498,470	\$9,339,676	19.71%
	Candidate	Loretta Sanchez	\$1,295,753	\$2,644,958	51.01%
	Candidate Total		\$8,794,223	\$11,984,634	26.62%
	PAC	Defenders of Freedom & Security	\$3,000	\$3,000	0.00%
	Party Committee	Central Cmte/California	\$629,312	\$629,312	0.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Central Cmte	\$1,962	\$1,962	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$85	\$85	0.00%
	Super PAC	California's New Frontier	\$105,848	\$105,848	0.00%
	Super PAC	Californians for Fiscal Responsibility	\$595,301	\$595,301	0.00%
	Super PAC	Spirit of Democracy America	\$52,862	\$52,862	0.00%
	PAC	California Federation of Teachers	\$21,682	\$21,682	0.00%
	PAC	California Labor Federation AFL-CIO	\$15,476	\$15,476	0.00%
	PAC	Service Employees Intl Union Local 1000	\$26,914	\$26,914	0.00%
	PAC	Service Employees Intl Union Local 2015	\$148,293	\$148,293	0.00%

	PAC	Service Employees Intl Union/California	\$34,066	\$34,066	0.00%
	PAC	Southwest Regional C	\$264	\$264	0.00%
	PAC	Santa Barbara Women's PAC	\$127	\$127	0.00%
	Super PAC	California's Middle Class	\$755,000	\$1,122,452	32.74%
	Outside Total		\$2,390,192	\$2,757,644	13.32%
	Total		\$11,184,415	\$14,742,278	24.13%
Colorado	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Michael F. Bennet	\$3,587,633	\$8,401,900	57.30%
	Candidate	Darryl Glen	\$93,618	\$178,889	47.67%
	Candidate Total		\$3,681,251	\$8,580,789	57.10%
	Super PAC	Americas PAC	\$0	\$574,504	100.00%
	Super PAC	Colorado Conservative	\$55,000	\$55,000	0.00%
	PAC	Conservative Campaign	\$13,009	\$13,225	1.63%
	PAC	Conservative Strikefor	\$200	\$200	0.00%
	Party Commi	Democratic Party of Co	\$32,012	\$32,012	0.00%
	Super PAC	Fair Share Action	\$0	\$245,579	100.00%
	Super PAC	Faith Family Freedom	\$0	\$6,448	100.00%
	Super PAC	FreedomWorks for Am	\$655	\$3,143	79.16%
	PAC	FreedomWorks PAC	\$219	\$219	0.00%
	Super PAC	Immigrant Voters Win PAC	\$0	\$406,551	100.00%
	PAC	National Assn for Gun Rights	\$125	\$125	0.00%

	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$6,411	\$6,411	0.00%
	PAC	Patriots for Economic Freedom	\$9,265	\$9,265	0.00%
	Super PAC	Person to Person PAC	\$2,270	\$2,270	0.00%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$20,545	\$20,545	0.00%
	Super PAC	Restoration PAC	\$0	\$1,332,119	100.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Conservatives Action	\$500	\$605,030	99.92%
	PAC	Senate Conservatives Fund	\$110,717	\$294,536	62.41%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$150	\$150	0.00%
	Super PAC	United We Can	\$0	\$128,389	100.00%
	PAC	VIGOP	\$219	\$219	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$251,297	\$3,735,940	93.27%
	Total		\$3,932,548	\$12,316,729	68.07%
Connecticut	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Richard Blumenthal	\$1,544,620	\$4,859,830	68.22%
	Candidate	Dan Carter	\$59,300	\$62,250	4.74%
	Candidate Total		\$1,603,920	\$4,922,080	67.41%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$10	\$10	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$10	\$10	0.00%
	Total		\$1,603,930	\$4,922,090	67.41%
Florida	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State

	Candidate	Marco Rubio	\$3,088,990	\$7,011,894	55.95%
	Candidate	Patrick Murphy	\$4,691,658	\$9,435,106	50.27%
	Candidate Total		\$7,780,648	\$16,447,000	52.69%
	PAC	American Fedn of St/C	\$12,719	\$1,365,945	99.07%
	Super PAC	Blue America PAC IE (\$0	\$14,382	100.00%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$10,310	\$11,013	6.38%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$22,705	\$22,705	0.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$260,147	\$754,901	65.54%
	Super PAC	Fair Share Action	\$0	\$65,820	100.00%
	Super PAC	Florida First Project	\$887,000	\$1,534,148	42.18%
	Super PAC	Floridians for a Strong Middle Class	\$536,983	\$536,983	0.00%
	Super PAC	For Our Future	\$0	\$199,984	100.00%
	Super PAC	Human Rights Campai	\$338	\$338	0.00%
	Super PAC	Immigrant Voters Win	\$0	\$347,727	100.00%
	PAC	Intl Assn of Fire Fighters	\$321	\$321	0.00%
	Super PAC	Lets Clean Up Washington	\$150,926	\$150,926	0.00%
	PAC	MoveOn	\$9,883	\$9,883	0.00%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$1,721,529	\$8,023,274	78.54%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$60,498	\$60,498	0.00%
	PAC	National Right to Life	\$818	\$50,000	98.36%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$4,388	\$4,388	0.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$1,115,000	\$10,105,530	88.97%

	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$3,195,070	\$3,432,665	6.92%
	PAC	Service Employees International Union	\$2,520	\$4,136	39.07%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Patriots Citizens Fund	\$26,436	\$26,436	0.00%
	Super PAC	United for Progress PAC	\$0	\$28,704	100.00%
	Super PAC	United We Can	\$0	\$138,629	100.00%
	Super PAC	VoteVets	\$3,135	\$84,305	96.28%
	Super PAC	Women Speak Out PAC	\$5,015	\$126,214	96.03%
	Super PAC	Working America Coalition	\$0	\$85,172	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$8,025,741	\$27,185,027	70.48%
	Total		\$15,806,389	\$43,632,027	63.77%
Georgia	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Johnny Isakson	\$2,917,233	\$4,792,068	39.12%
	Candidate	Jim Barksdale	\$32,378	\$213,187	84.81%
	Candidate Total		\$2,949,611	\$5,005,255	41.07%
	Super PAC	National Assn of Realtors	\$163,990	\$1,579,031	89.61%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$246	\$246	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$164,236	\$1,579,277	89.60%
	Total		\$3,113,847	\$6,584,532	52.71%
Hawaii	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Brian Schatz	\$913,300	\$1,969,328	53.62%

	Candidate Total		\$913,300	\$1,969,328	53.62%
	PAC	Longshoremen's/Warehousemen's Union	\$620	\$620	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$10	\$10	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$630	\$630	0.00%
	Total		\$913,930	\$1,969,958	53.61%
Idaho	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding		Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Mike Crapo	\$243,659	\$1,651,228	85.24%
	Candidate	Jerry Sturgill	\$105,375	\$349,109	69.82%
	Candidate Total		\$349,034	\$2,000,337	82.55%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Army	\$0	\$89	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$0	\$89	100.00%
	Total		\$349,034	\$2,000,426	82.55%
Illinois	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Mark Kirk	\$1,534,169	\$4,528,117	66.12%
	Candidate	Tammy Duckworth	\$1,530,625	\$6,819,465	77.56%
	Candidate Total		\$3,064,794	\$11,347,582	72.99%
	PAC	Conservative Strikeforce	\$1,100	\$1,100	0.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$49,357	\$49,357	0.00%
	PAC	Service Employees International Union	\$2,953	\$2,953	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$150	\$150	0.00%

	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$150,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Illinois Voices Matter	\$242,000	\$242,000	0.00%
	Super PAC	Independent Voice for Illinois	\$1,578,000	\$1,757,203	10.20%
	Super PAC	NextGen Climate Action	\$3,798	\$3,798	0.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$384	\$384	0.00%
	Super PAC	Special Operations for America	\$142	\$142	0.00%
	PAC	North End Breakfast Club	\$2,400	\$2,400	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$1,880,284	\$2,209,487	14.90%
	Total		\$4,945,078	\$13,557,069	63.52%
Indiana	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Todd Young	\$1,798,706	\$4,843,764	62.87%
	Candidate	Evan Bayh	\$0	\$0	
	Candidate Total		\$1,798,706	\$4,843,764	62.87%
	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$0	\$8,133,066	100.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$31,549	\$5,193,495	99.39%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$192,268	\$3,337,332	94.24%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$223,543	\$2,385,542	90.63%
	Super PAC	Freedom Partners Action Fund	\$0	\$1,066,825	100.00%
	Super PAC	NEA Advocacy Fund	\$0	\$833,216	100.00%
	PAC	St/Cnty/Munic Employees	\$12,715	\$780,113	0.00%
	Super PAC	New Prosperity Foundation	\$0	\$415,000	100.00%

	Super PAC	Defending Main Street	\$0	\$125,000	100.00%
	PAC	Senate Conservatives Fund	\$79,067	\$109,497	27.79%
	PAC	Citizens United	\$360	\$27,318	98.68%
	Super PAC	Rampart PAC	\$13,437	\$13,437	0.00%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$13,396	\$13,396	0.00%
	Party Committee	Indiana Republican State Cmte	\$970	\$970	0.00%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$289	\$289	0.00%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$233	\$233	0.00%
	PAC	Gun Owners of America	\$0	\$26	100.00%
	PAC	Madison Project	\$7	\$7	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$567,834	\$22,434,762	97.47%
	Total		\$2,366,540	\$27,278,526	91.32%
Iowa	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Chuck Grassley	\$1,488,158	\$3,157,819	52.87%
	Candidate	Patty Judge	\$213,375	\$1,058,563	79.84%
	Candidate Total		\$1,701,533	\$4,216,382	59.64%
	Party Committee	Democratic Party of Iowa	\$3,169	\$3,169	0.00%
	PAC	MoveOn.org	\$8,087	\$8,087	0.00%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$18	\$18	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$10	\$10	0.00%
	Super PAC	Hunter Action Fund	\$3,800	\$53,865	92.95%

	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$577	\$577	0.00%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Army	\$0	\$209	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$15,661	\$65,935	76.25%
	Total		\$1,717,194	\$4,282,317	59.90%
Kansas	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Jerry Moran	\$502,879	\$1,924,908	73.88%
	Candidate	Patrick Wiesner	\$0	\$2,250	100.00%
	Candidate Total		\$502,879	\$1,927,158	73.91%
	Total		\$502,879	\$1,927,158	73.91%
Kentucky	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Rand Paul	\$387,067	\$1,661,708	76.71%
	Candidate	Jim Gray	\$997,536	\$1,537,443	35.12%
	Candidate Total		\$1,384,603	\$3,199,151	56.72%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$985	\$985	0.00%
	PAC	Gun Owners of America	\$26	\$26	0.00%
	PAC	Patriots for Economic Freedom	\$35	\$9,265	99.62%
	Super PAC	America's Liberty PAC	\$5,250	\$13,913	62.27%
	Super PAC	Climate Hawks Vote	\$6,219	\$6,219	0.00%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$200	\$5,010	96.01%
	Super PAC	Concerned American Voters	\$0	\$329,955	0.00%

	Super PAC	New Power PAC	\$33,680	\$33,680	0.00%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Patriots Citizens Fund	\$2,170	\$3,367	35.55%
	Super PAC	KENTUCKY MOVING FORWARD	\$125,200	\$307,895	59.34%
	Outside Total		\$173,765	\$710,315	75.54%
	Total		\$1,558,368	\$3,909,466	60.14%
Louisiana	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out- Of-State
	Candidate	Charles Boustany	\$1,908,204	\$3,040,154	37.23%
	Candidate	John Kennedy	\$1,555,287	\$2,426,164	35.90%
	Candidate	John Fleming	\$470,944	\$1,255,276	62.48%
	Candidate	Foster Campbell	\$424,333	\$771,368	44.99%
	Candidate	Caroline Fayard	\$299,667	\$611,158	50.97%
	Candidate Total		\$4,658,435	\$8,104,120	42.52%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$54	\$54	0.00%
	Super PAC	Defend Louisiana	\$172,894	\$172,894	0.00%
	Super PAC	Ending Spending Action Fund	\$0	\$840,430	100.00%
	Super PAC	Louisiana Prosperity Fund	\$149,500	\$149,500	0.00%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Army	\$0	\$31	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$322,448	\$1,162,909	72.27%
	Total		\$4,980,883	\$9,267,029	46.25%
Maryland	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out- Of-State

	Candidate	Chris Van Hollen	\$4,324,062	\$6,329,737	31.69%
	Candidate	Kathy Szeliga	\$491,947	\$939,748	47.65%
	Candidate Total		\$4,816,009	\$7,269,485	33.75%
	Super PAC	L PAC	\$0	\$500	100.00%
	PAC	Citizens United	\$0	\$27,676	100.00%
	Party Committee	Central Cmte/Maryland	\$0	\$8,562	100.00%
	PAC	Service Employees Intl Union Local 32BJ	\$4,236	\$38,904	89.11%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$150	\$150	0.00%
	Super PAC	Clean Slate Baltimore PAC	\$0	\$8,443	0.00%
	Super PAC	Committee for Maryland's Progress	\$180,750	\$620,582	70.87%
	Super PAC	National Assn of Realtors	\$25,000	\$926,062	97.30%
	Super PAC	Sierra Club Independent Action	\$5,000	\$50,585	90.12%
	Super PAC	Women Vote!	\$512,968	\$2,934,855	82.52%
	Super PAC	Working for Maryland	\$0	\$15,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Working for Us PAC	\$10,000	\$1,668,982	99.40%
	Outside Total		\$738,104	\$6,300,301	88.28%
	Total		\$5,554,113	\$13,569,786	59.07%
Missouri	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Roy Blunt	\$1,767,700	\$5,601,859	68.44%
	Candidate	Jason Kander	\$2,131,845	\$6,309,800	66.21%
	Candidate Total		\$3,899,545	\$11,911,659	67.26%

	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$1,000	\$8,038,473	99.99%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$482,990	\$3,257,853	85.17%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$491,765	\$3,069,336	83.98%
	PAC	End Citizens United	\$47,146	\$1,786,338	97.36%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$1,590,696	\$1,590,696	0.00%
	Super PAC	VoteVets	\$0	\$1,572,635	100.00%
	PAC	Credit Union National Assn		\$500,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Heartland Resurgence	\$283,540	\$369,150	23.19%
	PAC	American College of Radiology	\$35,991	\$221,285	83.74%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$118,887	\$118,887	0.00%
	PAC	St/Cnty/Munic Employees	\$8,308	\$118,234	92.97%
	Super PAC	Women Speak Out PAC	\$2,500	\$68,504	96.35%
	Super PAC	National Assn of Realtors	\$14,743	\$29,611	50.21%
	Super PAC	Communications Workers of America	\$0	\$19,571	100.00%
	Super PAC	American Dental Assn	\$0	\$13,429	100.00%
	Super PAC	For Our Future	\$0	\$9,754	100.00%
	Super PAC	Working America Coalition	\$0	\$5,876	100.00%
	Super PAC	America Rising PAC	\$1,783	\$1,783	0.00%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$1,201	\$1,201	0.00%
	PAC	Intl Assn of Fire Fighters	\$791	\$791	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$140	\$140	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$3,081,481	\$20,793,547	85.18%

	Total		\$6,981,026	\$32,705,206	78.65%
Nevada	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Catherine Cortez Masto	\$1,143,057	\$8,054,769	85.81%
	Candidate	Joe Heck	\$1,286,873	\$5,448,160	76.38%
	Candidate Total		\$2,429,930	\$13,502,929	82.00%
	Super PAC	AAPI Victory Fund	\$0	\$23,501	100.00%
	PAC	St/Cnty/Munic Employees	\$6,619	\$4,407,439	99.85%
	Super PAC	Latino Victory PAC	\$0	\$75,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	VoteVets	\$1,250	\$1,094,211	99.89%
	PAC	American Medical Assn	\$1,600	\$18,714	91.45%
	PAC	Conservative Strikeforce	\$750	\$2,300	67.39%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$480,787	\$6,519,061	92.62%
	PAC	End Citizens United	\$17,160	\$2,074,278	99.17%
	PAC	MoveOn	\$7,562	\$7,562	0.00%
	PAC	NARAL Pro-Choice America	\$300	\$6,527	95.40%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$704,850	\$7,471,286	90.57%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$33,386	\$667,795	95.00%
	PAC	National Right to Life	\$0	\$6,441	100.00%
	PAC	Safari Club International	\$11,550	\$45,533	74.63%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$0	\$140	100.00%
	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$257,250	100.00%

	Super PAC	Americas PAC	\$0	\$294,840	100.00%
	Super PAC	For Our Future	\$0	\$202,166	100.00%
	Super PAC	Freedom Partners Action Fund	\$100,000	\$8,392,928	98.81%
	Super PAC	Campaign Equality Votes	\$1,043	\$1,043	0.00%
	Super PAC	Immigrant Voters Win	\$0	\$485,980	100.00%
	Super PAC	John Bolton Super PAC	\$25,000	\$650,000	96.15%
	Super PAC	League of Conservation Voters	\$0	\$2,072,427	100.00%
	Super PAC	National Assn of Realtors	\$3,900	\$1,505,427	99.74%
	Super PAC	NextGen Climate Action	\$0	\$531,246	100.00%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$1,250	\$2,038,600	99.94%
	Super PAC	Protecting Choice in California	\$0	\$409	100.00%
	Super PAC	Restoration PAC	\$0	\$6,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$8,133,568	\$8,133,568	0.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$50,705	\$6,541,563	99.22%
	Super PAC	We Vote - Nosotros Votamos	\$3,000	\$36,283	91.73%
	Super PAC	Women Vote!	\$300,000	\$2,116,520	85.83%
	Super PAC	Working America Coalition	\$0	\$30,935	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$9,884,280	\$55,716,973	82.26%
	Total		\$12,314,210	\$69,219,902	82.21%
New Hampshire	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Kelly Ayotte	\$2,528,904	\$9,321,216	72.87%

	Candidate	Maggie Hassan	\$1,430,459	\$7,577,683	81.12%
	Candidate Total		\$3,959,363	\$16,898,899	76.57%
	PAC	American College of Radiology	\$1,750	\$223,701	99.22%
	PAC	American Fedn of St/C	\$3,225	\$1,236,540	99.74%
	Super PAC	VoteVets	\$0	\$1,200,348	100.00%
	Party Commi	Democratic Senatorial	\$185,527	\$7,614,170	97.56%
	PAC	End Citizens United	\$36,588	\$1,695,043	97.84%
	PAC	MoveOn	\$19,782	\$6,876	-187.70%
	PAC	NARAL Pro-Choice America	\$10,475	\$10,223	-2.47%
	Party Commi	National Republican S	\$58,269	\$6,807,167	99.14%
	PAC	National Right to Life	\$0	\$1,792	100.00%
	PAC	Safari Club Internation	\$2,750	\$25,000	89.00%
	PAC	Service Employees Int	\$1,375	\$1,375	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$0	\$140	100.00%
	PAC	VIGOP	\$1,055	\$2,166	51.29%
	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$47,917	100.00%
	Super PAC	Responsible Solutions	\$17,949	\$2,536,894	99.29%
	Super PAC	ClearPath Action	\$0	\$136,187	100.00%
	Super PAC	Granite State Solutions	\$0	\$18,657,191	100.00%
	Super PAC	Campaign Equality Votes	\$0	\$1,030	100.00%
	Super PAC	Independence USA PAC	\$0	\$4,771,203	100.00%
	Super PAC	John Bolton Super PAC	\$0	\$705,877	100.00%

	Super PAC	National Right to Life Victory Fund	\$0	\$1,792	100.00%
	Super PAC	NEA Advocacy Fund	\$0	\$1,568,440	100.00%
	Super PAC	NextGen Climate Action	\$0	\$456,559	100.00%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$0	\$1,393,669	100.00%
	Super PAC	Priorities USA Action	\$5,000	\$132,105	96.22%
	Super PAC	Security is Strength	\$0	\$271,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$75,000	\$34,000	-120.59%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$9,479	\$11,369,239	99.92%
	Super PAC	United We Can	\$0	\$521,890	100.00%
	Super PAC	USW Works	\$0	\$28,030	100.00%
	Super PAC	Women Vote!	\$0	\$2,676,833	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$428,224	\$64,134,397	99.33%
	Total		\$4,387,587	\$81,033,296	94.59%
New York	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Charles E Schumer	\$7,153,892	\$12,810,489	44.16%
	Candidate	Wendy Long	\$30,550	\$71,400	57.21%
	Candidate Total		\$7,184,442	\$12,881,889	44.23%
	Super PAC	America is Worth It	\$0	\$39,600	100.00%
	PAC	American College of Radiology	\$32,583	\$100,000	67.42%
	PAC	Conservative Party of New York State	\$1,935	\$2,658	27.20%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$10	\$10	0.00%

	Outside Total		\$34,528	\$142,268	75.73%
	Total		\$7,218,970	\$13,024,157	44.57%
North Carolina	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Richard Burr	\$1,682,268	\$5,580,819	69.86%
	Candidate	Deborah Ross	\$1,568,735	\$5,300,450	70.40%
	Candidate Total		\$3,251,003	\$10,881,269	70.12%
	Super PAC	AAPI Victory Fund	\$0	\$21,500	100.00%
	PAC	American College of Radiology	\$111,440	\$239,824	53.53%
	PAC	St/Cnty/Munic Employees	\$2,608	\$1,214,090	99.79%
	PAC	Conservative Strikeforce	\$200	\$200	0.00%
	PAC	Democracy for America	\$14,739	\$177,564	91.70%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$678,811	\$6,340,101	89.29%
	PAC	MoveOn.org	\$6,136	\$6,136	0.00%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$28,369	\$28,369	0.00%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$50,438	\$2,468,888	97.96%
	PAC	National Right to Life	\$615	\$70,000	99.12%
	PAC	Replacements Ltd	\$4	\$4	0.00%
	PAC	Service Employees International Union	\$0	\$908,490	100.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$140	\$140	0.00%
	Super PAC	ClearPath Action	\$391,816	\$391,816	0.00%
	Super PAC	Communications Workers of America	\$0	\$23,926	100.00%

	Super PAC	Environment America Action Fund	\$25,496	\$25,496	0.00%
	Super PAC	Grow NC Strong	\$25,000	\$60,000	58.33%
	Super PAC	John Bolton Super PAC	\$238	\$500,000	99.95%
	Super PAC	League of Conservation Voters	\$0	\$553,081	100.00%
	Super PAC	NextGen Climate Action	\$0	\$22,109	100.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$275,000	\$7,413,223	96.29%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$6,186	\$220,166	97.19%
	Super PAC	Women Speak Out PAC	\$0	\$219,653	100.00%
	Super PAC	Women Vote!	\$1,000	\$1,767,764	99.94%
	Outside Total		\$1,618,236	\$22,672,540	92.86%
	Total		\$4,869,239	\$33,553,809	85.49%
North Dakota	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	John Hoeven	\$314,035	\$1,128,689	72.18%
	Candidate Total		\$314,035	\$1,128,689	72.18%
	Total		\$314,035	\$1,128,689	72.18%
Ohio	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Rob Portman	\$3,434,590	\$10,112,328	66.04%
	Candidate	Ted Strickland	\$1,556,696	\$5,691,284	72.65%
	Candidate Total		\$4,991,286	\$15,803,612	68.42%
	Super PAC	VoteVets	\$225	\$90,943	99.75%

	PAC	St/Cnty/Munic Employees	\$228,279	\$598,269	61.84%
	Party Committee	Democratic Party of Ohio	\$170,072	\$170,072	0.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$111,708	\$111,708	0.00%
	PAC	MoveOn	\$8,348	\$8,348	0.00%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$697,315	\$3,645,001	80.87%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$74,889	\$1,791,909	95.82%
	Party Committee	Republican Party of Ohio	\$377,615	\$377,615	0.00%
	PAC	United Steelworkers	\$856	\$856	0.00%
	PAC	VIGOP	\$2,589	\$2,589	0.00%
	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$400,923	100.00%
	Super PAC	ClearPath Action	\$0	\$387,910	100.00%
	Super PAC	Fighting for Ohio Fund	\$1,390,000	\$9,256,437	84.98%
	Super PAC	For Our Future	\$0	\$42,710	100.00%
	Super PAC	Freedom Partners Action Fund	\$500	\$9,981,583	99.99%
	Super PAC	Good Jobs & Strong Communities PAC	\$0	\$198,677	100.00%
	Super PAC	Mission16	\$114	\$114	0.00%
	Super PAC	National Assn of Realtors	\$103,500	\$977,696	89.41%
	Super PAC	NEA Advocacy Fund	\$0	\$22,905	100.00%
	Super PAC	New Leadership for Ohio	\$788,104	\$788,104	0.00%
	Super PAC	NextGen Climate Action	\$15	\$18,395	99.92%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$1,065,207	\$1,065,207	0.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$12,305	\$9,578,963	99.87%

	Super PAC	Tea Party Army	\$0	\$44	100.00%
	Super PAC	United We Can	\$0	\$48,655	100.00%
	Super PAC	Women Speak Out PAC	\$1,000	\$82,135	98.78%
	Super PAC	Working America Coalition	\$0	\$19,170	100.00%
	PAC	Ohio Voter Fund PAC	\$0	\$201,528	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$5,032,641	\$39,868,466	87.38%
	Total		\$10,023,927	\$55,672,078	81.99%
Oklahoma	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	James Lankford	\$938,804	\$1,163,059	19.28%
	Candidate	Sean Braddy	\$6,629	\$6,629	0.00%
	Candidate Total		\$945,433	\$1,169,688	19.17%
	Total		\$945,433	\$1,169,688	19.17%
Oregon	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Ron Wyden	\$1,500,875	\$5,313,877	71.76%
	Candidate	Mark Callahan	\$1,500	\$6,750	77.78%
	Candidate Total		\$1,502,375	\$5,320,627	71.76%
	Super PAC	Oregon Right to Life Victory PAC	\$0	\$587	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$0	\$587	100.00%
	Total		\$1,502,375	\$5,321,214	71.77%

Pennsylvania	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Spending	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Pat Toomey	\$3,699,599	\$11,240,143	67.09%
	Candidate	Katie McGinty	\$2,255,386	\$4,767,472	52.69%
	Candidate Total		\$5,954,985	\$16,007,615	62.80%
	Super PAC	Accountable Leadership	\$732,286	\$1,389,634	47.30%
	Super PAC	VoteVets	\$0	\$87,363	100.00%
	PAC	St/Cnty/Munic Employees	\$143,619	\$2,774,769	94.82%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$25,864	\$25,864	0.00%
	PAC	Conservative Strikeforce	\$200	\$200	0.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Party of Pennsylvania	\$3,668	\$3,668	0.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Senatorial Campaign Cmte	\$1,390,574	\$7,809,332	82.19%
	PAC	End Citizens United	\$128,098	\$2,066,360	93.80%
	PAC	MoveOn	\$6,136	\$6,136	0.00%
	PAC	NARAL Pro-Choice America	\$4,295	\$26,934	84.05%
	Party Committee	National Republican Senatorial Cmte	\$634,674	\$5,149,849	87.68%
	PAC	Safari Club International	\$13,025	\$30,000	56.58%
	PAC	Service Employees International Union	\$1,825	\$1,577,224	99.88%
	PAC	The 15104	\$119,000	\$119,000	0.00%
	PAC	United Steelworkers	\$856	\$856	0.00%
	PAC	VIGOP	\$2,648	\$2,648	0.00%
	Super PAC	American Unity PAC	\$0	\$130,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$587,150	\$1,461,602	59.83%

	Super PAC	Environment America Action Fund	\$0	\$96,525	100.00%
	Super PAC	For Our Future	\$0	\$180,527	100.00%
	Super PAC	Freedom Partners Action Fund	\$250	\$7,273,802	100.00%
	Super PAC	Growth & Opportunity PAC	\$0	\$262,789	100.00%
	Super PAC	Campaign Equality Votes	\$1,030	\$1,030	0.00%
	Super PAC	Independence USA PAC	\$0	\$3,362,165	100.00%
	Super PAC	League of Conservation Voters	\$25,050	\$643,300	96.11%
	Super PAC	NEA Advocacy Fund	\$0	\$222,801	100.00%
	Super PAC	NextGen Climate Action	\$200	\$449,700	99.96%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$51,750	\$2,736,031	98.11%
	Super PAC	Priorities USA Action	\$75,754	\$75,754	0.00%
	Super PAC	Prosperity for Pennsylvania	\$937,750	\$1,893,138	50.47%
	Super PAC	Senate Leadership Fund	\$0	\$9,084,686	100.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$108,145	\$18,814,249	99.43%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Patriots Citizens Fund	\$10,865	\$97,829	88.89%
	Super PAC	United We Can	\$0	\$498,766	100.00%
	Super PAC	USW Works	\$101,059	\$101,059	0.00%
	Super PAC	Women Vote!	\$231,363	\$3,679,595	93.71%
	Super PAC	Working America Coalition	\$0	\$7,914	100.00%
	Outside Total		\$5,337,134	\$72,143,099	92.60%
	Total		\$11,292,119	\$88,150,714	87.19%

South Carolina	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Tim Scott	\$626,150	\$2,949,912	78.77%
	Candidate	Thomas Dixon	\$13,670	\$22,621	39.57%
	Candidate Total		\$639,820	\$2,972,533	78.48%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$472	\$472	0.00%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$626	\$626	0.00%
	PAC	VIGOP	\$4,684	\$108,261	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$5,782	\$109,359	94.71%
	Total		\$645,602	\$3,081,892	79.05%
South Dakota	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	John Thune	\$445,052	\$2,000,644	77.75%
	Candidate Total		\$445,052	\$2,000,644	77.75%
	Total		\$445,052	\$2,000,644	77.75%
Utah	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Mike Lee	\$216,160	\$2,555,089	91.54%
	Candidate	Misty Snow	\$2,180	\$2,430	10.29%
	Candidate Total		\$218,340	\$2,557,519	91.46%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$4,542	\$10,456	56.56%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$626	\$626	0.00%
	Super PAC	FreedomWorks for America	\$620	\$92,843	99.33%

	PAC	Madison Project	\$2	\$2	0.00%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$161	\$161	0.00%
	Super PAC	Senate Conservatives Action	\$0	\$11,853	100.00%
	PAC	Senate Conservatives Fund	\$21,343	\$159,226	86.60%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Army	\$0	\$332	100.00%
	Super PAC	Tea Party Patriots Citizens Fund	\$450	\$3,367	86.63%
	Super PAC	Women Speak Out PAC	\$16,750	\$16,750	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$44,494	\$295,616	84.95%
	Total		\$262,834	\$2,853,135	90.79%
Vermont	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Patrick Leahy	\$257,341	\$2,312,113	88.87%
	Candidate Total		\$257,341	\$2,312,113	88.87%
	Total		\$257,341	\$2,312,113	88.87%
Washington	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Patty Murray	\$2,222,866	\$4,893,418	54.57%
	Candidate	Chris Vance	\$183,324	\$184,574	0.68%
	Candidate Total		\$2,406,190	\$5,077,992	52.62%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$10	\$10	0.00%
	Outside Total		\$10	\$10	0.00%
	Total		\$2,406,200	\$5,078,002	52.62%

Wisconsin	Type	Candidate Name	In-State Funding	Total Funding	Percent Out-Of-State
	Candidate	Ron Johnson	\$3,938,144	\$7,989,399	50.71%
	Candidate	Russ Feingold	\$2,693,165	\$11,017,868	75.56%
	Candidate Total		\$6,631,309	\$19,007,267	65.11%
	PAC	Amegy Bank	\$0	\$1,000	100.00%
	PAC	Club for Growth	\$15,415	\$23,304	33.85%
	PAC	Intl Assn of Fire Fighters	\$544	\$544	0.00%
	PAC	National Rifle Assn	\$18,418	\$18,418	0.00%
	PAC	Sierra Club	\$95	\$95	0.00%
	PAC	VIGOP	\$2,357	\$2,357	0.00%
	Super PAC	Americas PAC	\$10,000	\$248,400	95.97%
	Super PAC	Citizen PAC	\$0	\$65,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Club for Growth Action	\$323,250	\$1,519,375	78.72%
	Super PAC	For Our Future	\$0	\$104,070	100.00%
	Super PAC	Freedom Partners Action Fund	\$2,836,137	\$2,836,137	0.00%
	Super PAC	League of Conservation Voters	\$256	\$497,711	99.95%
	Super PAC	Let America Work	\$797,900	\$873,536	8.66%
	Super PAC	New Prosperity Foundation	\$0	\$70,000	100.00%
	Super PAC	Planned Parenthood Votes	\$1,000	\$135,282	99.26%
	Super PAC	Reform America Fund	\$91,350	\$1,325,117	93.11%
	Super PAC	Senate Majority PAC	\$672	\$672	0.00%

	Super PAC	Working America Coalition	\$0	\$5,270	100.00%
	Party Committee	Democratic Party of Wisconsin	\$17,065	\$17,065	0.00%
	Super PAC	Reform Wisconsin Fund	\$91,350	\$742,113	87.69%
	Outside Total		\$4,205,809	\$8,485,466	50.44%
	Total		\$10,837,118	\$27,492,733	60.58%