

Bill Igoe

2026-02-21

Abstract

I wrote this paper in response to the question: 'For which political party are campaign donations most "grassroots" in nature?'

The answer: Neither party can truly be considered grassroots, as it is the 'vital few'—a small number of large donors—who fund the vast majority of our elections.

There is also a darker reason I downloaded the election data containing 58 million records: The 2024 election cycle may be the last one where this detailed campaign finance data remains fully open and accessible to the public.

How the 'Vital Few' Shaped the 2024 Election Cycle

Introduction

Campaign fundraising in the 2024 election cycle was shaped by an extraordinary concentration of financial support: fewer than 3,000 donors accounted for half of the money directed through PAC Organizations and other. In effect, in a post-Citizens United (2010) world, the nation's election process resembles a capital market in which a relatively small set of large donors supplies a disproportionate share of political funding. In fact, the record shows that in 2024, the largest political donor was \$266.47 million.

The 'vital few' refers to the Pareto principle (also known as the 80/20 rule), where a small number of donors typically account for the majority of total campaign contributions.

To my knowledge, this paper is among the largest donor-level aggregations of F.E.C donations data analyzed to date.

Data and Methodology

Using data from the Federal Election Commission over 58 million donations were downloaded and aggregated into just under 8.3 million distinct donors to account for multiple donations from a single donor. Using the data, I applied various statistical metrics to illustrate that a 'vital few' actors had an outsized impact on total donations. Importantly, aggregation by donor means these figures reflect total financial activity rather than single transactions.

Results by Party

Gini coefficient (within each party)

(Table:1)

Party/Entity	Gini Coef
PAC Organizations and other	0.9
Republican	0.767
Democratic	0.733

The Gini coefficient summarizes how concentrated total giving is within each group. A value of 0 would mean donors contribute roughly evenly; a value of 1 would mean nearly all dollars come from a tiny number of donors. The striking result here is not that any group is perfectly “equal”—none is—but that concentration is extreme across the board, with the PAC Organizations and other bucket the most top-heavy. In other words: within each classification, a small financial apex accounts for a large share of total funding.

Recall that the Gini Coefficient is an often used metric for measuring inequality. The Gini Coefficient for income of the United States is 0.488. This level has steadily increased since 1970.

Given the income Gini coefficient as a reference, the most interesting statistic is the Gini Coefficient of 0.9 for PAC Organizations and other as shown in Table 1. This level of political concentration is highly unusual. The Gini Coefficient for Democratic and Republican donors is 0.733 and 0.767, respectively. While the two coefficients may look similar, because the Gini coefficient is nonlinear, even modest differences imply that the Democratic donor base is somewhat more grassroots than the Republican donor base.

Totals by party

(Table:2)

Party/Entity	Donors	Gifts	Millions of Dollars	Mean
PAC Organizations and other	4,212,112	35,509,246	\$12,197.33	\$2,895.78
Democratic	2,213,019	12,072,523	\$1,953.84	\$882.89
Republican	1,202,633	8,379,772	\$1,266.70	\$1,053.27

This table provides basic scale: how many distinct donors appear in each classification, how many donations they made, and the total dollars those donors contributed. Two features matter for interpretation. First, the donor counts are large enough that these results reflect broad patterns rather than outliers. Second, the mean donor amount is much larger than the

median (shown later), which is the classic signature of a heavy-tailed distribution: many small donors and a small number of very large donors. The difference in average amounts between the two parties strengthen the 'grass-roots' discussion of the Gini Coefficient.

Share of total dollars by party

(Table:3)

Party/Entity	Millions of Dollars	Percent
PAC Organizations and other	\$12,197.33	79.112%
Democratic	\$1,953.84	12.673%
Republican	\$1,266.70	8.216%

This table answers the question: 'Where are the dollars, in aggregate?' The shares reflect the classification rules used in the donor aggregation—especially the PAC Organizations and other bucket 79.112%—so this is not a statement about party preferences so much as party labeling. Still, the headline is clear: a very large fraction of total dollars sits outside formal party labels, which is exactly why distributional statistics (like the Lorenz curve and Gini) are more informative than raw totals alone. The percentage for Democratic and Republican parties is 12.673% and 8.216%, respectively

How many donors fund half the money (by party)

(Table:4)

Party/Entity	Donors for Half
PAC Organizations and other	2,535
Republican	44,449
Democratic	91,111

This is the most intuitive concentration metric in the report. It asks: how many of the largest donors does it take to accumulate half of all dollars in each classification? Smaller numbers mean sharper concentration. Framed this way, donor inequality becomes immediately tangible: the 'vital few' account for an outsized fraction of total funding, and the PAC Organizations and other bucket is dramatically more concentrated than the major-party buckets. In fact, the ratio of PAC Organizations and other to Democratic Party is 36 times more effective. For PAC Organizations and other 2,535 provide half the money. This metric alone defines the post-Citizens United world.

Top 1% / 0.1% / 0.01% share of dollars (by party)

(Table:5)

Party/Entity	Top 1%	Top 0.1%	Top 0.01%
PAC Organizations and other	68.432%	53.541%	36.648%
Republican	34.426%	20.976%	12.769%
Democratic	27.299%	11.421%	3.915%

These “top-slice” shares quantify how much funding is supplied by the most financially significant donors. The top 1% captures broad concentration; the top 0.1% and top 0.01% isolate the extreme tail. In financial terms, this is the “capital apex” of political giving. When these slices become large, it indicates that the funding system is dominated by a very small number of donors, even if the donor population itself is massive. The top 0.01 percent of donors make up 36.648%, 12.769% and 3.915% of donations for PAC Organizations and other, Republican and Democratic groups, respectively.

Bottom-half share of dollars (by party)

(Table:6)

Party/Entity	Bottom 50%
PAC Organizations and other	2.168%
Republican	5.821%
Democratic	6.999%

The flip side of concentration is what the broad middle contributes. This table estimates the share of dollars contributed by the bottom half of donors within each classification. A low bottom-half share implies that political giving is not just unequal—it is structurally dominated by the top. Put plainly: millions of donors may participate, but their dollars collectively account for only a small fraction of the total compared with the upper tail. Again, the table suggests that the Democratic donor base may be somewhat more grassroots

Taken together, these tables describe a funding distribution that looks less like a normal consumer market and more like a venture-capital return profile: many small participants, and a small set of donors who supply a disproportionate share of total dollars. The Lorenz curve visualizes that imbalance directly, showing how quickly cumulative dollars accumulate as one moves from small donors to the largest donors.

Lorenz Chart by Party

Lorenz Curve of Political Contributions (by Party Classification) — Cycle 2024




Figure (1) Lorenz Curve

The Lorenz curve provides a visual representation of donor inequality by plotting the cumulative share of donors against the cumulative share of dollars. Perfect equality would appear as a 45-degree line, where donors contribute proportionally to their numbers. Instead, the curves bend sharply away from that line, revealing a funding structure dominated by a small financial apex.

For reference, I added the 80/20 rule as the black line. That rule implies a Gini Coefficient of 0.76. Political donations are far more concentrated than the classical 80/20 rule.

The most pronounced curvature appears among PAC Organizations and other, indicating that a tiny fraction of donors accounts for the majority of funding. While both major parties exhibit meaningful inequality, the divergence from parity is greatest outside formal party structures, suggesting that political capital is highly concentrated within a narrow donor tier.

This visual evidence reinforces the statistical findings reported earlier. Metrics such as the Gini coefficient and the number of donors required to fund half of all donations describe the same structural reality from a mathematical perspective. The Lorenz curve makes that imbalance immediately visible: millions participate, yet the financial influence of the system is disproportionately shaped by a comparatively small group of donors.

Seen alongside the Lorenz curves, these donor records make visible the financial apex

responsible for much of modern campaign funding.

The Salt of the Earth

I begin this part with a simple statistic. The median donation is \$319.00.

3.253 million people gave less than that figure to provide \$422.49 million for the Democratic process. It took 4 donors to offset that effort.

Who are these 'vital few'?

(Table:7)

Name	Type	Millions of Dollars
MELLON, TIMOTHY 82331 SELF-EMPLOYED INVESTMENTS	Individual	\$165.00
ADELSON, MIRIAM 89145 ADELSON CLINIC PHYSICIAN	Individual	\$106.00
YASS, JEFF 19004 SIG MANAGING DIRECTOR	Individual	\$83.11
UIHLEIN, RICHARD E. 60044 ULINE CEO	Individual	\$81.46
MOSKOVITZ, DUSTIN A 94126 ASANA CEO	Individual	\$50.00
MELLON, TIMOTHY 82331 SELF EMPLOYED INVESTOR	Individual	\$32.00
SINGER, PAUL ELLIOTT 33480 EMC PRESIDENT	Individual	\$27.00
RAMASWAMY, VIVEK 45069 N/A ENTREPRENEUR	Individual	\$24.79
BIGELOW, ROBERT T. 89119 SELF-EMPLOYED AEROSPACE/REAL ESTATE/GENERAL CONTRACT	Individual	\$20.00
EYCHANER, FRED 60614 N/A RETIRED	Individual	\$20.00
KOUM, JAN 95051 RETIRED RETIRED	Individual	\$19.23
UIHLEIN, RICHARD 60044 ULINE CEO/OWNER	Individual	\$18.89
DUNN, TIMOTHY 79710 CROWNQUEST OPERATING EXECUTIVE	Individual	\$18.55
SHANAHAN, NICOLE 89501 SELF EMPLOYED INVESTOR	Individual	\$16.85
SINGER, PAUL E. 02115 EMC PRESIDENT	Individual	\$15.50
ADELSON, MIRIAM 89145 ADELSON DRUG CLINIC PHYSICIAN	Individual	\$15.00
RICKETTS, J. JOE 82922 SELF EMPLOYED BUSINESSMAN / PHILANTHROPIST	Individual	\$14.85
BIGELOW, ROBERT T 89032 SELF-EMPLOYED AEROSPACE & REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT	Individual	\$14.18
CLEMENT, CHRISTINA, HH LOREN REV. 19901 NJS HAIR CARE SELF EMPLOYED	Individual	\$12.01
HENDRICKS, DIANE 53512 ABC SUPPLY CHAIRWOMAN	Individual	\$11.95

These twenty individual donors accounted for \$766.37 million. Given the steepness the Lorenze curve these results should not come as a surprise. Below I break down the results by of all donors.

(Table:8)

Tier	Donors	Millions of Dollars	Mean
100m+	5	\$913.22	\$182,644,685.20
10m–100m	98	\$2,307.35	\$23,544,383.78
1m–10m	936	\$2,127.88	\$2,273,375.41
100k–1m	9,757	\$2,338.21	\$239,644.55
10k–100k	120,613	\$2,625.72	\$21,769.80
1k–10k	1,520,004	\$3,805.28	\$2,503.46
200–1k	2,810,749	\$1,177.62	\$418.97
<200	2,042,295	\$122.59	\$60.03

This final table confirms that wealth has an outsized influence elections. The competitive nature of winner take-all elections begets a game theory dynamic for both parties where, given enough time and sufficient propaganda (good or bad), extreme financial concentration risks weakening that belief. Benjamin Franklin warned use of this possible outcome - 'A republic, if you can keep it'.

I must remind you. The results above are from what are considered to be individual donations. The results are more alarming when looking at donor aggregates.

(Table:9)

Name	Party/Entity	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
FUTURE FORWARD USA ACTION 20003	PAC Organizations and other	\$266.47	22
MUSK, ELON 78734 SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES CORP. CEO	PAC Organizations and other	\$248.52	23
MELLON, TIMOTHY 82331 SELF-EMPLOYED INVESTMENTS	PAC Organizations and other	\$165.00	10
MAJORITY FORWARD 20005	PAC Organizations and other	\$127.23	58
ADELSON, MIRIAM 89145 ADELSON CLINIC PHYSICIAN	PAC Organizations and other	\$106.00	6
YASS, JEFF 19004 SIG MANAGING DIRECTOR	PAC Organizations and other	\$83.10	47
EMPOWER PARENTS PAC 33606	PAC Organizations and other	\$82.50	1
UIHLEIN, RICHARD E. 60044 ULINE CEO	PAC Organizations and other	\$81.43	67
COINBASE 94607	PAC Organizations and other	\$71.00	6

Name	Party/Entity	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
SENATE LEADERSHIP FUND 20011	PAC Organizations and other	\$67.44	20
FUND FOR POLICY REFORM 19809	PAC Organizations and other	\$60.00	1
SECURING AMERICAN GREATNESS 33401	PAC Organizations and other	\$52.56	1
MOSKOVITZ, DUSTIN A 94126 ASANA CEO	PAC Organizations and other	\$50.00	8
LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, INC. 20005	PAC Organizations and other	\$48.98	35
HOUSE MAJORITY FORWARD 20005	PAC Organizations and other	\$47.09	21
CLUB FOR GROWTH ACTION 20036	PAC Organizations and other	\$45.14	37
AMERICAN ACTION NETWORK 20006	PAC Organizations and other	\$43.04	17
DEMOCRACY PAC 20005	PAC Organizations and other	\$42.83	33
RESTORATION PAC 60515	PAC Organizations and other	\$39.16	61
ONE NATION 20169	PAC Organizations and other	\$35.58	5

These twenty donations amount to \$1,763.06 million, or 4.173 times the 3252971.0 of donors who gave less than the median of \$319.00 per donor. That count ratio is 162648.55 to one.

Conclusion - The Grapes of Wrath of Campaign Finance

Steinbeck wrote of the forgotten man struggling against forces he could neither see nor understand. In modern campaign finance, those forces are not dust storms or failing crops — but concentrated capital.

This study began with a statistic: the median donor contributed just \$319. Millions of Americans participated in the democratic process through modest gifts that, collectively, represented civic belief more than financial power. Yet that effort is increasingly overshadowed by a remarkably small number of individuals capable of deploying sums that rival institutional funding.

On a personal note, I find these figures haunting. Last summer I cycled alone around Lake

Michigan, stopping in small towns across Wisconsin and Michigan. There I saw something very different from concentrated financial power. I saw young entrepreneurs reopening storefronts, immigrant families running aging motels, and communities investing sweat equity into local renewal.

These are the citizens upon whom the durability of democratic institutions ultimately depends.

A political system functions best when participation feels meaningful — when citizens believe their voice carries weight alongside their vote. Extreme financial concentration risks weakening that belief. The question is not whether large donors have the right to participate; they do. The question is whether the growing imbalance between ordinary citizens and financial elites can coexist indefinitely with broad public trust.

Democracies rarely fail all at once. More often, confidence erodes quietly.

The data presented here suggest that the health of the system may depend less on the size of its largest donors — and more on whether the smallest still believe they matter.

Appendix: Largest Donors (for reference)

This appendix lists the largest aggregated donors for reference. These rows are included to support verification and follow-up reporting; they are not required to interpret the concentration metrics.

The magnitude of these donations provides important context for the distributional statistics presented earlier. The largest aggregated donor exceeded \$266 million, while several others contributed sums measured in the tens or hundreds of millions. Figures of this scale help explain why concentration metrics such as the Gini coefficient approach extreme values — a small number of donors can materially shift the financial center of gravity of the entire funding landscape.

Notably, the largest donations are concentrated within PAC Organizations and other, reinforcing earlier findings that this classification exhibits the greatest financial inequality. When individual donations reach eight- and nine-figure levels, the resulting distribution begins to resemble that of venture capital allocation rather than broad-based participation.

Top donors within each party classification (aggregated by donor_key).

(Table:10)

Party	Donor	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
Democratic	PRITZKER, JB 60606 STATE OF ILLINOIS GOVERNOR	\$2.71	7

Party	Donor	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
Democratic	PUYALLUP TRIBE OF INDIANS 98404	\$1.71	99
Democratic	HORNE, ANDREW 85018 SALT RIVER ORTHODONTICS ORTHODONTIST	\$1.31	3
Democratic	THANEDAR, SHRI 48203 STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE REPRESENTATIVE	\$1.21	3
Democratic	ETTINGER, JEFFREY M. 55912	\$1.19	3
Democratic	ROUDA, HARLEY 92651 TRIDENT HOLDINGS, INC. CEO	\$0.86	3
Democratic	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY 84201	\$0.85	4
Democratic	FEDERATED INDIANS OF GRATON RANCHERIA 94928	\$0.80	127
Democratic	BEKENSTEIN, JOSHUA 01778 BAIN CAPITAL INVESTOR	\$0.64	58
Democratic	EYCHANER, FRED 60614 NEWSWEB CORPORATION OWNER	\$0.59	14
Democratic	KLARMAN, SETH 02129 THE BAUPOST GROUP CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	\$0.59	24
Democratic	HOFFMAN, REID 98221 GREYLOCK PARTNERS VENTURE CAPITALIST	\$0.58	8
Democratic	DOERR, ANN HOWLAND 94301 NONE HOMEMAKER	\$0.58	6
Democratic	HARRIS, SR., WILLIAM 02421 MASS GENERAL HOSPITAL MD	\$0.58	6
Democratic	HOFFMAN, REID 94043 GREYLOCK VENTURE CAPITAL	\$0.58	8
Democratic	WHITESIDES, GEORGE T. 91390 SELF EMPLOYED POLICY ADVOCATE	\$0.57	10
Democratic	REESE, LEXI 94062 LEXI REESE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE	\$0.54	10
Democratic	STRYKER, PATRICIA 80524 SELF-EMPLOYED PHILANTHROPIST	\$0.54	6
Democratic	SOSNICK, AARON 89509 ART ADVISORS LLC FUND MANAGEMENT	\$0.52	70
Democratic	RANDALL, GIOVANNA 10011 HONOR NYC PRESIDENT/HEAD DESIGNER	\$0.52	51
Republican	RAMASWAMY, VIVEK 45069 N/A ENTREPRENEUR	\$24.79	20
Republican	CLEMENT, CHRISTINA, HH LOREN REV. 19901 NJS HAIR CARE SELF EMPLOYED	\$12.01	82
Republican	KOUM, JAN 95051 RETIRED RETIRED	\$10.00	4
Republican	NEVER BACK DOWN INC. 78734	\$5.25	2
Republican	SINGER, PAUL MR. 10019 ELLIOTT MANAGEMENT CORP. PRINCIPAL	\$5.00	1
Republican	GRIFFIN, KENNETH C. 33131 CITADEL INVESTMENT GROUP CEO	\$5.00	2
Republican	DAVIS, JAMES S. MR. 02135 NEW BALANCE CHAIRMAN	\$4.00	7
Republican	JOHNSON, PERRY 48084 PERRY JOHNSON SALES	\$3.80	12
Republican	ADELSON, MIRIAM DR. 89109 CHAIRWOMAN/MEDICAL DIRECTOR ADELSON CLINIC	\$3.00	2
Republican	DRAPER, TIMOTHY C. 94401 DRAPER MANAGEMENT COMPANY VENTURE CAPITAL	\$3.00	3
Republican	STEPHENS, WARREN A. MR. 72201 STEPHENS INC. EXECUTIVE	\$2.76	4

Party	Donor	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
Republican	WISCONSIN VICTORY COMMITTEE 41071	\$2.75	2
Republican	RUST, JOHN 47274 ROSE ACRE FARMS, INC. FARMER	\$2.71	22
Republican	WINRED 22219	\$2.52	613
Republican	RYAN, PATRICK G. MR. 55331 RYAN CO. CHAIRMAN	\$2.51	5
Republican	RYAN, SHIRLEY W. 60601 PATHWAYS.ORG CEO/CHAIRMAN	\$2.50	1
Republican	TEPPER, DAVID 33480 TEPPER SPORTS & ENTERTAINMENT PRESIDENT	\$2.35	4
Republican	STAND FOR AMERICA INC 77008	\$2.15	4
Republican	MICHIGAN VICTORY COMMITTEE 41071	\$2.10	3
Republican	DAUGHTRY, KELLY 27577 DAUGHTRY WOODARD LAWRENCE ATTORNEY	\$2.07	5
PAC Organizations and other	FUTURE FORWARD USA ACTION 20003	\$266.47	22
PAC Organizations and other	MUSK, ELON 78734 SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES CORP. CEO	\$248.52	23
PAC Organizations and other	MELLON, TIMOTHY 82331 SELF-EMPLOYED INVESTMENTS	\$165.00	10
PAC Organizations and other	MAJORITY FORWARD 20005	\$127.23	58
PAC Organizations and other	ADELSON, MIRIAM 89145 ADELSON CLINIC PHYSICIAN	\$106.00	6
PAC Organizations and other	YASS, JEFF 19004 SIG MANAGING DIRECTOR	\$83.10	47
PAC Organizations and other	EMPOWER PARENTS PAC 33606	\$82.50	1
PAC Organizations and other	UIHLEIN, RICHARD E. 60044 ULINE CEO	\$81.43	67
PAC Organizations and other	COINBASE 94607	\$71.00	6
PAC Organizations and other	SENATE LEADERSHIP FUND 20011	\$67.44	20
PAC Organizations and other	FUND FOR POLICY REFORM 19809	\$60.00	1
PAC Organizations and other	SECURING AMERICAN GREATNESS 33401	\$52.56	1
PAC Organizations and other	MOSKOVITZ, DUSTIN A 94126 ASANA CEO	\$50.00	8
PAC Organizations and other	LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, INC. 20005	\$48.98	35
PAC Organizations and other	HOUSE MAJORITY FORWARD 20005	\$47.09	21

Party	Donor	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
PAC Organizations and other	CLUB FOR GROWTH ACTION 20036	\$45.14	37
PAC Organizations and other	AMERICAN ACTION NETWORK 20006	\$43.04	17
PAC Organizations and other	DEMOCRACY PAC 20005	\$42.83	33
PAC Organizations and other	RESTORATION PAC 60515	\$39.16	61
PAC Organizations and other	ONE NATION 20169	\$35.58	5

Top donors overall (aggregated by donor_key).

(Table:11)

Party/Entity	Donor	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
PAC Organizations and other	FUTURE FORWARD USA ACTION 20003	\$266.47	22
PAC Organizations and other	MUSK, ELON 78734 SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES CORP. CEO	\$248.52	23
PAC Organizations and other	MELLON, TIMOTHY 82331 SELF-EMPLOYED INVESTMENTS	\$165.00	10
PAC Organizations and other	MAJORITY FORWARD 20005	\$127.23	58
PAC Organizations and other	ADELSON, MIRIAM 89145 ADELSON CLINIC PHYSICIAN	\$106.00	6
PAC Organizations and other	YASS, JEFF 19004 SIG MANAGING DIRECTOR	\$83.10	47
PAC Organizations and other	EMPOWER PARENTS PAC 33606	\$82.50	1
PAC Organizations and other	UIHLEIN, RICHARD E. 60044 ULINE CEO	\$81.43	67
PAC Organizations and other	COINBASE 94607	\$71.00	6
PAC Organizations and other	SENATE LEADERSHIP FUND 20011	\$67.44	20
PAC Organizations and other	FUND FOR POLICY REFORM 19809	\$60.00	1
PAC Organizations and other	SECURING AMERICAN GREATNESS 33401	\$52.56	1
PAC Organizations and other	MOSKOVITZ, DUSTIN A 94126 ASANA CEO	\$50.00	8

Party/Entity	Donor	Millions of Dollars	Gifts
other			
PAC Organizations and other	LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, INC. 20005	\$48.98	35
PAC Organizations and other	HOUSE MAJORITY FORWARD 20005	\$47.09	21
PAC Organizations and other	CLUB FOR GROWTH ACTION 20036	\$45.14	37
PAC Organizations and other	AMERICAN ACTION NETWORK 20006	\$43.04	17
PAC Organizations and other	DEMOCRACY PAC 20005	\$42.83	33
PAC Organizations and other	RESTORATION PAC 60515	\$39.16	61
PAC Organizations and other	ONE NATION 20169	\$35.58	5
PAC Organizations and other	AB FOUNDATION 20024	\$35.23	35
PAC Organizations and other	HOROWITZ, BEN 94025 AH CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PARTNER	\$34.38	6
PAC Organizations and other	ANDREESSEN, MARC 94025 AH CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PARTNER	\$34.38	6
PAC Organizations and other	GRIFFIN, KENNETH C. 33131 CITADEL INVESTMENT GROUP CEO	\$34.00	6
PAC Organizations and other	AMERICA VOTES 20036	\$33.58	51
PAC Organizations and other	UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS 20001	\$32.77	22
PAC Organizations and other	MELLON, TIMOTHY 82331 SELF EMPLOYED INVESTOR	\$32.00	9
PAC Organizations and other	BUILDING AMERICA'S FUTURE 20006	\$28.47	11
PAC Organizations and other	NEA ADVOCACY FUND, ASSOCIATION 20005 NEA NOT APPLICABLE	\$27.84	7
PAC Organizations and other	KOCH INDUSTRIES INC. 67220	\$27.00	9

(Table:12)

Committee Type	Number	Millions of Dollars	Mean
Independent expenditure-only (Super PACs)	192,824	\$3,434.34	\$17,810.76
Hybrid PAC (with Non-Contribution Account) - Nonqualified	2,644,263	\$2,643.45	\$999.69
PAC -- Nonqualified	4,150,521	\$2,172.10	\$523.33

Committee Type	Number	Millions of Dollars	Mean
House	1,571,045	\$628.93	\$400.33
Hybrid PAC (with Non-Contribution Account) - Qualified	425,826	\$599.44	\$1,407.72
Party - qualified	1,801,092	\$528.76	\$293.58
Senate	2,667,879	\$528.22	\$197.99
Presidential	1,931,791	\$487.83	\$252.53
PAC Qualified	2,158,661	\$443.84	\$205.61
Independent expeditor (person or group)	8,550	\$15.37	\$1,797.84
Party - nonqualified	9,720	\$12.64	\$1,300.84
Single-candidate independent expenditure	19	\$0.77	\$40,264.05