



Civic Election Financing in the Fraser Valley

By Gary McKenna

NOVEMBER 2012

Table of Contents

KEY FINDINGS	4
INTRODUCTION	4
METHODOLOGY	5
ANALYSIS	6
SELF-FUNDED CANDIDATES.....	10
A BRIEF LOOK AT NUMBERED COMPANIES & ANONYMOUS DONATIONS	11
FRASER VALLEY VS. METRO VANCOUVER	13
CITIZEN DONATIONS	14
ACCESS TO DATA.....	15
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	17
CONCLUSION.....	19
WORKS CITED	20
APPENDIX A	21
CAMPAIGN DONATION TABLES	21
<i>TABLE 1 — DONATION TOTALS BY CATEGORY</i>	22
<i>TABLE 2 — AVERAGE DONATION SIZE BY YEAR & MUNICIPALITY</i>	23
<i>TABLE — 3 TOTAL AVERAGE DONATION SIZE COMBINED</i>	25
2005	25

2008	25
2011	25
2005 + 2008 + 2011.....	26
2008	26
2011	26
 <i>TABLE — 4 COMPARISON OF AVERAGE DONATION SIZE BETWEEN METRO</i>	
<i>VANCOUVER AND FRASER VALLEY.....</i>	
2005	27
2008	27
2011	27
2005+2008+2011 TOTALS	28
2008	29
2011	29
APPENDIX B	30
CAMPAIGN DONATION SPREADSHEETS	30

Civic Election Financing in the Fraser Valley

By Gary McKenna

KEY FINDINGS

- Contrary to popular belief, unions are heavily outgunned when it comes to campaign contributions and do not provide a financial balance to the large amount of donations that come from the business community, particularly developers.
- The largest contributors in the 2005, 2008 and 2011 municipal elections were candidates who donated to their own campaigns.
- A healthy amount of campaign contributions came from individual citizens for between \$208.32 and \$373.12 cents.
- While the overall total of union donations was smaller than contributions from the development and corporate community, the per donation average from the labour movement was considerably higher.

INTRODUCTION

A long held belief in municipal politics is that the campaigns of those who seek office are largely funded by labour unions on the left and corporate land developers on the right. However, financial disclosure documents from five municipalities in the Lower Mainland's Fraser Valley region from the 2005, 2008, and 2011 elections tell a different

story. Both union and corporate donations were dwarfed by contributions from candidates to their own campaigns and from individual donors. Furthermore, union donations made up only a small percentage of the communities studied, with labour groups being vastly outspent by developers and corporate interests. Union donations in the Fraser Valley do not provide a financial balance to the large corporate and development interests, who donate more money to a larger pool of candidates.

METHODOLOGY

In order to uncover trends in civic election campaign contributions, financial disclosure documents were analyzed from five communities from the 2005, 2008 and 2011 civic elections. The municipalities from the Metro Vancouver region included the City of Langley, with a population of 26,119, the Township of Langley, with a population of 104, 177 and the District of Maple Ridge, with a population of 96,122 as of 2011 (B.C. Stats). The Fraser Valley communities included Abbotsford, with a population of 139,442, and the District of Mission, with a population of 42,517 as of 2011 (B.C. Stats). These communities were selected in order to analyze trends between similar sized communities, while creating an opportunity to uncover any differences between the two regional districts that make up the Lower Mainland.

Each candidate that runs in a municipal election must submit a financial disclosure document to the chief election officer in their respective community outlining expenditures and contributions incurred during their campaigns. These documents break

contributions into three major categories: union, corporate and individual. For the purposes of this study, contributors were classified into six different categories:

- Union: labour groups and trade unions
- Candidate: contributions from candidates and their immediate family members to their own campaigns
- Citizen: Donations from individuals not related to the candidate
- Developer: Corporate donations from the development industry, including realtors, contractors, real estate developers and businesses tied to the development of land
- Misc. Business: Corporate donations not related to the development industry
- Numbered Company: Donations from numbered entities

By breaking up the contributors into smaller categories, particularly the division of the corporate grouping into developers and non-developers, the analysis presented in this paper can better identify where donations are coming from. By separating the development industry from other businesses, we are able to see the influence that segment of the donor population has over elected officials. (It should also be noted that financial disclosure documents for the Township of Langley's 2005 municipal election were destroyed ahead of the seven year deadline that municipalities are required to keep the documents. For that reason the tables presented in the appendixes below show two sets of numbers: tables with the 2008 and 2011 Langley Township numbers and tables that do not have those figures. For the purposes of this essay, Township numbers are only included when noted.)

ANALYSIS

An overview of Table 1 shows that union donations make up a small percentage of overall contributions between the three election cycles. Union donations totaled \$52,706 compared to \$181,739 from the development industry and \$168,838 from miscellaneous businesses for a total of \$350,577. That means that of the total amount of contributions over the three election cycles in all five communities (\$1.2 million), union contributions made up 4.4 per cent, while the development industry made up 15.1 per cent and miscellaneous businesses made up 14.1 per cent for a total of 29.2 per cent. These numbers can be broken down further by individual election. In the 2005 campaign, for example, unions made only four donations for a total of \$2,350 over the five municipalities. Developers meanwhile, made 95 donations totaling \$59,000, a per donation average of about \$621.

On a per contribution basis, unions donate more than any other category, excluding the candidates contributions to themselves. Table 3 analyzes these figures, finding that over the three election cycles, unions gave on average \$810 per donation, while an average contribution from the development community was around \$644 or \$580 from the non-development related corporations. There are several possibilities that could explain this gap in the per contribution average. Unions may not have the financial resources to fund as many campaigns as their counterparts in the corporate community. Donation patterns in Appendix B show that unions tend to focus their donations on a smaller handful of candidates. In the City of Langley, for example, two donations were made to one candidate, totaling \$1,000 in 2005. A candidate in Mission that same year received

\$1,000 — the only union donation in Mission that election cycle — while one candidate in Maple Ridge was given \$350 for his campaign and none of the candidates in Abbotsford received union financial support.

Per donation averages under the union category were up considerably in 2008 as well. Fourteen donations were made for an average of \$1,076 per contribution, a figure that drops to \$831 when Township of Langley numbers are included. An increase in the number of labour movement contributions also occurred in 2011, dropping the average union donation to \$767, or \$765 when the Township numbers are included. Over the three elections studied, the labour movement does appear to be trying to close the gap with the other donation categories. Union donations have grown from a total of \$2,350 in the Fraser Valley in 2005 to \$15,071 in 2008 and \$35,385 in the most recent race. With only three election cycles to study, it is difficult to say whether these numbers are random, or whether they are the beginning of a trend that will see an increase in union donations in the Fraser Valley region. Union contributions for these five communities will have to be analyzed after future elections to see if there is a growing amount of labour support in the studied municipalities.

As mentioned above, the union strategy in municipal election spending appears to involve giving a limited number of key candidates larger amounts of money to conduct their campaigns. By spending more on fewer candidates, union officials may feel they have a better chance of getting the people they support the most votes, ensuring some representation from the labour movement on the various councils. Corporate and business

interests, on the other hand, do not appear to have this same level of organization. It is true that local Chamber of Commerce's do tend to endorse candidates, but businesses will often donate large amounts to a wide-cross section of candidates. More than 600 donations came from developers, miscellaneous businesses and numbered companies, compared to only 64 from the labour movement in all three elections not including the Township of Langley. Prominent businesses in a given community, for example Bobcat Country or various agriculture firms in Abbotsford, or Genstar developers in Mission, do tend to appear more frequently in the campaign disclosure forms of the candidates. However, numerous businesses are also donating to a variety of campaigns, increasing the number of donations and reducing the overall contribution average.

In some instances, it was not uncommon to see corporate donors contribute to competing campaigns. In the 2008 Abbotsford municipal election, for example, Paul Esposito's Restaurants donated \$1,000 to both the mayoral campaign of George Perry and Alvin Epp. John Redekop Construction in the 2011 Township of Langley election also did not appear to have any qualms about donating to rival mayoral campaigns, giving \$1,000 to Mel Kositsky and \$500 to the eventual winner Jack Froese. This type of bet hedging is not widespread among corporate contributors in the five communities analyzed, but it certainly exists to a greater degree than on the labour side.

It should also be noted that while donations from the labour movement have increased over the last three elections, contributions from developers and miscellaneous businesses have remained relatively static in their support of municipal candidates. Developer

contributions have hovered around the \$60,000 mark (\$59,000 in 2005, \$61,797 in 2008 and \$60,942 in 2011) while businesses not associated with the development industry have averaged slightly below that at \$56,279 (\$54,165 in 2005, \$60,387 in 2008 and \$54,286 in 2011). This consistency is particularly noteworthy given the economic uncertainty that followed the 2008 financial crisis. During a time period when most businesses were cutting back on spending, it does not appear that the tremors in the global economy have had any impact on the amount corporate interests contribute to municipal politics. This fact could indicate the importance business owners and developers place on these expenditures.

SELF-FUNDED CANDIDATES

By far, the largest contributions to civic election campaigns in the municipalities studied came from the candidates themselves. Several particularly notable contributions occurred in Maple Ridge in 2005, where one candidate donated \$40,000 to their campaign, while another contributed \$26,063. In Langley Township a candidate donated more than \$10,000 to their campaign while in Abbotsford in 2008 donations ranging from as small \$7 to as high as \$20,000 can be found in Appendix B. These larger donations are outliers in the data but do serve as examples of the impact a candidate with financial means can have on an election. Not surprisingly, these single donations can show spikes in the data for these municipalities in their respective election years, as noted in Table 1. Maple Ridge's 2005 figure under the candidate column, for example, is considerably higher than the Maple Ridge 2008 and Maple Ridge 2011 categories, in large part due to the \$40,000 and \$26,063 candidate contributions. The same goes for Abbotsford's 2008 candidate

contribution numbers, which is more than double the amount in 2005 and six times larger than the 2011 figure.

For more rounded analysis of the candidate contribution figures, we must analyze Table 3, which reins in some of these outlier donations into a more manageable mean. Overall, the candidate donation sizes have been fairly consistent in the three election cycles analyzed, with the average donation being \$2,722 in 2005, \$2,650 in 2008 and dropping off to \$1,795 in 2011. Over the three elections, the average contribution from a candidate to their own campaign was \$2,372. These numbers do not dramatically change when Langley Township's figures are added to the data, dropping slightly to \$2,547 in 2008 and \$1,706 in 2011. The candidate categories accounts for the largest single pool of campaign contributions, making up 38 per cent of all contributions over the three elections analyzed. Clearly, being a council or mayoral candidate with disposable income is an advantage. Candidates, particularly those who are just starting out in municipal politics, do not have the fundraising connections necessary to ensure the economic viability of their campaigns. Those who are seeking a council or mayoral seat and are able to give themselves the funds needed to get started, have a much better chance of increasing their name recognition in the community than someone who does not have the same financial resources. Currently, there are no limits to how much a candidate can spend on their election effort. This issue will be explored further in part two of this essay.

A BRIEF LOOK AT NUMBERED COMPANIES & ANONYMOUS DONATIONS

The amount of money that comes from numbered companies is minuscule when looked at within the overall totals of campaign donations. Over the three election cycles analyzed in this essay, numbered companies donated \$18,700 (\$7,800 in 2005, \$6,600 in 2008 and \$4,300 in 2011), making up 1.5 per cent of the overall amount contributed. However, because numbered companies do not provide detailed names or contact information, the donations that come from these entities are difficult to trace. Essentially, numbered company donors are able to contribute large amounts to a campaign without providing much information to the public that would identify where that money is coming from. While the donations in this category are small, the anonymity that comes with these donations is troubling and could leave the process open to abuse.

The same issues arise around anonymous donations. According to Section 87(b) of the Local Government Act, a person cannot make an anonymous campaign contribution if the value of the donation is more than \$50. However, Section 90(4a) states that for every contribution of \$100 or less, information such as the donors name and address does not need to be provided on the public financial disclosure statements. That essentially means that anonymous donations of \$99 or less are allowed under the Local Government Act. This is also concerning, particularly when one considers the case of Coun. John Smith, who raised \$18,375 in the 2005 Abbotsford municipal campaign. According to his financial disclosure statements from that election, Smith received six \$99 anonymous corporate contributions and 11 \$99 contributions from anonymous individuals (John Smith Abbotsford Financial Disclosure Statement, 2005). The total amount of

anonymous donations to the Smith campaign comes to \$1,675, or close to 10 per cent of his overall contributions. While there is certainly no evidence to suggest any malfeasance on Smith's part, the large number of anonymous contributions does highlight some issues with the current reporting process. The public has no way of knowing for sure where these contributions came from. It is also much too easy for a candidate dealing with a donor who wishes to remain anonymous to break up a contribution into smaller amounts and report it as multiple \$99 contributions. While this would be in violation of the Local Government Act, oversight is limited at the municipal level, leaving the process open to abuse.

FRASER VALLEY VS. METRO VANCOUVER

When comparing the Fraser Valley Regional District with the communities studied within the Metro Vancouver boundary, as shown in Table 4, it is first important to note the population differences between the two regions. The communities in the district — Abbotsford and Mission — have a total population of 181,959 while the Metro Vancouver communities — minus the Township of Langley — have a total population of 122,241. There are also several issues that should be considered when examining Table 4. First of all, it reduces the overall sample size by not including the Township of Langley. Without the 2005 data, the Township figures could not be included because they would have skewed the results, making it difficult to compare the overall totals for the 2008 and 2011 data with the overall 2005 numbers. Furthermore, Table 4 separates the remaining four communities into two groups of two, making some of the totals more sensitive to outliers. For example, several large candidate contributions in Maple Ridge in 2005 has

skewed that category in Table 4, making the per donor average considerably higher than in the 2008 and 2011 charts. The issue of outliers is discussed further below. With that caveat in mind, it is interesting to note that there is not much difference between the two regions when it comes to the overall amounts donated and their per donor averages over the three elections studied. According to Table 4, union donations are higher on the Metro Vancouver side (\$34,806 compared to \$17,900), while developers and miscellaneous businesses contribute more in the Fraser Valley Regional District (\$219,695 compared to \$130,674). Developers tended to contribute more per donation in the regional district than the miscellaneous businesses, while the opposite was true in Metro Vancouver. One area where the differences between the two regions seems particularly significant is in the citizen donation category. In Abbotsford and Mission a typical individual donation from a person not associated with the candidate, a union or a corporation is approximately 40% higher than in Metro Vancouver, a difference of about \$100. The per donation average in the regional district hovers around the \$350 mark (\$344.23 in 2005, \$330.26 in 2008 and \$373.12 in 2011) while the average in Metro Vancouver is \$253 (\$311.09 in 2005, \$208.47 in 2008 and \$240.32 in 2011). A \$100 difference would be a small percentage in the other categories, but because the citizen category has the smallest per donation average, the amount is significant. It is difficult to say what this difference means. Do residents in the Fraser Valley Regional District feel stronger about civic politics than people in the Metro Vancouver region? Is the number a statistical anomaly? More data and further research would be required in order to find the answers to these questions.

CITIZEN DONATIONS

If there is one part of the data outlined in this study that might give hope to civic democracy advocates, it is the citizen contribution category. According to the data, individual citizen donations are alive and well, making up 28% of the overall contribution total for the three elections studied, a figure that is second only to the candidate category. With the inclusion of the data from the Township of Langley, Table 3 shows that 1,447 citizen donations were made in the last three civic elections in the five communities studied. That figure compares to 83 union donations, 229 candidate donations, 491 developer donations and 375 miscellaneous business donations. However, when we look at the per donation averages it soon becomes apparent why candidates are so eager to attract the support of larger entities, like unions and corporations. As was touched on above, citizens donated on average approximately \$300 when all five communities are grouped together. That number is considerably smaller than the \$910 union average donation or the \$613 per donation average from developers and miscellaneous businesses. That means one union donation is worth three citizen donations, while one corporate donation is worth approximately two citizen donations. It is easier for candidates to focus their fundraising efforts on a handful of corporate and labour interests than it is to go around to numerous individuals in the community to solicit a larger number of smaller contributions.

ACCESS TO DATA

When conducting the research for this essay, numerous roadblocks existed in accessing the data required and there did not appear to be any consistency between the five

municipalities when it came to providing financial disclosure documents to the public. Section 93(a) of the Local Government Act states that financial disclosure statements "must be available for public inspection in the local government offices during their regular office hours from the time of filing until seven years after general voting day for the election to which they relate" (Local Government Act, 1996). The 2005 civic election was held on Nov. 15, meaning that financial disclosure statements should have been available in August, when requests were first made to the Township of Langley. Instead, it appears the documents were prematurely destroyed in contravention of the law. Langley Township is perhaps the most egregious example of the lack of consistency that appears to permeate the handing of financial disclosure statements in the five communities studied. Some municipalities, like Mission and the City of Langley, were quick to accommodate requests for documents, and routinely email PDFs of the statements to those who request them. Abbotsford and Maple Ridge permit people to examine and photograph the documents at city hall. Financial disclosure documents for the 2008 and 2011 civic elections in the Township of Langley were available for viewing, but photographs of the paper work were prohibited and laptops were not permitted for note taking. People who wish to see the statements may only have a pen and paper while viewing the documents. Some of the municipalities studied for this essay, like Maple Ridge and Mission, posted their financial disclosure forms for certain years on their respective websites, while others, like Abbotsford and the Township of Langley did not. This type of ad hoc handling of documents and the fact that the Township of Langley broke the law by destroying their 2005 disclosure statements is problematic. Not only does it lack transparency, it makes the task of uncovering which candidates received

contributions from what interests increasingly difficult. Rules about how the documents can be viewed should not vary depending on the municipality and all forms should be available online. Reforms should be considered to bring civic election financing under the umbrella of Elections BC, changes that will be discussed further in the second part of this essay that will deal with solutions to some of the issues outlined in paper one.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

One of the areas where this study falls short centers around the fact that the sample size is taken over a short time frame. Three civic elections is not enough to identify long term trends in campaign contributions and it does not allow for outliers in the data to be rounded out. Because of current election regulations, financial disclosure statements are destroyed after seven years, making it difficult to acquire and analyze some of the historical data that would be pertinent to a study such as this. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that in small municipalities like the ones studied in this essay, several wellknown candidates can dwarf the rest of the field in terms of fundraising, creating outliers in the data that can sway the mean. Candidates like former Abbotsford Mayor George Perry, who spent \$60,920 on his 2008 campaign, or Langley City mayor Peter Fassbender, who spent \$28,300 on his election bid raised amounts that contrast sharply with some of their opponents and some of the candidates seeking council seats. Future research should separate the mayoral candidates from the council candidates for independent comparisons, which could help eliminate some of the skew that well-funded politicians can bring to the data. Some of these candidates will be examined further in part two of this paper, which will examine a dollar to vote ratio.

There is also the issue of where the municipalities are located. The communities analyzed in this essay predominantly vote for more right-leaning candidates at the provincial and federal level. In fact, five of the six provincial MLAs in the studied area are either members of the BC Liberal Party or, in the case of independent MLA John Van Dongen, former members of the BC Liberal Party and provincial Conservative Party. Only Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows New Democratic Party MLA Michael Sather is aligned with a political organization that is associated with the labour movement. The same type of right-leaning representation can be found in the Fraser Valley at the federal level, as well. The three federal ridings in the region (Abbotsford, Pitt Meadows-Maple RidgeMission and Langley) are held by Conservative Party members. Neither the BC Liberal Party nor the Conservative Party are known to have close ties to the labour movement. That would suggest that despite the region's predominantly working class population, it tends to support candidates with pro-business leanings. This could mean that civic candidates that do not conform to a more corporate-centered philosophy may have a difficult time running in these five municipalities and unions may feel they are better served by utilizing their resources in other communities. As noted above, communities on the Metro Vancouver side of the Lower Mainland tended to have higher union donations, while communities in the Fraser Valley had lower numbers of labour movement contributions. Further areas of study could build on the data provided in this essay and expand the map beyond the Fraser Valley into communities like Vancouver, Burnaby, New Westminster and the Tri-Cites, where a stronger union presence exists and where labour-friendly candidates have faired better in campaigns at the provincial and federal level.

CONCLUSION

In the five communities analyzed, unions are a small but significant player when it comes to campaign financing. Developers and corporate interests donated close to seven times as much as organizations affiliated with the labour movement in the three election cycles that were studied. The popular notion that unions serve as a counterbalance to corporate dollars in civic races is flawed, at least in Mission, Maple Ridge, Abbotsford, Langley Township and Langley City. The union strategy appears to be to concentrate their donations to a few candidates in order to maximize the potential for getting their endorsees elected. This essay noted several differences between donation patterns between the Fraser Valley Regional District and Metro Vancouver. Residents in the regional district had a higher per donation average compared to those in Metro Vancouver and union donations were stronger the further west the community was located in the Lower Mainland. Access to the financial disclosure statements required for this paper was woefully inadequate and inconsistent across the region, one of the many issues that will be explored in greater detail in the second paper.

WORKS CITED

Local Government Act. *Electors and Elections, Part 3*. B.C. 1996.

B.C. Stats <http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/StatisticsBySubject/Demography/Population-Estimates.aspx> Government of British Columbia. Nov. 6, 2012.

APPENDIX A
Campaign Donation Tables

TABLE 1 — DONATION TOTALS BY CATEGORY

CITY/YEAR	Union	Candidates	Citizens	Developers	Misc. Business	Numbered companies
Mission2005	\$1,000	\$29,626	\$14,182	\$8,750	\$5,690	\$1,800
Mission2008	\$2,100	\$27,272	\$2,450	\$1,050	\$1,798	\$0
Mission2011	\$6,500	\$34,522	\$1,368	\$2,087	\$1,844	\$800
MapleRidge2005	\$350	\$71,561	\$51,238	\$12,350	\$3,450	\$5,000
MapleRidge2008	\$5,000	\$13,208	\$40,854	\$22,372	\$9,276	\$6,100
MapleRidge2011	\$12,758	\$37,634	\$30,654	\$13,500	\$8,850	\$2,250
Abby2005	\$0	\$48,593	\$57,762	\$34,600	\$32,504	\$800
Abby2008	\$4,500	\$115,858	\$49,070	\$30,575	\$36,863	\$500
Abby2011	\$3,800	\$21,661	\$45,272	\$30,250	\$33,892	\$1,250
LangCity2005	\$1,000	\$16,287	\$21,869	\$3,300	\$12,521	\$200
LangCity2008	\$3,471,	\$18,626	\$9,179	\$7,800	\$12,450	\$0
LangCity2011	\$12,227	\$30,096	\$9,480	\$15,105	\$9,700	\$0
LangTown2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LangTown2008	\$4,050	\$26,288	\$45,822	\$56,319	\$17,740	\$4,800
LangTown2011	\$7,600	\$50,175	\$72,596	\$67,486	\$29,250	\$6,900

**TOTALS BELOW DO NOT INCLUDE LANGLEY TOWNSHIP
BECAUSE DATA IS MISSING FROM 2005.**

YEAR	Union	Candidates	Citizens	Developers	M. Biz	Numbered
2005	\$2,350	\$166,067	\$145,051	\$59,000	\$54,165	\$7,800
2008	\$15,071	\$174,964	\$101,553	\$61,797	\$60,387	\$6,600
2011	\$35,285	\$123,913	\$86,774	\$60,942	\$54,286	\$4,300
TOTAL	\$52,706	\$464,944	\$333,378	\$181,739	\$168,838	\$18,700

TABLE 2 — AVERAGE DONATION SIZE BY YEAR & MUNICIPALITY

Donation Size = Total Donations / Number of Donors

Mission 2005

Union: 1,000/1 = \$1,000
 Candidates: 29,626/12 = \$2,468.83
 Citizen: 14,182/36 = \$393.94
 Developers: 8,750/6 = \$1,458.33
 Misc. Business: 5,690/8 = \$711.25
 Numbered Companies: 1,800/3 = \$600

Mission 2008

Union: 2,100/2 = \$1,050
 Candidates: 27,272/16 = \$1,704.50
 Citizen: 2,450/15 = \$163.33
 Developers: 1,050/4 = \$262.50
 Misc. Business: 1,798/8 = \$224.75
 Numbered Companies: 0/0 = \$0

Mission 2011

Union: 6,500/5 = \$1,300
 Candidates: 34,522/23 = \$1,500.96
 Citizen: 1,368/11 = \$124.36
 Developers: 2,087/6 = \$347.83
 Misc. Business: 1,844/7 = \$263.43
 Numbered Companies: 800/2 = \$400

Maple Ridge 2005

Union: 350/1 = \$250
 Candidates: 71,561/10 = \$7,156.10
 Citizen: 51,238/216 = \$237.21
 Developers: 12,350/26 = \$475
 Misc. Business: 3,450/11 = \$313.63
 Numbered Companies: 5,000/4 = \$1,250

Maple Ridge 2008

Union: 5,000/1 = \$5,000
 Candidates: 13,208/6 = \$2,201.33
 Citizen: 40,854/197 = \$207.38
 Developers: 22,372/49 = \$456.57

Misc. Business: 9,276/18 = \$515.33
 Numbered Companies: 6,100/5 = \$1,220

Maple Ridge 2011

Union: 12,758/10 = \$1,275.8
 Candidates: 37,634/19 = \$1,980.74
 Citizen: 30,654/145 = \$211.41
 Developers: 13,500/22 = \$613.64
 Misc. Business: 8,850/20 = \$442.50
 Numbered Companies: 2,250/7 = 321.43

Abbotsford 2005

Union: 0/0 = \$0
 Candidates: 48,593/31 = \$1,567.52
 Citizen: 57,762/173 = \$333.88
 Developers: 34,600/57 = \$607.02
 Misc. Business: 32,504/75 = \$433.39
 Numbered Companies: 800/3 = \$2,400

Abbotsford 2008

Union: 4,500/2 = \$2,250
 Candidates: 115,858/28 = \$4,137.79
 Citizen: 49,070/141 = \$348.01
 Developers: 30,575/43 = 711.05
 Misc. Business: 36,863/58 = \$635.57
 Numbered Companies: 500/1 = \$500

Abbotsford 2011

Union: 3,800/9 = \$422.22
 Candidates: 21,661/14 = \$1,547.21
 Citizen: 45,272/114 = \$397.12
 Developers: 30,250/45 = \$672.22
 Misc. Business: 33,892/48 = \$706.08
 Numbered Companies: 1,250/3 = \$416.67

Langley City 2005

Union: $1,000/2 = \$500$

Candidates: $16,287/8 = \$2,035$

Citizen: $21,869/19 = \$1,151$

Developers: $3,300/6 = \$550$

Misc. Business: $12,521/18 = \$695.61$

Numbered Companies: $200/1 = \$200$

Langley Township 2011

Union: $7,600/10 = \$760$

Candidates: $50,175/33 = \$1,520.45$

Citizen: $72,596/158 = \$459.47$

Developers: $67,486/104 = \$648.90$

Misc. Business: $29,250/40 = \$731.25$

Numbered Companies: $6,900/6 = \$1,150$

Langley City 2008

Union: $3,471/9 = \$385.67$

Candidates: $18,626/16 = \$1,164.13$

Citizen: $9,179/43 = \$213.47$

Developers: $7,800/13 = \$600$

Misc. Business: $12,450/14 = \$889.29$

Numbered Companies: $0/0 = \$0$

Langley City 2011

Union: $12,227/22 = \$555.77$

Candidates: $30,096/13 = \$2,315.08$

Citizen: $9,480/22 = \$430.91$

Developers: $15,105/16 = \$944.06$

Misc. Business: $9,700/6 = \$1,616.67$

Numbered Companies: $0/0 = 0$

Langley Township 2005

N/A

Langley Township 2008

Union: $4,050/9 = \$450$

Candidates: $26,288/13 = \$2,022.14$

Citizen: $45,822/157 = \$291.86$

Developers: $56,319/94 = \$599.14$

Misc. Business: $17,740/44 = \$403.18$

Numbered Companies: $4,800/7 =$

$\$685.71$

**TABLE — 3 TOTAL AVERAGE DONATION SIZE
COMBINED**

2005

(Without Township of Langley)

Category	Donation Total	Number of Donors	Average Donation
Union	\$2,350	4	\$587.50
Candidates	\$166,067	61	\$2,722
Citizens	\$145,051	444	\$326.69
Developers	\$59,000	95	\$621.05
Misc. Business	\$54,165	112	\$483.62
Numbered Comp.	\$7,800	11	\$709.09

2008

(Without Township of Langley)

Category	Donation Total	Number of Donors	Average Donation
Union	\$15,071	14	\$1,076.50
Candidates	\$174,964	66	\$2,650.97
Citizens	\$101,553	396	\$256.45
Developers	\$61,797	109	\$566.94
Misc. Business	\$60,387	98	\$616.19
Numbered Comp.	\$6,600	6	\$1,100

2011

(Without Township of Langley)

Category	Donation Total	Number of Donors	Average Donation
Union	\$35,285	46	\$767.07
Candidates	\$123,913	69	\$1,795.84
Citizens	\$86,774	292	\$297.17
Developers	\$60,942	89	\$684.74
Misc. Business	\$54,286	81	\$670.20
Numbered Comp.	\$4,300	12	\$358.33

2005 + 2008 + 2011

(Without Township of Langley)

Category	Donation Total	Number of Donors	Average Donation
Union	\$52,706	64	\$823.53
Candidates	\$464,944	196	\$2,372.16
Citizens	\$333,378	1,132	\$294.50
Developers	\$181,739	282	\$644.46
Misc. Business	\$168,838	291	\$580.20
Numbered Comp.	\$18,700	29	\$644.83

2008

(With Township of Langley)

Category	Donation Total	Number of Donors	Average Donation
Union	\$19,121	23	\$831.35
Candidates	\$201,252	79	\$2,547.49
Citizens	\$147,355	553	\$266.46
Developers	\$118,116	203	\$581.85
Misc. Business	\$78,127	142	\$550.19
Numbered Comp.	\$11,400	13	\$876.92

2011

(With Township of Langley)

Category	Donation Total	Number of Donors	Average Donation
Union	\$42,855	56	\$765.80
Candidates	\$174,088	102	\$1,706.75
Citizens	\$159,370	450	\$354.16
Developers	\$128,428	193	\$665.43
Misc. Business	\$83,536	121	\$690.38
Numbered Comp.	\$11,200	18	\$622.22

TABLE — 4 COMPARISON OF AVERAGE DONATION SIZE BETWEEN METRO VANCOUVER AND FRASER VALLEY

- Langley Township not included because of missing 2005 data

2005

Category	MetroVanTotal	PerDonorAvg.	FraserValleyTotal	PerDonorAvg.
Union	\$1,350	\$450	\$1,000	\$1,000
Candidate	\$87,848	\$4,880.44	\$78,219	\$1,819.05
Citizen	\$73,107	\$311.09	\$71,944	\$344.23
Developer	\$15,650	\$489.06	\$43,350	\$688.10
Misc. Biz	\$15,971	\$550.72	\$38,194	\$460.17
Numbered	\$5,200	\$1,040	\$2,600	\$433.33

2008

Category	MetroVanTotal	PerDonorAvg.	FraserValleyTotal	PerDonorAvg.
Union	\$8,471	\$847.10	\$6,600	\$1,650
Candidate	\$31,834	\$1,447	\$143,130	\$3,252.95
Citizen	\$50,033	\$208.47	\$51,520	\$330.26
Developer	\$30,172	\$486.65	\$31,625	\$672.87
Misc. Biz	\$21,726	\$678.94	\$38,661	\$585.77
Numbered	\$6,100	\$1,220	\$500	\$500

2011

Category	MetroVanTotal	PerDonorAvg.	FraserValleyTotal	PerDonorAvg.
Union	\$24,985	\$780.78	\$10,300	\$735.71
Candidate	\$67,730	\$2,116.56	\$56,183	\$1,518.46
Citizen	\$40,134	\$240.32	\$46,640	\$373.12
Developer	\$28,605	\$752.76	\$32,337	\$634.06
Misc. Biz	\$18,550	\$713.46	\$35,736	\$649.75
Numbered	\$2,250	\$321.43	\$2,050	\$410

2005+2008+2011 TOTALS

Category	MetroVanTotal	PerDonorAvg.	FraserValleyTotal	PerDonorAvg.
Union	\$34,806	\$773.47	\$17,900	\$942.11
Candidate	\$187,412	\$2,602.94	\$277,532	\$2,238.16
Citizen	\$163,274	\$254.32	\$170,104	\$347.15
Developer	\$74,427	\$563.84	\$107,312	\$666.53
Misc. Biz	\$56,247	\$646.52	\$112,591	\$551.92
Numbered	\$13,550	\$797.06	\$5,150	\$429.17

**TABLE -5 COMPARISON BETWEEN LANGLEY
TOWNSHIP AND CITY OF LANGLEY**

2008

Cateogry	City Total	PerDonorAvg.	Town Total	PerDonorAvg.
Union	\$3,471	\$385.67	\$4,050	\$450
Candidate	\$18,626	\$1,164.13	\$26,288	\$2,022.15
Citizen	\$9,179	\$213.47	\$45,822	\$291.86
Developer	\$7,800	\$600	\$56,319	\$599.14
Misc. Biz	\$12,450	\$889.29	\$17,740	\$403.18
Numbered	\$0	\$0	\$4,800	\$685.71

2011

Cateogry	City Total	PerDonorAvg.	Town Total	PerDonorAvg.
Union	\$12,227	\$555.77	\$7,600	\$760
Candidate	\$30,096	\$2,315.08	\$50,175	\$1,520.45
Citizen	\$9,480	\$430.91	\$72,596	\$459.47
Developer	\$15,105	\$944.06	\$67,486	\$648.90
Misc. Biz	\$9,700	\$1,616.67	\$29,250	\$731.25
Numbered	\$0	\$0	\$6,900	\$1,150

APPENDIX B
Campaign Donation Spreadsheets

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: ABBOTSFOR		YEAR: 2005			
Union	Individual candidate	individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
	5828	100	250	200	500
	400	250	1000	100	100
	230	200	500	300	200
	240	200	200	437	800
	1000	200	100	500	
	4376	200	1000	340	
	500	300	1000	20	
	1100	100	500	100	
	25	1000	500	150	
	15	250	1000	250	
	80	1000	300	1000	
	150	250	750	500	
	2000	150	200	500	
	1835	100	150	250	
	6347	500	250	200	
	1800	500	250	250	
	200	200	500	500	
	10	250	250	250	
	200	500	200	100	
	60	99	250	99	
	85	99	350	99	
	9	99	1000	99	
	516	99	1000	99	
	5500	99	500	99	
	2092	99	250	99	
	1000	99	500	326	
	468	97	200	500	
	714	96	250	200	
	791	99	300	200	
	6813	50	200	200	
	4209	95	200	1000	
	48593	1000	250	300	
		500	200	100	
		500	5000	200	
		50	500	500	
		500	2500	1000	
		100	500	481	
		100	1000	547	
		1500	500	250	
		2000	300	300	
		500	250	500	
		1100	200	100	
		500	500	572	
		200	500	287	

Campaign Donations Project

		500	500	500	
		500	100	200	
		1500	300	500	
		100	1000	500	
		100	200	3500	
		1100	500	500	
		253	1000	500	
		253	1000	500	
		100	1000	500	
		100	1000	500	
		85	500	500	
		100	1000	500	
		100	400	500	
		100	34600	100	
		100		500	
		100		150	
		20		500	
		20		250	
		110		500	
		150		500	
		100		250	
		200		200	
		100		250	
		100		2000	
		20		1000	
		20		1000	
		250		250	
		100		500	
		500		500	
		100		250	
		500		500	
		250		32504	
		500			
		201			
		100			
		50			
		50			
		50			
		400			
		500			
		500			
		1000			
		300			
		500			
		200			
		300			
		500			
		500			

Campaign Donations Project

		100		
		500		
		400		
		50		
		250		
		100		
		250		
		300		
		100		
		200		
		200		
		100		
		1500		
		200		
		100		
		100		
		1600		
		500		
		500		
		200		
		200		
		100		
		2000		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		50		
		200		
		500		
		200		
		1300		
		250		
		200		
		100		
		500		
		500		
		500		
		200		
		200		
		300		
		200		
		100		
		800		
		500		
		500		
		500		

Campaign Donations Project

		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		100		
		500		
		100		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		100		
		20		
		20		
		20		
		10		
		50		
		50		
		40		
		40		
		5000		
		500		
		100		
		500		
		200		
		500		
		500		
		200		
		500		
		57762		

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: ABBOTSFOR		YEAR: 2008			
Union	Individual candidate	individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
1000	2232	500	2000	200	500
3500	9293	500	500	200	500
4500	14902	500	500	1500	
	459	500	500	500	
	631	500	175	500	
	2817	500	350	1000	
	7945	500	200	500	
	7	175	700	500	
	2566	1400	250	5000	
	500	350	400	300	
	20000	140	500	200	
	211	250	300	175	
	5000	100	500	350	
	4371	50	500	500	
	2700	100	350	289	
	300	200	1000	289	
	11098	125	500	140	
	10612	500	250	450	
	2400	200	2000	1500	
	1045	1000	500	250	
	332	100	2500	250	
	223	100	1000	250	
	1559	50	1000	250	
	1344	50	1500	500	
	166	50	1500	250	
	272	100	1500	250	
	311	150	500	125	
	12562	1000	500	190	
	115858	500	250	400	
		250	500	240	
		250	150	200	
		75	750	250	
		500	150	250	
		500	500	125	
		1000	500	190	
		250	1000	1000	
		100	200	1000	
		100	400	500	
		1000	2000	500	
		50	500	500	
		50	1000	1000	
		50	200	200	
		50	500	200	
		50	30575	250	

Campaign Donations Project

		500		5000	
		250		1000	
		150		500	
		150		2000	
		300		1000	
		150		150	
		300		500	
		100		750	
		200		1000	
		250		150	
		1000		300	
		20		200	
		50		600	
		100		500	
		100		36863	
		50			
		25			
		50			
		50			
		50			
		20			
		25			
		30			
		250			
		100			
		250			
		250			
		50			
		200			
		200			
		400			
		100			
		250			
		250			
		500			
		1000			
		1000			
		1000			
		100			
		500			
		100			
		1000			
		1000			
		2000			
		500			
		400			
		200			
		300			
		500			

Campaign Donations Project

		250		
		250		
		500		
		200		
		500		
		200		
		200		
		250		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		500		
		200		
		2000		
		1000		
		100		
		150		
		150		
		200		
		500		
		100		
		100		
		200		
		200		
		100		
		200		
		1000		
		500		
		300		
		15		
		750		
		100		
		100		
		1000		
		500		
		100		
		100		
		2500		
		100		
		250		
		100		
		54		
		116		
		250		
		200		
		49070		

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: ABBOTSFOR		YEAR: 2011			
Union	Individual candidate	individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
500	4098	150	500	1600	500
500	471	100	200	500	500
250	250	100	500	500	250
500	2654	200	1000	200	1250
250	150	500	1000	500	
500	150	100	200	1000	
500	233	200	2000	200	
300	615	200	250	500	
500	2391	2500	1000	2000	
3800	9000	2000	500	500	
	100	2000	1000	200	
	100	2000	1000	5000	
	1344	500	500	1000	
	105	1000	500	500	
	21661	500	500	1000	
		3000	250	1000	
		1000	500	250	
		500	500	200	
		1000	400	250	
		500	500	500	
		500	500	500	
		500	500	2000	
		200	250	250	
		500	2000	300	
		200	1000	1792	
		100	1000	150	
		250	1000	1000	
		150	1000	100	
		100	1000	500	
		25	500	300	
		70	500	500	
		30	500	500	
		10	500	500	
		20	350	1000	
		500	250	250	
		250	250	1000	
		200	300	2000	
		100	1000	500	
		100	500	200	
		100	500	500	
		400	2000	200	
		200	500	200	
		100	250	500	
		150	1000	100	

Campaign Donations Project

		100	300	100	
		150	30250	250	
		100		300	
		250		1000	
		250		33892	
		250			
		500			
		500			
		225			
		100			
		100			
		100			
		100			
		100			
		100			
		150			
		100			
		1000			
		150			
		577			
		190			
		100			
		50			
		40			
		40			
		40			
		500			
		150			
		1000			
		500			
		1000			
		1000			
		100			
		500			
		1000			
		250			
		100			
		200			
		225			
		500			
		500			
		100			
		100			
		150			
		250			
		300			
		200			
		250			
		100			

Campaign Donations Project

		100		
		280		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		150		
		100		
		200		
		1250		
		100		
		200		
		500		
		100		
		250		
		100		
		1000		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		300		
		1000		
		45272		

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: Langley City		YEAR: 2005			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
750	6985	500	100	200	200
250	3222	1800	500	100	200
1000	2659	2803	200	500	
	1292	500	1500	500	
	477	100	500	1000	
	1102	99	500	200	
	250	100	3300	100	
	300	200		100	
	16287	10000		100	
		500		5000	
		500		200	
		200		500	
		1500		500	
		836		100	
		1016		106	
		150		2715	
		500		500	
		500		100	
		65		12521	
		21869			

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: Langley City		YEAR: 2008			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
100	4259	500	100	150	
300	203	100	200	50	
600	607	80	50	50	
500	550	250	500	2000	
1000	420	400	50	100	
250	900	500	1000	100	
500	570	400	500	2000	
150	1000	100	250	100	
71	660	200	150	500	
3471	2785	100	500	1500	
	1000	100	2000	5000	
	1000	100	2000	200	
	800	100	500	200	
	1820	200	7800	500	
	1831	50		12450	
	221	50			
	18626	250			
		100			
		50			
		150			
		150			
		100			
		100			
		100			
		50			
		100			
		50			
		200			
		200			
		50			
		100			
		500			
		500			
		250			
		300			
		100			
		1300			
		40			
		250			
		100			
		500			
		259			
		9179			

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: Langley City		YEAR: 2011			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
1000	290	400	1000	2000	
500	2752	100	1000	5000	
200	4593	500	5000	1000	
927	2000	200	500	200	
500	240	500	1000	1000	
1000	748	150	1500	500	
200	539	40	500	9700	
400	4762	40	2000		
500	430	1000	1000		
250	8582	100	1000		
300	500	1000	100		
500	1957	1000	250		
100	2703	500	100		
250	30096	500	90		
500		500	25		
500		1000	40		
1000		500	15105		
500		150			
1500		150			
1000		500			
100		150			
500		500			
12227		9480			

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: Langley To		YEAR: 2008			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
500	500	2000	150	580	1000
180	120	1150	1000	500	1000
120	60	1000	2010	250	1000
500	4274	950	500	200	500
500	500	850	1000	200	300
250	1345	100	250	120	500
500	550	500	1000	120	500
1000	100	500	1000	60	4800
500	9000	400	40	200	
4050	1000	350	40	200	
	2000	250	250	250	
	6112	250	300	250	
	727	250	500	200	
	26288	120	1000	100	
		120	250	500	
		120	950	100	
		100	950	1000	
		99	950	200	
		60	950	250	
		60	250	250	
		60	1000	100	
		60	500	300	
		60	500	350	
		50	675	100	
		20	675	300	
		300	675	250	
		200	1000	1000	
		200	200	250	
		200	500	950	
		150	200	1000	
		100	2000	500	
		500	1200	1000	
		200	1000	250	
		250	1000	200	
		150	950	1000	
		200	950	100	
		100	950	1000	
		100	950	60	
		250	820	500	
		100	800	500	
		500	500	100	
		100	500	950	
		150	500	950	
		100	500	500	

Campaign Donations Project

		250	480	17740	
		500	420		
		100	300		
		250	250		
		250	250		
		500	120		
		200	60		
		100	60		
		150	500		
		100	200		
		100	1000		
		300	250		
		99	1000		
		99	300		
		500	500		
		450	200		
		100	99		
		100	200		
		250	200		
		300	450		
		200	450		
		100	450		
		80	450		
		250	250		
		250	500		
		80	200		
		80	95		
		50	1000		
		95	500		
		100	200		
		250	1000		
		500	250		
		150	1000		
		30	250		
		260	500		
		100	250		
		250	1000		
		250	250		
		1000	1000		
		200	500		
		150	500		
		250	1000		
		1000	250		
		500	250		
		500	950		
		200	950		
		250	950		
		100	950		
		100	1200		

Campaign Donations Project

		100	500		
		100	56319		
		150			
		500			
		250			
		250			
		100			
		260			
		200			
		50			
		50			
		2000			
		2000			
		250			
		1000			
		500			
		100			
		300			
		200			
		100			
		100			
		40			
		100			
		100			
		100			
		40			
		100			
		120			
		150			
		160			
		200			
		200			
		200			
		200			
		200			
		200			
		140			
		250			
		250			
		100			
		250			
		250			
		400			
		450			
		450			
		500			

Campaign Donations Project

		40		
		500		
		40		
		500		
		500		
		500		
		500		
		500		
		500		
		500		
		40		
		40		
		1000		
		45822		

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: Langley To		YEAR: 2011			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
500	500	100	500	50	300
500	267	40	250	500	600
500	500	100	250	500	3000
2500	200	50	500	300	500
1000	120	500	1000	400	500
100	3593	200	250	200	2000
500	204	500	250	200	6900
500	20	500	500	200	
500	550	100	1000	1000	
1000	7736	200	1500	500	
7600	64	100	200	250	
	380	100	100	1000	
	354	100	300	500	
	575	100	500	500	
	500	120	1000	500	
	168	430	200	500	
	1215	120	250	500	
	749	120	100	200	
	7600	180	250	1000	
	1072	100	250	1000	
	600	100	1000	200	
	2500	200	500	5000	
	3000	150	250	500	
	200	100	250	500	
	500	2000	1500	500	
	212	250	200	1000	
	500	250	250	400	
	500	100	600	1000	
	2155	100	640	500	
	2486	1000	640	500	
	312	100	640	500	
	200	100	250	150	
	10643	500	500	300	
	50175	250	250	100	
		100	500	300	
		250	250	500	
		250	250	1000	
		200	500	500	
		100	500	5000	
		100	250	1000	
		100	800	29250	
		300	750		
		500	640		
		200	640		

Campaign Donations Project

		250	640		
		250	300		
		250	640		
		500	500		
		400	250		
		250	500		
		250	250		
		250	250		
		500	250		
		100	250		
		200	500		
		200	100		
		20	1000		
		20	500		
		20	250		
		20	250		
		20	500		
		20	1000		
		20	500		
		20	250		
		20	500		
		20	500		
		20	500		
		100	250		
		150	500		
		100	2000		
		1500	500		
		250	800		
		250	500		
		250	500		
		250	1156		
		750	4000		
		100	500		
		300	250		
		2000	500		
		1000	500		
		300	500		
		1000	100		
		1000	500		
		250	1000		
		2500	250		
		400	300		
		400	1000		
		100	1000		
		2540	500		
		597	250		
		500	1500		
		250	500		
		250	1500		

Campaign Donations Project

		150	1500		
		2000	1000		
		5464	1000		
		125	750		
		250	2500		
		480	1000		
		300	1000		
		250	2000		
		250	1000		
		250	2000		
		100	1000		
		300	67486		
		500			
		400			
		300			
		200			
		100			
		1000			
		500			
		500			
		100			
		275			
		1500			
		250			
		100			
		100			
		200			
		100			
		100			
		800			
		1000			
		500			
		1500			
		1000			
		500			
		100			
		250			
		1000			
		1000			
		1000			
		200			
		1000			
		150			
		1935			
		300			
		250			
		500			
		100			
		500			

Campaign Donations Project

		200		
		750		
		2000		
		2500		
		1000		
		100		
		1000		
		100		
		100		
		250		
		100		
		750		
		250		
		500		
		1000		
		500		
		72596		

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: MAPLE RIDGE		YEAR: 2005			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
350	386	250	1000	200	2000
	300	200	1000	500	2000
	270	500	1000	650	500
	40000	100	500	100	500
	26063	100	500	250	5000
	1130	100	500	250	
	2078	200	500	500	
	250	100	500	250	
	250	100	250	250	
	834	100	250	250	
	71561	100	250	250	
		100	250	3450	
		100	250		
		200	250		
		250	250		
		100	250		
		100	250		
		100	250		
		100	250		
		100	250		
		200	250		
		100	250		
		100	250		
		200	250		
		250	250		
		100	250		
		250	250		
		500	250		
		250	250		
		450	250		
		100	150		
		250	150		
		300	300		
		100	12350		
		250			
		500			
		200			
		200			
		100			
		250			
		100			

Campaign Donations Project

		125		
		100		
		250		
		250		
		500		
		500		
		100		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		135		
		250		
		250		
		120		
		100		
		100		
		500		
		250		
		500		
		100		
		500		
		100		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		200		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		200		

Campaign Donations Project

		250		
		250		
		450		
		100		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		200		
		200		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		350		
		250		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		500		
		100		
		100		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		200		
		250		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		100		
		250		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		200		
		500		
		500		

Campaign Donations Project

		500		
		250		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		450		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		250		
		200		
		250		
		450		
		450		
		450		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		200		
		500		
		500		
		333		
		100		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		500		
		175		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		250		
		200		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		500		
		50		
		100		
		50		
		50		
		100		
		100		

Campaign Donations Project

		100		
		100		
		250		
		75		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		500		
		500		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		500		
		500		
		100		
		250		
		250		
		250		
		300		
		51238		

Campaign Donations Project

Campaign Donations Project

		100	250		
		100	1000		
		100	300		
		100	300		
		100	100		
	111	22372			
	200				
	160				
	100				
	100				
	100				
	400				
	100				
	120				
	50				
	1000				
	3500				
	100				
	500				
	100				
	500				
	200				
	250				
	200				
	100				
	150				
	100				
	350				
	100				
	200				
	200				
	100				
	125				
	100				
	100				
	300				
	250				
	200				
	252				
	250				
	500				
	450				
	250				
	500				
	100				
	200				
	250				
	500				
	250				

Campaign Donations Project

Campaign Donations Project

		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		200		
		160		
		160		
		160		
		160		

Campaign Donations Project

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: MAPLE RIDGE		YEAR: 2011			
Union	Individual candidate	Individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies
100	2394	500	300	2000	250
500	560	200	500	200	500
500	10530	100	150	300	500
1000	200	300	500	250	250
5458	3275	100	250	100	250
1200	158	100	1000	200	250
1000	1140	300	200	200	250
1750	2305	250	300	300	2250
750	2692	100	200	300	
500	1181	250	500	300	
12758	1000	100	500	300	
	750	100	400	300	
	1000	400	400	350	
	500	984	1000	200	
	1019	500	500	300	
	370	250	300	250	
	1916	250	500	2500	
	4779	250	500	100	
	1865	100	500	200	
	37634	200	1500	200	
		500	3000	8850	
		200	500		
		125	13500		
		50			
		30			
		50			
		250			
		300			
		250			
		100			
		100			
		200			
		240			
		500			
		250			
		400			
		250			
		250			
		2250			
		750			
		100			
		50			
		500			

Campaign Donations Project

		200		
		100		
		40		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		75		
		500		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		100		
		150		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		300		
		75		
		50		
		100		
		100		
		50		
		50		
		50		
		40		
		30		
		100		
		50		
		100		
		50		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		50		
		100		

Campaign Donations Project

		50		
		300		
		100		
		50		
		20		
		150		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		50		
		50		
		500		
		400		
		250		
		500		
		250		
		50		
		200		
		100		
		500		
		500		
		100		
		500		
		100		
		100		
		300		
		100		
		100		
		100		
		75		
		50		
		100		
		40		
		100		
		200		
		100		
		500		
		1800		
		100		
		150		
		100		
		300		
		200		
		130		
		100		
		100		
		500		
		100		

Campaign Donations Project

		1500			
		100			
		50			
		30654			

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: MISSION		YEAR: 2005				
Union	Individual candidate	individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies	
1000	635	500	5000	2000	500	
1000	1456	500	1000	1000	1000	
	747	500	1000	1000	300	
	2234	200	1000	400	1800	
	60	1000	250	540		
	1502	1000	500	200		
	7831	1500	8750	250		
	5500	476		300		
	727	100		5690		
	133	100				
	3591	135				
	5210	200				
	29626	25				
		1196				
		500				
		500				
		250				
		250				
		250				
		200				
		500				
		50				
		50				
		50				
		50				
		1500				
		500				
		50				
		250				
		250				
		500				
		200				
		14182				

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: MISSION		YEAR: 2008				
Union	Individual candidate	individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies	
1900	160	100	100	200		
200	1951	100	500	200		
2100	25	100	200	100		
	10334	100	250	224		
	1167	100	1050	224		
	3000	100		250		
	1512	100		250		
	712	100		350		
	2015	100		1798		
	1484	750				
	1287	50				
	100	50				
	100	250				
	100	200				
	400	250				
	2925	2450				
	27272					

Campaign Donations Project

CITY: MISSION		YEAR: 2011				
Union	Individual candidate	individual citizen	Corporate Developers	Corporate Business	Numbered Companies	
500	1510	50	500	300	300	
2500	1000	50	137	100	500	
500	1600	50	500	470	800	
500	3000	50	250	159		
2500	1000	100	500	115		
6500	548	100	200	500		
	1596	100	2087	200		
	874	168		1844		
	1500	100				
	1600	100				
	1317	500				
	1538	1368				
	1500					
	7300					
	245					
	877					
	900					
	1060					
	820					
	582					
	1510					
	545					
	2100					
	34522					