

*Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
*Office of Campaign and Political Finance*

---

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
December 14, 2006

CONTACT: Denis Kennedy  
Director of Public Information  
(617) 727-8352 / (800) 462-6273

## **\$15.3 million spent on statewide ballot questions in 2006**

More than \$15.3 million was spent to promote the passage or defeat of the three questions put before voters on this year's statewide ballot, a campaign that included record spending for a single proposition, according to figures released today by the Office of Campaign and Political Finance.

The OCPF study showed a total of \$15,320,327 spent on the questions, which concerned the sale of wine in food stores, the nomination of candidates in state primary elections, and home-based child care providers. Each question was defeated.

The total spending in 2006 fell short of the record aggregate of \$16.1 million that was set in 1992, when four questions were on the statewide ballot. It ranks third overall, trailing the amount spent in 2000 by \$15,000.

The vast majority of the activity this year concerned **Question 1**, which sought to change state law to allow municipalities to grant licenses to grocery and other food stores to sell wine.

A total of **\$13,063,293** was spent on Question 1, marking a new record for single-question activity in Massachusetts. The old record was the \$9.1 million spent in 1988 on an unsuccessful proposal to ban power plants that generate nuclear waste.

The committee favoring expanded wine sales, Yes on 1: Grocery Stores and Consumers for Fair Competition, reported spending \$7,273,511. Expenditures made by other parties in the form of in-kind contributions to the committee, such as staff, supplies and other materials, totaled \$448,167, to make the aggregate amount spent in favor \$7,721,678. On the other side, the Vote No on One Committee reported expenditures of \$5,260,746, another \$7,737 was spent independently of the committee by outside parties, and \$73,132 was spent in in-kind contributions to the committee, for total opposition expenditures of \$5,341,614. The yes committee was funded primarily by grocery stores, while the no side's primary backers were liquor distributors and retailers.

-- MORE --

While the Question 1 activity was a new spending record for a single question, the Yes on 1 committee's spending did not top the record for spending by a single ballot question committee. That mark of just under \$8.2 million was set in 1998 by proponents of a successful question upholding deregulation of the power industry. Nevertheless, the 2006 yes committee's spending is the third highest total ever recorded in an OCPF study.

Placing second in total spending this year was activity concerning **Question 3**, which advocated a change in state law to allow home-based child-care providers to bargain collectively with the state. A total of \$1,540,833 was spent by the lone committee organized for the question, the Campaign for Our Children's Future, which was funded solely by three units of the Service Employees International Union. Another \$223,806 in in-kind contributions was provided to the committee, making for total expenditures on the question of **\$1,764,639**. There was no committee organized to oppose Question 3, and no other spending was reported.

The proposition with the least financial activity in 2006 was **Question 2**, which proposed changes in the election laws to allow a candidate to receive the nomination of more than one party.

Committee expenditures totaled \$384,703, all of it spent by one of the two committees organized to support the question, the Yes on Question 2 Committee. Top contributors to the committee included several unions, a Northampton-based foundation and a corporation based in Arkansas. The only activity by the other committee, Mass. Citizens for Ballot Choice, was the receipt of an in-kind contribution of \$5.42. Expenditures in the form of in-kind contributions accounted for another \$107,692, for a total of **\$492,396** spent on the question. There was one committee organized to oppose the question, Citizens for Clear Choice, but it disbanded in October without raising or spending any money.

The side spending the greater amount of money did not prevail on any of the three questions in 2006. The disparity was greatest on Question 3, where the yes committee and the SEIU units spent more than \$1.7 million in an unsuccessful campaign; on the other hand, there was no organized committee and no other activity recorded in opposition. As in Question 3, there was no financial activity in opposition to Question 2, but the disparity between the opposing sides on the latter question was smaller.

The total spending figures do not include aggregate committee liabilities outstanding as of Nov. 15, which totaled \$320,803. However, liabilities are included in the charts that follow, and must be reported until they are paid.

The figures in this study are based on reports filed by committees and other organizations covering the period through Nov. 15 and are subject to change due to any subsequent corrections, deletions or additions made as the result of any review conducted by OCPF or amendments filed by committees or other organizations. Ballot question committees still in operation after Nov. 15 must file year-end reports with OCPF on or before Jan. 22, 2007. Those reports may include additional financial activity.

Reports filed by each of the committees may be found on OCPF's Electronic Filing System, a searchable database accessible on the office's web site at [www.mass.gov/ocpf](http://www.mass.gov/ocpf). A copy of this study is also being posted on the web site.

Reports filed by corporations and organizations disclosing expenditures concerning ballot questions (Form CPF 22) are on file at OCPF's office in Room 411 of the McCormack State Office Building, One Ashburton Place, Boston.

*A breakdown of activity for each question, as well as a list of the top contributors to each ballot question committee, follows.*

# Campaign Finance Activity for the 2006 Statewide Ballot Questions

Totals include receipts and expenditures by each ballot question committee organized with OCPF, as well as expenditures by outside parties, made independent of any committee or in the form of in-kind contributions to a committee.

## Question 1: Allowing the sale of wine in food stores (Defeated)

Committee	Organized	Receipts	Expenditures	In-Kind Contributions	Liabilities
<b><i>Support</i></b>					
Yes on 1: Grocery Stores and Consumers for Fair Competition <sup>1</sup>	8/05	\$ 7,355,817.93	\$7,273,510.93	\$448,167.25	\$ 79,413.06
<b><i>Committee total</i></b>		\$ 7,355,817.93	\$7,273,510.93	\$448,167.25	\$ 79,413.06
Independent expenditures			--		
In-kind contributions			\$ 448,167.25		
<b><i>Total expenditures in favor</i></b>			<b>\$7,721,678.18</b>		
<b><i>Oppose</i></b>					
Vote No on One Committee <sup>2</sup>	2/06	\$ 5,476,291.20	\$ 5,260,745.59	\$73,131.66	\$ 175,000.00
<b><i>Committee total</i></b>		\$ 5,476,291.20	\$ 5,260,745.59	\$73,131.66	\$ 175,000.00
Independent expenditures			\$ 7,737.12		
In-kind contributions			\$ 73,131.66		
<b><i>Total expenditures in opposition</i></b>			<b>\$ 5,341,614.37</b>		
<b><i>Question 1 Totals</i></b>		<b>\$12,832,109.13</b>	<b>\$13,063,292.55</b>		<b>\$254,413.06</b>

<sup>1</sup> Originally Massachusetts Food Association for Consumer Convenience in Wine Sales

<sup>2</sup> Originally Stop Alcohol's Further Extension to Youth (SAFETY), later Wine Merchants and Concerned Citizens for SAFETY.

## Question 2: Nomination of candidates for public office (Defeated)

Committee	Organized	Receipts	Expenditures	In-Kind Contributions	Liabilities
<b><i>Support</i></b>					
Yes on Question 2 Committee <sup>3</sup>	9/05	\$435,358.50	\$384,703.09	\$107,687.50	\$66,390.00
Mass. Citizens for Ballot Choice	9/06	--	--	\$5.42	--
<b><i>Committee total</i></b>		\$435,358.50	\$384,703.09	\$107,692.92	\$66,390.00
Independent expenditures			--		
In-kind contributions			\$107,692.92		
<b><i>Total expenditures in favor</i></b>			<b>\$492,396.01</b>		
<b><i>Oppose</i></b>					
Citizens for Clear Choice	7/06 <sup>4</sup>	--	--	--	--
<b><i>Committee total</i></b>		--	--	--	--
Independent expenditures			--		
In-kind contributions			--		
<b><i>Total expenditures in opposition</i></b>			--		
<b><i>Question 2 Totals</i></b>		<b>\$435,358.50</b>	<b>\$492,396.01</b>		<b>\$66,390.00</b>

<sup>3</sup> Originally the Mass. Ballot Freedom Committee.

<sup>4</sup> Dissolved in October 2006 after no financial activity.

### Question 3: Family child care providers (Defeated)

Committee	Organized	Receipts	Expenditures	In-Kind Contributions	Liabilities
<b><i>Support</i></b>					
Campaign for Our Children's Future	8/05	\$ 1,638,553.81	\$ 1,540,832.96	\$223,805.75	--
<b><i>Committee total</i></b>		\$ 1,638,553.81	\$ 1,540,832.96	\$223,805.75	--
Independent expenditures			--		
In-kind contributions			\$223,805.75		
<b><i>Total expenditures in favor</i></b>			<b>\$ 1,764,638.71</b>		
<b><i>Oppose</i></b>					
No committees organized	--	--	--	--	--
<b><i>Committee total</i></b>		--	--	--	--
Independent expenditures			--		
In-kind contributions			--		
<b><i>Total expenditures in opposition</i></b>			--		
<b><i>Question 3 Total</i></b>		<b>\$ 1,638,553.81</b>	<b>\$ 1,764,638.71</b>		<b>--</b>

## Total Activity by Question – 2006

<i>Question</i>	<i>Committee receipts</i>	<i>Committee and other expenditures</i>	<i>In-kind contributions*</i>	<i>Ending committee liabilities</i>
1 - Wine sales	<b>\$12,832,109.13</b>	<b>\$13,063,292.55</b>	<b>\$521,298.91</b>	<b>\$254,413.06</b>
2 – Nomination of candidates	<b>\$435,358.50</b>	<b>\$492,396.01</b>	<b>\$107,692.92</b>	<b>\$66,390.00</b>
3 – Family child care providers	<b>\$1,638,553.81</b>	<b>\$1,764,638.71</b>	<b>\$223,805.75</b>	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$14,906,021.44</b>	<b>\$15,320,327.27</b>	<b>\$852,797.58</b>	<b>\$320,803.06</b>

All figures are through Nov. 15, 2006.

\*In-kind contributions made by outside parties to ballot question committees are included in the spending totals for each question.

## Statewide Ballot Question Expenditures 1988 – 2006

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of Questions <sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Number of Committees</i>	<i>Total spent</i>
1988	4	18	\$13,317,952.42
1990	6	20	\$ 5,661,062.44
1992	4	8	\$16,139,661.07
1994	9	23	\$11,155,835.97
1996	1	3	\$ 1,210,777.52
1998	3	9	\$ 9,999,283.54
2000	8	16	\$15,340,199.45
2002	3	6	\$ 2,332,880.51
2006	3	6	\$15,320,327.27

Note: There were no questions on the statewide ballot in 2004.

1. Total number of questions on statewide ballot. Some questions featured no campaign finance activity.



## Top Contributors to Ballot Question Committees 2005 - 2006

*(Includes both monetary and in-kind contributions.)*

### Question 1 – Wine Sales

#### *In favor*

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Contributor</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1.	Stop & Shop	\$3,001,401
2.	Shaw's / Albertson's	\$1,739,068
3.	Hannaford Brothers Co.	\$686,233
4.	Whole Foods Market	\$538,969
5.	Demoulas Super Markets	\$403,300

#### *Opposed*

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Contributor</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1.	United Liquors Ltd	\$632,420
2.	Horizon Beverage Co.	\$522,387
3.	Beer Distributors of Mass. Inc.	\$413,961
4.	Martignetti Companies	\$376,112
5.	Mass. Package Store Association	\$283,027

## Question 2 – Nomination of Candidates

*In favor*

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Contributor</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1.	United Food & Commercial Workers, Washington	\$115,000
2.	Solidago Foundation, Northampton	\$110,000
3.	Citizens Services Inc., Little Rock, AR	\$103,687
4.	SEIU Local 2020 Roxbury, MA	\$26,300
5.	SEIU General Fund, Washington	\$25,000
	Teamsters Drive Fund, Washington	\$25,000
	Communications Workers of America, Washington	\$25,000

### Question 3 – Collective bargaining for child care providers

*In favor*

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Contributor</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1.	SEIU General Fund, Washington	\$1,812,717
2.	SEIU Local 888, Boston	\$48,341
3.	SEIU Local 1199, Boston	\$1,238

The three SEIU entities accounted for all the itemized contributions to the committee.