

# Campaign Finance Activity by Political Action Committees in Massachusetts

2001 & 2002

One Ashburton Place, Room 411 Boston, Massachusetts 02108 (617) 727-8352 (800) 462-OCPF

June 2003

# **INTRODUCTION**

The Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF) administers Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 55, which provides for disclosure and regulation of campaign finance activity on the state, county and municipal levels. Several types of political committees in Massachusetts file reports with OCPF, including those organized on behalf of individual candidates for public office; committees promoting or opposing ballot questions; committees registered on behalf of political parties on the ward, town, city and state level; and political action committees and people's committees.

PACs are political committees organized to receive and distribute funds to support candidates in Massachusetts, generally based on a unifying principle or purpose as defined in their original statements of organization. People's committees are committees that have been in existence as PACs for six months or more, have made contributions to five or more candidates and only receive contributions from individuals at a maximum annual amount that is indexed biennially by OCPF every two years and is now \$123. Contributions from people's committees do not count toward a candidate's statutory limit on annual aggregate contributions from PACs. (Unless specifically noted otherwise, the term "PACs" in this report also includes people's committees.)

Section 18 of Chapter 55 requires PACs to disclose their campaign finance activity in reports filed regularly with OCPF. The filing schedule varies by the year: PACs are required to file reports once for a non-election year and three times for a state election (even-numbered) year. In an election year, those reports are filed eight days prior to the primary election in September; eight days prior to the November election; and on the following Jan. 20. For a non-election year, only one report is filed for the year and is due on the following Jan. 20.<sup>1</sup>

For the time periods covered by this report, PACs were required to disclose their account balances at the beginning of each reporting period; aggregate receipts for the reporting period; aggregate expenditures for the reporting period; in-kind contributions for the reporting period; itemized receipts over \$50; itemized expenditures over \$50; and all outstanding liabilities.

The maximum amount a PAC or people's committee may contribute to an individual candidate is \$500 in a calendar year. The campaign finance law also sets an aggregate annual limit on what candidates may receive in total from all PACs. That limit ranges from \$150,000 for a candidate for governor to \$18,750 for a Senate candidate and \$7,500 for a House candidate. The limits do not include contributions from people's committees, which candidates may receive without limitation in the aggregate.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A limited number of PACs are organized with municipal officials to support local candidates. These committees file reports locally and are not included in this study.

# METHODOLOGY

This study examines campaign finance activity by political action committees in Massachusetts during the 2001-02 state election cycle.<sup>2</sup>

The statistical information contained in this study is based on information received by OCPF in campaign finance reports filed by PACs for the calendar years 2001 and 2002. Because the report is based primarily on the figures reported by PACs, not those provided by candidate's committees, the numbers contained herein are subject to amendment after a routine cross-check by OCPF with reports filed by candidates and committees. This study includes many corrections, additions and deletions that may occur as a result of any review conducted by OCPF or amendments filed by PACs, candidates or political committees. However, some changes, especially those taking place after April 2003, are not included in this study.

Those interested in determining the exact amount of PAC and people's committee contributions accepted by individual candidates and committees are advised to check those candidates' and committees' reports for the relevant time periods to determine the amounts actually accepted. In some cases, a contribution reported to have been made by a PAC ultimately may not have been accepted by a candidate's committee, due to a variety of factors such as a candidate's policy concerning accepting such contributions or a candidate having already reached the annual PAC contribution limit before the reported contribution was sent. A PAC contribution attributed to a candidate is deleted from the candidate's total only if the PAC reports receiving a refund check from the intended recipient or receiving the original check uncashed.

Unless specifically noted, the totals used here reflect contributions PACs reported making to **candidates for state or county office only**, not those who held or were seeking local office only in 2001 or 2002.<sup>3</sup> "State office" includes any of the six statewide constitutional offices (Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Treasurer, Secretary or Auditor), Governor's Council, Senate and House of Representatives. "County office" includes District Attorney, Sheriff, County Commissioner, Clerk of Courts, Treasurer, Register of Deeds and Register of Probate. "Local office" includes

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  This study was prepared and written by Denis Kennedy, OCPF's Director of Public Information, using figures compiled by the Office's Audit staff. Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the data contained in this report. However, for numerous reasons, the detailed information may contain errors. In addition, none of the comparative data has been adjusted for inflation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this study, "candidate" is defined as a person registered with OCPF as holding or seeking state or county office and/or maintaining a campaign committee. The latter category includes those not on the 2002 ballot who still received PAC contributions.

citywide elective office (mayor or councilor-at-large) in Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield, and Worcester, the five cities whose mayoral and citywide council candidates were required by statute to file reports with OCPF in 2001 and 2002. The total amount of money PACs reported giving to these local candidates is reported below, but that aggregate is not included in the subsequent contribution totals and breakdowns such as those by incumbency and party. Some state and county candidates may also have held local office, such as a selectman or city councilor running for or serving in the state Legislature, but are listed here only as state or county candidates.

The aggregate figures include candidates running in any special elections in 2001 or 2002. However, the breakdowns for winners of a seat and candidates on the ballot do not include those candidates. Those two categories apply only to the 2002 state primary and general elections.

## FINDINGS

## I. Overview

The 2001-02 election cycle was one of the busiest in terms of PAC activity ever recorded by OCPF. The \$2.25 million in contributions was the second-highest ever posted in a cycle, and each of the two years ranked in the top ten for total contributions ever recorded in an OCPF study.

The most recent PAC numbers illustrate the continued resurgence by the committees from a relative lull in the mid-1990s, when changes in the statute led to a decline in the number of PACs and in activity by those remaining. At that time PAC contributions dipped to their lowest figure in ten years and the average amount donated reached the lowest level ever recorded in an OCPF study.

2001		2002
194	PACs contributed to candidates*	214
18	PACs contributed to only 1 candidate	14
166	PACs contributed to 2 or more	200
	candidates	
3,900	Number of PAC contributions to	4,880
	candidates	
275	Candidates listed as recipients of PAC	403
	contributions	
\$958,778	Total contributions by PACs to	\$1,294,807
	candidates	
\$246	Average PAC contribution to individual	\$265
	candidates	

# Campaign Finance Activity by PACs 2001 And 2002

\* Contributions to state and county candidates only are included in this table

The number of PACs registered with OCPF remained at around 300 in 2001-02. As in previous years, about two-thirds, or around 200, made contributions to candidates in 2001 and 2002. The number of PACs making contributions reached 214 in 2002, the highest annual number recorded in an OCPF study.

The list of top PACs according to total amounts contributed continued to be dominated by labor, business and professional groups. Labor unions accounted for 80 percent of the top 20 PACs for the cycle, a figure that was identical to its share in the list for 1999-2000.

## II. Breakdown of PAC Activity

Massachusetts PACs reported contributions to state and county candidates of **\$958,778 in 2001** and **\$1,294,807 in 2002**, for a two-year total of **\$2,253,586**. (Contributions by PACs to candidates for citywide office in the state's five largest cities – Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester -- amounted to an additional \$55,810 in 2001 and \$36,820 in 2002, for a two-year total of \$92,630. Unless noted, these local figures are not included in the breakdowns that follow.)

#### Activity by Cycle

The \$2.25 million two-year total of contributions to state and county candidates in 2001-02 is the second highest of any election cycle since OCPF began tracking and publishing total PAC activity in 1982. The cycle featuring the highest total contributions was 1989-90 (\$2,289,158).

### Two-year Cycles with the Highest Total PAC Contributions to State and County Candidates 1982-2002

Rank	Cycle	Total	Statewide election?
1.	1989-90	\$2,289,158	Y
2.	2001-02	\$2,253,586	Y
3.	1993-94	\$2,140,468	Y
4.	1997-98	\$2,136,116	Y
5.	1999-2000	\$2,054,479	N
6.	1991-92	\$2,033,883	N
7.	1987-88	\$1,806,438	N
8.	1995-96	\$1,669,127	N
9.	1985-86	\$1,444,561	Y
10.	1983-84	\$1,006,025	N

#### Activity by Year

In the rankings of the 21 individual years tracked in an OCPF study since 1982, the total PAC contribution figure of \$1,294,807 for 2002 ranks as the third highest annual total and the highest posted since the all-time high of \$1,401,299 in 1994. The 2002

contribution figure represents an increase of just over \$200,000 from the previous election year, 2000.

The contribution total for 2001, \$958,778, is the second-highest such figure for a non-election year and the  $10^{\text{th}}$  highest overall. The highest total contribution figure for a non-election year was the amount posted in 1999, which was about \$3,000 higher than 2001.

The first eight of the top 10 years in terms of total contributions are state election years, which occur in even-numbered years. In addition, the presence of statewide candidates on the ballot every four years has meant additional activity: the top four years were statewide election years.

## Years with the Highest Total PAC Contributions to State and County Candidates 1982-2002

Rank	Year	Total Contributions	Type of year
1.	1994	\$1,401,299	(e)(s)
2.	1990	\$1,376,908	(e)(s)
3.	2002	\$1,294,807	(e)(s)
4.	1998	\$1,246,213	(e)(s)
5.	1992	\$1,220,585	(e)
6.	1988	\$1,162,853	(e)
7.	2000	\$1,092,639	(e)
8.	1996	\$992,528	(e)
9.	1999	\$961,840	(n)
10.	2001	\$958,778	(n)

(e) = State election year. (s) = State election year that also included statewide offices. (n) = Non-election year.

#### Average PAC contribution

The amount of the average PAC contribution to an individual candidate rose in 2001-02 from the previous cycle, continuing a rise from an all-time low in 1996.

The average contribution was \$246 in 2001, an increase of \$18 from the year before. The average rose to \$265 in 2002, which was the highest figure since 1994, when the average was \$270. (The highest average ever recorded was \$331 in 1983; the all-time low was the \$200 recorded in 1996.)

The relatively higher averages of the 1980s and early 1990s were due largely to two factors: the lack of any limit on PAC contributions to candidates until 1988 and, for the next six years, a contribution limit that was higher than it is today. At the end of 1994, the maximum annual contribution was lowered from \$1,000 to \$500, which eliminated larger contributions and contributed to the drop of the average to drop in subsequent years.

#### **Aggregate spending**

PACs reported spending a total of \$4,583,202 in 2001-02, an increase of about 3 percent from the previous cycle. (In contrast, the spending in 1999-2000 represented a 14 percent increase over 1997-98.) Contributions to candidates (including some municipal candidates) accounted for about 54 percent of the 2001-02 total, up from the 46 percent figure of 1999-2000 but similar to the 55 percent recorded in 1997-98.

# Aggregate Receipts And Expenditures by PACs Reporting in 2001 And 2002

2001						
Total Receipts	\$2,608,341					
Total Expenditures	\$2,136,644					
Contributions to candidates	\$1,106,497					
(state and local)	(87% state & county, 13% local)					
Contributions as percentage of total spending	52%					
20	02					
Total Receipts	\$2,419,325					
Total Expenditures	\$2,446,558					
Contributions to candidates	\$1,365,288					
(state and local)	(95% state & county, 5% local)					
Contributions as percentage of	56%					
total spending						
Com	bined					
Total Receipts	\$5,027,667					
Total Expenditures	\$4,583,202					
Contributions to candidates	\$2,471,784					
(state and local)	(91% state & county, 9% local)					
Contributions as percentage of	54%					
total spending						

By law, PACs may expend money "for the enhancement of the principle" for which they were organized, which may include other categories of expenditures as long as those expenditures meet that test. Examples of additional spending by PACs include administrative and fundraising expenses as well as contributions to other political committees, including federal and state party committees, local and federal candidates not registered with OCPF and ballot question committees. (See the table below for a breakdown of PAC contributions by the type of recipient.)

	2001	2002	Cycle
State and county candidates	\$958,778	\$1,294,807	\$2,253,586
Party committees (state and local)	\$49,378	\$7,689	\$57,067
PACs	\$41,530	\$25,471	\$67,001
Citywide candidates*	\$55,810	\$36,820	\$92,630
State ballot question committees	\$1,000	\$500	\$1,500
TOTAL: Contributions to all candidates and committees	\$1,106,497	\$1,365,288	\$2,471,784

# Breakdown of PAC Contributions by Type of Recipient 2001-02

\* Candidates for mayor and councilor-at-large in Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester.

#### Cash on hand

Once again, PACs ended the period covered in this report with more funds than they started with. The committees reported cash on hand of about \$3.4 million at the start of 2001 and a cumulative ending balance of about \$4 million at the end of 2002.

### **III.** Contribution Recipient Categories

Statistics from 2001-2002 showed the most common recipients of PAC money in past cycles – candidates for the Legislature, winning candidates, Democrats and incumbents -- continued to receive a substantial majority of contributions.

#### **Office Sought**

Once again, PACs continued to direct the vast majority of their contributions to candidates for legislative office in Massachusetts. Candidates for the General Court (Senate and House) accounted for \$1,676,560 in PAC contributions in the 2001-02 cycle, or about 74 percent of the amount given to state and county candidates. Statewide candidates received a total of \$345,476, or just over 15 percent.

Legislative candidates' three-fourths share of PAC contributions noted above is less than the 85 percent recorded in the 1999-2000 cycle. The lower share may be explained partly by the presence of statewide candidates in the latest cycle, but not completely: in 1997-98, the last statewide election, legislative candidates' share of PAC contribution was 83 percent.

#### **On the Ballot**

Candidates who were on the state ballot in 2002 received a substantial majority of PAC contributions in both years of the election cycle. About 93 percent of PAC contributions over the cycle, or \$2,102,204, went to candidates who were on the ballot. The on-ballot share was 90 percent in 2001 and rose to almost 96 percent in 2002. All of the percentages were increases over the 1999-2000 cycle, when the on-ballot percentage of contributions was about 87 percent for the two years.

The remaining contributions went to county incumbents who were not on the ballot or to candidates who had some campaign finance activity after running in 2002, such as legislators who did not seek re-election in 2002. Also receiving contributions were some municipal candidates who had previous sought state office.

#### Winners

PACs once again usually backed winners in their respective races in the 2001-02 cycle. Contributions to candidates who ultimately won their races in the 2002 election accounted for 75 percent of contributions, or \$1,690,928, for the two-year period: 81 percent of the amount contributed in 2001 and 70 percent in 2002. The percentage for the entire cycle is down from 1999-2000, when it was 89 percent.

#### **Party Affiliation**

Democrats continued to receive the bulk of PAC contributions in the most recent cycle, as members of the party received 91.6 percent of contributions in 2001-02, or \$2,063,629. That figure represents a record high, slightly higher than the 90.8 percent share recorded by Democrats in the 1997-98 cycle.

Republicans received almost all of the rest of the PAC contributions, with their \$153,744 accounting for 6.8 percent of contributions for the cycle.

#### Incumbency

PAC continued to favor incumbents in 2001-02, as those who held office were far more likely to receive contributions.<sup>4</sup> Contributions to incumbents amounted to 77.7 percent of the total for the cycle, or \$1,751,134. That figure was down from the 84.5 percent posted in 1999-2000. Incumbents accounted for just under 84 percent of contributions in 2001 and 73 percent in 2002. The incumbents' share of contributions has traditionally dipped in an election year as challengers enter the races.

## **IV. PAC Characteristics**

#### Number of PACs

The number of PACs registered each year with OCPF is rather fluid, as committees are constantly organizing and disbanding. Therefore it is difficult for any snapshot of the number of PACs at any single time of the year to be completely representative.

The number of PACs registered with the office remained largely constant during the 2001-02 election cycle, hovering at around 300. Just under 300 such committees were open at the start of 2001; the number was about 305 at the end of 2002. Both totals are less than the all-time high listed in a PAC study, the 323 recorded in 1991.

The number of PACs registered with OCPF has gradually increased in recent years after reaching a 12-year low of 261 in 1996. The decline in PACs at that time was attributed largely to a tightening of the reporting and organization requirements for PACs contained in the comprehensive reform of the campaign finance law in 1994, which to the dissolution of some PACs and the abolition of most PACs controlled by candidates.

Of more relevance is the number of PACs that actually make contributions during an election cycle. In recent cycles, only about two-thirds of all PACs have been active contributors to candidates in any one year. The number of PACs making at least one contribution to a state or county candidate was 194 in 2001 and 214 in 2002. The 2002

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For the purposes of this report, incumbents are defined as individuals holding *state or county* office in part or all of 2001 and 2002, regardless of any other office sought during the period. For example, a state legislator running for statewide office is treated as an incumbent, though he or she is running for another office. Non-incumbents are defined as individuals not holding state or county office during the years indicated. This may include individuals who held elective office on the municipal level.

figure is the highest ever recorded by OCPF, three more than the previous record in 1992 and 14 more than the third highest in 2000.

#### **Top Contributors**

Labor, business and professional interests once again accounted for the most active PACs in 2001-02. Of the Top 20 PACs for total contributions to candidates in the cycle, 16 represented labor groups such as unions, including firefighters, electrical workers and public employees, both active and retired. That is the same breakdown found in the 1999-2000 cycle, though some of the PACs in the list have changed.

Of the remaining four PACs in the Top 20, three represent business or professional groups, including beer distributors, bankers and optometrists. The other PAC is the House Democratic leadership PAC, headed by Speaker Thomas Finneran.

While the 16 labor PACs does not represent an increase from two years before, the figure illustrated the continued predominance of unions in the list of active PACs: the number of labor PACs in the Top 20 is double the number from 1993-94.

A listing of the Top 20 PACs by contributions to state and county candidates for each year and for the entire cycle follows.

# Top 20 PACs Contributions to State and County Candidates 2001-2002 Election Cycle

Rank	Committee	Total
1.	Retired Public Employees PAC	\$94,650
2.	MA Laborers' District Council PAC	\$81,925
3.	Professional Firefighters of MA People's Committee	\$68,570
4.	Boston Police Patrolmen's Assoc. PAC	\$66,000
5.	Int'l Union of Operating Engineers Local 4 Social PAC	\$61,950
6.	Speaker Finneran's House Victory Fund PAC	\$60,950
7.	Beer Distributors' PAC	\$58,940
8.	Ironworkers Union Local 7 PAC	\$55,500
9.	Mass. Federation of Teachers PAC	\$50,625
10.	Pipefitters Local #537 PAC	\$49,650
11.	Eastern Massachusetts Brick Layers People's Committee	\$41,135
12.	Boston Carmen's Union PAC	\$41,025
13.	Mass. Bankers PAC	\$39,850
14.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 103 PAC	\$34,450
15.	SEIU NAGE Local 5000 PAC	\$30,800
16.	Plumbers Union Local #12 PAC	\$30,450
17.	Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 17 People's Committee	\$30,275
18.	Mass. Optometric PAC	\$29,900
19.	Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 2222 PAC	\$29,400
20.	MA State Labor Council PAC	\$29,400

# Top 20 PACs for Contributions to State and County Candidates 2001

Rank	Committee	Total
1.	Retired Public Employees PAC	\$50,450
2.	Boston Police Patrolmen's Assoc. PAC	\$42,000
3.	Mass. Laborers' District Council PAC	\$35,150
4.	Professional Firefighters of Mass. People's Committee	\$33,000
5.	Int'I Union of Operating Engineers Local 4 Social PAC	\$28,000
6.	Speaker Finneran's House Victory Fund PAC	\$27,000
7.	Beer Distributors' PAC	\$26,300
8.	Pipefitters Local #537 PAC	\$25,300
9.	Ironworkers Union Local 7 PAC	\$24,225
10.	Mass. Bankers PAC	\$19,300
11.	Local 254 Service Employees Int'l Union PAC	\$18,400
12.	Eastern Massachusetts Brick Layers People's Committee	\$17,655
13.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 103 PAC	\$17,250
14.	MA State Labor Council PAC	\$15,550
15.	Chiropractic PAC of Mass.	\$15,500
16.	New Car Dealer PAC	\$13,800
17.	Boston Carmen's Union PAC	\$13,800
18.	Mass. Optometric PAC	\$12,975
19.	Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 2222 PAC	\$12,700
20.	Insurance Agents & Brokers of Mass. PAC	\$12,500

# 2002

Rank	Committee	Total
1.	Mass. Laborers' District Council PAC	\$46,775
2.	Retired Public Employees PAC	\$44,200
3.	Mass. Federation of Teachers PAC	\$38,725
4.	Professional Firefighters of Mass. People's Committee	\$35,570
5.	Speaker Finneran's House Victory Fund PAC	\$33,950
6.	Int'l Union of Operating Engineers Local 4 Social PAC	\$33,950
7.	Beer Distributors' PAC	\$32,640
8.	Ironworkers Union Local 7 PAC	\$31,275
9.	SEIU NAGE Local 5000 PAC	\$30,800

10.	Boston Carmen's Union PAC	\$27,225
11.	Pipefitters Local #537 PAC	\$24,350
12.	Boston Police Patrolmen's Association PAC	\$24,000
13.	Eastern Massachusetts Brick Layers People's Committee	\$23,480
14.	Mass. Bankers PAC	\$20,550
15.	Plumbers Union Local #12 PAC	\$19,950
16.	Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 17 People's Committee	\$18,375
17.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 103 PAC	\$17,200
18.	Mass. Optometric PAC	\$16,925
19.	Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 2222 PAC	\$16,700
20.	Nurse Plan PAC – Mass. Nurses Association	\$16,250

A listing of total contributions by each PAC for the cycle may be found on OCPF's website, *www.mass.gov/ocpf*.

#### **People's Committees**

People's committees are committees that have been in existence as PACs for six months or more, have made contributions to five or more candidates and only receive contributions from individuals at a maximum annual amount that is indexed biennially by OCPF every two years and is now \$123. Contributions from people's committees do not count toward a candidate's statutory limit on annual aggregate contributions from PACs.

Contributions by people's committees in 2001-02 rose slightly from the previous cycle, despite a slight dip in the number of committees making contributions. A total of \$163,227 was contributed, accounting for just over 7 percent of all contributions to state and county candidates. The 2002-2002 total is up about \$5,000 from 1999-2000, but about \$25,000 short of the highest ever recorded by OCPF in 1997-98.

While the amount contributed rose slightly, the number of people's committees making contributions dropped. Eight such committees made contributions in 2002, down two from the previous election year of 2000.

The amount of the average contribution to a candidate from a people's committee was once again slightly lower than the average for conventional PACs. The average contribution in 2001 was \$227, which was \$19 less than the PAC average, while the average in 2000 was 249, which was \$16 lower than the PAC average. People's committee averages were also below the PAC contribution average in both 1999 and 2000.

The list of the Top 20 PACs for a cycle once again included three people's committees. The committees -- the Professional Firefighters People's Committee, the

Eastern Massachusetts Bricklayers and the Sheet Metal Workers Local 17—were the same three that placed on the list in the previous cycle.

Despite the significant activity logged by the three above committees, the 2001-02 election cycle saw a drop in the number of people's committees. The number organized with OCPF at the end of 2002 was 11, a decrease of one from the same time in 2000. The 200 figure was in turn a drop of two from 1998, so the number of people's committees has decreased by three over four years. (As noted earlier in this study, the people's committees classification was created by statute that took effect in 1995.)

	Number contributing	Amount contributed	% of total PAC contributions
1995	4	\$ 28,245	4.2
1996	9	\$ 82,240	8.3
Total fe	or cycle	\$110,690	6.6
1997	9	\$ 81,235	9.1
1998	11	\$107,513	8.6
Total fo	or cycle	\$188,748	8.8
1999	10	\$ 79,420	8.2
2000	10	\$ 78,755	7.2
Total fo	or cycle	\$158,175	7.7
2001	<b>2001</b> 9		7.6
2002	8	\$90,425	7.0
Total fo	or cycle	\$163,227	7.2

# Contributions by People's Committees 1995-2002

# PAC Campaign Finance Activity 1993 - 2002

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	<i>1998</i>	1999	2000	2001	2002
Number of										
PACs making	169	199	154	184	169	186	182	200	194	214
contributions										
Number of	3,042	5,195	3,324	4,694	4,306	5,527	4,343	4,788	3,900	4,880
<b>Contributions</b>										
Total	\$2,353,963	\$2,574,782	\$1,884,065	\$2,406,180	\$1,831,976	\$2,470,980	\$2,274,490	\$2,484,715	\$2,608,341	\$2,419,325
Receipts										
Total	\$2,067,189	\$2,759,392	\$1,573,374	\$2,266,707	\$1,623,866	\$2,280,414	\$1,950,649	\$2,483,356	\$2,136,644	\$2,446,558
<b>Expenditures</b>										
Total										
contributions	\$739,169	\$1,401,299	\$676,599	\$992,528	\$889,903	\$1,246,213	\$961,840	\$1,092,639	\$958,778	\$1,294,807
to state &										
county										
candidates										
Average	\$243	\$270	\$204	\$200	\$207	\$225	\$221	\$228	\$246	\$265
contribution										