

INTRODUCTION

This study examines campaign finance activity by political action committees in Massachusetts during the 2005-06 state election cycle.

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 expend funds to support or oppose 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 started as PACs, but now receive contributions only from individuals at a maximum annual amount that is indexed biennially by OCPF every two years (the limit is now \$140. 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.)

PAC Disclosure Requirements

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 activity in a non-election year and three times for activity in 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, the single report is due on the following Jan. 20.¹

Section 18C of Chapter 55 requires PACs with receipts or expenditures of more than \$10,000 in a two-year election cycle to file their reports electronically with OCPF. Committees not meeting that threshold are not required to e-file, but are still encouraged to submit their reports electronically. Reports e-filed by PACs and all other candidates and committees may be found in OCPF's Electronic Filing System, which is accessible through the Electronic Filing section of OCPF's website, www.mass.gov/ocpf.

For the time period 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

¹ 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.

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 an individual candidate 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. (As noted above, there is no limit on the aggregate amount a candidate may receive from people's committees.)

Methodology

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 2005 and 2006. 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 the spring of 2007, 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 that were 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 aggregate 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 2005 or 2006. "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. The total amount of money PACs reported giving to candidates seeking city or town office is contained in this study, but that aggregate is not included in the 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 for the purposes of this report are considered state or county candidates. In addition, some

legislative candidates may have sought local office, such as mayor, in 2005. Though they may have received contributions during their campaigns for local office, they are also treated as state candidates in this study.

The aggregate figures include candidates running in any special elections in 2005 or 2006. 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 2006 state primary and general elections.

This study was compiled and written by Denis Kennedy, OCPF's Director of Public Information, based on information filed by with the office by PACs. Those seeking further information on the study or any other facet of the Massachusetts campaign finance law may contact the Office of Campaign and Political Finance, John W. McCormack Building, One Ashburton Place, Room 411, Boston, MA 02108. This study and other data are also available on the office's web site, at www.mass.gov/ocpf.

August 2007

FINDINGS

I. Overview

The 2005-06 election cycle saw political action committees in Massachusetts set several new records, as new highs were reached for total expenditures, total amounts contributed and the number of committees giving to candidates.

Two years after setting a record, PACs reached a new high for contributions to state and county candidates. The contribution total of just under \$2.6 million eclipsed the 2003-04 total by \$177,000. The presence of candidates for statewide office in the mix in the last cycle helped drive up the contribution total.

The \$1.44 million in contributions in 2006 was a new annual high, surpassing the previous record, set in 1994, by more than \$42,000. The 2005 figure of \$1.15 million ranked ninth all-time but is the highest total ever recorded for a year that did not feature any state elections at all, statewide or otherwise (not including any special elections due to legislative vacancies).

A total of 233 PACs, more than two-thirds of the number registered with OCPF, reported making contributions to candidates in the latest cycle. The 221 PACs contributing in 2006 was the highest annual total ever recorded by OCPF.

A new level was also reached in aggregate PAC expenditures. The committees' reported total of \$5.6 million broke the previous record set two years before. Less than half of the 2005-06 total, however, went toward contributions to state or local candidates. The rest went was used for administrative costs as well as contributions to other PACs, parties and ballot question committees.

The 2005-06 PAC totals reflect a continuing trend of growth in PAC activity since the mid-1990s, when changes in the law led to a drop in the number of PACs and contributions by those committees. The effect was short-lived, however, as PACs have seen increases in such benchmarks as aggregate expenditures, contributions and the number of committees giving to candidates.

Campaign Finance Activity by PACs 2003-04 and 2005-06 Election Cycles

2003	2004	Year	2005	2006
177	195	PACs contributing to state and county candidates*	189	221
260	381	State and county candidates listed as recipients of PAC contributions	268	367
\$1,022,045	\$1,397,035	Total contributions by PACs to state and county candidates	\$1,153,350	\$1,443,627
\$254	\$265	Average PAC contribution to an individual candidate	\$272	\$291

A total of 451 candidates were reported as recipients of at least one PAC contribution in 2005-06: 406 on the state or county level and 45 on the local level.

Labor, business and professional groups continued to be the top contributors in the 2005-06 cycle. Unions and labor organizations accounted for 15 of the top 20 PACs in terms of contributions, a showing that was unchanged from the previous cycle.

PACs continued to direct the bulk of their contributions to the same types of candidates they have supported in the past: legislative candidates, Democrats, incumbents and winners in the 2006 election were once again more likely to receive PAC dollars in 2005-06.

II. Breakdown of PAC Activity

Aggregate Spending

PACs reported spending a total of \$5,614,504 in 2005-06, up almost 9 percent from the previous two-year cycle. The spending total is the highest ever recorded in a two-year cycle, surpassing the previous two-year high of \$5,159,895 set in 2003-04. PAC expenditures for a cycle have exceeded \$5 million only three times: in addition to the last two cycles, the mark was cracked in 1989-90, when total PAC spending reached \$5,046,256.

Contributions to candidates (state, county and some municipal) accounted for slightly less than 50 percent of all PAC spending in 2005-06, a drop of only a few tenths of a point from 2003-04 but a more marked drop from the 54 percent posted in 2001-02.

**Aggregate Receipts And Expenditures
by PACs in 2005 and 2006**

2005	
Total Receipts	\$2,832,860
Total Expenditures	\$2,583,618
Contributions to candidates (state and certain local)	\$1,266,250 (91% state & county, 9% local)
Contributions as percentage of total spending	49%
2006	
Total Receipts	\$2,725,045
Total Expenditures	\$3,030,886
Contributions to candidates (state and local)	\$1,501,177 (96% state & county, 4% local)
Contributions as percentage of total spending	49.5%
Combined: 2005-06	
Total Receipts	\$5,557,905
Total Expenditures	\$5,614,504
Contributions to candidates (state and local)	\$2,767,427 (94% state & county, 6% local)
Contributions as percentage of total spending	49.3%

By law, a PAC may expend money only “for the enhancement of the principle” for which it was 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.

Massachusetts PACs reported total contributions to state and county candidates of \$1,153,350 in 2005 and \$1,443,627 in 2006, for a two-year total of \$2,596,977. (Contributions to candidates for mayor and councilor-at-large in the state’s five largest cities – Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester – as well as to various other local candidates, amounted to an additional \$112,900 in 2005 and \$57,550 in 2006, for a two-year total of \$170,450.

**Breakdown of PAC Contributions by Type of Recipient
2005-06**

TO:	2005	2006	Cycle
State and county candidates	\$1,153,350	\$1,443,627	\$2,596,977
Local candidates*	\$112,900	\$57,550	\$170,450
PACs	\$49,514	\$65,810	\$115,324
Party committees (state and local)**	\$51,895	\$122,140	\$174,035
State ballot question committees	\$500	\$33,450	\$33,950
TOTAL: Contributions to all candidates and committees	\$1,368,159	\$1,722,577	\$3,090,736

* This category is made up almost entirely of candidates for mayor and councilor-at-large in Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester, who report their campaign finance activity to OCPF, but also includes some candidates for local office who have also sought state office and are still registered with OCPF.

** Of the total given to party committees for the cycle, \$154,190, or 89 percent, went to state committees: \$132,840 to the Democratic State Committee and \$21,350 to the Republican State Committee. The rest was given to their affiliates on the city, town or ward level.

Activity by Cycle

The 2005-06 PAC figure of just under \$2.6 million in contributions to state and county candidates is the highest ever recorded in a two-year election cycle since OCPF began tracking and publishing PAC activity in 1982. The cycle with the greatest activity prior to 2005-06 was 2003-04, in which PACs reported contributions of almost \$2.3 million.

The list of the top ten election cycles in terms of PAC contributions is equally divided among cycles with elections for statewide offices and those that did not. As noted above, cycles that include a statewide election tend to feature a greater amount of PAC contributions. The 2003-04 cycle ranks second despite the absence of statewide races, but is the only cycle in the top six not to feature a statewide election.

**Two-year Cycles with the Highest Total PAC Contributions to
State and County Candidates
1982-2006**

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Cycle</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Statewide election?</i>
1.	2005-06	\$2,596,977	Y
2.	2003-04	\$2,419,304	N
3.	1989-90	\$2,289,158	Y
4.	2001-02	\$2,253,586	Y
5.	1993-94	\$2,140,468	Y
6.	1997-98	\$2,136,116	Y
7.	1999-2000	\$2,054,479	N
8.	1991-92	\$2,033,883	N
9.	1987-88	\$1,806,438	N
10.	1995-96	\$1,669,127	N

Activity by Year

Total contributions to state and county candidates in 2006 reached an all-time high, eclipsing a record that had stood for 12 years. The \$1,442,627 posted in 2006 exceeded the 1994 total by more than \$42,000.

The 2004 figure remains, however, the highest contribution total ever recorded in an election year that did not feature statewide contests. Each of the other five years in the top six in terms of total contributions featured a statewide election.

The 2005 total makes it the ninth ranking year ever recorded and the highest non-election year in terms of PAC contributions. The previous mark for non-election year PAC activity was set in 2003, at just over \$1 million.

**Years with the Highest Total PAC Contributions to
State and County Candidates
1982-2006**

Rank	Year	Total Contributions	Type of year
1.	2006	\$1,443,627	(e)(s)
2.	1994	\$1,401,299	(e)(s)
3.	2004	\$1,397,259	(e)
4.	1990	\$1,376,908	(e)(s)
5.	2002	\$1,294,807	(e)(s)
6.	1998	\$1,246,213	(e)(s)
7.	1992	\$1,220,585	(e)
8.	1988	\$1,162,853	(e)
9.	2005	\$1,153,350	(n)
10.	2000	\$1,092,639	(e)

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

Average PAC Contribution

The average amount of a PAC contribution to an individual candidate in 2006 was \$291, up \$26 from the last election in 2004 and the largest figure recorded by OCPF in 23 years. The \$331 average contribution figure posted in 1983 remains the record. The all-time lowest average was the \$200 recorded in 1996.

While the 2006 average was not a new record, the \$272 figure recorded in 2005 was the largest ever for a non-election (odd-numbered) year. The previous record for a non-election year was \$266, from 1989.

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. Starting in 1995, the maximum annual contribution was lowered from \$1,000 to \$500, which eliminated larger contributions and contributed to the drop of the average in subsequent years.

Cash on Hand

In recent years, PACs as a whole have ended election cycles with more money than they had on hand at the start of the period. For example, the committees reported a total of about \$300,000 more on hand at the end of 2004 than at the start of 2003. That was the case once again in 2005-06, though the margin of increase was significantly smaller than in previous cycles. At the end of 2006, PAC ending balances totaled \$4,108,246, about \$10,000 more than two years before.

III. Contribution Recipient Categories

As a whole, PACs continued to support the types of candidates who have received the bulk of their contributions in past years. Legislative candidates were most likely to receive donations, though the share sent to statewide candidates grew in the 2006 election year. Incumbents and Democrats were two other groups that were more likely to receive contributions, as were candidates who ultimately won their elections in November 2006. In addition, PACs giving to political party committees were more likely to support Democratic committees on the state or local level.

Office Sought

Contenders for the House and Senate received 81 percent of all contributions to state and county candidates in the cycle, or \$2,110,615. That is a drop of 5 percentage points from 2003-04.

A chief reason for the drop was the presence of races for the six statewide offices on the 2006 ballot. Statewide candidates as a whole receive a larger share of PAC contributions in statewide election years, due to increased activity by incumbents and the emergence of additional candidates for those offices. Statewide candidate received just under 11 percent of total PAC contributions for the two-year cycle, with a greater share in the election year: 8.4 percent in 2005 and 12.5 percent in 2006.

PAC contributions to state and county candidates by office sought 2005-06

	Legislative	Statewide	County	Governor's Council
2005	\$959,435	\$97,200	\$86,705	\$10,010
2006	\$1,151,180	\$180,675	\$100,122	\$11,650
TOTAL	\$2,110,615	\$277,875	\$186,827	\$21,660

On the Ballot

Candidates who ran for state or county office in 2006 accounted for the vast majority of PAC contributions, continuing a longstanding trend. A total of \$2,428,042, or 93 percent of all contributions, went to candidates who appeared on the ballot (or, in a few cases, mounted write-in campaigns). That was down slightly from the 2003-04 figure of 96 percent, but still consistent with a longstanding trend in PAC contributions.

The remaining contributions went largely to incumbents who were not on the ballot, such as legislators who did not seek re-election in 2004, or to candidates who had some campaign finance activity after running in 2004.

Success of Campaigns

Once again, PACs usually gave to candidates who ultimately won their respective contests in 2006. Contributions over the two-year period to candidates who won state or county office totaled \$2,217,960, or 85 percent of all contributions. That percentage is four points less than in 2003-04.

The share given to eventual winners was larger in the off-election year of 2005, with almost 89 percent. The winners' portion traditionally decreases slightly in an election year as the number of candidates increases; the winners' share in 2006 was 83 percent.

Party Affiliation

PACs once again directed the bulk of their contributions to Democrats in the 2005-06 election cycle. Candidates who were members of that party received a total of \$2,435,672, making up just under 94 percent of all contributions. The percentage is the highest ever recorded in an OCPF study, surpassing the 93 percent recorded in 2003-04.

A total of \$155,745, or 6 percent, went to candidates in the Republican party. The remaining \$5,560 went to candidates who were not a member of either of the two parties, which were the only two parties certified by the Secretary of the Commonwealth for the 2006 state election.

Incumbency

Candidates seeking re-election were once again more likely to receive PAC contributions in 2005-06 than those who were not incumbents. Contributions to incumbents accounted for 84 percent of the total for the two years, or \$2,192,025. That share is down three percentage points from the previous cycle.

Incumbents received 86 percent of contributions in 2005 and 83 percent in 2006. The incumbents' share of contributions has traditionally dipped in an election year as challengers enter the races.

IV. PAC Characteristics

Number of PACs Contributing

The number of PACs organized with OCPF is a fluid number, with various committees organizing and disbanding throughout an election cycle. Nevertheless, the number of PACs registered with OCPF at any one time has remained at just over 300 in recent years. A total of 304 PACs were registered with OCPF at the start of 2005 and 302 were open at the end of 2006.

The level of activity of PACs varies, with most committees reporting significant activity, including contributions, and some posting few receipts and expenditures. In recent cycles, up to two-thirds of all PACs have been active contributors to candidates in any one year. A total of 189 PACs reported contributing in 2005 and 221 did so in 2006. The latter figure is a record for contributing PACs in a single year, eclipsing the previous record of 214 posted in 2002.

The number of PACs reporting contributions to at least one candidate for state or county office in the entire 2005-06 cycle was 233. The two-year figure is higher than either number because of some PACs contributed in only one of the two years, resulting in an overall total that is higher than any single year. Of the 233 PACs, 177 reported making contributions in both years, while 56 did so in only one year.

Top Contributors

PACs representing labor, business and professional interests continued to dominate in terms of contributions to candidates. Of the top 20 PACs in terms of total contributions, 15 represented unions or labor organizations, including firefighters, police officers, teachers, plumbers, ironworkers and transportation workers, either active or retired. That is the same amount of such PACs that appeared on the list in 2003-04. The remaining five PACs on the list represented professional or other business interests, including realtors, beer distributors, new car dealers, real estate attorneys and bankers. The number of PACs in this group represents an increase of one over 2003-04.

Seventeen of the PACs on the most recent top 20 also appeared on the 2003-04 list. The number one committee in 2003-04, the Retired Public Employees PAC, finished at the top again for the 2005-06 cycle, as well as in each of the two individual years. (Its total contributions in 2003-04 were \$100,800, about \$20,000 less than its most recent level.) In fact, the Retired Public Employees PAC has reported the most contributions for each of the last five election cycles, since 1997-98. The PAC has also finished first in total contributions to candidates in eight of the last 10 years, finishing second to the same PAC, the Mass. Laborers District Council, in 1998 and 2002. The latter PAC finished 13th in the 2005-06 cycle and out of the top ten in both 2005 and 2006.

**Top 20 PACs by Total
Contributions to State and County Candidates
2005-2006 Election Cycle**

	Committee	Total Contributions
1.	Retired Public Employees PAC	\$120,950
2.	MA Correction Officers Federated Union PAC	\$95,900
3.	MA Assoc. of Realtors PAC	\$85,400
4.	Boston Carmen's Union PAC	\$76,675
5.	Professional Firefighters of MA People's Committee	\$76,657
6.	Ironworkers Union Local 7 PAC	\$74,340
7.	Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 17 People's Committee	\$62,225
8.	Beer Distributors' PAC	\$60,300
9.	New Car Dealers PAC	\$56,900
10.	Pipefitters Local #537 PAC	\$54,325
11.	Int'l Union of Operating Engineers Local 4 Social PAC	\$53,025
12.	American Federation of Teachers MA PAC	\$51,950
13.	MA Laborers' District Council PAC	\$49,575
14.	Boston Police Patrolmen's Assoc. PAC	\$40,000
15.	Plumbers Union Local #12 PAC	\$38,775
16.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 103 PAC	\$38,750
17.	Real Estate Bar Association for MA PAC	\$36,700
18.	Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 2222 PAC	\$36,600
19.	MA Bankers PAC	\$36,400
20.	Eastern Massachusetts Brick Layers People's Committee	\$33,665

**Top 20 PACs by Total
Contributions to State and County Candidates
2005**

	Committee	Total Contributions
1.	Retired Public Employees PAC	\$59,100
2.	MA Correction Officers Federated Union PAC	\$47,200
3.	Boston Carmen's Union PAC	\$42,550
4.	Ironworkers Union Local 7 PAC	\$40,990
5.	MA Assoc. of Realtors PAC	\$38,400
6.	Professional Firefighters of MA People's Committee	\$35,125
7.	Pipefitters Local #537 PAC	\$30,025
8.	Int'l Union of Operating Engineers Local 4 Social PAC	\$28,875
9.	Beer Distributors' PAC	\$27,700
10.	Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 17 People's Committee	\$27,450
11.	New Car Dealers PAC	\$27,400
12.	MA Laborers' District Council PAC	\$24,600
13.	American Federation of Teachers MA PAC	\$24,050
14.	Real Estate Bar Association for MA PAC	\$21,950
15.	MA Bankers PAC	\$20,400
16.	Plumbers Union Local #12 PAC	\$18,175
17.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 103 PAC	\$18,100
18.	Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 2222 PAC	\$16,125
19.	Committee for a Democratic Senate PAC	\$15,500
20.	Boston Police Patrolmen's Association PAC	\$15,500

**Top 20 PACs by Total
Contributions to State and County Candidates
2006**

	PAC	Total Contributions
1.	Retired Public Employees PAC	\$61,850
2.	MA Correction Officers Federated Union PAC	\$48,700
3.	MA Assoc. of Realtors PAC	\$47,000
4.	Professional Firefighters of MA People's Committee	\$41,532
5.	Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 17 People's Committee	\$34,775
6.	Boston Carmen's Union PAC	\$34,125
7.	Ironworkers Union Local 7 PAC	\$33,350
8.	Beer Distributors' PAC	\$32,600
9.	New Car Dealers PAC	\$29,500
10.	American Federation of Teachers MA PAC	\$27,900
11.	MA Laborers' District Council PAC	\$24,975
12.	Boston Police Patrolmen's Assoc. PAC	\$24,500
13.	Pipefitters Local #537 PAC	\$24,300
14.	Int'l Union of Operating Engineers Local 4 Social PAC	\$24,150
15.	Massachusetts Nurses PAC	\$21,325
16.	Eastern Massachusetts Brick Layers People's Committee	\$21,090
17.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 103 PAC	\$20,650
18.	Plumbers Union Local #12 PAC	\$20,600
19.	Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 2222 PAC	\$20,475
20.	Committee for a Democratic Senate PAC	\$17,500

People's Committees

A people's committee is a form of PAC that receives contributions only from individuals up to a maximum annual amount that is indexed biennially by OCPF every two years and is now \$140.² Contributions from people's committees do not count toward a candidate's statutory limit on annual aggregate contributions from PACs.

The number of people's committees organized with OCPF rose slightly in 2005-06. There were 12 such committees on file at the end of 2006, up two from the same time in 2004.

Contributions by people's committees reached their highest level ever in the 2005-06 cycle. A total of \$213,297 was donated, representing 8.2 percent of all contributions. While the 2005-06 amount was the highest total contribution amount ever, it fell slightly short of the highest percentage of contributions, the 8.8 percent set in 1998.

Contributions by People's Committees 1995-2006

	<i>Number contributing</i>	<i>Amount contributed</i>	<i>% of total PAC contributions</i>
1995	4	\$ 28,245	4.2
1996	9	\$ 82,240	8.3
Total for cycle		\$110,690	6.6
<hr/>			
1997	9	\$ 81,235	9.1
1998	11	\$107,513	8.6
Total for cycle		\$188,748	8.8
<hr/>			
1999	10	\$ 79,420	8.2
2000	10	\$ 78,755	7.2
Total for cycle		\$158,175	7.7
<hr/>			
2001	9	\$72,802	7.6
2002	8	\$90,425	7.0
Total for cycle		\$163,227	7.2
<hr/>			

² This limit is next due for adjustment at the end of 2007.

2003	8	\$99,334	9.7
2004	8	\$96,810	6.9
Total for cycle		\$196,144	8.1
2005	8	\$91,375	7.9
2006	10	\$121,922	8.4
Total for cycle		\$213,297	8.2

A total of 10 people's committees made contributions to candidates in 2005-06: eight in both years and two in 2006 alone.

For the fourth straight election cycle, three particular people's committees made the list of top 20 PACs in terms of contributions: the Professional Firefighters People's Committee, the Sheet Metal Workers Local 17, and the Eastern Massachusetts Bricklayers.

Total Contributions by People's Committees 2005-06

	Committee	Total
1.	Professional Firefighters of MA	\$76,657
2.	Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 17	\$62,225
3.	Eastern Massachusetts Brick Layers	\$33,665
4.	Elevator Constructors Local 4	\$14,750
5.	Massachusetts Dental Society	\$9,250
6.	Nat'l Assn of Industrial & Office Properties	\$7,600
7.	UFCW Local 1459	\$6,325
8.	Brockton Fire Fighters	\$2,550
9.	Coalition of Regional Nonprofit Housing Agencies Affordable Housing	\$200
10.	Women's Republican Club of Melrose	\$75

A breakdown of total PAC contributions for the 2005-06 cycle may be found at the end of this study.