

Greasing the Wheels:

The Crossroads
of Campaign
Money &
Transportation
Policy



November
2009

PIRGIM
Education Fund



Greasing the Wheels:
The Crossroads of Campaign Money
& Transportation Policy

By Lisa Gilbert, Democracy Advocate
& John M. Krieger, Transportation Advocate, Staff Attorney

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Mark Stout PhD of Mark L. Stout Consulting, David Donnelly, National Campaigns Director for Public Campaign Fund, and Robert Puentes of the Brookings Institution for generously taking time to read, comment, and interpret data for this report.

Thanks also to Phineas Baxandall and Brian Walker of U.S.PIRG for editorial assistance and Jeffrey Musto for research assistance.

Thanks to Surdna Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation for their generous support of this effort.

The authors bear responsibility for any factual errors. The recommendations are those of the PIRGIM Education Fund. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders or those who provided review.

© 2009 PIRGIM Education Fund. We issue this report under a Creative Commons “some rights reserved” license. You are free to copy, distribute, or display the work for non-commercial purposes, with attribution. For more information about this Creative Commons License, visit: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

PIRGIM Education Fund: With public debate around important issues often dominated by special interests pursuing their own narrow agenda, PIRGIM Education Fund offers an independent voice that works on behalf of the public interest. PIRGIM 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.

For more information about PIRGIM Education Fund or for additional copies of this report, please visit: www.pirgim.org

Cover Photo: © Shutterstock

Table of Contents:

Executive Summary	3
Introduction.....	5
Grease by Any Other Name - Money	6
Federal Transportation Campaign Giving	
State Transportation Campaign Giving	
The System Rolls On, But Bridges are Ignored	11
Conclusion.....	15
Appendix	16

Executive Summary

In the wake of the Minnesota I-35 bridge collapse there was enormous public outcry and recognition of the need to repair our crumbling infrastructure. Americans expected public officials to respond to the tragedy with a large scale effort to address the nearly 73,000 structurally deficient bridges in this country. The findings in this report suggest that did not happen.

As Congress prepares a new multi-year, multibillion dollar transportation bill, we explored the intersection of money and politics and recent transportation funding decisions.

We analyzed two data sets and new information that shine light on the influence of campaign giving on transportation funding decisions at the state and federal level. First the report examines, on a state-by-state basis, how much money was contributed to both federal and state campaigns by highway interests, defined as those from the development, automobile, transportation, and construction sectors. Then, the report looks at the number and dollar amounts of transportation earmarks from the 2008 federal transportation appropriations bill that were funded in each state to highlight the priorities of members of Congress.

Key findings:

- In 2008 there were 704 earmarked “member projects,” in the 50 states and the District of Columbia, totaling more than a half a billion dollars in federal-aid highway projects on the annual transportation appropriations bill.
- Members of Congress earmarked funds in the 2008 appropriations bill for just 74 bridge repair projects. Only slightly more than 10 percent of the highway funds allocated for “member projects” in that year’s appropriations bill went to bridge repair or restoration.¹
- At the same time, in 2008, highway interests gave over 133 million dollars to candidates for both federal and state office.

The findings suggest that elected officials often overlook preventative maintenance projects, especially when new capacity projects are encouraged by campaign contributions.

¹ Excluding emergency relief funding that was appropriated for the I-35W bridge after the collapse.

Recommendations:

We recommend reform of current campaign finance policy in order to ensure that the public interest is protected and that transportation decisions are made based on smart policy rather than politics.

- Congress should move to a voluntary system of publicly financing our elections that is focused on incentivizing small dollar donors and would raise the voices of individuals, keep elections competitive, and reduce the special access and influence of large corporate donors.
- Congress should spend taxpayers' money more wisely by focusing transportation dollars on solving our nation's biggest problems. Federal transportation money should be spent only on projects that produce real results over the long haul - for example, by reducing our dependence on oil, curbing global warming pollution, alleviating congestion, improving safety, and supporting healthy, sustainable communities.

Introduction:

Two years ago, when Minnesota's I-35 bridge collapsed into the Mississippi River, America woke up to the startling fact that over seventy thousand bridges on the national highway system were deemed as "structurally deficient." The national media and Congressional leaders reflected on how our great nation's basic infrastructure could be so badly neglected and called for immediate action and a shifting in national priorities to prevent future tragedies.

But the policy decisions that followed largely ignored the outcry. In the 2008 Transportation Appropriations bill, which was signed into law just a few months after the collapse, members of Congress choose to earmark highway funds for a variety of other uses, but only 10% of the project requests were for bridge repairs.²

This is indicative of a long trend that has persisted since the completion of the Interstate system. Many legislators and decision makers on both the state and federal level continue to use their influence to support construction of new highway capacity projects rather than our backlog of failing bridges.

A missing element in this debate has been the role of money and campaign giving in transportation policy. In a political system in which elected officials must raise huge sums of campaign contributions from major donors to win reelection, spending may be skewed toward road widening and new highway projects favored by developers, road builders and other interests. Deferring maintenance to build new capacity may seem senseless – much like a family with a leaky roof who instead builds a new addition – but it makes sense in Congress if money and politics favor those choices.

Until last year, it was nearly impossible to look closely at Congressional decision making about which types of highway projects get favored. The transportation earmarks in spending bills remained buried in obscurity without comprehensive information about their amounts or who requested them. While transportation earmarks and their famous "bridges to nowhere" have often been denounced as wasteful or corrupt, little solid analysis has been possible to determine how transportation earmarks might systematically be misspent.

² While the 2008 transportation appropriations bill allocated funding for various federal transportation agencies and programs, the earmark requests in the bill were specifically examined for this report, because they are a clear demonstration of the influence and prioritization of members of Congress, because their project requests circumvent agency review.

This report makes use of new data that allows detailed analysis of transportation earmarks in the 2008 appropriations bill, the first transportation spending bill after the I-35 W bridge collapse. Our research first examined each of the 704 earmarks made through the federal-aid highway program to determine what percentage were specifically dedicated to bridge repair projects.³ Mark Stout, a 25-year veteran of the New Jersey Department of Transportation and their former Director of Policy led the data coding effort.

Combined with detailed data on campaign contributions at the state and federal level, this report gives the first picture of how campaign contributions influence the kinds of transportation projects funded by Congress.

Grease by any other name - Money :

An impressive amount of money was spent by highway interests in the 2008 campaign cycle. Highway interests from the construction and transportation industry contributed \$80,381,414 directly to federal candidates, with 47 percent of the gifts going to Democrats and 53 percent going to Republican candidates.⁴

At the state level, \$53,555,970 was spent on direct campaign contributions from those same interests, with 39 percent going to Democrats and 61 percent going to Republicans. Together these sums show that in a single year transportation interests attempted to grease the wheels for their projects by making over 133 million dollars in campaign contributions to candidates⁵.


The numbers in direct contributions we found were large, and yet we know that still more money is spent by these same interests every year to peddle influence as they fund massive lobbyist expenditures, donate to political action committees and 527s, and give directly to political parties in a continuing effort to grease the wheels.

³ This report focused specifically on the member requests from the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Mark Stout, a 25-year veteran of the New Jersey Department of Transportation and their former Director of Policy led the data coding effort.

⁴ 2008 federal campaign contribution data compiled from the Center for Responsive Politics, found at www.opensecrets.org.

⁵ 2008 state campaign contribution data compiled from the National Institute of Money in State Politics, found at <http://www.followthemoney.org>.

**State Level Contributions received by Candidates from Highway Interests
(2008, R/D)***



*Excludes Washington DC, Guam, Puerto Rico, USVI, and American Somoa

More than \$50 million in campaign gifts in a single year is an especially large sum for state-level candidates, considering that campaign price tags for a typical state senate seat range in cost from as little as \$5,000 in North Dakota to a max of \$900,000 in California.⁶

In addition, highway interests spend more than many other industry groups on state level contributions. For instance, the energy and natural resources lobby spent \$43,452,702 in 2008, while the defense industry spent only \$260,757 to state candidates.⁷

Highway interests have a real stake in what projects get priority on a state transportation plan in a state. They make sure that they are heard on the topic.

At the federal level, the influence of big money contributions is better known, but no less troubling. Consider that over 80 million dollars was contributed directly to candidates at the federal level from highway interests in 2008, and the average price tag of a winning House of Representative race over the last two election cycles was only 1.2 million, while the average winning U.S. Senate race was 8.5 million.⁸


In other words, campaign contributions from highway interests could have financed the entire winning campaigns of almost one-in-ten senators or about 75 members of the House. Especially as highway interests target their gifts to “swing” votes and likely earmark sponsors, it is easy to see how this spending is very influential.

⁶ According to campaign data compiled by the Pew Center on the States, which can be found at http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/ttw/trends_map_data_table.aspx?trendID=19&assessmentID=10.

⁷ According to campaign data compiled by the National Institute for Money and State Politics, which can be found at [http://www.followthemoney.org/database/IndustryTotals.phtml?f=C&s=0&g\[\]=4](http://www.followthemoney.org/database/IndustryTotals.phtml?f=C&s=0&g[]=4).


⁸ According to campaign data compiled by the Center for Public Integrity, which can be found at http://www.opensecrets.org/bigpicture/elec_stats.php?cycle=2008.

Federal Level Contributions Received by Candidates from Highway Interests (2008 R/D)*



*Excludes Washington DC, Guam, Puerto Rico, USVI, and American Somoa

Campaign Contributions to State and Federal Candidates from Highway Interests, 2008 cycle



*Excludes Washington DC, Guam, Puerto Rico, USVI, and American Samoa

Here in Michigan, highway interests contributed \$952,062 to candidates at the state level, \$2,268,823 to federal candidates, and received 13 earmarks that totaled \$9,622,000.

State	# of Earmarks	Total earmarks \$	Total Federal \$	Total state \$
Michigan	13	\$9,622,000	\$2,268,823	\$952,062

The System Rolls on, but Bridges are Forgotten:

The height of new bridge and road construction occurred from 1956 to 1971, during the early building phase of the Interstate Highway System. Many of the bridges and overpasses that Americans travel over every day were built at that time and are therefore currently reaching a critical age.

The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) recently reported that one in every 4 bridges in this country is “in bad shape and in need of repair” and gave our nation’s bridges a barely passing grade overall on their annual national infrastructure report card.⁹

While powerful interests and developers lobby aggressively for project funding at all levels of government, these bridges are largely being ignored. Mark Stout, a former New Jersey Department of Transportation official confirmed that bridges are often given “short shrift” by elected officials.

“Unfortunately, bridge repair projects are often not thought of as very glamorous or newsworthy by local elected officials, business groups, and other people that influence Congressional earmarks. Even resurfacing projects attract more support, as the public sees and complains about potholes in their roads. What they don’t see are the rusty pieces of steel supporting the bridges they drive over every day,” Stout explained.

On the federal level, the influence that legislators hold over funding priorities is most pointedly demonstrated by the projects that they earmark for federal funding on spending bills.

According to the US Office of Management and Budget, the process of earmarking federal funds for member projects “circumvents otherwise applicable merit-based or competitive allocation processes, or specifies the location or recipient, or otherwise curtails the ability of the executive branch to manage its statutory and constitutional responsibilities pertaining to the funds allocation process.”¹⁰

While earmarks can be a legitimate means for members of Congress to recognize important unmet local needs, the type of earmarks Congress tends to select says much about how priorities get established. Earmarks are often described as a way for members of Congress to “bring home the bacon” to their district, and also to reward the interests that put and keep them in

⁹ American Society of Civil Engineers. *2009 Report Card for America’s Infrastructure*. March 2009.

¹⁰ *OMB Guidance to Agencies on Definition of Earmarks*. Retrieved from http://earmarks.omb.gov/earmarks_definition.html

power. While transportation interests continue to pour millions into federal campaign contributions, the projects and priorities they support win funding over necessary repair and maintenance projects.

The 2008 transportation appropriations bill, as passed in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008, funded 704 earmarked transportation projects at a cost of more than \$570 million under the federal-aid highway program, which is the largest source of federal road spending.

In spite of increased calls to address our nation's crumbling bridges following the I-35 W collapse, only 11% of the highway earmarks in that bill, which passed just months after the collapse, went to bridge repair projects. A survey of the 2008 earmarked projects shows that of the 704 member projects, only 74 funded repair or maintenance of a bridge, tunnel, or overpass.¹¹ The delegation from Mississippi, for instance, secured funding for 19 earmarked projects at a cost of \$29,414,000, and despite having a backlog of over 3,000 structurally-deficient bridges in the state, none of their earmarks went to bridge repair.

Here in Michigan, 1,584 bridges, or 14.5% of the total bridges in the state, are rated as structurally deficient, and yet our delegation requested only 3 earmarks for bridge repairs in the 2008 appropriations bill.

The total amount of taxpayer funds earmarked by members of Congress in 2008 for the federal highway program was \$582,315,000. The same money could have been used to bring approximately 20 structurally deficient bridges per state or two bridges per Congressional district into a state of good repair.¹²

¹¹ Excludes emergency relief funding for the I-35 W bridge.

¹² Using US Department of Transportation figure for structurally-deficient bridges and American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials estimate in 2008 of cost to repair every structurally deficient bridge in the country (\$48 billion), the average cost to repair each bridge is \$658,725.

Earmarks in the 2008 Appropriations Bill and Structurally-Deficient Bridges

State	Earmarks	Total amount	Earmarks for Bridge Repair	Earmarked bridge repair funds	Bridges	Structurally Deficient (2007)
Alabama	10	\$8,320,000	2	\$1,960,000	15,881	1,899
Alaska	1	\$7,350,000	0	-	1,229	155
Arizona	9	\$6,920,000	2	\$2,546,000	7,348	181
Arkansas	8	\$8,718,000	1	\$1,803,000	12,531	997
California	62	\$40,791,000	6	\$3,522,000	24,184	3,140
Colorado	13	\$11,128,000	0	-	8,366	580
Connecticut	11	\$7,051,000	2	\$2,548,000	4,175	358
Delaware	4	\$3,756,000	0	-	857	20
Florida	32	\$21,241,000	5	\$3,377,000	11,663	302
Georgia	21	\$9,516,000	2	\$1,433,000	14,563	1,028
Hawaii	3	\$15,013,000	0	-	1,115	142
Idaho	8	\$7,370,000	1	\$317,000	4,104	349
Illinois	24	\$14,240,000	3	\$1,167,000	25,998	2,501
Indiana	13	\$7,536,000	1	\$1,392,000	18,494	2,030
Iowa	14	\$9,769,000	3	\$1,794,000	24,776	5,153
Kansas	15	\$9,110,000	3	\$2,149,000	25,461	2,991
Kentucky	9	\$14,673,000	1	\$906,000	13,637	1,362
Louisiana	13	\$12,182,000	0	\$980,000	13,342	1,780
Maine	5	\$3,357,000	1	\$490,000	2,387	349
Maryland	16	\$12,513,000	1	\$328,000	5,127	388
Massachusetts	17	\$13,861,000	1	\$980,000	5,018	585
Michigan	13	\$9,622,000	3	\$1,188,000	10,923	1,584
Minnesota	12	\$7,518,000	0	-	13,067	1,156
Mississippi	19	\$29,414,000	0	-	17,007	3,002
Missouri	34	\$26,419,000	4	\$5,390,000	24,071	4,433
Montana	5	\$11,552,000	1	\$657,000	4,980	473
Nebraska	6	\$3,379,000	2	\$1,033,000	15,475	2,382
Nevada	14	\$9,404,000	1	\$453,000	1,705	47
New Hampshire	4	\$4,655,000	1	\$1,715,000	2,364	383
New Jersey	10	\$8,086,000	1	\$980,000	6,448	750
New Mexico	14	\$8,268,000	3	\$1,666,000	3,850	404
New York	34	\$20,817,000	1	\$294,000	17,361	2,128
North Carolina	17	\$10,989,000	3	\$2,035,000	17,783	2,272
North Dakota	3	\$1,998,000	0	\$1,998,000	4,458	743
Ohio	28	\$15,956,000	2	\$1,058,000	27,998	2,862
Oklahoma	8	\$4,274,000	1	\$316,000	23,524	5,793
Oregon	8	\$5,472,000	1	\$679,000	7,318	514
Pennsylvania	24	\$17,011,000	4	\$1,715,000	22,325	5,802
Rhode Island	2	\$1,848,000	1	\$490,000	748	164
South Carolina	8	\$6,405,000	0	-	9,221	1,260
South Dakota	8	\$8,363,000	0	-	5,924	1,216
Tennessee	9	\$6,684,000	0	-	19,838	1,325

Texas	31	\$15,518,000	2	\$2,167,000	50,271	2,186
Utah	8	\$4,794,000	1	\$1,453,000	2,851	233
Vermont	4	\$3,092,000	0	-	2,712	500
Virginia	9	\$8,701,000	1	\$2,717,000	13,417	1,208
Washington	34	\$28,708,000	4	\$3,410,000	7,651	400
West Virginia	12	\$45,269,000	0	-	7,001	1,058
Wisconsin	10	\$9,898,000	1	\$490,000	13,798	1,302
Wyoming	4	\$4,663,000	1	\$316,000	3,030	389
Washington DC	4	\$2,842,000	0	-	245	24
NAT TOTAL	704	\$574,482,000	74	\$59,912,000	599,766	72,524

Bridge repair also often loses out in state transportation planning. While new capacity projects typically dominate State Transportation Improvement Plans, states spend on average just 5 percent of their transportation budgets on bridge repair.¹³ Amazingly, several states even divert federal funds that are specifically sent from the Federal Highway Administration for bridge repair into new capacity and legislator pet projects.¹⁴

¹³ According to *Meeting the Needs of America's Bridges*, a report released by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials in Sept. 2007, states spent a total of \$73 billion on transportation projects in 2004. Of that amount, \$3.9 billion was committed to bridge repair and rehabilitation.

¹⁴ Robert S. Kirk and William J. Mallet, *Highway Conditions and the Federal/State Role (Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, Aug. 2010).

Conclusion

Our nation's current campaign system forces elected officials onto a never-ending fundraising treadmill. The day after they take office, politicians must turn an eye towards raising enough money for their reelection. This climate can lead legislators to spend more time talking to influential big donors and deep-pocketed interest groups than focusing on the vital issues of the day. In the case of the highway interests, the public suffers from the lack of "fixes" to critical roads and bridges they are forced to take to work daily.

In addition, corporate special interests know that money spent on lobbying and campaign contributions reap real rewards when they are seeking specific legislation, earmarks, and audiences with members of both state and federal office.

The money in politics has bred an environment that the public is all too aware of. In a recent bipartisan poll by the Tarrance Group and Lake Research, nearly four in five voters thought that large contributions and their influence would prevent Congress from tackling big hot-button issues like the mortgage melt down, out-of-control health care costs, and the fragile national economy.¹⁵

Recommendations:

We recommend reform of current campaign finance policy in order to ensure that the public interest is protected and that transportation decisions are made based on smart policy rather than politics.

- Congress should move to a voluntary system of publicly financing our elections that is focused on incentivizing small dollar donors and would raise the voices of individuals, keep elections competitive, and reduce the special access and influence of large corporate donors.
- Congress should spend taxpayers' money more wisely by focusing transportation dollars on solving our nation's biggest problems. Federal transportation money should be spent only on projects that produce real results over the long haul - for example, by reducing our dependence on oil, curbing global warming pollution, alleviating congestion, improving safety, and supporting healthy, sustainable communities.

¹⁵ Findings from a nationwide survey of 800 likely voters conducted by Lake Research Partners and The Tarrance Group and presented to the Congressional Fair Elections Coalition in Feb. 2009. See http://www.uspirg.org/uploads/hW/ci/hWcivu_HEv47o0MbdTAn4A/polling-presentation-bdr.pdf.

Appendix:

Federal Contributions State-by-State Breakdown from Highway Interests

		Federal Contributions to Candidates		
		Construction Interests	Highway Interests	Total Federal Special Interests
	AL			
Total		\$542,987.00	\$458,617.00	\$1,001,604.00
\$ D		\$138,200.00	\$158,656.00	\$296,856.00
\$ R		\$471,487.00	\$299,961.00	\$771,448.00
% D		25%	35%	30%
% R		75%	65%	70%
	AK			
Total		\$216,825.00	\$475,500.00	\$692,325.00
\$ D		\$-	\$-	\$-
\$ R		\$216,825.00	\$475,500.00	\$692,325.00
% D		0%	0%	0%
% R		100%	100%	100%
	AZ			
Total		\$5,819,061.00	\$3,074,277.00	\$8,893,338.00
\$ D		\$173,589.00	\$207,149.00	\$380,738.00
\$ R		\$5,645,472.00	\$2,867,128.00	\$8,512,600.00
% D		3%	7%	4%
% R		97%	93%	96%
	AR			
Total		\$211,385.00	\$433,450.00	\$644,835.00
\$ D		\$166,999.00	\$368,950.00	\$535,949.00
\$ R		\$44,386.00	\$64,500.00	\$108,886.00
% D		79%	85%	83%
% R		21%	15%	17%
	CA			
Total		\$2,045,192.00	\$1,804,627.00	\$3,849,819.00
\$ D		\$969,612.00	\$1,022,053.00	\$1,991,665.00
\$ R		\$1,075,580.00	\$782,574.00	\$1,858,154.00
% D		47%	57%	52%
% R		53%	43%	48%
	CO			
Total		\$392,217.00	\$330,623.00	\$722,840.00
\$ D		\$297,117.00	\$252,123.00	\$549,240.00
\$ R		\$95,100.00	\$78,500.00	\$173,600.00
% D		76%	76%	76%
% R		24%	24%	24%
	CT			
Total		\$364,550.00	\$246,800.00	\$611,350.00
\$ D		\$305,800.00	\$218,500.00	\$524,300.00
\$ R		\$58,750.00	\$28,300.00	\$87,050.00
% D		84%	89%	86%
% R		16%	11%	14%
	DE			
Total		\$257,196.00	\$113,317.00	\$370,513.00
\$ D		\$257,196.00	\$89,940.00	\$347,136.00
\$ R		\$-	\$23,377.00	\$23,377.00
% D		100%	79%	94%
% R		0%	21%	6%
	FL			
Total		\$1,660,888.00	\$1,787,959.00	\$3,448,847.00
\$ D		\$434,423.00	\$584,719.00	\$1,019,142.00

\$ R		\$1,226,465.00	\$1,203,240.00	\$2,429,705.00
% D		26%	33%	30%
% R		74%	67%	70%
GA				
Total		\$600,392.00	\$831,167.00	\$1,431,559.00
\$ D		\$96,890.00	\$183,418.00	\$280,308.00
\$ R		\$503,502.00	\$647,749.00	\$1,151,251.00
% D		16%	22%	20%
% R		84%	78%	80%
HI				
Total		\$248,600.00	\$337,850.00	\$586,450.00
\$ D		\$248,600.00	\$337,850.00	\$586,450.00
\$ R		\$-	\$-	\$-
% D		100%	100%	100%
% R		0%	0%	0%
ID				
Total		\$174,695.00	\$69,732.00	\$244,427.00
\$ D		\$-	\$-	\$-
\$ R		\$174,695.00	\$69,732.00	\$244,427.00
% D		0%	0%	0%
% R		100%	100%	100%
IL				
Total		\$6,604,103.00	\$2,712,326.00	\$9,316,429.00
\$ D		\$6,050,845.00	\$2,348,519.00	\$8,399,364.00
\$ R		\$553,258.00	\$363,807.00	\$917,065.00
% D		92%	87%	90%
% R		8%	13%	10%
IN				
Total		\$562,963.00	\$422,077.00	\$985,040.00
\$ D		\$322,110.00	\$238,042.00	\$560,152.00
\$ R		\$240,853.00	\$184,035.00	\$424,888.00
% D		57%	56%	57%
% R		43%	44%	43%
IA				
Total		\$372,740.00	\$416,062.00	\$788,802.00
\$ D		\$123,750.00	\$272,417.00	\$396,167.00
\$ R		\$183,060.00	\$143,645.00	\$326,705.00
% D		33%	65%	50%
% R		67%	35%	50%
KS				
Total		\$528,818.00	\$597,577.00	\$1,126,395.00
\$ D		\$-	\$53,670.00	\$53,670.00
\$ R		\$528,818.00	\$543,907.00	\$1,072,725.00
% D		0%	9%	5%
% R		100%	91%	95%
KY				
Total		\$859,046.00	\$701,203.00	\$1,560,249.00
\$ D		\$85,600.00	\$72,950.00	\$158,550.00
\$ R		\$773,446.00	\$628,253.00	\$1,401,699.00
% D		10%	10%	10%
% R		90%	90%	90%
LA				
Total		\$909,427.00	\$837,588.00	\$1,747,015.00
\$ D		\$412,047.00	\$418,088.00	\$830,135.00
\$ R		\$497,380.00	\$419,500.00	\$916,880.00
% D		45%	50%	48%
% R		55%	50%	52%
ME				
Total		\$359,586.00	\$239,834.00	\$599,420.00

\$ D		\$358,586.00	\$70,390.00	\$428,976.00
\$ R		\$-	\$169,444.00	\$169,444.00
% D		100%	29%	72%
% R		0%	71%	28%
	MD			
Total		\$380,960.00	\$405,797.00	\$786,757.00
\$ D		\$348,160.00	\$385,297.00	\$733,457.00
\$ R		\$32,800.00	\$20,500.00	\$53,300.00
% D		91%	95%	93%
% R		9%	5%	7%
	MA			
Total		\$444,684.00	\$358,101.00	\$802,785.00
\$ D		\$444,684.00	\$358,101.00	\$802,785.00
\$ R		\$-	\$-	\$-
% D		100%	100%	100%
% R		0%	0%	0%
	MI			
Total		\$731,411.00	\$1,537,412.00	\$2,268,823.00
\$ D		\$240,100.00	\$598,850.00	\$838,950.00
\$ R		\$491,311.00	\$938,562.00	\$1,429,873.00
% D		33%	39%	37%
% R		67%	61%	63%
	MN			
Total		\$910,324.00	\$924,619.00	\$1,834,943.00
\$ D		\$323,914.00	\$468,961.00	\$792,875.00
\$ R		\$586,410.00	\$455,658.00	\$1,042,068.00
% D		36%	51%	43%
% R		64%	49%	57%
	MS			
Total		583500	\$585,937.00	\$1,169,437.00
\$ D		169800	\$272,640.00	\$442,440.00
\$ R		413700	\$313,297.00	\$726,997.00
% D		29%	47%	38%
% R		71%	53%	62%
	MO			
Total		\$687,078.00	\$1,139,769.00	\$1,826,847.00
\$ D		\$181,800.00	\$355,585.00	\$537,385.00
\$ R		\$505,278.00	\$784,184.00	\$1,289,462.00
% D		26%	31%	29%
% R		74%	69%	71%
	MT			
Total		\$276,587.00	\$351,294.00	\$627,881.00
\$ D		\$228,787.00	\$351,294.00	\$580,081.00
\$ R		\$47,800.00	\$-	\$47,800.00
% D		83%	100%	92%
% R		17%	0%	8%
	NE			
Total		\$217,150.00	\$195,655.00	\$412,805.00
\$ D		\$20,700.00	\$13,000.00	\$33,700.00
\$ R		\$196,450.00	\$182,655.00	\$379,105.00
% D		10%	7%	8%
% R		90%	93%	92%
	NV			
Total		\$566,173.00	\$343,350.00	\$909,523.00
\$ D		\$218,503.00	\$172,100.00	\$390,603.00
\$ R		\$347,670.00	\$171,250.00	\$518,920.00
% D		39%	50%	43%
% R		61%	50%	57%
	NH			

Total		\$184,652.00	\$249,712.00	\$434,364.00
\$ D		\$24,550.00	\$5,260.00	\$29,810.00
\$ R		\$160,102.00	\$244,452.00	\$404,554.00
% D		13%	2%	7%
% R		87%	98%	93%
NJ				
Total		\$1,170,948.00	\$604,669.00	\$1,775,617.00
\$ D		\$944,048.00	\$277,299.00	\$1,221,347.00
\$ R		\$226,900.00	\$327,370.00	\$554,270.00
% D		81%	46%	69%
% R		19%	54%	31%
NM				
Total		\$509,084.00	\$270,073.00	\$779,157.00
\$ D		\$57,100.00	\$40,450.00	\$97,550.00
\$ R		\$451,984.00	\$229,623.00	\$681,607.00
% D		11%	15%	13%
% R		89%	85%	87%
NY				
Total		\$4,036,869.00	\$1,911,877.00	\$5,948,746.00
\$ D		\$3,712,804.00	\$1,673,177.00	\$5,385,981.00
\$ R		\$324,065.00	\$238,700.00	\$562,765.00
% D		92%	88%	91%
% R		8%	12%	9%
NC				
Total		\$813,687.00	\$803,781.00	\$1,617,468.00
\$ D		\$216,311.00	\$155,181.00	\$371,492.00
\$ R		\$597,376.00	\$648,600.00	\$1,245,976.00
% D		27%	19%	23%
% R		73%	81%	77%
ND				
Total		\$40,750.00	\$123,150.00	\$163,900.00
\$ D		\$40,750.00	\$123,150.00	\$163,900.00
\$ R		\$-	\$-	\$-
% D		100%	100%	100%
% R		0%	0%	0%
OH				
Total		\$1,266,492.00	\$969,968.00	\$2,236,460.00
\$ D		\$297,972.00	\$241,765.00	\$539,737.00
\$ R		\$968,520.00	\$728,203.00	\$1,696,723.00
% D		24%	25%	24%
% R		76%	75%	76%
OK				
Total		\$496,890.00	\$423,950.00	\$920,840.00
\$ D		\$65,600.00	\$36,000.00	\$101,600.00
\$ R		\$431,290.00	\$387,950.00	\$819,240.00
% D		13%	8%	11%
% R		87%	92%	89%
OR				
Total		\$650,944.00	\$717,905.00	\$1,368,849.00
\$ D		\$271,864.00	\$312,294.00	\$584,158.00
\$ R		\$379,080.00	\$405,611.00	\$784,691.00
% D		42%	44%	43%
% R		58%	56%	57%
PA				
Total		\$1,327,650.00	\$1,253,898.00	\$2,581,548.00
\$ D		\$543,665.00	\$592,908.00	\$1,136,573.00
\$ R		\$783,985.00	\$660,990.00	\$1,444,975.00
% D		41%	47%	44%
% R		59%	53%	56%
RI				

Total		\$187,328.00	\$76,750.00	\$264,078.00
\$ D		\$187,328.00	\$76,750.00	\$264,078.00
\$ R		\$-	\$-	\$-
% D		100%	100%	100%
% R		0%	0%	0%
SC				
Total		\$719,678.00	\$475,786.00	\$1,195,464.00
\$ D		\$214,750.00	\$159,850.00	\$374,600.00
\$ R		\$504,928.00	\$315,936.00	\$820,864.00
% D		30%	34%	31%
% R		70%	66%	69%
SD				
Total		\$137,842.00	\$183,299.00	\$321,141.00
\$ D		\$23,487.00	\$129,399.00	\$152,886.00
\$ R		\$114,355.00	\$53,900.00	\$168,255.00
% D		17%	71%	48%
% R		83%	29%	52%
TN				
Total		\$878,063.00	\$818,384.00	\$1,696,447.00
\$ D		\$181,850.00	\$241,500.00	\$423,350.00
\$ R		\$696,213.00	\$576,884.00	\$1,273,097.00
% D		21%	30%	25%
% R		79%	70%	75%
TX				
Total		\$2,653,761.00	\$2,252,825.00	\$4,906,586.00
\$ D		\$1,535,553.00	\$562,563.00	\$2,098,116.00
\$ R		\$1,118,208.00	\$1,690,262.00	\$2,808,470.00
% D		58%	25%	43%
% R		42%	75%	57%
UT				
Total		\$136,550.00	\$143,095.00	\$279,645.00
\$ D		\$56,300.00	\$70,946.00	\$127,246.00
\$ R		\$80,250.00	\$72,149.00	\$152,399.00
% D		41%	50%	46%
% R		59%	50%	54%
VT				
Total		\$7,800.00	\$10,950.00	\$18,750.00
\$ D		\$7,800.00	\$10,950.00	\$18,750.00
\$ R		\$-	\$-	\$-
% D		100%	100%	100%
% R		0%	0%	0%
VA				
Total		\$639,968.00	\$794,410.00	\$1,434,378.00
\$ D		\$74,400.00	\$148,119.00	\$222,519.00
\$ R		\$565,568.00	\$646,291.00	\$1,211,859.00
% D		12%	19%	16%
% R		88%	81%	84%
WA				
Total		\$581,180.00	\$759,520.00	\$1,340,700.00
\$ D		\$291,098.00	\$562,761.00	\$853,859.00
\$ R		\$290,082.00	\$196,759.00	\$486,841.00
% D		50%	74%	64%
% R		50%	26%	36%
WV				
Total		\$328,050.00	\$442,750.00	\$770,800.00
\$ D		\$182,950.00	\$350,250.00	\$533,200.00
\$ R		\$145,100.00	\$92,500.00	\$237,600.00
% D		56%	79%	69%
% R		44%	21%	31%

	WI			
Total		\$372,454.00	\$485,678.00	\$858,132.00
\$ D		\$165,029.00	\$177,298.00	\$342,327.00
\$ R		\$207,425.00	\$308,380.00	\$515,805.00
% D		44%	37%	40%
% R		56%	63%	60%
	WY			
Total		\$90,950.00	\$116,336.00	\$207,286.00
\$ D		\$-	\$-	\$-
\$ R		\$90,950.00	\$116,336.00	\$207,286.00
% D		0%	0%	0%
% R		100%	100%	100%
	TOTALS	Total Fed Transportation	Total Fed	Total Fed Special Interests
Total		\$44,760,128.00	\$35,621,286.00	\$80,381,414.00
\$D		\$21,713,021.00	\$15,821,132.00	\$37,534,153.00
\$R		\$23,046,877.00	\$19,800,154.00	\$42,847,031.00
%D		49%	44%	47%
%R		51%	56%	53%

State Contributions State-by-State Breakdown from Highway Interests

		State Contributions to Candidates		
		Transportation Interests	Construction	Total Special Interest
AL				
Total		\$152,820	\$500,046	\$652,866
\$ D		\$32,100	\$123,900	\$156,000
\$ R		\$120,720	\$376,146	\$496,866
% D		21%	25%	24%
% R		79%	75%	76%
AK				
Total		\$141,972	\$116,505	\$258,477
\$ D		\$26,209	\$24,285	\$50,494
\$ R		\$115,764	\$92,220	\$207,984
% D		18.00%	21%	20%
% R		82%	79%	80%
AZ				
Total		\$33,205	\$42,954	\$76,159
\$ D		\$2,619	\$3,887	\$6,506
\$ R		\$30,586	\$39,967	\$70,553
% D		8%	9%	9%
% R		92%	91%	91%
AR				
Total		\$81,151	\$117,800	\$198,951
\$ D		\$62,251	\$89,325	\$151,576
\$ R		\$17,500	\$25,925	\$43,425
% D		77%	76%	76%
% R		22%	22%	24%
CA				
Total		\$1,952,703	\$2,839,995	\$4,792,698
\$ D		\$868,020	\$1,099,019	\$1,967,039
\$ R		\$1,084,683	\$1,740,877	\$2,825,560
% D		44%	39.00%	41%
% R		56%	61.00%	59%
CO				
Total		\$58,372	\$109,570	\$167,942
\$ D		\$30,257	\$39,015	\$69,272
\$ R		\$27,965	\$70,555	\$98,520
% D		52%	36.00%	41%
% R		48%	64.00%	59%
CT				
Total		\$5,410	\$4,880	\$10,290
\$ D		\$3,080	\$2,600	\$5,680
\$ R		\$2,205	\$2,200	\$4,405
% D		57%	55%	55%
% R		41%	45%	45%
DE				
Total		\$25,576	\$146,722	\$172,298
\$ D		\$14,456	\$71,577	\$86,033
\$ R		\$11,120	\$75,145	\$86,265
% D		57%	49%	50%
% R		43%	51%	50%
FL				
Total		\$715,147	\$2,049,051	\$2,764,198
\$ D		\$175,301	\$442,634	\$617,935

\$ R		\$539,698	\$1,602,742	\$2,142,440
% D		25%	22%	22%
% R		75%	78%	78%
GA				
Total		\$607,012	\$865,642	\$1,472,654
\$ D		\$126,532	\$147,565	\$274,097
\$ R		\$477,129	\$711,777	\$1,188,906
% D		21%	17%	19%
% R		79%	82%	81%
HI				
Total		\$35,440	\$27,700	\$63,140
\$ D		\$31,840	\$18,800	\$50,640
\$ R		\$3,600	\$8,900	\$12,500
% D		90%	68%	80%
% R		10%	32%	20%
ID				
Total		\$37,250	\$136,182	\$173,432
\$ D		\$1,750	\$10,950	\$12,700
\$ R		\$35,500	\$124,732	\$160,232
% D		5%	8%	7%
% R		95%	92%	93%
IL				
Total		\$1,118,652	\$2,428,889	\$3,547,541
\$ D		\$635,038	\$1,505,770	\$2,140,808
\$ R		\$483,614	\$923,119	\$1,406,733
% D		57%	62%	60%
% R		43%	38%	40%
IN				
Total		\$632,124	\$1,571,760	\$2,203,884
\$ D		\$232,234	\$403,931	\$636,165
\$ R		\$399,891	\$1,161,701	\$1,561,592
% D		37%	26%	29%
% R		63%	74%	71%
IA				
Total		\$257,202	\$994,495	\$1,251,697
\$ D		\$137,927	\$634,250	\$772,177
\$ R		\$119,275	\$360,245	\$479,520
% D		54%	64%	62%
% R		46%	36%	38%
KS				
Total		\$143,567	\$410,767	\$554,334
\$ D		\$48,541	\$131,860	\$180,401
\$ R		\$95,026	\$278,907	\$373,933
% D		33%	32%	33%
% R		66%	68%	67%
KY				
Total		\$144,453	231,926	\$376,379
\$ D		\$88,750	\$146,835	\$235,585
\$ R		\$50,587	\$84,028	\$134,615
% D		61%	63%	63%
% R		35%	36%	37%
LA				
Total		\$30,350	\$111,800	\$142,150
\$ D		\$11,350	\$41,400	\$52,750
\$ R		\$19,000	\$70,400	\$89,400
% D		37%	37%	37%
% R		63%	63%	63%

	ME			
Total		\$9,379	\$10,880	\$20,259
\$ D		\$2,765	\$2,200	\$4,965
\$ R		\$6,614	\$8,680	\$15,294
% D		29%	20%	25%
% R		70%	80%	75%
	MD			
Total		\$96,812	\$81,801	\$178,613
\$ D		\$74,801	\$62,026	\$136,827
\$ R		\$22,011	\$19,775	\$41,786
% D		77%	76%	77%
% R		23%	24%	23%
	MA			
Total		\$95,285	\$148,352	\$243,637
\$ D		\$88,220	\$134,170	\$222,390
\$ R		\$7,065	\$13,782	\$20,847
% D		93%	90%	91%
% R		7%	9%	9%
	MI			
Total		\$575,063	\$376,999	\$952,062
\$ D		\$218,959	\$148,794	\$367,753
\$ R		\$331,904	\$193,380	\$525,284
% D		38%	39%	39%
% R		58%	51%	61%
	MN			
Total		\$15,963	\$21,950	\$37,913
\$ D		\$2,065	\$4,425	\$6,490
\$ R		\$13,773	\$17,525	\$31,298
% D		13%	20%	17%
% R		86%	80%	83%
	MS			
Total		\$22,000	\$88,555	\$110,555
\$ D		\$0	0	\$0
\$ R		\$0	0	\$0
% D		0%	0%	0%
% R		0%	0%	100%
	MO			
Total		\$535,426	\$2,336,359	\$2,871,785
\$ D		\$104,675	\$393,516	\$498,191
\$ R		\$430,751	\$1,942,843	\$2,373,594
% D		20%	17%	17%
% R		80%	83%	83%
	MT			
Total		\$32,815	\$143,223	\$176,038
\$ D		\$10,888	\$49,874	\$60,762
\$ R		\$21,032	\$90,240	\$111,272
% D		33%	35%	35%
% R		64%	63%	65%
	NE			
Total		\$34,462	\$123,121	\$157,583
\$ D		\$0	\$0	\$0
\$ R		\$9,096	\$29,450	\$38,546
% D		0%	0%	0%
% R		36%	24%	100%
	NV			
Total		\$498,318	\$835,199	\$1,333,517
\$ D		\$187,981	\$345,699	\$533,680
\$ R		\$278,613	\$459,750	\$738,363
% D		38%	41%	40%

% R		56%	55%	60%
	NH			
Total		\$78,909	\$40,450	\$119,359
\$ D		\$45,450	\$8,325	\$53,775
\$ R		\$33,459	\$32,125	\$65,584
% D		58%	21%	45%
% R		42%	79%	55%
	NJ			
Total		\$728,681	\$1,778,147	\$2,506,828
\$ D		\$442,432	\$1,146,353	\$1,588,785
\$ R		\$286,249	\$631,794	\$918,043
% D		61%	64%	63%
% R		39%	36%	37%
	NM			
Total		\$115,450	\$109,736	\$225,186
\$ D		\$71,750	\$64,190	\$135,940
\$ R		\$43,700	\$45,546	\$89,246
% D		62%	58%	60%
% R		38%	41%	40%
	NY			
Total		\$683,131	\$1,358,824	\$2,041,955
\$ D		\$345,385	\$538,285	\$883,670
\$ R		\$337,746	\$817,039	\$1,154,785
% D		51%	40%	43%
% R		49%	60%	57%
	NC			
Total		\$510,000	\$748,756	\$1,258,756
\$ D		\$288,973	\$493,034	\$782,007
\$ R		\$217,738	\$246,796	\$464,534
% D		57%	66%	62%
% R		43%	33%	38%
	ND			
Total		\$67,810	\$80,570	\$148,380
\$ D		\$0	\$0	\$0
\$ R		\$67,810	\$80,570	\$148,380
% D		0%	0%	0%
% R		100%	100%	100%
	OH			
Total		\$395,109	\$605,649	\$1,000,758
\$ D		\$91,700	\$144,832	\$236,532
\$ R		\$303,184	\$460,417	\$763,601
% D		23%	22%	24%
% R		77%	76%	76%
	OK			
Total		\$381,586	\$232,576	\$614,162
\$ D		\$149,337	\$82,330	\$231,667
\$ R		\$232,249	\$150,246	\$382,495
% D		39%	35%	38%
% R		61%	65%	62%
	OR			
Total		\$320,328	\$763,232	\$1,083,560
\$ D		\$119,455	\$351,728	\$471,183
\$ R		\$197,873	\$396,805	\$594,678
% D		37%	46%	43%
% R		62%	52%	57%
	PA			
Total		\$1,092,152	\$3,246,488	\$4,338,640
\$ D		\$566,031	\$2,021,352	\$2,587,383
\$ R		\$526,121	\$1,224,137	\$1,750,258

% D		52%	62.00%	60%
% R		48%	38%	40%
	RI			
Total		\$76,160	\$101,875	\$178,035
\$ D		\$63,460	\$80,195	\$143,655
\$ R		\$12,700	\$21,480	\$34,180
% D		83%	79%	81%
% R		17%	21%	19%
	SC			
Total		\$355,629	\$209,272	\$564,901
\$ D		\$98,448	\$50,585	\$149,033
\$ R		\$257,181	\$158,667	\$415,848
% D		28%	24%	26%
% R		72%	76%	74%
	SD			
Total		\$33,550	\$23,950	\$57,500
\$ D		\$6,050	\$2,500	\$8,550
\$ R		\$27,100	\$20,900	\$48,000
% D		18%	10%	15%
% R		81%	87%	85%
	TN			
Total		\$541,938	\$574,765	\$1,116,703
\$ D		\$224,889	\$245,250	\$470,139
\$ R		\$313,049	\$319,465	\$632,514
% D		42%	43%	42%
% R		58%	56%	58%
	TX			
Total		\$1,705,566	\$6,321,430	\$8,026,996
\$ D		\$307,068	\$1,273,064	\$1,580,132
\$ R		\$1,398,498	\$5,048,366	\$6,446,864
% D		18%	20%	20%
% R		82%	80%	80%
	UT			
Total		\$34,207	\$159,250	\$193,457
\$ D		\$2,005	\$10,900	\$12,905
\$ R		\$32,202	\$148,350	\$180,552
% D		6%	7%	7%
% R		94%	93%	93%
	VT			
Total		\$20,500	\$63,779	\$84,279
\$ D		\$3,600	\$3,050	\$6,650
\$ R		\$16,900	\$59,679	\$76,579
% D		18%	5%	8%
% R		82%	94%	92%
	VA			
Total		\$1,155,529	\$1,295,799	\$2,451,328
\$ D		\$457,739	\$520,386	\$978,125
\$ R		\$669,641	\$748,203	\$1,417,844
% D		40%	40%	40%
% R		58%	58%	60%
	WA			
Total		\$697,892	\$684,549	\$1,382,441
\$ D		\$373,669	\$233,773	\$607,442
\$ R		\$317,218	\$440,393	\$757,611
% D		53%	34%	44%
% R		45%	64%	56%
	WV			
Total		\$123,150	\$173,000	\$296,150

\$ D		\$93,800	\$144,850	\$238,650
\$ R		\$29,350	\$28,150	\$57,500
% D		76%	84%	81%
% R		24%	16%	19%
	WI			
Total		\$225,739	\$630,355	\$856,094
\$ D		\$77,750	\$281,747	\$359,497
\$ R		\$138,569	\$302,188	\$440,757
% D		34%	45%	42%
% R		61%	48%	58%
	WY			
Total		\$29,850	\$19,600	\$49,450
\$ D		\$4,200	\$3,650	\$7,850
\$ R		\$25,650	\$15,950	\$41,600
% D		14%	19%	16%
% R		86%	81%	84%
	TOTALS	Total State Transportation	Total State	Total State Special
Total		\$17,460,795.00	\$36,095,175.00	\$53,555,970.00
\$D		\$7,051,800.00	\$13,778,686.00	\$20,830,486.00
\$R		\$10,238,909.00	\$21,922,277.00	\$32,161,186.00
%D		40%	38%	39%
%R		60%	62%	61%

*State Data: National Institute on Money in State Politics,

*National Data: Center for Responsive Politics, <http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/>

