

2014 Fannie Lou Hamer Report

**Analysis and Review of
Democratic Party Spending**

June 25, 2014

Made possible by support from **Steve Phillips and Susan Sandler**

Foreword

50 years ago, Fannie Lou Hamer and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party challenged the Democratic Party to embrace people of color as a core component of its electoral coalition. 50 years later, significant progress has been made, but there remains no institutional mechanism within the Party to monitor, review and recommend additional efforts.

The need for such a mechanism is particularly urgent today given both the country's rapidly changing demographics (People of Color comprised 45% of the Democratic voters in 2012) and the opportunity to forge a virtually insurmountable progressive majority that could enact the sweeping legislation and policy changes that the voters seek. Such change is not inevitable, even in light of the demographic shifts. Only with a disciplined and focused effort can Democrats ensure success at the ballot box. In fact, the election of a Black President may have lulled some Democrats into complacency about the Party's vulnerabilities. Now is no time for self-congratulation.

If Democrats are to build a lasting progressive majority in America, we must rigorously review all of our practices and policies, honestly assess the nature of our investments, and put in place plans and procedures to harness the energy of the new American majority of People of Color and progressive Whites. This report is a first step in that direction. It is inspired by the spirit of Fannie Lou Hamer and her compatriots, and reflects the widely-shared commitment of Democrats to carry on that work and create a Democratic Party and country we can all be proud of.



Steve Phillips
Founder and Chairman, PowerPAC+

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
Glossary	4
Introduction	5
Models of Excellence: Best Practices	7
Findings	12
Conclusion	17
Researcher Biography	18
Appendix	20

Glossary

Glossary of Terms

MBE – Minority Business Enterprise

MBEs are usually exclusively businesses with at least 51% ownership by racial or ethnic minorities. But for purposes of this report, we defined MBEs as also including businesses with any ownership share held by a person who is African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American. We also included any firm with at least one principal who is African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American in the MBE grouping. For purposes of this report, MBEs need not be formally certified as such by a third party.

Procurement/Contracting

Outside purchase of goods or services necessary for the electoral program operations of the Party.

Supplier

A business that supplies goods and/or services to the Party.

Voters of Color

Adults aged 18 and older who are citizens and otherwise eligible to vote in the US and who are African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American.

People of Color

Residents of the US who are African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American.

Democratic Party

For purposes of this report, “Democratic Party” or “Party” refers, collectively, to all three of the largest Democratic party committees: the Democratic National Committee (DNC), the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC), and the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC)

Introduction

Follow the Money

Even amidst the massive infusion of “outside” money, the Democratic Party remains the largest source of funds for Democrats seeking office (other than the Presidency). Each cycle, the Party takes in hundreds of millions of dollars and uses these funds to provide the national electoral infrastructure and support those of the states. While most of the media attention falls on the mega-donors who make significant financial contributions to the Democratic Party, in the aggregate, small donors actually contribute more to the Party’s finances than do the mega-donors. Indeed, donors who made contributions of less than \$200 provided a full third of the Party’s financial resources over the past two cycles, having donated over \$371,345,529.

When an organization actively solicits and then successfully draws such a significant share of its funds from working families, it is more than reasonable to expect that the organization provide assurances to those individuals that their money is being well spent. This is the essence of the American capital markets and the attendant securities law framework, as well as non-profit entities, and the same principles and practices should apply in the contests to elect our country’s leaders. Transparency is paramount, as is the need to demonstrate responsible stewardship of those contributors’ hard-earned dollars.

Given its financial heft, the Party wields tremendous influence over the behavior of

Table 1: Sources of Contributions to Democratic Party, 2010 & 2012 Cycles, by Size & Committee

		DNC	DCCC	DSCC	Total	
Contributions from individuals in amounts of \$200 or more	2010	\$93,816,557.00	\$51,731,338.00	\$48,343,578.00	\$352,723,378.00	31%
	2012	\$43,361,571.00	\$60,902,750.00	\$54,567,584.00		
Contributions from individuals in amounts of Less Than \$200	2010	\$103,328,673.00	\$37,497,496.00	\$34,238,027.00	\$371,345,529.00	33%
	2012	\$75,860,221.00	\$70,805,335.00	\$49,615,777.00		
Other (mainly loans & transfers)	2010	\$27,312,209.00	\$74,667,218.00	\$46,961,838.00	\$414,018,549.00	36%
	2012	\$171,218,714.00	\$52,134,954.00	\$41,723,616.00		
Total Receipts	2010	\$224,457,439.00	\$163,896,052.00	\$129,543,443.00		
	2012	\$290,440,506.00	\$183,843,039.00	\$145,906,977.00		
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS		\$514,897,945.00	\$347,739,091.00	\$275,450,420.00	\$1,138,087,456.00	

SOURCE: <http://www.fec.gov/fecviewer/CandidateCommitteeDetail.do>

candidates, operatives, and ultimately, Democratic voters. Where it puts its resources is almost always determinative of the direction in which any particular campaign will go and consequently, its financial contributions to candidates are the single most important factors in the degree to which a candidate will focus on New American Majority voters or not. To put this in perspective, during the 2010 and 2012 Election Cycles, the

Democratic Party disbursed well over a billion dollars, not counting the funds raised by the Obama Reelection committee. Three committees, the DNC, DSCC, and DCCC together account for almost all of those funds, having disbursed \$1,136,855,565.00 in that four year period, according to the FEC reports they filed.

The Outsized Role of Consultants

An outsized share of the funds collected by the Party is allocated to consultants hired to service the multiple needs of its candidates as well as to inform and shape its own internal decision making processes. Well over half a billion dollars was spent on these consultants over the past two election cycles, an amount that represents approximately half of the funds raised and disbursed by the Party. Out of every dollar that a small donor in Georgia gave in response to a request by Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid, or President Obama in her mailbox, half of it, or 50 cents, ended up in the account of a consultant (while much of this money was spent on television ads, these ads were still directed – and often shaped – by consultants).

Given the dominant role of consultants within the Democratic Party, it is natural to ask about the Party's procurement process by which these consultants are chosen. How well is it designed to ensure that the millions of dollars in consultant fees are used as effectively as possible? Are those funds purchasing the products and services of the best and brightest consultants that half a billion dollars can buy? And how well suited are

the consultants in meeting the Party's bottom line: increasing the share of votes cast for our Party by the American electorate? How skilled are the consultants at reaching those sectors of the electorate that are growing relative to others, such as Hispanic and single women voters?

These questions form the basis for this report. We begin by highlighting ways in which organizations in other contexts have structured and oriented themselves to maximize both their efficiency and transparency. We then describe the examination we conducted regarding the spending on consultants by the Democratic Party and share the findings from that research.

Models of Excellence

Best Practices in Public Contracting

While we examine the racial background of Party consultants in this report, our ultimate objective is to win elections. Any organization, especially one managing the complexities and challenges of appealing to a society undergoing tremendous advances in media, technology, culture, and demographics, must operate at the highest level of efficiency. Of paramount importance to this task is a well-functioning procurement process that enables the organization to seek out and acquire innovative, high quality services offered by the best consultants available. One context in which this is done well is public contracting.

Through decades of trial and error, a set of best practices has emerged for awarding public contracts in ways that are fair, transparent, and beneficial to the public entity seeking services or products. There is much to be learned from this body of knowledge that can be useful to the Democratic Party, which is a kind of public entity of its own in that it relies on investments from members of the public to finance its operations.

The Performance Audit Committee of the National State Auditors Association (NSAA) has developed a document that distills the core components of an effective public contracting process. The NSAA's *Contracting for Services: A National State Auditors Association Best Practices Document* identifies five essential steps in public contracting:

1. Develop Performance Requirements

The agency should develop performance requirements that will hold vendors accountable for the delivery of quality services.

Performance requirements should:

1. Clearly state the services expected.
2. Clearly define performance standards and measurable outcomes.
3. Identify how vendor performance will be evaluated.
4. Include positive or negative performance incentives.
5. Identify the staff that will be responsible for monitoring vendor performance. Ensure that sufficient staff resources are available to handle vendor/contract management properly.
6. Clearly define the procedures to be followed if, during the course of performance of a service contract, unanticipated work arises that requires modification to the contract.

2. Utilize a Request for Proposal process

The decision to employ a Request for Proposal commits an agency to a formal process based on fair and open competition and equal access to information. This decision allows the agency to systematically define the acquisition process and the basis on which the proposals will be assessed. [Among other things], the RFP should:

- a. Clearly state the evaluation criteria and weighting factors for scoring proposals
- b. Allow sufficient time for vendors to prepare good proposals
- c. Avoid specifications that favor a particular bidder or brand
- d. Specify the qualifications for the company and/or personnel who would be assigned to the project

3. Conduct a Fair and Transparent Award process

The contract award process should ensure vendor proposals are responsive to the agency's needs, consistently and objectively evaluated, and contracts are awarded fairly to responsible vendors. Without proper awarding practices, there is little assurance an agency is selecting the most qualified vendor at the best price.

4. Use objective criteria in making Award decisions

When making an award decision, the agency should:

- a. Ensure that an adequate number of proposals were received.
- b. Use an evaluation committee, comprised of individuals who are trained on how to score and evaluate the proposals and who are free of impairments to independence
- c. Use fixed, clearly defined, and consistent scoring scales to measure the proposal against the criteria specified in the RFP
- d. Document the award decision and keep supporting materials

5. Monitor Contract Performance

Contract monitoring is an essential part of the contracting process. Monitoring should ensure that contactors comply with contract terms, performance expectations are achieved, and any problems are identified and resolved.


Best Practices in Affirmative Action

Modern demographics necessitate that we run and win elections among an electorate that is increasingly racially diverse and that in multiple ways is very different from the one that our Party infrastructure was built to service. Indeed, today's voter looks quite different from the model voter of even 50 years ago who was much more likely to be male, have a job with a union that afforded him time off to vote during the work day, and have access to an array of news sources that offered some semblance of balanced reporting on the candidates and their positions, among

other things. Today, women, especially those not married, form a core part of the Democratic Party's base, as do Voters of Color. To put it bluntly, these voters are already the largest constituencies within our Party, and their influence will only increase over the coming decades. Over 45% of the votes cast for President Obama in 2012 came from Voters of Color. Add to that the votes of single White women and it is clear that the majority of our party is what we've traditionally thought of as our minority voters. But 70+% of the Democratic vote cannot be considered a

minority. Clearly, a new nomenclature is called for in light of these changes, and New American Majority seems an apt term to describe our Party's base. The 2008 and 2012 Obama victories demonstrated unequivocally that it is possible to win by mobilizing Voters of Color and a progressive White base in sufficient numbers. Consultants of all races will be tested in future campaigns that lack a historic and galvanizing candidate such as Barack Obama.

Figure 1: Share of Obama Voters, by Race & Ethnicity - 2012



SOURCE: Analysis of Edison Exit Polls for 2012 Election, accessed via <http://www.cnn.com/election/2012/results/race/president>

Therefore, how to ensure that our Party is staffed with the right array of talent is a critical question. Fortunately, we now have decades of experience in how to act affirmatively to overcome historic institutional bias so as to diversify the pool of talent that can support the mission of an organization like the Democratic Party. Cities, counties, school districts, states, the federal government as well as public and private corporations have wrestled, to greater and lesser degrees, with the challenge of diversifying the

talent pool in a country struggling to overcome centuries of racial discrimination and exclusion. Inclusion and racial justice are core values of the Democratic Party, so it is only natural that the Party would want to “walk the walk” on issues of diversity.

Affirmative action in contracting has also been referred to as “supplier diversity,” and Richard Hernandez, a Certified Professional Contracts Manager, defines supplier diversity as “the process of developing a supplier base that mirrors an organization’s customer base.”¹

PolicyLink, a national research and action institute dedicated to economic and social equity, has developed a toolkit that clearly describes the core components of best practices in affirmative action contracting.² The broad strokes of the best practices distilled by PolicyLink can be summarized in four steps:

1. Conduct a disparity study to diagnose the problem

Research should be done on local agencies and their history of contracting with minority firms. What percent of contracts go to minority firms, compared to the existing number of those firms? Are there particular areas in which they are particularly under-represented?³

2. Set goals for diversifying contract awards

Setting quantifiable goals for making purchases from minority-owned businesses (MBEs) and women-owned business (WBEs) is critical to the success of any supplier diversity program. Goals set the necessary performance standards. They are established by customer requirements, benchmarking and using historical best

performance. MBE/WBE goals need to be tailored by commodity area and then rolled-up into an overall company goal. MBE/WBE procurement goals should be included in the corporate supplier diversity policy statement.⁴

3. Make a plan to increase access and capacity

Programs must address both access to opportunity and capacity to execute the work.

“Small disadvantaged businesses are often caught in a catch-22 in trying to achieve parity with more established or non-minority firms. It is easier to get large contracts when you have already gotten large contracts. And the personal connections and networks that have been established are hard to break into, carrying past discrimination into the present. Programs to increase opportunity attempt to break through these patterns by changing the way those selecting contractors do business.”⁵

Any comprehensive minority contracting program should include some of these approaches along with those to increase opportunity.⁶

Elements of successful plans include the following, among other things:

a. Outreach

A pro-active program is needed to outreach to minority- and women- owned businesses. This involves attending trade fairs, having a web site, advertising, etc. Outreach is essential to learning the capabilities of individual MBE/WBE suppliers. Having an Internet presence is crucial to an outreach program. An internal supplier diversity intranet is also a best practice.⁷

b. Education and Training

A wide range of training and technical assistance

programs have been created to help small and minority businesses increase their capacity and gain parity with other firms.

c. Requiring the use of sub-contractors

Sometimes a particular agency will commit itself to minority firm participation, and include MBE goals in its Requests for Proposals (RFPs).⁸

4. Measure progress and hold decision-makers accountable

Managers as well as individual buyers need to be held accountable for reaching MBE and WBE goals. The best companies include this in buyer performance appraisals along with cost savings, product/service quality, and reduced procurement cycle times. What gets measured, gets done.⁹

Defining and Operationalizing Cultural Competence

As we stated previously, the ultimate goal of these efforts is to win. And winning among today's multiracial and ever evolving electorate requires cultural competence at its finest. It is especially true that in order to be effective year after year and election after election, campaign leadership must immerse themselves in the cultures and ways of seeing the world of the voters they want to attract, whatever race the candidates or campaign managers may be. Cultural competence implies the ability to work effectively in cross-cultural contexts, and to develop practices that incorporate the beliefs, behaviors, and needs of the groups represented in a consumer base or constituency.

In the field of public health, researchers and practitioners have grappled for several years with the challenge of developing culturally competent practices, and have created useful models with applicability to the electoral context. One well-accepted definition of cultural competence entails "understanding the importance of social and cultural influences on patients' health beliefs and behaviors, considering how these factors interact at multiple levels of the health care delivery system (e.g., at the level of structural processes of care or clinical decision-making) and finally devising interventions that take these issues into account to assure quality health care delivery to diverse patient populations."¹⁰ Cultural competence is considered a cornerstone in any attempt to eliminate racial/ethnic health disparities in both health and health care.

The framework developed by these researchers for

cultural competence includes the following:

- Organizational cultural competence interventions. (Efforts to ensure that the providers and leadership is diverse and representative of its patient population)
- Structural cultural competence interventions. (Actions to ensure that services within the delivery system provide full access to all patients)
- Clinical cultural competence interventions. (Efforts to improve provider knowledge and understanding of the relationship between sociocultural factors and health beliefs and actions)

Findings

Methodology

We conducted an audit of the expenditures made by three national party committees, the Democratic National Committee (DNC), Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC) and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC), to assess which consulting firms working for the Party are owned by African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American individuals. We then extended this search to include firms that have African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American principals.

While we support transparency in cultural competency throughout the entire Democratic Party infrastructure, we limited this report to consultants hired through the three largest Party committees and their Independent Expenditure arms.

In this report, we provide information about the spending by the Democratic Party over two consecutive electoral cycles, 2010 and 2012. These include one midterm cycle and one presidential cycle. While both occurred during a period of tremendous growth within the non-White voting age population and during the tenure and reelection of the nation's first African American president, there are no other factors that would lead us to determine that this time period might in any meaningful way be inappropriate to examine

for these purposes.

Our analysis of the spending patterns of the Democratic Party follows.

Data Sources

Federal Election Commission

The Federal Election Commission requires that political committees disclose financial information on a regular basis, and provides a free public web portal that allows all reports and statements filed by political committees to be inspected, downloaded, and copied by any interested member of the public. The available information includes expenditures by the Committees of interest.

In May, 2014, we accessed the online data via the web portal for the three committees: the Democratic National Committee (FEC Committee #C00010603), the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (FEC Committee #C00042366), and the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (FEC Committee #C00000935), for the periods spanning January 1, 2009-December 31, 2010 and January 1, 2011-December 31, 2012.¹¹ This data included approximately 40,000 data points on the parameters of interest related to Party financial disbursements. We then merged the three data sets across the committees, and excluded all

expenditures that were not deemed to be made to outside consultants. Each observation was coded as either a consultant expenditure or a non-consultant expenditure, and as being disbursed to an MBE firm or a non-MBE firm. To ensure consistency in coding, coding by different individuals on identical batches were compared and any discrepancies in the coding addressed by the data manager. In addition, we sought out and received external reviews of our MBE and non-MBE coding to minimize the possibility of over or under inclusion in the relevant categories.

Leadership Interviews

To both inform and supplement our review of the FEC data, we invited the leadership of three committees to participate by responding to a series of questions relating to:

1. The processes and procedures for soliciting and awarding contracts to consultants for work on the Party's political program. This included questions regarding any outreach to MBEs or tracking of contracts awarded to MBEs.
2. Any standards or criteria used to evaluate a consultant's experience and expertise in communicating with, engaging, or mobilizing Voters of Color.
3. Any procedures or criteria considered to determine the potential impact of increased participation by Voters of Color in a given geographic area or race.

Representatives of all three committees participated in candid, good-faith, in-depth discussions with us. We are grateful to the leadership of the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee,

and the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee for graciously participating in this first consultant diversity report and hope that the leadership of state Democratic Party organizations will be as forthcoming in Phase Two of our work when we review expenditures in key state parties.

Challenges Related to Data

Despite multiple attempts to obtain a comprehensive database of MBE contract recipients, it does not appear that the Party has one and we did not receive one for this or any other time period. The Party does provide publicly a list of firms that have self-selected and self-identified as MBEs by completing the DNC's online Supplier Diversity form, but the majority of the firms that we deemed to be MBE firms were not included on this list. Given our inability to identify one unified list that covered the pertinent organizations and time periods, it is possible that there will be discrepancies between the information we present in this report and information that the Party's entities or individual consulting firms may possess and subsequently share.

In addition to the challenge described above, we were limited in our ability to determine whether all payments made to similarly named firms were in fact being made to the same firm but under slightly different spellings or punctuations. Where we encountered recipients of disbursements with the exact same name, we collapsed them into one firm. But where we found even slight discrepancies, we allowed them to remain as separate firms in the file.

While we would have liked to examine the actual contracts awarded to catalogue the scope of the

projects conducted by the consultants and the skills and qualifications of the consultant staff who worked on these projects, the publicly-available data prevented us from doing so. Accordingly, the analysis in this report is limited to the available information about the consultants engaged by the Democratic Party, such as company name, and the other publicly available information we were able to obtain from each company’s website or media reports about the companies.

Open Source Data

Recognizing that Democrats and progressives have generally benefited from the power of the people to collectively analyze and improve data, we are taking an open source approach to this review and analysis. Our underlying data is freely available on our website at http://www.powerpacplus.org/2014_fannie_lou_hamer_report, and we encourage anybody – including Party leadership – to update, clean, improve, or correct any errors we have made. It is only by having the most accurate data possible that we will be able to develop the most effective plans possible.


Results

Overall, Party spending on consulting firms with expertise on engaging African American, Latino, Asian American or Pacific Islander, Native American voters during the 2010 and 2012 election cycles is a very small percentage of the Party’s spending on consultants overall. Consulting firms received \$514 million in disbursements from the Party during the relevant time period. With regard to the share of dollars disbursed to consulting firms, even using a fairly generous definition of MBE status¹², only 1.7%, (\$8.7 million) of the \$514 million dollars spent by the Party on consultants during these time periods were disbursed to MBE firms.¹³

The amounts received by each MBE firm and the total received by all 14 MBE firms are detailed in the Table 2.

With regard to the share that MBE firms won of contracts awarded by the Democratic Party,

Figure 2: Dollars Disbursed to Consulting Firms by Democratic Party, by MBE Status – 2010 & 2012



SOURCE: <http://www.fec.gov/fecviewer/CandidateCommitteeDetail.do>

the numbers were also very low. We identified 285 firms that received disbursements by the Democratic Party in the 2010 and 2012 Cycles. Of these, 14 were deemed to be MBE firms and


the remaining 271 were not. The MBE firms comprised just 4.9% of the 285 firms.

Among the 14 MBE firms that received contract awards, four firms alone received 87% of the dollars disbursed by the Party to MBEs. Each of these four received disbursements in amounts of \$1 million or more dollars. The others received much smaller shares of the MBE portion, ranging from 0.1% to 3%. The range of dollar amounts disbursed to all 14 MBE firms spanned from \$4,925.00 to \$2.2 million dollars, with a mean of \$624,034.34 and a median of \$173,391.25.

Of the MBE firms receiving contracts, five are polling firms, and three offer primarily

communications services, and the remainder primarily offer political strategy services and IT.

Figure 3: Share of MBE Firms Awarded Contracts by Party



SOURCE: <http://www.fec.gov/fecviewer/CandidateCommitteeDetail.do>

Table 2: MBE Firms Awarded Contracts by Democratic Party – 2010 & 2012

Firm Name	Disbursement Amount	% of MBE Firm Dollars	% of All Firm Dollars
Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc.	\$2,206,772.50	25%	0.43%
SKD Knickerbocker	\$2,138,671.51	24%	0.42%
Brilliant Corners Research, Inc.	\$1,908,369.26	22%	0.37%
Thoughtworks	\$1,328,464.92	15%	0.26%
Three Point Media, LLC	\$294,976.43	3%	0.06%
Steve J. Hill J Street Strategies	\$285,250.00	3%	0.06%
Murphy Vogel Askew Reilly, LLC	\$63,882.50	3%	0.05%
Benavides & Associates	\$82,900.00	0.9%	0.02%
Dewey Square Group, LLC	\$81,054.73	0.9%	0.02%
Nesbitt Research Group, LLC	\$59,098.26	0.7%	0.01%
Ronald L. Lester Lester & Associates	\$45,670.00	0.5%	0.01%
Pineda Consulting	\$30,883.13	0.4%	0.01%
Allen H. Nesbitt Nesbitt Research Group, LLC	\$5,561.98	0.1%	0.001%
Chambers Lopez & Gaitan	\$4,925.47	0.1%	0.001%
MBE Firm Revenue from Party	\$8,736,480.69	1.70%	
All Firm Revenue from Party	\$513,865,171.07		

Among all 285 firms that received contract awards, fifty-four firms received \$1 million or more in disbursements from the Party. The range of disbursement amounts among the \$1 million or more firms was \$1,043,479 to \$273,867,883. However, if we exclude the \$273,867,883, the top of the range is \$25,698,127.

The Democratic National Committee provides an opportunity for MBE firms to submit requests to be considered for contracts via its website, www.Democrats.org. Under its Supplier Diversity List link, the Party states that, “The DNC is committed to diversity in the vendors and contractors we use, and we encourage minority-owned businesses—including those owned by women, veterans, and members of the LGBT community—to register for contract consideration.” On that same link it also provides a list of 28 MBE firms that it has already vetted. Of these, we were only able to identify two that received contracts in either the 2010 or 2012 cycle, and they are included in the 14 MBE firms described above.

In addition to the Supplier List found on the www.Democrats.org website, a third party provides a list of 22 MBE firms that offer services to Democrats and non-profits, including the Democratic Party.¹⁴ Only one firm appears on both MBE lists, and it is the only firm from the third-party list that won a contract during the 2010 and 2012 cycles from the Democratic Party.

Highlights of Best Practices Already Undertaken

This report is not the first effort aimed at highlighting the need for diverse talent, skill, and experience among the consultants hired by the Democratic Party. Others before us have spoken

and written at length about the importance of this issue. The Party has responded in a variety of ways and positive steps have been taken, including but not limited to the following:

- Engagement of firms that have individuals in positions of authority who are well-versed and experienced in motivating Voters of Color. One good example of this is the engagement of Dewey Square firm, which has Minyon Moore (African American) and Maria Cardona (Latina) on its staff.
- Establishment of a process and goals to ensure diversity among vendors to the Democratic National Convention.
- Establishment of the position of Chief Diversity Officer by the DNC and hiring a highly experienced person to fill that position.
- Efforts to identify consultants of color, such as the DCCC’s hiring of a Diversity Director, who focuses on collection of resumes, training, and communicating to key constituencies nationwide.
- Efforts by the DCCC to work with the Congressional Black Caucus and Congressional Hispanic Caucus to identify minority owned vendors and encourage their participation in the Independent Expenditure proposal process.
- DCCC’s hiring of a training director whose responsibilities include ensuring that job opportunities are shared with diverse communities and stakeholders.

Caveats Regarding the Findings

In determining which firms met our criteria as MBE firms, we relied upon publicly available information. It is possible that we failed to identify some firms that would meet our criteria, and the addition of these firms might impact on our findings.

The FEC data does not provide great specificity with regard to the nature of the services procured, so we were limited in our ability to categorize the services rendered via the contract. We therefore relied upon each firm's public statements regarding the goods and services it provides in our categorization.

FEC expenditure data are not always accurate and can be amended by the entity filing disclosure reports after they have been posted. Inaccuracies could include the name or amount of the expenditure. In addition, small differences in the name of an expenditure recipient in various reports may result in a failure to recognize that it is one and not two separate entities.

We welcome corrections to the data that could help us improve the accuracy of this report. An online version is available at http://www.powerpacplus.org/2014_fannie_lou_hamer_report and it will be updated periodically as any errors or additional information are brought to our attention.

References

- ¹ Hernandez, R.J. (July 2004). Best Practices in Supplier Diversity. Retrieved from: http://www.e-mbe.net/tutorials/supplierdiversity/nc-best_practices_in_supplier_diversity_july2004.pdf.
- ² PolicyLink. (August 2002). EquitableDevelopment Toolkit: Minority Contracting. Retrieved from: <http://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/minority-contracting.pdf>.
- ³ PolicyLink 2002.
- ⁴ Hernandez 2004.
- ⁵ PolicyLink 2002.
- ⁶ PolicyLink 2002.
- ⁷ Hernandez 2004.
- ⁸ PolicyLink 2002.
- ⁹ Hernandez 2004.
- ¹⁰ Betancourt, J,R, Green, A,R., Carillio, J.E., Ananeh Forempong, O. (2003). Defining cultural competence: a practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care. 2nd Public Health Rep, 118(4): 293–302.
- ¹¹ Data for all three committees accessed via the FEC web portal address: <http://www.fec.gov/fecviewer/CandidateCommitteeDetail.do>
- ¹² We deemed a firm to be a Minority Business Enterprise if it was owned by at least one African American, Latino, Asian American, Pacific Islander, or Native American, or if it had a principal from one of these groups. Where we were in doubt, we erred on the side of including the firm in the MBE category.
- ¹³ The largest amount of Party money went to the entity that purchases television ads, but given the importance of ethnic media to the New American Majority, the cultural competence of who handles the television buying is critical.
- ¹⁴ <http://www.minoritypoliticalconsultants.org/>

Conclusion

It bears emphasizing that the current Party leadership is comprised of individuals who both care about and understand the importance of structural changes to help the Party engage the New American Majority. Progress has been made in recent years, and there is willingness and openness to move in the right direction. Advocates of embracing and including people of color do not have to resort to storming the Democratic Convention floor as the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party did in 1964.

At the same time, it is deeply disappointing that we are even having this conversation in 2014, fifty years after Fannie Lou Hamer challenged the Party and the nation, thirty years after the Rainbow Coalition raised all of these same issues, and six years after the election of America's first African American President. If People of Color are smart and talented enough that one of them can serve as leader of the free world, then they are certainly smart and talented enough to run political campaigns for Congress, Senate, and the White House. Making the structural changes necessary to assure cultural competence and effectiveness in campaigns is not just the right thing to do. It is what Democrats *must* do if they are going to cement a progressive, multi-racial majority for decades to come.

Researcher Biography

Julie Martínez Ortega, J.D., Ph.D.

Julie Martínez Ortega, J.D., Ph.D. is a quantitative researcher and an attorney with over twenty years of experience working on electoral, health, immigration, employment, and labor issues impacting Latinos, low-income families, youth, and minority communities. She is the Senior Advisor to the Latino Engagement Fund of the Democracy Alliance on Research matters. At the Cost, Finance, & Access division within Health and Human Services, she worked alongside other social scientists analyzing the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS), the nation's most complete source of data on the cost and use of health care and insurance. As Research Director at American Rights at Work she established the policy analysis team for the nation's leading organized labor and workers' rights advocacy and research organization, and shaped its findings into effective materials for legislative and organizing campaigns. Dr. Martinez Ortega has taught graduate and undergraduate courses on Health Policy, Race and the Law, Wealth and Social Inequality, and Legal Studies. She has served as a consultant on the Latino and African American electorates for political and issues campaigns. As VP for Policy & Advocacy at PowerPAC.org, Dr. Martínez Ortega collaborates with progressive leaders to develop and implement research and advocacy projects that energize, expand, and empower the electorate, and ensure that America's growing

diversity is reflected in policy outcomes. She was born and raised in a large Mexican American family with deep roots in South Texas, and is a graduate of Stanford University, the UCLA School of Law, and Brandeis University's Heller School for Social Policy and Management. She was admitted to the California Bar in 1995 and lives in Washington, DC.

Appendix

Consulting Firms Receiving \$1 Million or More from Democratic Party 2010 & 2012 Cycles

* Indicates MBE

Firm	Dollars Received from Party
Great American Media	\$273,867,882.60
Nexus Direct	\$25,698,126.74
Integral Resources, Inc.	\$18,163,291.93
PDR Resources, Inc.	\$9,269,981.62
Action Mailers	\$9,066,365.06
The Benenson Strategy Group	\$8,628,799.89
Meyer Associates Inc	\$8,394,802.43
Bully Pulpit Interactive	\$7,521,688.18
Media Strategies & Research	\$6,494,233.14
Telefund, Inc.	\$5,886,869.51
Shorr Johnson Magnus Media	\$5,835,447.65
Harstad Strategic Research	\$5,335,888.19
Telefund, Inc. ATTN: Nicole Lane	\$5,260,080.04
Vertis Communications Attn: Robin Hubner	\$5,082,846.18
David Binder Research	\$4,485,137.74
Blue State Digital, LLC	\$4,364,944.27
Anzalone Liszt Research, Inc.	\$4,146,302.53
Adelstein Liston, LLC	\$3,795,266.20
NGP VAN, Inc.	\$3,362,569.58

* Indicates MBE

Firm	Dollars Received from Party
Abar Hutton Media	\$3,297,163.00
Direct Advantage Marketing	\$3,200,578.39
Lake Group Media, Inc.	\$2,978,708.04
Mack Crouse Group, LLC	\$2,728,232.10
Angle Mastagni Mathews Political Strategies, LLC	\$2,634,211.88
Murphy Putnam Media LLC	\$2,367,695.64
Anne Lewis Strategies LLC	\$2,362,456.32
Chapman Cubine Adams & Hussey	\$2,239,581.05
Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc.*	\$2,206,772.50
Telefund, Inc. Attention: Nicole Lane	\$2,187,723.03
SKD Knickerbocker*	\$2,138,671.51
Buying Time, LLC	\$2,027,430.30
NCEC Services, Inc.	\$1,972,750.00
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, Inc.	\$1,952,754.84
Brilliant Corners Research, Inc.*	\$1,908,369.26
American Directions attn: Steve Zuppas	\$1,903,050.50
Print Mail Communications	\$1,893,627.68
Integrated Direct Marketing, LLC	\$1,721,857.30
Public Interest Communications Inc.	\$1,661,451.78
Global Strategy Group LLC	\$1,643,821.64
Dixon / Davis Media Group, LLC	\$1,625,806.35
Ralston Lapp Media	\$1,545,104.01
The Winding Creek Group, Inc.	\$1,525,319.63

* Indicates MBE

Firm	Dollars Received from Party
Finnacial Innovations	\$1,496,177.49
Thoughtworks	\$1,328,464.92
The Contact Group, Inc.	\$1,301,906.77
Webcraft, LLC d/b/a Vertis Communications	\$1,251,588.29
PDR Resources Inc	\$1,217,321.94
The Mellman Group, Inc.	\$1,215,727.79
Mission Control, Inc.	\$1,186,706.25
The Feldman Group, Inc.	\$1,164,189.91
The Strategy Group Inc.	\$1,156,431.17
Multi Media Services, Inc.	\$1,062,000.00
AKPD Message & Media	\$1,052,688.17
The Spoken Hub LLC	\$1,043,479.18
Total	\$ 478,860,342.11

All Consulting Firms Receiving Disbursements from Party - 2010 & 2012

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
4C Partners LLC	\$109,055.14		\$62,903.23	\$171,958.37
A. J. Goodman Consulting			\$44,000.00	\$44,000.00
Abar Hutton Media	\$312,212.00		\$2,984,951.00	\$3,297,163.00
Action Mailers	\$294,899.64	\$8,771,465.42		\$9,066,365.06
Adelstein Liston, LLC	\$2,145,266.20		\$1,650,000.00	\$3,795,266.20
AKPD Message & Media		\$1,052,688.17		\$1,052,688.17
Allen H. Nesbitt Nesbitt Research Group, LLC	\$5,561.98			\$5,561.98
Amanda Miller Seventh Street Strategies LLC			\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00
American Directions Attn: Steve Zuppas	\$45,034.25	\$1,858,016.25		\$1,903,050.50
AMM Political Strategies			\$66,435.49	\$66,435.49
AMS Communications Inc.		\$882,996.05		\$882,996.05
Angle Mastagni Mathews Political Strategies, LLC	\$617,142.58	\$2,017,069.30		\$2,634,211.88
ANM Political Strategies			\$187,463.88	\$187,463.88
Anne Davis Davis Research Solutions	\$7,500.00			\$7,500.00
Anne Lewis Strategies LLC			\$2,362,456.32	\$2,362,456.32
Antaramian/Pettit Square Partners, LLC		\$29,116.64		\$29,116.64
Anzalone Liszt Research, Inc.	\$1,041,325.00	\$2,217,668.53	\$887,309.00	\$4,146,302.53
Archer Group Inc		\$180,959.70		\$180,959.70
Aria Communications		\$92,130.50		\$92,130.50
Atlas Project, Inc.			\$155,000.00	\$155,000.00

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Avalanche Services	\$52,910.75	\$257,443.73		\$310,354.48
AVF Consulting Inc	\$47,633.71	\$50,732.37	\$54,037.58	\$152,403.66
Bay View Funding Eastern Harbor Media, LLC	\$192,567.90			\$192,567.90
Bay View Lending f/k/a Harris O'Malley Marketing, Inc.		\$143,190.00		\$143,190.00
Behr Communications, Inc.	\$40,830.00			\$40,830.00
Ben P. Yuhas Yuhas Consulting Group, LLC	\$7,500.00			\$7,500.00
Benavides & Associates		\$82,900.00		\$82,900.00
Benchmark Fundraising Strategies, LLC			\$2,741.22	\$2,741.22
Benchmark Research, LLC		\$1,760.00		\$1,760.00
Benchmark Strategies			\$35,567.01	\$35,567.01
Benenson Strategy Group	\$796,330.00	\$7,182,721.62	\$649,748.27	\$8,628,799.89
Bennett, Petts & Normington, LLC	\$54,000.00		\$252,017.50	\$306,017.50
Bertolina & Barnato Consulting, Inc.	\$54.33			\$54.33
Blue State Digital, LLC	\$953,197.50	\$3,411,746.77		\$4,364,944.27
BRAINSTORM MEDIA, INC.		\$41,684.78		\$41,684.78
Brand New School LLC	\$99,800.00			\$99,800.00
Brilliant Corners Research, Inc.	\$94,334.94	\$1,814,034.32		\$1,908,369.26
Brushfire Strategies	\$82,639.92		\$36,606.00	\$119,245.92
BTA Public Relations		\$59,631.50		\$59,631.50
BTS Strategies, Inc.	\$328,527.51			\$328,527.51
Bulletproof		\$43,629.09		\$43,629.09
Bully Pulpit Interactive	\$681,000.00	\$5,503,183.53	\$1,337,504.65	\$7,521,688.18

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Buying Time, LLC	\$2,027,430.30			\$2,027,430.30
Campaign Comm. Solutions Inc. Stones' Phones, Inc.	\$113,770.30			\$113,770.30
Campaign Finance Consultants			\$16,645.21	\$16,645.21
Campaign Group, Inc.	\$368,700.00			\$368,700.00
CapAd Communications, Inc.	\$71,364.89	\$3,000.00		\$74,364.89
Capitol Compliance Associates		\$56,029.75	\$191,867.03	\$247,896.78
Capitol Strategies			\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00
Carrick Consulting, Inc.	\$90,450.00			\$90,450.00
Catalist, LLC	\$277,860.00	\$88,333.93	\$275,500.00	\$641,693.93
CDP Strategies LLC			\$24,038.32	\$24,038.32
Chambers Lopez & Gaitan			\$4,925.47	\$4,925.47
Chapman Cubine Adams & Hussey		\$2,239,581.05		\$2,239,581.05
Cherry, Bekaert & Holland, Llp		\$89,000.00		\$89,000.00
CHS Mailing, Inc.	\$83,612.58			\$83,612.58
Cogent Communications, Inc.			\$35,700.00	\$35,700.00
Common Cents Consulting, LLC ATTN: Darryl Tattrie	\$11,500.00		\$2,145.00	\$13,645.00
Compass Media Group, Inc.	\$88,950.00			\$88,950.00
Consorte Media, Inc.		\$6,172.72		\$6,172.72
Contact Group, Inc.		\$1,301,906.77		\$1,301,906.77
Convergence Tech Consulting			\$22,402.00	\$22,402.00
Covad Communications		\$56,840.03		\$56,840.03
Covergance Tech Consulting			\$10,218.40	\$10,218.40

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Creative Associates, LLC		\$32,342.40		\$32,342.40
CSA Research Solutions			\$19,954.66	\$19,954.66
Cultivated Clients			\$87,419.13	\$87,419.13
Data Farm Consulting, LLC			\$181,000.00	\$181,000.00
David Binder Research		\$4,205,137.74	\$280,000.00	\$4,485,137.74
David Heller Main Street Communications, LLC	\$286,015.00			\$286,015.00
David L. Andrukitis, Inc.	\$158,764.70	\$6,132.79		\$164,897.49
DCH Advisors, Inc			\$61,428.00	\$61,428.00
DCH Advisors, Inc.			\$130,000.00	\$130,000.00
Dewey Square Group, LLC	\$41,054.73		\$40,000.00	\$81,054.73
Direct Advantage Marketing	\$607,690.31	\$414,297.10	\$2,178,590.98	\$3,200,578.39
Direct Advantage Marketing Attn: Tami S. Rieger		\$129,357.00		\$129,357.00
Dixon / Davis Media Group, LLC	\$1,411,720.35		\$214,086.00	\$1,625,806.35
Dixon Davis Media Group	\$237,138.00			\$237,138.00
DMH Marketing	\$126,306.73			\$126,306.73
DNR Group	\$98,229.84			\$98,229.84
Donor Services Group, LLC	\$340,229.06			\$340,229.06
DR & Associates, LLC			\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00
EFH Consulting		\$3,569.00		\$3,569.00
Eichenbaum & Associates, Inc.	\$140,000.00			\$140,000.00
Eleison Group, LLC	\$60,000.00			\$60,000.00
Elmendorf Strategies LLC Elmendorf Ryan	\$100.00			\$100.00

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Envision Communications, Inc.	\$109,196.66			\$109,196.66
Eye Street Research		\$100.00		\$100.00
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates, Inc.			\$314,660.00	\$314,660.00
Felan Strategies, LLC		\$40,500.00		\$40,500.00
Feldman Group, Inc.	\$20,000.00	\$871,134.88	\$273,055.03	\$1,164,189.91
Field Strategies Inc.	\$20,174.18			\$20,174.18
Financial Innovations		\$1,381,944.68	\$114,232.81	\$1,496,177.49
Fletcher Rowley Riddle, Inc.	\$168,000.00			\$168,000.00
Ford And Harrison, LLP		\$90,547.45		\$90,547.45
Fortune Media, Inc.	\$84,000.00			\$84,000.00
Funding Solutions, LLC		\$62,760.02		\$62,760.02
Future Link Consulting			\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
GBA Strategies	\$98,625.00		\$86,350.00	\$184,975.00
GCAT, LLC dba Target Distributing		\$39,023.82		\$39,023.82
Gelman, Rosenberg & Freedman	\$155,599.06			\$155,599.06
Genova, Burns & Giantomasi		\$245,954.20		\$245,954.20
Genova, Burns & Vernoia		\$146,932.72		\$146,932.72
Global Strategy Group LLC	\$1,309,746.64		\$334,075.00	\$1,643,821.64
Golden State Strategies, LLC			\$10,640.00	\$10,640.00
Goodmail Systems, Inc.			\$181,180.61	\$181,180.61
Gotham Research Group, LLC			\$133,500.00	\$133,500.00
Gragert Jones Research, LLC	\$228,127.91		\$177,803.91	\$405,931.82

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Great American Media	\$156,943,316.17	\$21,819,669.80	\$95,104,896.63	\$273,867,882.60
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, Inc.	\$1,090,179.00		\$862,575.84	\$1,952,754.84
Grindstone Research, LLP			\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Grossman Marketing Group		\$979,525.39		\$979,525.39
Grove Insight	\$564,526.46	\$323,597.00		\$888,123.46
Grunwald Communications			\$334,249.25	\$334,249.25
Halyard Strategies		\$1,082.29		\$1,082.29
Hamilton Campaigns	\$25,475.00		\$603,196.51	\$628,671.51
Harstad Strategic Research	\$12,360.00	\$4,413,321.07	\$910,207.12	\$5,335,888.19
Hays Research Group			\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Hickman Analytics, Inc.			\$707,328.56	\$707,328.56
Hildebrandtewes Consulting Inc.		\$10,717.69		\$10,717.69
Hilltop Public Solutions			\$30,207.08	\$30,207.08
Hirschberg Strategies	\$182,693.81			\$182,693.81
HM Consulting			\$46,000.00	\$46,000.00
Horizon Advisors		\$100,000.00		\$100,000.00
HSC, Inc.			\$191,313.09	\$191,313.09
Innovative Research Group, LLC			\$6,041.00	\$6,041.00
Insight Direct USA, Inc.	\$123,545.07			\$123,545.07
Integral Resources, Inc.	\$18,163,291.93			\$18,163,291.93
Integrated Direct Marketing, LLC	\$1,721,857.30			\$1,721,857.30
Interface Media Group Attn: Accts. Receivable		\$176,861.50		\$176,861.50

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
J Street Strategies, LLC	\$44,995.26			\$44,995.26
JBW Consulting, LLC			\$180,000.00	\$180,000.00
JDC Advertising			\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Jeff Link Link Strategies, LLC	\$8,500.00			\$8,500.00
Jefferson Street Strategies			\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
Jill Normington & Assoc Inc Bennett Petts & Normington	\$652,345.06			\$652,345.06
Joe Trippi & Associates	\$74,490.00			\$74,490.00
John Lapp Ralston Lapp Media	\$148,808.60			\$148,808.60
Kantar Media CMAG		\$435,000.00		\$435,000.00
Kauffman Group			\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Keller Consultants			\$90,831.61	\$90,831.61
Kelly & Associates, Inc.			\$848,502.35	\$848,502.35
Kiley & Company	\$10,000.00		\$826,800.00	\$836,800.00
Kroll Associates, Inc.		\$96,070.04		\$96,070.04
Kully Hall, LLC	\$23,000.00			\$23,000.00
Lake Group Media, Inc.	\$2,883,553.69	\$67,617.13	\$27,537.22	\$2,978,708.04
Lake Research Partners	\$15,635.00		\$60,611.15	\$76,246.15
Landmark Strategies Inc.	\$8,840.00			\$8,840.00
Lauterbach Group, Inc.		\$216,127.32		\$216,127.32
Level 3 Communications LLC		\$40,577.82		\$40,577.82
Link Strategies LLC	\$24,727.02	\$20,000.00	\$55,000.00	\$99,727.02
List Services Corporation		\$51,135.94		\$51,135.94

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
List Solutions		\$101,522.87		\$101,522.87
Lori LaFave			\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
LSG Strategies	\$10,524.42	\$9,969.21		\$20,493.63
Luc Media Group Inc.	\$299,000.00			\$299,000.00
Mack Crouse Group, LLC	\$1,979,433.15	\$748,798.95		\$2,728,232.10
Madeline Grunwald Grunwald Communications	\$14,476.00			\$14,476.00
Marcia Dickstein Sudolsky MSUDCO Consulting, LLC	\$22,348.94			\$22,348.94
Martiancraft LLC Attn: Dave Mark		\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00
Mayfield Strategy Group		\$3,387.54		\$3,387.54
McKenna Pihlaja	\$3,344.00		\$174,713.00	\$178,057.00
Mctigue & McGinnis LLC		\$99,647.43		\$99,647.43
Media Strategies & Research	\$2,258,644.00	\$3,131,761.98	\$1,103,827.16	\$6,494,233.14
Media Strategies & Research Media Fund Account		\$40,000.00		\$40,000.00
Media Strategies & Research, Inc.			\$428,710.00	\$428,710.00
Mellman Group, Inc.	\$228,000.00		\$987,727.79	\$1,215,727.79
Meredith J. DeWitt Consulting			\$22,500.00	\$22,500.00
Message and Media	\$172,000.00		\$454,046.00	\$626,046.00
Message Audience & Presentation		\$231,995.43		\$231,995.43
MessageLabs, Inc.	\$13,530.15			\$13,530.15
Meyer Associates	\$95,861.25			\$95,861.25
Meyer Associates Inc	\$1,478,021.40	\$3,626,743.99	\$3,290,037.04	\$8,394,802.43
Mis Department, Inc.		\$937,089.94		\$937,089.94

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Mission Control, Inc.	\$1,186,706.25			\$1,186,706.25
Monica Dixon			\$115,468.28	\$115,468.28
Morzep Consulting, Llc		\$2,915.89		\$2,915.89
Multi Media Services, Inc.			\$1,062,000.00	\$1,062,000.00
Mundy Katowitz Media	\$87,800.00			\$87,800.00
Murphy Putnam Media LLC	\$2,203,970.87		\$163,724.77	\$2,367,695.64
Murphy Vogel Askew Reilly LLC	\$263,882.50			\$263,882.50
Nancy Kohn Consulting LLC			\$371,671.77	\$371,671.77
National Field LLC	\$499,730.00	\$259,239.00		\$758,969.00
NCEC Services, Inc.	\$735,000.00	\$648,750.00	\$589,000.00	\$1,972,750.00
Nesbitt Research Group, LLC	\$18,808.00		\$40,290.26	\$59,098.26
Network Strategies		\$11,112.12		\$11,112.12
New Organizing Institute		\$11,592.54	\$20,000.00	\$31,592.54
New Partners Consulting, Inc.	\$66,925.31	\$86,123.87	\$29,101.91	\$182,151.09
Newburg Group, LLC		\$67,264.24		\$67,264.24
Nexus Direct			\$25,698,126.74	\$25,698,126.74
Nexus Strategies, Inc.			\$41,250.63	\$41,250.63
NGP Software, Inc.	\$61,600.00	\$203,775.00	\$101,329.72	\$366,704.72
NGP VAN, Inc.	\$64,699.50	\$3,216,193.40	\$81,676.68	\$3,362,569.58
O & R Consulting		\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00
Oblander Group, LLC		\$192,175.87		\$192,175.87
Ohlsen Research, LLC	\$10,000.00			\$10,000.00

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
One World Strategy Group, LLC	\$700.00			\$700.00
Otero Consulting Services		\$1,122.00		\$1,122.00
PDR Resources Inc			\$1,217,321.94	\$1,217,321.94
PDR Resources, Inc.		\$26,362.00	\$9,243,619.62	\$9,269,981.62
Perennial Strategy Group, LLC		\$3,213.00		\$3,213.00
Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc.	\$465,462.19	\$41,852.04	\$1,699,458.27	\$2,206,772.50
Pineda Consulting		\$30,883.13		\$30,883.13
Plouffe Strategies		\$5,800.06		\$5,800.06
PoliticsTVConsulting.com		\$983.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,983.00
Potomac Waves LLC	\$60,479.42			\$60,479.42
Precision Polling LLC		\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
Preston Harper Media Group		\$413,629.90		\$413,629.90
Preti ,Flaherty, Beliveau, & Pachios LLP		\$37,121.70		\$37,121.70
Print Mail Communications	\$1,893,627.68			\$1,893,627.68
ProList, Inc.	\$46,633.09			\$46,633.09
Public Interest Communications		\$61,852.10	\$97,517.52	\$159,369.62
Public Interest Communications Inc.	\$1,661,451.78			\$1,661,451.78
Putnam Partners LLC			\$96,747.03	\$96,747.03
QRS New Media, Inc.		\$60,000.00		\$60,000.00
Ralston Lapp Media	\$1,263,985.18		\$281,118.83	\$1,545,104.01
Raven Me LLC dba Small Society		\$71,100.00		\$71,100.00
Red Horse Strategies, LLC	\$11,550.00			\$11,550.00

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Reger Research			\$38,432.00	\$38,432.00
Research Network, Inc.		\$4,810.00		\$4,810.00
Revolution Messaging LLC		\$239,429.18	\$395,500.00	\$634,929.18
RHA Marketing, LLC	\$153,941.50			\$153,941.50
Ridder/Braden, Inc.	\$17,500.00		\$18,000.00	\$35,500.00
Rising Tide Interactive, LLC	\$87,012.97		\$10,000.00	\$97,012.97
Ronald L. Lester Lester & Associates	\$45,670.00			\$45,670.00
Rose Group Park Avenue LLC dba 583 Park Avenue	\$36,875.71			\$36,875.71
RST Marketing		\$565,486.69		\$565,486.69
RWT Production, LLC	\$58,958.57			\$58,958.57
Salsa Labs			\$90,500.00	\$90,500.00
Salsa Labs, Inc.	\$10,000.00	\$4,500.00	\$330,057.00	\$344,557.00
Sautter Communications, Inc.	\$52,331.67			\$52,331.67
SGR Consulting, LLC			\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00
Shepardson Stern & Kaminsky		\$212,637.93		\$212,637.93
Shorr Johnson Magnus Media	\$1,148,969.42		\$4,686,478.23	\$5,835,447.65
Siemens Communications		\$32,654.14		\$32,654.14
Siemens Enterprise Communications, Inc.		\$136,635.26		\$136,635.26
Sisk Mailing Service	\$341,853.00			\$341,853.00
SKD Knickerbocker	\$1,335,700.68	\$393,426.64	\$409,544.19	\$2,138,671.51
Snapstream Media		\$71,800.00		\$71,800.00
Social Stream Consulting		\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Southpawgroup			\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00
Spiros Consulting, LLC Edward Chapman	\$11,496.64			\$11,496.64
Spoken Hub LLC	\$436,270.15	\$50,412.42	\$556,796.61	\$1,043,479.18
Squier Knapp Dunn Communications Inc.	\$73,000.00	\$43,026.11	\$221,734.36	\$337,760.47
Stephen J. Hill J Street Strategies LLC	\$285,250.00			\$285,250.00
Stone's Phones, Inc.	\$25,727.40	\$24,321.00	\$2,500.00	\$52,548.40
Strategic Marketing & Mailing, Inc.	\$194,010.56			\$194,010.56
Strategic Productions LLC			\$41,811.80	\$41,811.80
Strategy Group Inc.	\$1,156,431.17			\$1,156,431.17
Strategy Group, Inc.			\$6,483.98	\$6,483.98
Straus/Baker LLC	\$200.32		\$268,657.14	\$268,857.46
Struble Eichenbaum Communcations			\$52,246.43	\$52,246.43
Struble Eichenbaum Communications	\$193,585.01		\$4,305.51	\$197,890.52
Sunstream Strategies LLC		\$207,762.90		\$207,762.90
Targetsmart Communication LLC		\$309,479.46		\$309,479.46
TargetSmart Communications LLC			\$168,735.92	\$168,735.92
Taryn Rosenkranz New Blue Interactive, LLC	\$147,891.39			\$147,891.39
Telefund, Inc.	\$1,387,754.26	\$4,499,115.25		\$5,886,869.51
Telefund, Inc. Attention: Nicole Lane	\$2,187,723.03			\$2,187,723.03
Telefund, Inc. Attn: Nicole Lane		\$5,260,080.04		\$5,260,080.04
Telephone Strategies Group	\$37,720.00			\$37,720.00
Tension Envelope Corporation		\$295,874.48		\$295,874.48
Third Coast Research, Inc.	\$9,436.26			\$9,436.26

Firm	DCCC	DNC	DSCC	Total
Thoughtworks		\$1,328,464.92		\$1,328,464.92
Three Point Media, LLC	\$294,976.43			\$294,976.43
TNS Media Intelligence		\$30,000.00		\$30,000.00
Tracey Buckman & Associates			\$171,000.00	\$171,000.00
Triplex A Donnelley Company	\$66,815.71	\$147,804.95		\$214,620.66
Tulchin Research Polling and Strategic Consulting	\$52,161.00			\$52,161.00
US Postal Service C/O Vertis Direct Marketing		\$858,047.32		\$858,047.32
Vanguard Strategy Group			\$9,700.00	\$9,700.00
Verdolino & Lowey, PC			\$136,913.14	\$136,913.14
Vertis Communications		\$313,560.20		\$313,560.20
Vertis Communications Attn: Robin Hubner	\$5,082,846.18			\$5,082,846.18
Voyant Strategies Inc			\$14,200.00	\$14,200.00
VR Research	\$90,932.14		\$125,792.66	\$216,724.80
Walsworth Landset Research, Inc.	\$122,956.38	\$6,315.49	\$89,460.57	\$218,732.44
Webcraft LLC		\$94,192.18		\$94,192.18
Webcraft, LLC d/b/a Vertis Communications		\$1,251,588.29		\$1,251,588.29
Well & Lighthouse LLC			\$200,375.00	\$200,375.00
West Wing Writers		\$70,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$74,000.00
Winding Creek Group, Inc.	\$62,217.36	\$1,440,901.07	\$22,201.20	\$1,525,319.63
Winning Connections, Inc.	\$191,786.46	\$109,122.86	\$7,790.00	\$308,699.32
Wired for Change	\$10,700.00	\$15,000.00	\$346,192.47	\$371,892.47
Zata 3 Consulting, LLC	\$9,000.00	\$14,510.08		\$23,510.08

2014 Fannie Lou Hamer Report

**Analysis and Review of Democratic
Party Spending**



Washington, D.C. Office
1333 H Street NW,
Third Floor, East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005