



# FAIR ELECTIONS IN MARYLAND COUNTIES |

**2022 UPDATE**

Matching Program for Counties  
Continues to Deliver

Emily Scarr, Maryland PIRG Foundation  
December 2023

**Maryland PIRG**  
Foundation

# FAIR ELECTIONS IN MARYLAND COUNTIES

---

## 2022 UPDATE

Matching Program for Counties  
Continues to Deliver

**Maryland PIRG**  
Foundation

Emily Scarr, Maryland PIRG Foundation

December 2023

# Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Joanne Antoine, Common Cause Maryland Executive Director for her review of drafts of this document, as well as her insights and suggestions. Thanks also to Ben Groff, Funk & Bolton Public Affairs for data analysis and editorial support, and Elizabeth Ridlington of Frontier Group for her data checking.

The authors bear responsibility for any factual errors. Policy recommendations are those of Maryland PIRG Foundation. 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.

© 2023 Maryland PIRG Foundation. 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 [creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0).

With public debate around important issues often dominated by special interests pursuing their own narrow agendas, Maryland PIRG Foundation offers an independent voice that works on behalf of the public interest. Maryland PIRG Foundation, a 501(c)(3) organization, works to protect consumers and promote good government. We investigate problems, craft solutions, educate the public, and offer meaningful opportunities for civic participation. For more information about Maryland PIRG Foundation or for additional copies of this report, please visit [www.marylandpirgfoundation.org](http://www.marylandpirgfoundation.org).

Frontier Group provides information and ideas to build a healthier, more sustainable America. We focus on problems that arise from our nation's material and technological wealth – the problems of abundance. We deliver timely research and analysis that is accessible to the public, applying insights gleaned from diverse fields of knowledge to arrive at new paths forward. For more information about Frontier Group, please visit [www.frontiergroup.org](http://www.frontiergroup.org).

The Fair Elections Maryland Coalition was founded to establish small donor campaign finance programs for local and state elections in Maryland. Since being founded, Fair Elections Maryland has worked with Montgomery County, Howard County, Prince George's County, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County to establish local small donor campaign finance programs. [www.fairelectionsmaryland.org](http://www.fairelectionsmaryland.org).

Layout: Ben Groff

Cover: Aaron Webb | Flickr, CC BY-NC-SA 2.0

# Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	4
How the Small Donor Matching Program Works.....	5
Impacts of the Small Donor Matching Program.....	7
2022 Election Cycle Details.....	8
Conclusion.....	9
Methodology.....	10
Appendix.....	12

# Executive Summary

**MARYLAND'S ELECTIONS, LIKE ELECTIONS** across the United States, are often dominated by big money – the large donations that come from a small pool of mega-donors and special interests. When big money dominates politics, it shapes everything from who decides to run for office to a candidate's ability to communicate their message to the public. Traditional campaign financing favors those with money and access, and people of color, women, low-income folks, young people, and immigrants are often left out.

In some places this dynamic is starting to change through systems of small donor public financing. Montgomery County and Howard County operated small donor public campaign financing programs. Programs are expected to come online for the 2024 or 2026 election cycles in Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Prince George's County, and Anne Arundel County, who have all passed similar laws.

The programs in Montgomery County and Howard County provide candidates for county-level positions with limited matching funds if they agree to accept contributions only from small donors. These programs are available for candidates regardless of political affiliation and have been used by candidates from both major political parties in 2018 and 2022. The goals of these programs include encouraging greater participation, reducing the influence of large donors, and enabling more residents to be able to run for public office.

In 2018, Montgomery County ran the first local election in Maryland to use a small donor matching system, and in 2019, Maryland PIRG reviewed data from that election and prepared

a report analyzing the effectiveness of the program in achieving its goals. The 2019 report found that:

1. Small donors accounted for a significantly larger portion of the fundraising for candidates qualifying for the program as compared to candidates who did not participate (98% vs. 3%).
2. The average donation was dramatically smaller for qualifying candidates than candidates who did not participate (\$86 vs. \$1,145).
3. The small donor program increased the participation of individual donors. Candidates who participated in the program received more contributions from individuals on average than non-participating candidates (850 vs. 434).
4. Candidates were able to run competitive races and successfully win elections using the small donor system.

This report updates and expands on the previous report by analyzing data from the 2022 election cycle. In 2022, both Howard and Montgomery counties operated small donor matching programs. Overall, the expanded data shows that the small donor matching system is continuing to achieve its stated goals. Our review of the 2022 data generally concurs with the 2018 report and continues to find that:

1. The small donor matching program elevates the role of small donors. Candidates who qualified for the program funded their campaigns almost completely through small donations and matching funds, while non-participating candidates received a much lower percentage of funds from small donations.

- Small donors provided 96% of the funding for qualified candidates in Montgomery County, while only providing 2% of funding to candidates who did not participate in the program.
  - Small donors provided 97% of the funding for qualified candidates in Howard County, while only providing 8% of the funding to candidates who did not participate in the program.
  - In aggregate across both counties, small donors provided 96% of funding to participating candidates, while only providing 3% of funding to candidates who did not participate in the matching program.
2. In 2022, as in 2018, the average donation was dramatically smaller for qualifying candidates than for candidates who did not participate in the matching program. This was true in both Montgomery County and Howard County.
- In Montgomery County, candidates qualifying for the small donor matching program received an average donation of \$120 from their contributors. For candidates who did not participate, the average contribution was \$2,948.
  - In Howard County, candidates who qualified for the program received an average contribution of \$139 while candidates who did not participate received an average donation of \$778.

## GOALS OF THE SMALL DONOR MATCHING PROGRAM

	Qualifying Candidates	Candidates who Did Not Participate	
✓ More small donor power	96%	3%	% of funding from small donors
✓ Reduced reliance on big money	\$124	\$2,137	Average contribution amount
✓ More individual participation	689	244	Average contributions from individuals
✓ Matching funds level the playing field	\$335	\$498	Average donation in County Council races, including matching funds

- In aggregate across both counties, qualifying candidates received an average contribution of \$124 while the average contribution for non-participating candidates was \$2,137.
3. Individual donors participate at a higher rate when candidates use the small donor matching program.
- In Montgomery County, qualifying candidates received on average 228% more contributions from individuals, than candidates who did not participate (701 vs. 214).
  - In Howard County, qualifying candidates received on average 94% more contributions from individuals, than candidates who did not participate (641 vs. 331).
  - In aggregate across both counties, qualifying candidates received on average 186% more contributions from individuals than candidates who did not participate (698 vs. 244).
4. Qualifying candidates are able to successfully use the matching program to compete on much more equal footing with candidates using traditional financing.
- Candidates for all Montgomery County offices who qualified for the program more than tripled their average contribution from \$120 to \$396 using matching funds. In the County Executive race, qualifying candidates increased their average contribution from \$144 to \$523.
  - Candidates for all Howard County offices nearly tripled their average contribution using matching funds, from \$139 to \$414.
- In County Council races in both counties, the average total contribution for qualifying candidates was \$335 compared to \$498 for non-participating candidates. By increasing the number of individual donors, qualifying candidates in these races were actually able to raise more money in total and on average per candidate than non-participating candidates.

These results demonstrate that as small donor matching programs expand to other counties and as counties gain more experience with their own programs, these programs continue to work as intended.

# Introduction

SINCE THE SUPREME COURT'S MISGUIDED DECISIONS IN *Citizens United vs. FEC* and *McCutcheon vs. FEC*, big money's influence in politics has increasingly become a critical issue for our democracy. Since 2010, the biggest donors have increased their share of total campaign spending in state and local elections. While in 2010 small donors combined to give more money than the top 100 biggest donors and their spouses, that was no longer the case for the 2022 cycle when those top 100 donors gave more than all small donors combined – even as small donor financing also surged.<sup>1</sup> Each cycle is seemingly poised to set a new record. In 2022, the total cost of federal and state elections was estimated to be \$16.7 billion.<sup>2</sup>

The problem of big money affects every part of politics – who runs for office, who wins, and how candidates and officials spend their time both while campaigning and in office. Because securing funds from large donors is such a necessary component of office-seeking, the dominance of big money can filter out candidates who lack connections to large donors and PACs, causing many otherwise worthy and willing candidates not to seek elected office.

More importantly, regular people don't have a voice in deciding who runs for office. When big money determines who can run for office, it means that everyone who doesn't have access to wealth is on the outside looking in. That's not how our democracy is supposed to work. Citizens should have an equal voice. Money should not determine the strength of a citizen's voice in our democracy.

The role of big money is not limited to federal elections. Across the country, we see similar

trends at the state and local level. While in the long term, reversing *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* by constitutional amendment is necessary, in the short term, one of the best solutions is to amplify the voices of small donors by providing matching funds. Such programs seek to balance the scales of our democracy in favor of ordinary voters, increasing their power and, by requiring candidates to pledge not to accept large contributions as a condition for receiving matching funds, reducing the influence of large donors as well.

## Maryland Responds with Innovative Public Financing Program

In 2011, the Maryland General Assembly established the Commission to Study Campaign Finance Law, issuing a final report in advance of the 2013 legislative session. In 2013, the General Assembly passed, and the Governor signed HB 1499, the Campaign Finance Reform Act of 2013 (Maryland Election Law §. 13-505), authorizing county governments to implement public financing programs.

The Montgomery County Council then passed Bill 16-14 in 2014, instituting a small donor campaign contribution matching program. Then in 2016, Howard County voters approved a charter amendment requiring the County Council to create by ordinance a Citizens' Election Fund system, which was ultimately enacted in July 2017.

The goals of these programs are to increase voter participation in elections, increase opportunities for residents to run for office, and reduce the influence of large donors. Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Prince George's County, and most recently Anne Arundel County, have all created their own small donor matching programs, however, for the 2022 election cycle, only Montgomery and Howard had operating programs.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 4 Takeaways About Money in the Midterms, Brennan Center for Justice, November 16, 2022, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/4-takeaways-about-money-midterms>

<sup>2</sup> Total cost of 2022 state and federal elections projected to exceed \$16.7 billion, Open Secrets, November 3, 2022, <https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2022/11/total-cost-of-2022-state-and-federal-elections-projected-to-exceed-16-7-billion/>



# How the Small Donor Matching Program Works

AS AN INITIAL STEP, BOTH MONTGOMERY COUNTY and Howard County established funds to provide matching donations to candidates for county office. In order to qualify to receive funds, candidates must file a notice of intent to make use of the fund, establish a campaign account, and meet a few conditions:

- They must meet minimum thresholds for the number of county-resident donors and amount of money raised during the qualifying period in order to demonstrate that their pursuit of public office is serious.
- They must accept only donations from individuals, and the maximum aggregate donation from an individual for the cycle must be \$250.
- They must refuse to accept donations from large donors, PACs, corporations, other candidates and political parties.

Once they qualify, they are eligible for limited matching funds for donations from county residents if they are in a contested election. While they can accept small donations from individuals outside of their county, those contributions are not eligible for a match.

Additionally, all other Maryland campaign finance laws continue to apply (prohibiting anonymous contributions, cash contributions greater than \$100, etc.) If a candidate meets these conditions, they qualify for matching funds for small donations made by county residents.

## County Executive Candidates

In both Montgomery and Howard counties, County Executive candidates must raise \$40,000 from at least 500 contributors who are county residents within the qualifying period to qualify for the program. Once they qualify, candidates receive matching funds at different ratios for different qualified contribution thresholds. The exact ratio differs slightly between the two programs.

- In Montgomery County, candidates receive \$6 per dollar raised for the first \$50 of each donation, and \$7 per dollar raised for the same threshold in Howard County.
- In both counties, candidates receive \$4 per dollar raised for the next \$50 up to \$100.
- In Montgomery County, candidates receive \$2 per dollar raised for the next \$50 up to \$150 while in Howard County the match is \$1 per dollar raised at this threshold.
- And in both counties, there is no match for any contributions of \$151+ (up to the maximum donation of \$250).
- A County Executive candidate can receive matching funds up to a maximum of \$700,000 in Howard County per election cycle, and \$750,000 for the primary and general election in Montgomery County (for a maximum of \$1,500,000 per cycle).

---

<sup>3</sup> The website for the Montgomery County Public Campaign Financing Program can be found at: [https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/bonds/campaign\\_financing.html](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/bonds/campaign_financing.html). The most recent version of the Summary Guide for the Montgomery County program can be found at: [https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/BONDS/Resources/Files/PEF\\_Summary\\_Guide\\_2021\\_6.pdf](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/BONDS/Resources/Files/PEF_Summary_Guide_2021_6.pdf). The website for the Howard County Citizens Election Fund Commission can be found at: <https://www.howardcountymd.gov/boards-commissions/citizens-election-fund-commission>. The most recent Summary Guide for the Howard County Citizens Election Fund can be found at: <https://www.howardcountymd.gov/sites/default/files/2022-06/CEF%20Summary%20Guide%20REVISED%206.28.2022.pdf>.

## County Council At-Large Candidates

Unlike Howard County, Montgomery County has at-large County Council seats where candidates run county-wide instead of within a specific district. Montgomery has a separate qualification tier for County Council At-Large candidates, who must raise \$20,000 from at least 250 Montgomery County contributors during the qualifying period to qualify for the program.

- Once they qualify, they receive \$4 per dollar raised for the first \$50 of each donation;
- \$3 per dollar raised for the next \$50 up to \$100; and,
- \$2 per dollar raised thereafter (up to a maximum donation of \$250).
- County Council At-Large candidates can receive matching funds up to \$250,000 for the primary and general election in Montgomery County (up to a maximum of \$500,000)

## County Council Candidates

In both Montgomery and Howard counties, County Council applicant candidates must raise \$10,000 from at least 125 contributors who are county residents within the qualifying period to qualify for the program. Again, the match ratios at different thresholds differ slightly between the two programs.

- In Montgomery County, qualifying candidates receive \$4 per dollar raised for the first \$50 of each donation, while in Howard County that ratio is \$5 per dollar raised.
- In both counties, candidates receive \$3 per dollar raised for the next \$50 up to \$100.

- In Montgomery County, candidates receive \$2 per dollar raised for the next \$50 up to \$150 whereas in Howard County that ratio is \$1 per dollar raised.
- And in both counties there is no match for contributions of \$151+ (up to the maximum donation of \$250). A County Council candidate can receive matching funds of up to \$85,000 per election cycle in Howard County, and up to \$125,000 for the primary and general election in Montgomery County (up to a maximum of \$250,000).

With matching ratios amplifying the impact of small contributions, matching funds can go a long way towards equalizing the impact of smaller contributions versus big money. Because participants in the matching program accept a \$250 contribution limit in exchange for matching funds at lower thresholds, the influence of big money is further limited.

# Impacts of the Small Donor Matching Program

THIS SECTION WILL EVALUATE WHAT IMPACT THE small donor matching programs in Montgomery and Howard counties had during the 2022 election cycle relative to the goals of the program.

## Increasing Participation

One of the clearest results of the small donor matching programs is that they increase citizen participation in the political process. The 2018 report found that a significant number of candidates chose to participate in the matching program, and that those who qualified for matching funds received on average far more individual contributions than those who did not participate (an average of 850 versus 434 contributions from individuals, or a 96% increase).

In 2022 the small donor matching program again encouraged more participation from individuals for elections to all offices in both Howard and Montgomery counties.

- In Montgomery County, candidates qualifying for the small donor matching program received on average more than three times the number of contributions from individuals than non-participating candidates did (701 vs 214).
- In Howard County, candidates qualifying for the program received on average 94% more contributions from individuals than candidates who did not participate (641 vs. 331).
- In aggregate, qualifying candidates received on average 689 contributions from individuals versus 244 on average for non-participating candidates, nearly a three-fold increase.

## Reducing the Influence of Big Money

The 2018 report found that the small donor matching program reduced the influence of big money in the political process by incentivizing and requiring qualifying campaigns to solicit and rely on small, individual donations, and by negating the funding advantage normally held by candidates pursuing conventional, big money financing. In 2022, this trend continued to hold.

Matching funds helped to mitigate the impact of the average donation made to qualifying and non-participating candidates. Typically, traditional campaign financing candidates rely not only on high-net-worth individuals but also groups like businesses who can give large contributions. Often, this does not expand participation, but rather allows the same individuals to further increase their influence.

Candidates and donors utilizing the matching program were able to magnify the impact of their small dollar contributions.

## Enabling More Residents to Run for Public Office

Finally, the 2018 report concluded that the small donor matching program did allow more residents to run for public office, citing reports from candidates and others involved in the implementation of the law that the small donor program was more democratic, removed barriers for people who traditionally have less access to big money, and made it possible for candidates to run and succeed who might not have otherwise done so.

While more data would be required to empirically prove any specific trends, a few observations can be made. First, for the second cycle in a row, a significant number of candidates used the program. Across both Montgomery and Howard counties more than a third of candidates used the program.

This included candidates for every kind of office in both counties – County Executive, County Council At-Large (Montgomery County only), and County Council District.

Many candidates who participated in the program won their races, including at the County Executive level, three of four At-Large County Council Members, including a non-incumbent who is a Black woman. In Howard County, three of five County Councilmembers won using the program, and a former County Executive used the program to fund a competitive rematch with the incumbent.

Based on the results of the races, the small donor matching program created another viable way for a person to run for office that does not require access to big money.

# 2022 Election Cycle Details

## Montgomery County

### COUNTY EXECUTIVE RACE

- Six candidates ran for the County Executive seat, and of those candidates, four reported campaign finance activity of any sort. Of the four candidates with campaign finance activity, two qualified for the small donor matching program and two candidates did not participate.
- Candidates who qualified for the program received on average 2,115 contributions from individuals versus 371 for non-participating candidates.

- The average contribution without matching funds for qualifying candidates was \$144 versus \$17,044 for non-participating candidates.

Once you apply matching funds the average contribution for qualifying candidates rose to \$523.

### COUNTY COUNCIL RACES

- 52 candidates ran for County Council seats, including At-Large and Council Districts 1-7, and 44 of those candidates had campaign finance activity. Of the 44 candidates who raised or loaned themselves funds, 17 qualified for matching funds, 21 did not participate in the matching program, and 6 candidates filed notice of intent to participate but ultimately failed to qualify.
- Candidates qualifying for the program received on average 535 contributions from individuals compared to 199 for non-participating candidates.
- The average contribution without matching funds for a County Council candidate qualifying for the program was \$109, while the average contribution for a non-participating candidate was \$492.
- Once you apply matching funds, the average contribution for a County Council candidate increased to \$337.

## Howard County

### COUNTY EXECUTIVE RACE

- Five candidates ran for the County Executive seat in 2022 of which three reported campaign finance activity. Of those three, one candidate qualified for funding, one candidate filed notice of intent to participate but failed to qualify, and one candidate did not participate. The candidate who failed to qualify had only four contributions.
- The qualifying candidate had an average contribution before matching funds of \$143, compared to \$895 for the candidate who did not participate.
- After adding matching funds, the average contribution for the qualifying candidate rose to \$458.

### COUNTY COUNCIL RACES

- 12 candidates ran for County Council, and all of them reported campaign finance activity. Of these, four candidates qualified for the matching program, seven did not participate, and one filed notice of intent to participate but failed to qualify.
- On average, qualifying candidates received 245 contributions from individuals, compared to 121 for candidates who did not participate.
- For qualifying candidates, the average contribution before the match was \$131, while for non-participating candidates it was \$522.
- Once matching funds were applied the average contribution for qualifying candidates increased to \$316.

# Conclusion

FAIR ELECTIONS REFORMS LIKE THE COUNTY-LEVEL small donor matching program are beginning to show results and a track record of success in Maryland, with other county-level programs scheduled to come online in the next few election cycles.

Data from the first two cycles where these programs have been active continue to show that the programs are succeeding in accomplishing their goals. The programs are magnifying the impact of small donors and putting small donors on more equal footing with big money. In turn, candidates who restrict themselves to small donors are, because of the matching program, able to compete with other candidates using traditional campaign finance.

As Maryland continues to gain experience with programs that reform campaign finance and limit the impact of big money, the state will no doubt begin to serve as a model for other communities. Maryland will be able to demonstrate that limiting the impact of big money can increase participation, limit the influence of interests backed by big money, and remove barriers for communities who lack access to big money – like young people, people of color, women, immigrants, and more.

Marylanders should continue to monitor how these programs are performing and track both the quantitative and qualitative impact of these programs over time. While there may be additional reforms needed in the future to continue momentum in the right direction, the early progress made in Maryland should be seen as encouraging and something on which to build.

# Methodology

## DATA ON CANDIDATES' CONTRIBUTIONS WERE OBTAINED

from the Maryland Campaign Reporting Information System, retrieved from: <https://campaignfinance.maryland.gov/Home/Disclosures> in June 2023. These data list the individual contributions from donors, as well as information about these donors, including their name, location, and type.

These data capture all of the funds candidates had available to spend during the election cycle, including money that candidates loaned their own campaigns and in-kind contributions. It is beyond the scope of this report to examine whether or not those loans were repaid.

The MDCRIS system reports all credits to a campaign account under the "Contributions/Loans" section of the Disclosures website. For each candidate running for office, a search was performed to locate any relevant campaign committees reporting fundraising activity during the 2022 election cycle (January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2022). This information was downloaded to a file for that individual candidate. The information accessible from the Contributions/Loans section of the Disclosures website includes contributions (including in-kind contributions) and loans, but also public contributions from the small donor matching program, refunds, and any other credit to the campaign account reported by the candidate. The first step in the analysis was to separate this campaign credit information by type for the purpose of continuing the analysis. Individual tabs were created to separately store data on public contributions, and refunds, as well as to track other data excluded from the analysis. Finally, a search was also conducted using the "Expenditures" section of the MDCRIS Disclosures website, for any return contributions, which have to be manually subtracted from the list of contributions.

To continue the analysis, the remaining data constituting contributions (monetary, in-kind, and loans) were aggregated by contributor.

Aggregation was performed on the basis of contributor name using the information provided to the State Board of Elections by each campaign. Because of typos and other data entry errors made by campaign staff, it is likely that a small number (less than 1%) of contributions from the same contributor were not cleaned and aggregated. However, these cases were deemed not to materially affect the analysis.

Next, the candidates were separated into three categories: candidates who qualified for the matching system, candidates who did not participate in the matching system, and candidates who filed notice of intent to participate but failed to qualify for the program, and thus ultimately did not participate in it. For each category of candidate, the following calculations were performed: (1) the numbers of contributions were summed within the category, (2) the total funds raised were summed, (3) the average contribution was calculated by dividing the result of (2) by the result of (1).

Next, the number of contributions made by individuals (defined as individual persons, i.e. excluding PACs, unions, and other organizations) was determined by counting the number of contributions made by individuals and dividing that number by the total number of contributions.

Next, the percent of contributions made by small donors was determined. This was done by counting the number of contributions of less than or equal to \$250 and dividing by the total number of contributions.

Next, the average number of contributions and funds raised per candidate was calculated by dividing the total number of contributions and the total dollars by the total number of candidates in each candidate category.

In addition, for candidates qualifying for the matching system, the following calculations were performed (1) the number of dollars coming from the matching fund were calculated; (2) the average contribution before matching funds were applied was calculated by subtracting the matching funds from total fundraising and dividing by the number of contributions, in order to accurately portray the amount of money given by each individual donor.

Finally, the percent of total fundraised dollars that came from small donations was calculated. For candidates who have not received matching funds, this was calculated by summing all contributions of less than or equal to \$250 and dividing by total fundraised dollars. For candidates receiving matching funds, this was done by summing all contributions of less than or equal to \$250, but this sum was then divided by the total fundraised dollars less matching contributions.

These calculations were repeated across the following categories within the three types of candidate committees: all candidates in the category, candidates running for county executive, candidates running for county council at large, all candidates running for district seats, and candidates running in each district. These detailed figures are in the appendix.

# Appendix

Table 1: Results among Montgomery County candidates who participated in the matching program and qualified for matching funds.

	Number of Candidates	Number of Contributions	Total Raised (\$)	Average Contribution (\$)	Total Match (\$)	Average Contribution w/o Match (\$)	Contributions from Individuals (%)	Contributions from Individuals	Total Raise from Small Donors and Matching Funds (%)
Total	19	13345	\$5,290,116	\$396	\$3,687,423	\$120	100%	13321	96%
County Executive	2	4236	\$2,217,020	\$523	\$1,608,117	\$144	100%	4230	98%
All County Council	17	9109	\$3,073,096	\$337	\$2,079,306	\$109	100%	9091	95%
County Council At-Large	5	4331	\$1,551,721	\$358	\$1,066,958	\$112	100%	4324	99%
County Council D1	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D2	1	600	\$242,438	\$404	\$160,984	\$136	100%	599	100%
County Council D3	1	258	\$88,901	\$345	\$58,005	\$120	100%	257	26%
County Council D4	2	777	\$293,530	\$378	\$204,571	\$114	100%	774	99%
County Council D5	3	1802	\$428,448	\$238	\$272,982	\$86	100%	1799	98%
County Council D6	3	991	\$352,232	\$355	\$234,641	\$119	100%	990	82%
County Council D7	2	350	\$115,827	\$331	\$81,165	\$99	99%	348	97%

Table 2: Results among Montgomery County candidates who did not participate in the matching program.

	Number of Candidates	Number of Contributions	Total Raised (\$)	Average Contribution	Total Match (\$)	Average Contribution w/o Match	Contributions from Individuals (%)	Contributions from Individuals	Total Raise from Small Donors and Matching Funds (%)
Total	23	5264	\$15,519,008	\$2,948	0	\$2,948	94%	4923	2%
County Executive	2	781	\$13,311,633	\$17,044	0	\$17,044	95%	742	0%
All County Council	21	4483	\$2,207,375	\$492	0	\$492	93%	4181	15%
County Council At-Large	3	2032	\$1,012,964	\$499	0	\$499	93%	1894	14%
County Council D1	1	898	\$687,515	\$766	0	\$766	92%	826	8%
County Council D2	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D3	1	117	\$64,685	\$553	0	\$553	90%	105	17%
County Council D4	4	660	\$146,190	\$221	0	\$221	94%	620	36%
County Council D5	3	368	\$60,747	\$165	0	\$165	99%	363	49%
County Council D6	5	97	\$489,195	\$225	0	\$100	93%	90	92%
County Council D7	4	311	\$210,290	\$676	0	\$676	91%	283	12%

Table 3: Results among Montgomery County candidates who participated in the program but did not qualify for matching funds.

	Number of Candidates	Number of Contributions	Total Raised (\$)	Average Contribution	Total Match (\$)	Average Contribution w/o Match	Contributions from Individuals (%)	Contributions from Individuals	Total Raise from Small Donors and Matching Funds (%)
Total	6	1293	\$194,282	\$150	\$0	\$150	99%	1278	55%
County Executive	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
All County Council	6	1293	\$194,282	\$150	\$0	\$150	99%	1278	55%
County Council At-Large	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D1	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D2	3	752	\$109,149	\$145	\$0	\$145	99%	743	58%
County Council D3	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D4	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D5	2	368	\$60,747	\$165	\$0	\$165	99%	363	49%
County Council D6	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D7	1	173	\$24,386	\$141	\$0	\$141	99%	172	58%



Table 4: Results among Howard County candidates who participated in the matching program and qualified for matching funds.

	Number of Candidates	Number of Contributions	Total Raised (\$)	Average Contribution	Total Match (\$)	Average Contribution w/o Match	Contributions from Individuals (%)	Contributions from Individuals	Total Raise from Small Donors and Matching Funds (%)
Total	5	3223	\$1,333,379	\$414	\$884,160	\$139	99%	3206	97%
County Executive	1	2227	\$1,018,854	\$458	\$700,000	\$143	100%	2225	100%
All County Council	4	996	\$314,525	\$316	\$184,160	\$131	98%	981	86%
County Council D1	1	196	\$31,781	\$162	\$10,718	\$107	99%	195	94%
County Council D2	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D3	1	299	\$84,812	\$284	\$53,122	\$106	96%	288	90%
County Council D4	1	284	\$132,547	\$467	\$71,769	\$214	99%	282	76%
County Council D5	1	217	\$65,386	\$301	\$48,550	\$78	100%	216	100%

Table 5: Results among Howard County candidates who did not participate in the matching program.

	Number of Candidates	Number of Contributions	Total Raised (\$)	Average Contribution	Total Match (\$)	Average Contribution w/o Match	Contributions from Individuals (%)	Contributions from Individuals	Total Raise from Small Donors and Matching Funds (%)
Total	8	3140	\$2,443,962	\$778	\$0	\$778	84%	2651	8%
County Executive	1	2157	\$1,930,838	\$895	\$0	\$895	84%	1802	6%
All County Council	7	983	\$513,124	\$522	\$0	\$522	86%	849	17%
County Council D1	2	225	\$213,967	\$951	\$0	\$951	80%	181	7%
County Council D2	1	97	\$67,641	\$697	\$0	\$697	60%	58	11%
County Council D3	1	14	\$1,470	\$105	\$0	\$105	79%	11	80%
County Council D4	2	370	\$101,586	\$275	\$0	\$275	97%	358	32%
County Council D5	1	277	\$128,461	\$464	\$0	\$464	87%	241	22%

Table 6: Results among Howard County candidates who participated in the program but did not qualify for matching funds.

	Number of Candidates	Number of Contributions	Total Raised (\$)	Average Contribution	Total Match (\$)	Average Contribution w/o Match	Contributions from Individuals (%)	Contributions from Individuals	Total Raise from Small Donors and Matching Funds (%)
Total	2	57	\$14,705	\$258	\$0	\$258	37%	54	37%
County Executive	1	4	\$6,084	\$1,521	\$0	\$1,521	1%	3	1%
All County Council	1	53	\$8,621	\$163	\$0	\$163	63%	51	63%
County Council D1	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D2	1	53	\$8,621	\$163	\$0	\$163	63%	51	63%
County Council D3	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D4	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
County Council D5	0	0	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a