



# **INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, 2006**

INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES IN FIVE STATES ALTER  
POLITICAL LANDSCAPES

By  
ANNE BAUER

With Assistance From Scott Jordan

AUGUST 1, 2007

*The National Institute on Money in State Politics is a nonpartisan 501(c)3 tax-exempt charitable organization dedicated to accurate, comprehensive and unbiased documentation and research on campaign finance at the state level. It compiles campaign-contribution information on every state-level candidate, major party committee and non-bond ballot measure committee in the country.*

*The Institute serves as the nation's only complete source of this data and makes its information freely available online at **[www.FollowTheMoney.org](http://www.FollowTheMoney.org)**.*

833 North Last Chance Gulch, Second Floor • Helena, MT 59601

Phone: 406-449-2480 • Fax: 406-457-2091

E-mail: [institute@statemoney.org](mailto:institute@statemoney.org)

**[www.FollowTheMoney.org](http://www.FollowTheMoney.org)**

This publication was made possible by grants from:

JEHT Foundation, *Fair and Participatory Elections*  
Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Strengthening U.S. Democracy*  
Ford Foundation, *Program on Governance and Civil Society*  
The Pew Charitable Trusts, *State Policy Initiatives*  
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, *Program on Democratic Practice*

The statements made and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the Institute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview.....4

Independent Expenditures in the States

Alaska.....7  
California.....11  
Colorado.....19  
Maine .....22  
Washington.....27

## OVERVIEW

In addition to making direct contributions, political donors have another tool at their disposal to influence the outcome of elections — independent expenditures. These expenditures are, by definition, made in support of or in opposition to candidates or ballot initiatives *without the knowledge or cooperation of the target*. While states often limit direct contributions to candidates or committees, they cannot limit independent expenditures.

Although 39 states have laws requiring some kind of disclosure of independent expenditures, this report focuses on the independent expenditure data obtained from five states with the best public accessibility — Alaska, California, Colorado, Maine and Washington.

Independent expenditures made in these five states in 2005 and 2006 totaled \$115 million. Of that, approximately \$62 million was spent on candidates and \$46 million on ballot measures.<sup>1</sup> These expenditures supplemented the \$1.1 billion in contributions raised in the same states — \$393 million raised by ballot measure committees and \$286.4 million raised by legislative and gubernatorial candidates.<sup>2</sup> The remainder was raised by party committees and statewide candidates.

More than one third, or \$22.1 million, of the \$62 million spent on candidates targeted those in gubernatorial races. In fact, in three of the five states — California, Maine and Colorado — the gubernatorial race captured most of the independent expenditures.

Many candidates received significant boosts to their campaigns from independent expenditures made on their behalf or in opposition to their rivals. For example, Washington's Supreme Court candidates raised a total of \$1.7 million in direct contributions, while independent expenditures targeting those races exceeded \$2.7 million. Targeted legislative candidates in Maine, Colorado and California also had more independent expenditures made on their behalf than flowed into their campaign coffers.

## COMPARISON OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE-LEVEL COMMITTEES, 2005-2006

STATE	TOTAL INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES	TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS <sup>3</sup>
California	\$104,748,209	\$996,342,383
Washington	\$6,384,350	\$45,221,911
Alaska	\$1,995,365	\$14,221,108
Maine	\$1,269,306	\$8,758,179
Colorado	\$386,120	\$35,797,923
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$114,783,350</b>	<b>\$1,100,341,503</b>

<sup>1</sup> Due to the types of reports filed, and the common practice among committees of listing multiple targets without differentiating how much of the expenditure went to each target, not all of the targets could be identified. Therefore, the amount which can be attributed to specified targets with certainty is lower than the overall amount reported by just over \$6 million.

<sup>2</sup> Data collection for the 2006 election cycle is substantially complete as of July 31, 2007. However, these figures will increase upon completion of the Institute's 2006 database.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

State contribution limits appeared to have an effect on the amounts of independent expenditures. Deep-pocketed supporters commonly contributed to both an individual's campaign, sometimes to the maximum allowed by law, and then also spent many times the state limit on the candidate's behalf on independent expenditures.

**California** is one of the largest states in terms of political giving, and the 2005-2006 election cycle was no exception. State-level campaign committees in the Golden State raised a total of \$996.3 million in contributions. An additional \$104.7 million was spent on independent expenditures, or 13 percent of the contributions raised. California limits the amount that can be contributed per election to candidates.<sup>4</sup> Independent expenditures targeting candidates reached \$51.1 million. There are no limits on giving to ballot measure committees, yet independent expenditures totaling \$43.9 million were made on several measures, most often targeting Republican Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's 2005 slate of initiatives.

In **Washington**, independent expenditures totaled nearly \$6.4 million, less than 1 percent of which targeted ballot measures. In contrast, ballot measure committees raised \$11 million in direct contributions. Candidates for state House and Senate raised \$18.1 million in campaign contributions, while independent expenditures targeting those same candidates totaled \$3.1 million. Washington limits contributions by political action committees, unions, corporations and individuals to \$700 per legislative candidate and \$1,400 per judicial candidate for both the primary and the general elections. Party committee giving is limited, as well.

Independent expenditures made in **Alaska** reached almost \$2 million. Of that, \$1.6 million was spent by ConocoPhillips, BP Alaska, and ExxonMobil to fight General Measure 2, which sought to impose a tax on oil and gas leases overlying untapped natural gas deposits. The three ballot measure committees opposing that measure raised \$1.7 million — the same amount as expended independently. ExxonMobil and BP Alaska contributed \$455,000 each to two of those ballot measure committees and ConocoPhillips gave \$250,000. It is difficult to say why the companies took the three-pronged approach of making independent expenditures — giving to ballot measure committees, giving to committees making independent expenditures, and contributing money directly to ballot measure committees — given that Alaska does not limit direct contributions to ballot measure committees.

Independent expenditures were important to party committees in **Maine** because the state limits the amount a party committee can give to a privately financed candidate to \$500 per election in the gubernatorial race and \$250 to legislative candidates per election. Moreover, no contributions may be made to a candidate once the candidate is certified as publicly financed.<sup>5</sup> The state of Maine fully subsidizes candidates who obtain a number of signatures of registered voters in support of their candidacy and who raise seed money in multiple contributions between \$5 and \$100.

Political party committees made 93 percent of the \$1.3 million in independent expenditures reported, a figure the Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices believes

---

<sup>4</sup> All the states cited in this report define the primary and general elections as separate elections.

<sup>5</sup> "Contribution Limits: Chart of Limits on Political Party Contributions to Candidates," National Conference of State Legislatures [on-line]; available from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/about/PartyCand.htm#c>; Internet; accessed July 26, 2007.

is low due to the state's narrow definition of independent expenditure.<sup>6</sup> Democratic party committees made two-thirds of the expenditures and Republicans made 29 percent.

In **Colorado**, independent expenditures totaling \$383,535 were spent on candidates. These expenditures amounted to very little compared to the \$19.3 million raised by candidate committees during that cycle.

As in California and Maine, the race for the governor's office attracted the most independent expenditures. Two of the six gubernatorial candidates were targeted — Republican Bob Beauprez, and his Democratic opponent Bill Ritter. The \$204,672 spent on these two candidates represented less than 3 percent of the nearly \$8.1 raised by the two candidates themselves.

#### HOW THE MONEY WAS SPENT

Advertising expenses, which totaled \$56.5 million, accounted for about half of the independent expenditures. Broadcast media was the most expensive. It rang up at \$52.7 million – more than twice the \$25.2 million spent on direct mails, the next largest expense. “Message support” expenses, such as direct mailings, phone banks, polls and surveys, accounted for almost as much as advertising, at \$55 million.

#### CATEGORIES OF INDEPENDENT SPENDING, 2005-2006

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>SUB-CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Advertising	Broadcast Media	\$52,741,030
	Other Advertising	\$1,940,130
	Print Media	\$1,008,627
	Billboards, Internet, and Other Media	\$805,457
<b>ADVERTISING TOTAL</b>		<b>\$56,495,245</b>
Message Support	Direct Mail	\$25,218,559
	Phone banks, Door-to-Door, Campaign Materials	\$15,328,865
	Signature Gathering and Other Activities	\$11,397,302
	Consultants	\$1,884,657
	Polling/Surveys	\$1,320,134
<b>MESSAGE SUPPORT TOTAL</b>		<b>\$55,149,517</b>
Administration	Salaries/Wages	\$805,457
	Professional Services	\$497,407
	Insurance and Miscellaneous Fees	\$478,608
	Travel	\$457,299
	Supplies & Equipment	\$105,374
	Food & Meetings	\$95,047
	Rent & Utilities	\$26,339
	Postage/Courier	\$2,554
<b>ADMINISTRATION TOTAL</b>		<b>\$2,463,722</b>
Other Expenses	Fundraisers	\$605,190
	Transfers/Other	\$69,676
<b>OTHER TOTAL</b>		<b>\$674,865</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$114,783,349</b>

<sup>6</sup> Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices, “2007 Study Report: Has Public Funding Improved Maine Elections?,” p. 56.

## ALASKA

Eighteen organizations and five individuals made nearly \$2 million in independent expenditures during Alaska's 2006 elections. The money almost exclusively targeted two ballot measures; in fact, 95 percent of the independent expenditures focused on those measures.

General Measure 2, which would have imposed a tax on oil and gas leases, was the primary lightning rod of independent expenditures, attracting \$1.7 million of expenditures made in opposition to it. These expenses supplemented the nearly \$1.7 million raised directly by three committees that formed to defeat the measure.

Although Alaska law prohibits corporate giving to PACs, there are no such limits on giving to ballot measure committees. Nevertheless, three large oil companies not only gave significant amounts to ballot measure committees, but also made significant independent expenditures. ConocoPhillips, BP Alaska, and ExxonMobil collectively spent \$1.6 million on independent expenditures and gave another \$1.1 million in direct contributions to committees opposing the measure, for a total of \$2.7 million. Their efforts and expenses paid off — two-thirds of the voters rejected the measure in November.

The NorthWest CruiseShip Association (NWCA) made \$181,752 in independent expenditures in their unsuccessful attempt at defeating Primary Measure 2, on the state's August primary ballot. The measure, which levies a voyage and gambling tax on cruise ships in Alaskan waters, was approved.

Of the nearly \$2 million spent in Alaska, \$1.7 million, or 86 percent, was spent on advertising. The remainder — \$272,415 — was spent on other means of supporting or opposing the targets, such as polling and surveys, printing and direct mail.

In sharp contrast to ballot measures, candidates were the target of only \$4,337 worth of independent expenditures, with \$3,388 targeting then-incumbent Gov. Frank Murkowski, a Republican.

### TOP SPENDERS

Seven of the 23 spenders accounted for 95 percent of the nearly \$2 million in independent expenditures. ConocoPhillips Alaska led the pack, spending about \$1.5 million for its successful efforts opposing General Measure 2.

Other top spenders opposing General Measure 2 were:

- the Alaska Support Industry Alliance, which “represents companies and organizations that provide goods and services for Alaska’s oil, gas and mineral industries,”<sup>7</sup> spent \$74,944;
- the Resource Development Council for Alaska, a group which “works for all resource sectors, including mining, oil and gas, fisheries, timber and tourism,”<sup>8</sup> spent \$64,982;

---

<sup>7</sup> “About Us,” *The Alaska Support Industry Alliance* [on-line]; available from <http://www.alaskaalliance.com/about.php>; Internet; accessed July 6, 2007.

- BP Alaska spent \$58,219;
- ExxonMobil spent \$36,355;
- Alaska's Future, a group funded in part by two contributions of \$50,000 from both ExxonMobil and BP Alaska,<sup>9</sup> spent \$34,203.

## MAJOR SPENDERS IN ALASKA, 2006

<b>MAJOR SPENDERS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>POSITION</b>
ConocoPhillips Alaska	\$1,473,182	Oppose General Measure 2
Alaska Support Industry Alliance	\$74,944	Oppose General Measure 2
Resource Development Council for Alaska	\$64,982	Oppose General Measure 2
BP Alaska	\$58,219	Oppose General Measure 2
ExxonMobil	\$36,355	Oppose General Measure 2
Alaska's Future	\$34,203	Oppose General Measure 2
<b>GENERAL MEASURE 2 TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,741,885</b>	
NorthWest CruiseShip Association	\$151,135	Oppose Primary Measure 2
<b>PRIMARY MEASURE 2 TOTAL</b>	<b>\$151,135</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,893,020</b>	

In addition to making these independent expenditures, several top spenders also made substantial contributions to committees that formed around the measures. ExxonMobil and BP Alaska contributed \$400,000 each to Alaska First, the principal committee organized in opposition to General Measure 2. ConocoPhillips provided \$250,000. ExxonMobil and BP Alaska also gave \$55,000 each to the Alaska Oil and Gas Association, another committee opposing the measure.

Another large spender was the NWCA, which made \$181,752 worth of independent expenditures in opposition to Primary Measure 2. The association's independent expenditures were in addition to providing all but \$8,500 of the \$1.3 million raised by Alaskans Protecting Our Economy, which formed to oppose the measure.

In contrast to the significant sums spent on the ballot measures, either through direct contributions or independent expenditures, these same entities gave very little to candidates. Of the top spenders, only two contributed to state-level candidates. BP Alaska gave a total of \$12,250 to 15 candidates for state office, and ConocoPhillips gave \$10,750 to 17 candidates, as well as \$2,000 to the Alaska Republican Party.

## OTHER SPENDERS

Alaska allows political subdivisions of the state, such as municipalities, school districts, and regional educational attendance areas, to use public funds to influence the outcome of an election

<sup>8</sup> "About RDC," *Resource Development Council for Alaska, Inc.* [on-line]; available from <http://www.akrdc.org/membership/>; Internet; accessed July 6, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Matt Volz, "APOC Delays Alaska's Future Case," *Anchorage Daily News*, Oct. 25, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.adn.com/news/politics/elections/2006/story/8342082p-8192961c.html>; Internet; accessed July 6, 2007.



concerning a ballot measure, proposition or question — if the funds have been specifically appropriated for that purpose by a state law or a municipal ordinance.<sup>10</sup>

Governmental agencies in Alaska spent a total of \$36,015 on various ballot issues. Most of that money, \$28,612, was spent by the Anchorage Department of Parks and Recreation to provide information on a host of municipal bond questions, including a nearly \$5 million bond issue for parks and recreation. The majority of Anchorage Parks and Recreation’s money, \$23,532 was spent on Proposition 7, which allowed the city to issue bonds worth up to \$44.1 million for roadway service and drainage improvements and increase the annual municipal tax cap to pay for associated operations.<sup>11</sup> Proposition 7 passed with 52 percent of the vote.

The Alaska Judicial Council, an independent citizen's commission created by the Alaska Constitution,<sup>12</sup> spent \$22,248 purchasing advertisements to get judicial retention information out to the public.

#### PRIMARY TARGETS OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

Two ballot measures garnered 95 percent of the independent expenditures; all of the money was spent in opposition to them. General Measure 2, vetted by former Governor Wally Hickel and other state politicians as a means of forcing gas companies to build a gas pipeline to transport natural gas to market, was the target of the lion’s share of the money, with \$1.7 million. The measure, soundly rejected by 65 percent of the voters, sought to “levy a tax on oil and gas leases overlying large deposits of natural gas.”<sup>13</sup> The tax would have been repealed once the pipeline was built and would have provided for a partial tax credit for any taxes paid while the measure was in effect.

Primary Measure 2 attracted \$151,135 of independent expenditures, all in opposition.

#### TOP TARGETS IN ALASKA, 2006

TARGET	PURPOSE	AMOUNT AGAINST
General Measure Two	Gasoline Tax	\$1,742,670
Primary Measure Two	Cruise Ship Tax	\$151,135
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,893,805</b>

#### HOW THE MONEY WAS SPENT

Most of the independent expenditures, 86 percent, paid for print, television, and radio advertisements. The remaining paid polls and surveys, printing, and direct mail.

<sup>10</sup> State Statute 15.13.145, *Alaska State Legislature Textual Infobases* [on-line]; available from <http://www.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/stattx06/query=15!2E13!2E145/doc/%7B@6856%7D?>; Internet; accessed June 14, 2007.

<sup>11</sup> “2006 Ballot Propositions,” *Municipality of Anchorage Municipal Election* [on-line]; available from <http://www.muni.org/Assembly2/2006Ballotprops.cfm>; Internet; accessed July 10, 2007.

<sup>12</sup> Alaska Judicial Council [on-line]; available from <http://www.ajc.state.ak.us>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

<sup>13</sup> “Ballot Measures,” *Division of Elections* [on-line]; available from [http://www.elections.state.ak.us/ballot\\_measures.php](http://www.elections.state.ak.us/ballot_measures.php); Internet; accessed July 9, 2007.

**CATEGORIES OF SPENDING IN ALASKA, 2006**

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>SUB-CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Advertising	Mixed Advertising	\$1,654,719
	Other Media	\$34,233
	Broadcast Media	\$22,248
	Print Media	\$11,749
<b>ADVERTISING TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,722,950</b>
Message Support	Polling/Surveys	\$149,600
	Other Campaign Support	\$61,592
	Get-out-the-Vote	\$59,035
	Direct Mail	\$2,188
<b>MESSAGE SUPPORT TOTAL</b>		<b>\$272,415</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,995,365</b>

Seventy-three percent of all the money spent on advertising went to Bradley Reid and Associates, an advertising firm based in Anchorage. ConocoPhillips and BP Exploration paid the firm nearly \$1.4 million to oppose General Measure 2, and the NWCA paid the firm \$24,000 for ads in opposition to Primary Measure 2.

## CALIFORNIA

More than 190 committees in California made \$104.7 million in independent expenditures during the 2005 and 2006 elections. These expenditures are in addition to the \$782 million raised directly by state-level party, candidate, and ballot measure committees.

Independent expenditures targeting candidates accounted for \$60.3 million, or 19 percent of the \$319.7 million candidates raised in direct contributions. An additional \$43.9 million was spent on ballot measures, supplementing the \$369.8 million raised directly by ballot measure committees.

An analysis of the independent expenditure reports filed by committees in California reveals:

- The top 10 spenders made two-thirds of all expenditures.
- Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team spent \$28.3 million, 27 percent of all independent expenditures.
- The gubernatorial race between Phil Angelides and Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2006 and Gov. Schwarzenegger's slate of four ballot initiatives, which failed in the November 2005 special election, took up \$54 million, or 52 percent of all the expenditures.
- Independent expenditures went primarily for advertising, at a cost of \$51.7 million, and message support activities such as direct mail and phone banking, at \$49.9 million.

With contribution limits in place in California, independent expenditures provided another vehicle for special interests to influence the outcome of the elections. California limits the amount which can be given to candidates per election.<sup>14</sup> Individuals, corporations, unions and committees can give up to \$22,300 to a gubernatorial candidate, \$5,600 to other statewide candidates, and \$3,300 to legislative candidates.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, these donors are limited to \$25,000 in contributions to political parties to benefit candidates<sup>16</sup> and \$5,600 to any committee if the contributions are earmarked for a candidate.<sup>17</sup> Contribution limits do not apply to ballot measure committees.

Independent expenditures made on behalf of or in opposition to candidates surpassed the contribution limits many times over. It should be noted, however, that organizations making independent expenditures often did not make the maximum or even any contributions to the candidates they supported.

---

<sup>14</sup> Primary, general, and special elections are considered separate elections of purposes of contribution limits.

<sup>15</sup> "Campaign Disclosure Manual 1," *California Fair Political Practices Commission*, June 2006, p.1-1 and Appendix 1-4.

<sup>16</sup> "Limits on Contributions to Political Parties," *National Conference of State Legislatures* [on-line]; available from [http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/about/contrib\\_pol\\_parties.htm](http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/about/contrib_pol_parties.htm); Internet; accessed July 18, 2007.

<sup>17</sup> "Limits to PACs," *National Conference of State Legislatures* [on-line]; available from [http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/about/cont\\_to\\_pac.htm](http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/about/cont_to_pac.htm); Internet; accessed July 18, 2007.

## TOP SPENDERS

Ten committees collectively spent \$70.5 million on independent expenditures, two-thirds of the total spent. One committee alone, Gov. Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team, spent \$28.3 million on independent expenditures, more than one-quarter of the total made.

### MAJOR SPENDERS IN CALIFORNIA, 2005-2006

SPENDER	TOTAL	POSITION
Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team	\$28,268,883	Support Schwarzenegger
Californians for a Better Government	\$9,865,582	Support Angelides
Alliance for a Better California	\$7,890,195	Support & Oppose Candidates & Measures
California Association of Hospitals	\$6,395,072	Support Proposition 86
Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions & Civic Participation Candidate PAC	\$5,360,509	Support & Oppose Candidates
Team 2006, Sponsored By California Sovereign Indian Nations	\$3,094,659	Support Candidates
California Alliance for Progress & Education an Alliance of Professionals Employers & Small Business	\$2,958,037	Support & Oppose Candidates
Working Californians	\$2,637,860	Support Candidates
Service Employees International Union & Affiliates	\$2,191,709	Support & Oppose Candidates
California Nurses Association	\$1,819,317	Support & Oppose Candidates & Measures
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$70,481,823</b>	

**Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team**, a committee controlled by the governor, spent over \$28 million in independent expenditures, mostly in support of his 2005 slate of initiatives. The California Recovery Team put most of its money, \$23.4 million, into purchasing television and radio advertising. Consultants, direct mail and other message support activities accounted for an additional \$4.1 million of the committee's spending. In addition, this committee gave \$2 million to the California Republican Party and to the ballot measure committee Campaign for Child Safety Ballot Measure.

To fund its expenditures, the committee raised \$44.8 million in contributions in 2005 and 2006. Gov. Schwarzenegger himself contributed \$7.7 million, and his re-election committee, Californians for Schwarzenegger 2006, gave another \$1 million. Other top contributors were: William A. Robinson, founder of the transportation company DHL of Teton, Idaho, gave \$2.2 million; Alex G. Spanos, president and chief executive officer of AG Spanos Companies of Stockton, Calif., gave \$1.5 million; the Jerry Perenchio Living Trust, started by media investor Perenchio, of Los Angeles, gave \$1.5 million; and B. Wayne Hughes, chairman of Public Storage, Inc., of Glendale, Calif. gave \$1 million. In comparison, Schwarzenegger's campaign committee raised \$45.7 million in contributions during the same period.

**Californians for a Better Government**, a committee supporting Democrat Phil Angelides' unsuccessful gubernatorial bid in 2006, made nearly \$9.9 million in independent expenditures —

\$9.1 million on television and radio advertising; \$681,965 on direct mail; and \$57,500 on polling and surveys. This committee made no direct contributions to candidates or ballot measures.

Six labor organizations and five individuals provided the funds for these expenditures. The preponderance of the committee's money, \$8.7 million, came from Angelides' partner, Sacramento developer Angelo Tsakopoulos and Tsakopoulos' daughter, Eleni Tsakopoulos-Kounalakis.<sup>18</sup> The California Teachers Association also kicked in \$1 million; the next largest contributor, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), gave \$100,000 — two IBEW locals gave \$50,000 each.

**The Alliance for a Better California** committee is a coalition of labor organizations.<sup>19</sup> The committee made almost \$7.9 million in independent expenditures in 2005 and 2006. It spent more than \$4 million in an effort to defeat Gov. Schwarzenegger; \$1.8 million against Proposition 77, a measure dealing with reapportionment; \$1.2 million to support Angelides; and \$875,000 to a measure which failed to make it on the ballot, but would have required shareholder consent for corporate contributions to ballot measures. Television and radio advertising commanded most of the committee's spending — \$5.7 million. Voter contact and message support cost an additional \$1.8 million.

In addition to making independent expenditures, this committee made direct contributions of \$1 million to the California Democratic Party.

To fund its expenditures, the Alliance for a Better California took in \$44.4 million in 2005 and 2006. The California Teachers Association and other state affiliates of the National Education Association gave a total of \$23.5 million. State and local chapters of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) contributed more than \$11 million. Other large contributors included the California Correctional Peace Officers Association, with almost \$3.7 million, and the California School Employees Association, with \$1.4 million.

**The California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems (CAHHS)** made almost \$6.4 million in independent expenditures to gather signatures to qualify a cigarette tax initiative, which became Proposition 86 once it qualified. CAHHS gave an additional \$10.9 million in direct contributions to the committee promoting the measure, Yes on Proposition 86.

**Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions and Civic Participation (SOL)**, a coalition of labor organizations, made nearly \$5.7 million in independent expenditures supporting and opposing candidates and ballot measures through both its candidate political action committee and issues committee.<sup>20</sup> SOL's issues committee spent \$362,783 on ballot measures, while its candidate committee spent almost \$5.4 million. Bucking the trend set by the other committees, the coalition spent 88 percent of its money, \$5 million, on message support, primarily

---

<sup>18</sup> Malcolm Maclachlan, "Fiscal Official in New Committee Backing Angelides Had Role in Davis Recall," *Capitol Weekly News*, April 23, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from [http://www.capitolweekly.net/news/article.html?article\\_id=661](http://www.capitolweekly.net/news/article.html?article_id=661); Internet; accessed July 10, 2007.

<sup>19</sup> The Alliance for a Better California [on-line]; available from <http://www.betterca.com/>; Internet; accessed July 11, 2007.

<sup>20</sup> The Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions and Civic Participation's reports identified which candidates it targeted, but contained conflicting information about whether the candidates were supported or opposed. Calls to Xavier Gonzalez, the coalition's executive director, went unreturned.

through voter contact.<sup>21</sup> The Strengthening Our Lives coalition made no direct contributions to ballot measure or candidate committees.

To fund their activities, state and local affiliates of the SEIU contributed about \$4.3 million to both committees in 2006.

**Team 2006, Sponsored By California Sovereign Indian Nations**, made \$3.1 million in independent expenditures in support of gaming-friendly candidates, including two hotly contested races: \$959,000 on behalf of Tony Strickland, a Republican candidate for state controller, and \$521,429 on behalf of Democratic Assemblywoman Nicole Parra. Team 2006 spent \$2.4 million, 80 percent of its budget, on television and radio advertising. It also spent \$536,796 on direct mail, \$116,639 on polling and surveys, and \$48,706 on message support, primarily phone banking.

Team 2006 collected \$3.2 million to pay for these expenditures — \$850,000 from the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians; \$800,000 each from the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians and the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation; \$685,715 from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians; and \$125,000 from the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. Although Team 2006 did not contribute directly to candidates or ballot measures, its members did. Often, their contributions to Senate and Assembly candidates met the limit. However, direct contributions reported by those tribes to Tony Strickland's campaign totaled only \$30,000 and to Nicole Parra's totaled only \$25,700. American Indian tribes in California fought to be excluded from campaign finance disclosure laws in recognition of their sovereignty. However, in December 2006, the state Supreme Court ruled the tribes were subject to the law.<sup>22</sup>

**The California Alliance for Progress and Education** made nearly \$3 million in independent expenditures primarily in support of Democratic candidates, including State Senators Lou Correa, Ron Calderon, and Gloria Negrete-McLeod and Assemblywoman Nicole Parra. About half of the expenditures, \$1.5 million, were made for television and radio advertising and almost \$1.1 million paid for direct mail.

To fund its activities, the committee raised \$1 million from the California Dental Association and \$1.2 million from the California Association of Realtors. Other contributors included medical, insurance, real estate mortgage brokers and building industry organizations.

**Working Californians** spent more than \$2.6 million on independent expenditures. Expenditures in support of Democrat John Chiang's successful race for state controller got the bulk of the money, \$2.2 million, with the rest going to Phil Angelides' gubernatorial campaign. However, since no purpose for the expenditures was listed on the committee's reports, the spending categories could not be determined. This committee made no direct political contributions to candidates or ballot measure committees.

---

<sup>21</sup> The majority of the contributions listed the purpose as "voter contact." The Institute interpreted that to mean direct contact with voters by someone from Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions and Civic Participation via telephone or in person. Calls for clarification about the purpose went unreturned by the coalition's executive director.

<sup>22</sup> Bob Egelko, "Ruling on Campaign Disclosure: Tribes Can Be Sued for Late Gift Report," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Dec. 22, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2006/12/22/BAG6AN4FPN1.DTL>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

Major contributors to Working Californians were UNITE HERE! with \$450,000, SEIU International with \$400,000, and the California State Council of Service Employees with \$300,327.

**The SEIU and its Affiliates** collectively made independent expenditures of \$2.2 million. Of that money, \$1.1 million went to support Phil Angelides and the remainder was distributed to support or oppose many other candidates. SEIU spent 67 percent of its money — \$1.5 million — on message support, including door-knocking, phone banking, printing of brochures and flyers, and direct mails. Administrative expenses of \$481,246 for salaries, payroll taxes, travel and miscellaneous expenses, accounted for the second largest share of expenditures.

The committee's independent expenditures were overshadowed by the \$8 million the SEIU and its affiliates gave in direct contributions to state committees. The main beneficiary of SEIU's largesse was the California Democratic Party, which received \$2.8 million. Other large contributions included \$1.6 million to the committee Yes on 82 – Preschool for All and \$484,000 to Phil Angelides.

**The California Nurses Association** had three committees that made independent expenditures — the California Nurses Association Initiative Political Action Committee, the California Nurses Association Political Action Committee (CAN-PAC), and Working Families for Better Healthcare. These three committees spent a total of \$1.8 million on candidates and ballot measures, with the bulk of the money — \$1.4 million — going to support Proposition 89, a campaign finance measure, in 2006. Of that, \$1.1 million was spent on signature gathering for that measure. In addition to these independent expenditures, the California Nurses Association gave \$5.3 million in direct contributions to candidates and ballot measures.

## ORGANIZED LABOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Labor organizations were a potent force in California politics in 2005 and 2006. In all, labor organizations and related coalitions made \$40.7 million in independent expenditures. Beyond independent expenditures, identified labor organizations made a combined total of \$56 million in direct political contributions to ballot measure, candidate, and party committees in 2005 and 2006.

## PRIMARY TARGETS OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

Independent expenditures targeting candidates accounted for \$60.3 million, while \$43.9 million was spent on ballot measures. Eighty-five percent of the independent expenditures were made in support of the targets, while just \$16 million was spent in opposition.

The 2006 gubernatorial race attracted slightly more than \$21 million, while Schwarzenegger's 2005 slate of initiatives attracted \$33 million. The top 10 targets captured 65 percent of all independent expenditures.

## TOP TARGETS IN CALIFORNIA, 2005-2006

TARGET	OFFICE/PURPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	TOTAL
Phil Angelides	Governor	\$15,491,364	\$7,151	\$15,498,515
Proposition 76* (2005)	School Funding	\$9,911,812	\$421,318	\$10,333,129
Proposition 75* (2005)	Employee Consent to Union Dues	\$7,791,067	\$706,835	\$8,497,902
Proposition 77 (2005)	Reapportionment	\$5,022,273	\$ 2,378,216	\$7,400,489
Proposition 74* (2005)	Public School Teacher Waiting Period	\$6,234,663	\$609,101	\$6,843,763
Proposition 86	Cigarette Tax Increase	\$6,495,471	\$39,667	\$6,535,138
Arnold Schwarzenegger	Governor	\$235,784	\$5,308,203	\$5,543,987
John Chiang	Controller	\$3,428,518	\$0	\$3,428,518
Lou Correa	State Senate	\$2,039,888	\$55,142	\$2,095,029
John Garamendi	Lieutenant Governor	\$1,635,430	\$121,667	\$1,757,096
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$58,286,270</b>	<b>\$9,647,300</b>	<b>\$67,933,566</b>

\* In addition, the CUEA HOPE committee spent \$3,203 on initiatives 74,75, and 76 without specifying how much of that amount went to each one.

Phil Angelides, Schwarzenegger's Democratic challenger in the governor's race, benefited from \$15.5 million of independent expenditures made on his behalf. Neither Angelides nor Schwarzenegger accepted the voluntary spending limits of the state's Political Reform Act, which would have capped spending for the governor's race at \$6 million in the primary and \$10 million in the general election.

Propositions 74 – 77, all of which failed, garnered a total of \$33 million in independent expenditures. They were contained in a package presented by Gov. Schwarzenegger during a special election held in 2005 and include:

- **Proposition 74** sought to increase from two to five years the amount of time in service before a teacher could be granted permanent status. A total of \$6.8 million was spent on this initiative. Nearly all the \$6.2 million spent in support of Proposition 74 came from Gov. Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team. Several labor, Democratic and progressive organizations spent \$609,101 to oppose this measure. The United Teachers Los Angeles PACE spent \$228,021 and Standing Up for California, the committee headed by Phil Angelides, spent \$175,604.
- Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team spent nearly \$7.8 million on independent expenditures supporting **Proposition 75**, which would have required annual consent of union employees to pay union dues. Opponents spent \$706,835, about one-tenth as much. The American Federation of Teachers Guild San Diego Community College District spent \$219,818; Standing Up for California spent \$175,475; and the California Nurses Association spent \$75,117.
- **Proposition 76**, one of Schwarzenegger's slate of 2005 initiatives, would have fundamentally changed the way schools were funded. The top organization making independent expenditures in favor of Proposition 76 was Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team, which spent almost \$9.7 of the \$9.9 million total expenditures made in favor of the measure. Opponents spent \$421,318; the largest



single spender opposing Proposition 76 was Standing Up for California, with \$176,004. The committee Workers Families for Faster Commutes, Cleaner Air California Labor Federation spent \$61,621 and California Nurses Association spent \$52,676 opposing the measure.

- **Proposition 77** would have reapportioned legislative districts. Again, the California Recovery Team accounted for most of the independent expenditures made in support of this measure, \$4.6 million. The California Republican Party supported the measure by giving \$398,000. Opponents spent nearly \$2.4 million opposing 77. The largest spenders opposing Proposition 77 were the Alliance for a Better California which spent \$1.8 million and the Strengthening Our Lives committee which spent \$221,166.

A measure on the 2006 ballot also attracted significant independent expenditures. Initiative 86 called for a \$2.60 per pack tax increase on tobacco products to fund health care and health insurance programs. Nearly \$6.4 million of the \$6.5 million spent around this measure came from the California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems (CAHHS). Standing Up for California spent the bulk of the remainder, \$87,934. Opponents of Proposition 86, in contrast, spent very little in independent expenditures; of the \$39,667 spent, \$37,538 came from the Committee to Protect the Political Rights of Minorities. Independent expenditures aside, this ballot measure generated contributions to committees in excess of \$83 million; over \$66.6 million of that was spent by opponents. Proponents contributed \$16.6 million, which included \$11 million from the California Association of Hospitals and Healthcare Systems.

Gov. Schwarzenegger's campaign, which raised \$45.7 million in direct contributions, generated significant independent expenditures, mostly in opposition to his candidacy. Of the \$5.5 million spent, \$5.3 million went to oppose him. Most of the money spent in opposition to the governor, \$4 million, came from the labor coalition Alliance for a Better California, which also made independent expenditures opposing the governor's package of ballot initiatives in 2005. An additional \$524,337 came from the committee, Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions and Civic Participation, and \$449,533 came from Teachers United with Fire Fighters and Correctional Officers.

Organizations supporting Democrat John Chiang's successful run for the state controller's office made \$3.4 million in independent expenditures. Working Californians, a labor coalition, spent \$2.2 million; Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions and Civic Participation spent \$661,854; and the committee Public Safety Officers, School Employees and Professional Engineers for Chiang spent \$297,809. Chiang accepted voluntary spending limits, which were \$4 million in the primary and \$6 million in the general election for statewide office.<sup>23</sup> Chiang raised \$3 million for his campaign.

Opponents and supporters of Democrat Lou Correa, who won his state senate race in District 34, made \$2.1 million in independent expenditures. Of the \$2 million spent by supporters, \$646,221 came from the California Alliance for Progress & Education; \$340,335 from Californians for Jobs and a Strong Economy; and \$214,449 from the California Association of Realtors. The California Nurses Association spent \$55,142 opposing his candidacy, through its committee Nurses and

---

<sup>23</sup> Fair Political Practices Commission, "The Political Reform Act," 2007, p. 65.

Working Families for Better Healthcare. Correa's campaign took in \$3.1 million in direct contributions.

Democrat John Garamendi's successful campaign for lieutenant governor also saw large independent expenditures. Supporters spent \$1.6 million. Major spenders in support of Garamendi included Taxpayers for Responsible Government, a labor coalition with major funding from the Professional Engineers in California Government, which spent \$676,438; the Strengthening Our Lives Through Education, Community Actions and Civic Participation, with \$544,354 in expenditures; and CAUSE Law Enforcement union with \$130,000. Opposition to Garamendi came from TaxpayersAdvocate.org PAC, which spent \$121,667. Garamendi's campaign took in \$5.4 million, which was well under the voluntary spending limits he accepted.

#### HOW THE MONEY WAS SPENT

Advertising and message support each accounted for almost half of California's independent expenditures. Radio and television spots consumed nearly all the advertising budget, while voter contact in the form of direct mails, door-knocking and phone banking took up the message support money. Spending on administration and fund raising together added up to less than 3 percent of the total.

#### CATEGORIES OF SPENDING IN CALIFORNIA, 2005-2006

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>SUB-CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Advertising	Broadcast Media	\$50,287,264
	Print Media	\$637,464
	Other Media	\$551,734
	Other Advertising	\$270,579
<b>ADVERTISING TOTAL</b>		<b>\$51,747,041</b>
Message Support	Direct Mail	\$21,243,545
	Phone banks, Door-to-Door, Campaign Materials	\$14,321,614
	Signature Gathering and Other Activities	\$11,335,166
	Consultants	\$1,839,280
	Polling/Surveys	\$1,162,221
<b>MESSAGE SUPPORT TOTAL</b>		<b>\$49,901,826</b>
Administration	Salaries/Wages	\$774,664
	Professional Services	\$497,182
	Insurance and Miscellaneous Fees	\$478,443
	Travel	\$456,666
	Supplies & Equipment	\$105,374
	Food & Meetings	\$89,204
	Rent & Utilities	\$24,267
	Postage/Courier	\$2,230
<b>ADMINISTRATION TOTAL</b>		<b>\$2,428,030</b>
Other Expenses	Fundraisers	\$604,631
	Transfers/Other	\$66,679
<b>OTHER TOTAL</b>		<b>\$671,310</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$104,748,207</b>

## COLORADO

Nine committees and five individuals spent \$383,535 on independent expenditures supporting or opposing Colorado candidates in 2006. These expenditures amounted to very little compared to the \$19.3 million raised by candidate committees during that cycle.

As in California and Maine, the race for the governor's office attracted the most independent expenditures. Two of the six gubernatorial candidates were targeted — Republican Bob Beauprez, and his Democratic opponent, Bill Ritter. The \$204,672 spent on these two candidates represented less than 3 percent of the nearly \$8.1 million raised by the two candidates themselves.

Independent expenditures targeting 16 of 179 legislative candidates totaled \$171,445, or 2 percent of the \$8.2 million raised for all legislative campaigns. However, three candidates received large boosts to their campaigns through independent expenditures in comparison to overall campaign contributions received. Each was unsuccessful.

Further analysis of the independent expenditure reports filed by committees in Colorado reveals:

- Independent expenditure made by two committees — the NRA Political Fund and the Colorado Leadership Fund's Political Fund — totaled \$286,000, accounting for nearly three-fourths of the expenditures.
- Advertising — particularly broadcast media — far and away commanded independent expenditures in Colorado, accounting for 82 percent of the money spent.
- In two cases, independent expenditures made on behalf of a candidate were more than the money raised by the candidates themselves.

### TOP SPENDERS

Four entities collectively spent \$340,486 on independent expenditures, accounting for 88 percent of the total spent.

### MAJOR SPENDERS IN COLORADO, 2006

<b>SPENDER</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
NRA Political Fund	\$143,954	Support Bob Beauprez
Colorado Leadership Fund	\$142,262	Support Republican Candidates
Service Employees International Union	\$29,220	Support Bill Ritter & Others
Chris W. Cox	\$25,050	Support Bob Beauprez
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$340,486</b>	

The National Rifle Association's Political Fund spent \$143,954 to purchase television, radio and print ads for Republican Bob Beauprez' unsuccessful bid for the governor's office. The NRA reported no direct political giving in the 2006 cycle in Colorado.

The Colorado Leadership Fund, which works to “elect Republican candidates including Bob Beauprez,”<sup>24</sup> spent \$142,262 on direct mail, phone calls, and television ads for three Republican House candidates who lost their bids for election: John Albright in House District 64; Matt Dunn in House District 38; and Affie Ellis in House District 29. The Colorado Leadership Fund reported no other political giving in Colorado in 2006.

The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) spent \$29,220 on direct mail on behalf of Ritter’s successful campaign and various House and Senate candidates not specified by the committee. In addition, the SEIU and state and local affiliates gave \$30,750 directly to Ritter’s candidate committee. It also gave \$150,000 in a single direct contribution to the Coloradans for Fairness Issue Committee, a committee supporting Referendum 1, which proposed to allow legal recognition of same-sex couples.<sup>25</sup>

Chris W. Cox, executive director of the NRA Institute for Legislative Action,<sup>26</sup> spent \$25,050 on outdoor advertising supporting Bob Beauprez.

Five individuals made \$34,833, or 9 percent of the independent expenditures. Two individuals combined spent \$32,166 — Chris W. Cox and William L. Armstrong of Cherry Creek Mortgage. Armstrong spent a total of \$7,116 on three Republican candidates: Matt Dunn, in his unsuccessful race for House District 38; Rep. Spencer Swalm in his victorious race for House District 37; and Sen. Ted Harvey, who won the open race for Senate District 30.

#### PRIMARY TARGETS OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

As in Maine, the race for the governor’s office attracted the most independent expenditures.

#### TOP TARGETS IN COLORADO, 2006

<b>CANDIDATE</b>	<b>OFFICE</b>	<b>SUPPORT</b>	<b>OPPOSE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Bob Beauprez	Governor	\$169,004	\$6,448	\$175,452
Matt Dunn	House District 38	\$89,511	\$0	\$89,511
Bill Ritter*	Governor/Other	\$29,220	\$0	\$29,220
John Albright	House District 64	\$23,594	\$0	\$23,594
Affie Ellis	House District 29	\$21,282	\$0	\$21,282
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$332,611</b>	<b>\$6,448</b>	<b>\$339,059</b>

\* The Service Employees International Union made this expenditure on a mailer endorsing Ritter and others.

Three entities made a total of \$175,452 of independent expenditures targeting Beauprez, who was defeated by Ritter. The NRA Political Fund paid \$143,954 supporting the Beauprez campaign, while Chris Cox, also of the NRA, spent an additional \$25,050. By comparison, the Brady Campaign to Control Gun Violence spent \$6,448 on direct mails and phone banks in opposition to Beauprez’ election. The \$169,004 of independent expenditures made supporting Beauprez was dwarfed by the \$3.7 million raised directly by Beauprez’ campaign.

<sup>24</sup> “Committee Detail,” *Colorado Secretary of State Elections Center* [on-line]; available from <http://www.sos.state.co.us/cpf/CommitteeDetailPage.do;jsessionid=0000G0IQSJRom4qUepSfA5Rpci-:121vl2b8g?cold=20065636497>; Internet; accessed July 20, 2007.

<sup>25</sup> “Frequently Asked Questions on Referendum 1,” *Coloradans for Fairness* [on-line]; available from [http://ccfae.convio.net/site/PageServer?pagename=Press\\_FAQ\\_Ref\\_1](http://ccfae.convio.net/site/PageServer?pagename=Press_FAQ_Ref_1); Internet; accessed July 26, 2007.

<sup>26</sup> National Rifle Association Institute for Legislative Action [on-line]; available from <http://www.nraia.org/About/>; Internet; accessed July 21, 2007.

The Service Employees International Union spent \$29,220 on direct mail on behalf of Ritter and various other state House and Senate candidates. By comparison Ritter raised nearly \$4.4 million in contributions.

Independent expenditures made in support of Republican House candidate Matt Dunn were a significant boost to his campaign. The \$89,511 spent on advertisements and a direct mail were more than twice the \$34,854 raised directly by Dunn’s own campaign.

Besides Dunn, two other unsuccessful candidates received significant boosts to their campaigns from independent expenditures. John Albright, a Republican vying for House District 64, raised \$22,165 in campaign contributions, slightly less than the \$23,594 paid out on his behalf in independent expenditures by the Colorado Leadership Fund. A cable TV advertisement paid for by the Colorado Leadership Fund on behalf of Republican House District 29 candidate Affie Ellis totaled \$21,282, slightly more than one-third the \$58,310 his campaign raised.

#### HOW THE MONEY WAS SPENT

Advertising — particularly broadcast media — far and away commanded independent expenditures in Colorado, accounting for 82 percent of the money spent. Broadcast media alone totaled \$238,396, or 62 percent of the expenditures.

#### CATEGORIES OF SPENDING IN COLORADO, 2006

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>SUB-CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Advertising	Television & Radio	\$238,396
	Internet & Billboard Ads	\$41,112
	Print Ads	\$29,558
	Unspecified	\$5,392
<b>ADVERTISING SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$314,457</b>
Message Support	Direct Mail	\$66,022
	Doorhangers, Buttons, T-Shirts, etc.	\$3,055
<b>MESSAGE SUPPORT SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$69,078</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$383,535</b>

Two businesses received three-quarters of the money reported as independent expenditures. Edmonds Associates, a political consulting firm, earned \$161,941 for advertising services ordered by the NRA and Chris Cox to support Bob Beauprez. Another political media consulting firm, Mentzer Media, Inc., received \$132,106 from the Colorado Leadership Fund for advertising in support of three Republican candidates for the state House.

## MAINE

Eight individuals and 23 groups made roughly \$1.3 million in independent expenditures during Maine's 2006 elections. These expenditures amounted to 15 percent of the nearly \$8.4 million spent directly by the candidates themselves.<sup>27</sup>

Independent expenditures targeting the two main gubernatorial candidates — Democratic Gov. Baldacci and his Republican challenger, Chandler Woodcock — totaled \$621,118, while those targeting legislative candidates totaled \$625,305. Party committees spent an additional \$6,019 supporting local-level candidates.

Independent expenditures most often paid for message-support activities, such as direct mail and phone banking, which cost a total \$799,244. Advertising, primarily television and radio broadcasting, accounted for most of the other costs — \$460,653.

Independent expenditures made by political action committees and political parties have been on the rise since 2000, due at least in part to the state's public-finance system and relatively low contribution limits.<sup>28</sup> The state of Maine fully subsidizes candidates who obtain a number of signatures of registered voters in support of their candidacy and who raise seed money in multiple contributions between \$5 and \$100. Privately financed candidates are subject to contribution limits — legislative candidates can receive no more than \$250 per election from any donor, while gubernatorial candidates can receive no more than \$500.<sup>29</sup>

Political party committees made 91 percent, or nearly \$1.2 million, of the total made in independent expenditures. This form of spending was an important tool in party committees' election kits because Maine is one of 20 states that limit the amount a party committee can give to a candidate.

However, the reported independent expenditures are just a fraction of the total spent by political action committees and the party committees, according to the state, because of the state's narrow definition of independent expenditures. "For communications to voters that ran more than 21 days before the 2006 general election, the costs were required to be reported as independent expenditures only if the communication explicitly urged the election or defeat of a candidate (e.g., "Vote Joe Smith on election day!")."<sup>30</sup> So, for example, the Maine Democratic Party paid more than \$1.1 million to Main Street Communications for television ads, yet over \$800,000 worth of those ads was not reported as independent expenditures because they did not expressly advocate for Baldacci.<sup>31</sup>

## TOP SPENDERS

Political parties made the vast majority of the independent expenditures. Democratic committees reported spending \$790,626, more than twice the \$371,911 reported by Republican committees.

---

<sup>27</sup> Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices, "2007 Study Report: Has Public Funding Improved Maine Elections?," May 2007, p. 40 & p. 52.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

## MAJOR SPENDERS IN MAINE, 2006

<b>MAJOR SPENDERS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Maine Democratic Party	\$567,389
Maine Republican Party	\$325,093
House Democratic Campaign Committee	\$147,051
Senate Democratic Campaign Committee	\$70,999
Maine Prosperity PAC	\$65,679
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,176,211</b>

### *Democratic Party Committees*

State and local subdivisions of the Democratic Party collectively made \$790,626 of independent expenditures, or 62 percent of the total money spent.

The Maine Democratic Party was the largest spender, with \$567,389. The two Democratic legislative caucuses — the House Democratic Campaign Committee and the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee — spent a total of \$218,050. In addition, two county parties spent \$5,186.

Democratic committees spent the money on over 90 candidates — \$530,770 in support of Democratic candidates and \$259,858 in opposition to their Republican challengers.

Most of the independent expenditures targeted the gubernatorial candidates — \$272,442 made in support of the winner, Baldacci, who did not receive public funding,<sup>32</sup> and \$252,283 spent in opposition to Woodcock, who did receive public funding.<sup>33</sup> An additional \$55,545 was spent supporting Brian Rines, a publicly financed Democratic candidate for state Senate who lost in the general election, and was also publicly financed.<sup>34</sup>

The bulk of the Democratic committees' expenditures went towards television and radio advertising, which cost \$387,665, while direct mail commanded \$198,408. An additional \$186,322 paid for campaign literature and phone banking.

### *Republican Party Committees*

State and local subdivisions of the Republican Party spent \$371,911 on independent expenditures, or 29 percent of the total money spent.

The Maine Republican Party made the bulk of those expenditures; their total was \$325,093, or 87 percent of the Republican spending. The two Republican legislative caucuses — the Maine Senate Republican Victory Fund and the House Republican Fund — made just \$46,298 in independent expenditures, about one-fifth of the money spent by their Democratic counterparts.

Republican Party committees targeted over 90 candidates — \$329,466 in support of Republican candidates and \$29,314 in opposition to their Democratic challengers.

---

<sup>32</sup> "Candidate List," *Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices* [on-line]; available from [http://www.maine-campaign-finance.com/public/candidate\\_office\\_sought\\_list.asp?Type=CAN&YEAR=2006](http://www.maine-campaign-finance.com/public/candidate_office_sought_list.asp?Type=CAN&YEAR=2006); Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

The Republican committees spent more money on the gubernatorial race than any other, spending \$65,150 in support of Woodcock and \$29,314 opposing Gov. Baldacci. The three legislative candidates most heavily targeted were:

- Republican Sen. Paula Benoit, who successfully challenged then-incumbent Democratic Sen. Arthur Mayo in District 19, with \$17,453;
- Republican Frank Farrington in his unsuccessful challenge for Senate District 32, with \$17,015;
- Republican state Rep. Kevin Glynn, who lost his bid for House District 27, with \$16,065.

Independent expenditures exceeded the total both Benoit and Glynn, who were both publicly financed, received in public money: \$10,651 for Benoit and \$22,008 for Glynn. Farrington raised \$33,495 in private contributions.

Unlike Democratic committees, Republican committees spent little on broadcast media, focusing instead on direct mail expenses, which totaled \$292,979. Advertising expenses totaled \$44,020 — \$42,195 on print ads and \$1,825 on radio advertising. An additional \$34,912 was spent on phone banking.

#### *Others*

In addition to the political parties, the Maine Prosperity PAC, a committee of the pro-business organization Alliance for Maine's Future,<sup>35</sup> spent \$65,679 in support of 40 candidates. Paula Benoit's race benefited the most, with \$5,160 in spending. The committee also spent money on three other Republican candidates: \$4,734 on Steve Bowen's unsuccessful race in House District 46; \$3,861 on Rep. Donna Finley's successful race House District 85; and \$3,805 on Lyle Cramer's narrowly lost bid for House District 125.

The Maine Prosperity PAC spent most of its money, \$29,468, on direct mail, but also spent \$18,837 on print ads and \$16,127 on phone banking. This PAC is a committee of the Alliance for Maine's Future, a pro-business organization.<sup>36</sup>

## PRIMARY TARGETS OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

Independent expenditures targeting the two main gubernatorial candidates — Baldacci and Woodcock — totaled \$621,118, nearly a quarter of the \$2.6 million these two candidates spent on their own campaigns.<sup>37</sup>

Gov. Baldacci and his opponent, Chandler Woodcock, both raised \$1.3 million in contributions.<sup>38</sup> They each also had more than \$300,000 of independent expenditures that targeted them. The stark

---

<sup>35</sup> Alliance for Maine's Future [on-line]; available from <http://www.allianceformaine.org/page.asp?content=AMFPac&g=AMFVOTE>; Internet; accessed July 18, 2007.

<sup>36</sup> AMF PAC, "Alliance For Maine [on-line]; available from <http://www.allianceformaine.org/page.asp?content=AMFPac&g=AMFVOTE>; Internet; accessed Aug. 1, 2007.

<sup>37</sup> Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices, "2007 Study Report: Has Public Funding Improved Maine Elections?," May 2007, page 52.



difference between the two is that expenditures targeting Baldacci were made primarily in support of his campaign, while those targeting Woodcock were made primarily in opposition.

#### TOP TARGETS IN MAINE, 2006

TARGET	OFFICE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	TOTAL
Chandler Woodcock	Governor	\$66,963	\$252,283	\$319,246
John Baldacci	Governor	\$272,558	\$29,314	\$301,872
Brian Rines	Senate	\$57,282	\$0	\$57,282
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$396,803</b>	<b>\$281,597</b>	<b>\$678,400</b>

Independent expenditures targeting legislative candidates totaled \$625,305, just 19 percent of the \$3.7 million spent by the candidates themselves.<sup>39</sup> The race for Senate District 21 attracted the most independent expenditures, \$70,575. Brian Rines, an unsuccessful Democratic candidate for the open seat in Senate District 21, attracted \$57,282 in independent expenditures, 47 percent more than the \$38,895 he received in public financing.<sup>40</sup> To counter the Democrats, Republican parties spent \$13,293 supporting Earle McCormick, Rines' opponent and ultimate victor. McCormick, who was also publicly financed, received \$62,278 in public funds.

#### HOW THE MONEY WAS SPENT

Of the nearly \$1.3 million of independent expenditures made in Maine, \$799,244 was spent on direct mail, phone banks, campaign materials and consultants. Advertising accounted for \$460,644 of the expenditures, with television and radio advertising taking the bulk of that money.

#### CATEGORIES OF SPENDING IN MAINE, 2006

CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY	AMOUNT
Message Support	Direct Mail	\$550,403
	Phone banks, Campaign Materials	\$241,512
	Consultants	\$7,329
<b>MESSAGE SUPPORT SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$799,244</b>
Advertising	Broadcast Media	\$392,442
	Print Media	\$66,829
	Other Media	\$1,382
<b>ADVERTISING SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$460,653</b>
Administration	Salaries/Wages	\$8,775
	Travel	\$633
<b>ADMINISTRATION SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$9,408</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,269,305</b>

<sup>38</sup> Maine Secretary of State Department of Governmental Ethics and Election Practices [on-line]; available from <http://www.maine-campaign-finance.com/MainePublic/CFReports/CAN/CFReports/ScheduleFReports/55107.htm>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>39</sup> Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices, "2007 Study Report: Has Public Funding Improved Maine Elections?," p. 40.

<sup>40</sup> "42-Day Post-General 2006 Campaign Schedule F Summary Section," *Maine Campaign Finance* [on-line]; available from <http://www.maine-campaign-finance.com/MainePublic/CFReports/CAN/CFReports/ScheduleFReports/52766.htm>; Internet; accessed July 27, 2006.

Three companies together received almost half of the money spent on independent expenditures. Main Street Communications, a political consulting firm in Washington, D.C., was paid \$339,545 by the Democratic Party for television advertising in support of Gov. Baldacci and opposing Woodcock. The Creative Imaging Group, a promotional products and commercial printing business in Scarborough, Maine, was paid \$173,737 for direct mail services from the Maine Prosperity PAC and the Maine Republican Party. The Strategy Group, a political consulting firm with offices in Washington, DC, Chicago and Los Angeles, was paid a total of \$110,942 for literature and direct mail services by the Democratic Party supporting Baldacci and opposing Woodcock.

## WASHINGTON

Seven individuals and 66 committees made nearly \$6.4 million in independent expenditures during Washington's 2006 elections. Legislative candidates were the target of 48 percent of the expenditures, while Supreme Court candidates were the target of 43 percent. Less than 1 percent was spent on ballot measures.

The \$2.7 million in independent expenditures targeting the three Supreme Court races was 36 percent greater than the \$1.7 million raised directly by the six candidates.

Two Supreme Court candidates, in particular, received significant boosts from independent expenditures. John Groen raised \$454,033 for his unsuccessful campaign to unseat Justice Gerry Alexander on the Supreme Court, just one-third of the \$1.4 million total made in independent expenditures supporting Groen and opposing Alexander. Stephen Johnson raised \$343,260 in his unsuccessful effort to unseat Justice Susan Owens; his campaign kitty totaled 60 percent of the \$571,150 spent on independent expenditures supporting Johnson and opposing Owens.

Ten committees were responsible for making 74 percent of all independent expenditures. More than half of all expenditures — nearly \$3.4 million — paid for direct mailings, while more than one-quarter paid for radio and television advertisements.

Independent expenditures are another vehicle available to special interests to influence the outcome of elections in the state of Washington, which has relatively strict contribution limits. Political action committees (PACs), unions, corporations and individuals can give a maximum of \$700 to legislative candidates and \$1,400 to judicial candidates per election.<sup>41</sup> Candidate committees are prohibited from giving to fellow judicial and legislative candidates. Further, legislative candidates can only receive \$0.70 per registered voter from state and caucus committees and \$0.35 per registered voter from county and legislative district party committees.

Accusations of financial shell games were lodged against several independent expenditure committees for having “shell PACs to conceal donors names and avoid having to list them on ads.” For example, It's Time For A Change PAC was largely funded by the ChangePAC, which in turn received most of its funding from the Building Industry Association of Washington (BIAW).<sup>42</sup> In response to the accusations, Tom McCabe of the BIAW claims that since state law requires them to list their donors in their commercials, “it is easier to list one donor on 30-second ads than to spend 13 seconds listing five donors.”<sup>43</sup>

## TOP SPENDERS

The 10 committees responsible for making 74 percent of all independent expenditures were varied.

Three groups that focused mostly on Supreme Court races — Citizens to Uphold the Constitution, It's Time For A Change, and Americans Tired of Lawsuit Abuse — spent nearly \$2.3 million,

---

<sup>41</sup> Primary and general elections are considered separate elections.

<sup>42</sup> Brad Shannon, “State to Look at Five PACs in Court Races,” *The News Tribune*, Sept. 26, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://dwb.thenewstribune.com/news/local/story/6097252p-5344131c.html>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

<sup>43</sup> Brad Shannon, “State to Look at Five PACs in Court Races,” *The News Tribune*, Sept. 26, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://dwb.thenewstribune.com/news/local/story/6097252p-5344131c.html>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

representing more than one-third of all independent expenditures made in Washington in 2006. These groups, not the candidate campaign committees, paid for all of the television advertising related to the Supreme Court elections.<sup>44</sup>

### MAJOR SPENDERS IN WASHINGTON, 2006

<b>MAJOR SPENDERS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
It's Time For A Change	\$1,255,360
Citizens to Uphold The Constitution/FairPAC	\$646,768
Roosevelt Fund	\$596,281
Realtors Quality of Life PAC	\$408,028
Building Industry Association of Washington/BIAW	\$369,830
Harry Truman Fund	\$364,437
Americans Tired of Lawsuit Abuse	\$357,500
Citizens Action Group	\$312,170
Working Families Who Have Had Enough	\$208,555
Affordable Healthcare Coalition	\$191,769
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,710,698</b>

#### *Builders and Realtors*

The Building Industry Association of Washington (BIAW), which seeks to limit regulation of the building industry and accuses the current court of “rewriting history and eviscerating property rights,”<sup>45</sup> was the largest spender, focusing primarily on Supreme Court races.

It's Time For A Change spent more than \$1 million, or 84 percent of its total, on Supreme Court races. In addition, the BIAW itself spent \$347,630, or 94 percent of its expenditures on Supreme Court races. In all, the two committees made \$1.6 million in independent expenditures, with \$1.4 million spent on the Supreme Court races. Neither of the committees made direct contributions to any of the Supreme Court candidates.

It's Time For A Change was bankrolled by the ChangePAC, which received \$750,000 from the BIAW, \$90,000<sup>46</sup> from BIAW's PAC, the Washington Affordable Housing Council,<sup>47</sup> and \$120,000 from Bruce McCaw, a Bellevue developer.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> James Sample, “Special Interest Groups Dominate Washington Supreme Court Television Advertising,” *Justice at Stake Campaign*, Sept. 20, 2006 [on-line]; available from <http://www.justiceatstake.org/contentViewer.asp?breadcrumb=7,55,892>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>45</sup> Richard Roesler, “High Court Races Get Dirty; 'Activist' Tag Applied To Opponents,” *Spokesman Review*, Sept. 3, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from [http://www.spokesmanreview.com/tools/story\\_pf.asp?ID=147958](http://www.spokesmanreview.com/tools/story_pf.asp?ID=147958); Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>46</sup> “Public Resources,” *Public Disclosure Commission* [on-line]; available from <http://web.pdc.wa.gov/servlet/ContServlet>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>47</sup> “BIAW Political Program,” *Building Industry Association of Washington* [on-line]; available from <http://www.biaw.com/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabindex=3&tabid=108&navid=1>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

<sup>48</sup> Brad Shannon, “State to Look at Five PACs in Court Races,” *The News Tribune*, Sept. 26, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://dwb.thenewstribune.com/news/local/story/6097252p-5344131c.html>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

The Realtors Quality of Life PAC, funded entirely by the Washington Association of Realtors, spent over \$400,000 supporting mostly state House and Senate candidates. The PAC spent \$183,615 supporting Republican candidates and \$182,828 supporting Democratic candidates.

### *Legal Groups*

The Washington chapter of Americans Tired of Lawsuit Abuse spent \$357,500 on Supreme Court races. In addition, the Justice for Washington committee, an offshoot of Americans Tired of Lawsuit Abuse,<sup>49</sup> spent \$112,534. Justice for Washington received its funding from two committees — the Citizens to End Lawsuit Abuse and the Constitutional Law PAC.

Citizens to Uphold the Constitution, “a coalition of trial lawyers and labor, environmental, and tribal groups,”<sup>50</sup> was active in all three Supreme Court races, spending a total of \$646,768 in support of all three incumbents’ successful bids for re-election, and in opposition to their challengers. Three donors alone provided half of the committee’s funds used to make these expenditures, each giving \$100,000: the Puyallup Tribe of Indians, the Tulalip Tribes of Washington and the Washington State Council of Service Employees.<sup>51</sup>

### *Partisan Groups*

Three partisan political action committees made over \$1.5 million in independent expenditures in the state, 86 percent of which were spent on direct mail.

The Harry Truman Fund, a PAC that supports Democratic state House candidates, made more than \$360,000 in independent expenditures. In addition, the committee gave over \$335,140 in direct contributions to candidates as well as party committees.

The Roosevelt Fund, a PAC that supports Democratic state Senate candidates, targeted several races, spending most of its nearly \$600,000 on direct mail. The Roosevelt Fund also contributed over \$130,000 directly to the state Democratic Party and \$28,000 to Senate candidates, giving the \$1,400 maximum to 18 of them.

To fund these expenses, the Roosevelt Fund and the Harry Truman Fund raised money from similar sources. Labor groups contributed over \$600,000 combined and the Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee, a national committee that supports state-level Democratic legislative candidates, gave each committee \$200,000.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> “Capitol Chat transcript: State Supreme Court candidates Susan Owens and Stephen Johnson,” *The Olympian*, Oct. 28, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.theolympian.com/capitolchat/story/47819.html>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>50</sup> Brad Shannon, “State to Look at Five PACs in Court Races,” *The News Tribune* [on-line], Sep. 26, 2006; available from <http://dwb.thenewstribune.com/news/local/story/6097252p-5344131c.html>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

<sup>51</sup> “Public Resources,” *Public Disclosure Commission* [on-line]; available from <http://web.pdc.wa.gov/servlet/ContServlet>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>52</sup> “Public Resources,” *Public Disclosure Commission* [on-line]; available from <http://web.pdc.wa.gov/servlet/ContServlet>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

A Republican PAC, the Citizens Action Group, spent \$312,170 in independent expenditures, almost entirely on legislative races. The Citizens Action Group was funded by two state-based committees, the Speakers Roundtable and the Leadership Council.<sup>53</sup>

### *Labor*

The Washington Education Association PAC spent over \$140,000 supporting three winning Democratic Senate candidates — Derek Kilmer, Claudia Kauffman, and Eric Oemig.

To pay for these expenses, the Washington Education Association PAC raised 60 percent of its funds from the association itself, while most of the remaining funds came from unitemized contributions. Unitemized contributions are those under the state's \$25 reporting threshold for reporting identifying information such as the contributor's name and address.

Two SEIU unions made independent expenditures targeting Supreme Court and legislative campaigns. SEIU Local 775 spent \$89,178 targeting legislative races, while the SEIU Washington Political Action Fund spent \$27,159.

The Affordable Healthcare Coalition made \$191,769 in independent expenditures, primarily in support of Democratic legislative candidates and in opposition to Republican candidates. To fund the expenses, the Coalition raised money primarily from the SEIU Washington State Council and three SEIU locals — 775, 1199, and 925.

## PRIMARY TARGETS OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

In all, nearly \$3.1 million in independent expenditures was spent on candidates running for the state legislature, while over \$2.7 million in independent expenditures was spent on state Supreme Court races. Less than 1 percent was spent on ballot measures.

Because of the type of reports filed, many of the targets of the independent expenditures could not be classified since a number of committees listed multiple targets without differentiating the specific dollars spent on each of the targets.

### *The Supremes*

Independent expenditures targeting the three Supreme Court races totaled over \$2.7 million, 93 percent of which targeted the candidates running in Districts 2 and 8. In District 2, incumbent Justice Susan Owens defeated challenger Stephen Johnson. District 8 saw incumbent Justice Gerry Alexander defeat challenger John Groen in the primary election, and run uncontested in the general election. Alexander was the focus of an onslaught of negative advertising, with 92 percent of the \$535,700 of independent expenses directed at Alexander were made in opposition to him.

---

<sup>53</sup> "Public Resources," *Public Disclosure Commission* [on-line]; available from <http://web.pdc.wa.gov/servlet/ContServlet>; Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

## TOP TARGETS IN WASHINGTON, 2006

TARGET	OFFICE	FOR	AGAINST	TOTAL
Groen, John M.	Supreme Court	\$861,686	\$299,479	\$1,161,165
Johnson, Stephen L.	Supreme Court	\$447,233	\$119,549	\$566,782
Alexander, Gerry L.	Supreme Court	\$41,018	\$494,680	\$535,698
Owens, Susan	Supreme Court	\$156,171	\$123,916	\$280,087
Sheldon, Timothy M.	Senate	\$79,495	\$182,625	\$262,121
Esser, Luke E.	Senate	\$116,986	\$127,714	\$244,700
Nixon, Toby	Senate	\$55,963	\$140,502	\$196,465
Kilmer, Derek C.	Senate	\$94,636	\$76,792	\$171,428
Olson, Bret A.	House	\$123,060	\$6,329	\$129,389
Schmidt, David A.	Senate	\$38,294	\$72,968	\$111,262
		<b>\$2,014,542</b>	<b>\$1,644,554</b>	<b>\$3,659,096</b>

Challengers Groen and Johnson were “conservative property rights candidates” supported by conservative legal and business interests. Incumbent Justices Owens and Alexander, on the other hand, had the backing of Gov. Chris Gregoire and “liberal leaning unions, lawyers, and the abortion-rights group NARAL.”<sup>54</sup> The Legacy Fund, a PAC Gregoire controls,<sup>55</sup> contributed \$15,000 directly to the Citizens to Uphold the Constitution.

The third Supreme Court race, one that pitted incumbent Justice Tom Chambers against Jeannette Burrage, garnered slightly more than \$181,000 in independent expenditures. This race was targeted by those upset with Chambers for siding with proponents of gay marriage.<sup>56</sup> Two committees — Citizens for Judicial Integrity and Citizens to Uphold the Constitution, formerly known as FairPAC — spent \$164,658 opposing Chambers, which accounted for 91 percent of the expenditures made in this race. Despite the money spent in opposition to him, Chambers easily defeated Burrage in the primary election with nearly 60 percent of the vote.

### *The Body Legislative*

Senate candidates were the targets of over \$1.7 million in independent expenditures, 95 percent of which targeted just seven of the 25 Senate races in 2006.

The top target among Senate candidates was incumbent Democratic Sen. Timothy Sheldon. Working Families Who Have Had Enough PAC spent almost \$160,000 in independent expenditures unsuccessfully opposing Sheldon’s re-election bid for District 35, and over \$48,000 supporting his primary opponent, Kyle Lucas. To help fund their expenditures, the committee

<sup>54</sup> Brad Shannon, “State to Look at Five PACs in Court Races,” *The News Tribune*, Sept. 26, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://dwb.thenewstribune.com/news/local/story/6097252p-5344131c.html>; Internet; accessed July 25, 2007.

<sup>55</sup> Ralph Thomas, Gregoire’s Prowess at Filling Coiffers Continues,” *The Seattle Times*, Aug. 11, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://archives.seattletimes.nwsource.com/cgi-bin/texis.cgi/web/vortex/display?slug=gregoire11m&date=20060811&query=st>; Internet; accessed July 31, 2007.

<sup>56</sup> Richard Roesler, “High Court Races Get Dirty; ‘Activist’ Tag Applied To Opponents,” *Spokesman Review*, Sept. 3, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from [http://www.spokesmanreview.com/tools/story\\_pf.asp?ID=147958](http://www.spokesmanreview.com/tools/story_pf.asp?ID=147958); Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

received half of its funds, \$100,000, from the Progressive Majority, a political action committee “dedicated exclusively to electing progressive champions at the state and local level.”<sup>57</sup>

Kyle Lucas's unsuccessful campaign to unseat Sen. Timothy Sheldon in District 35 raised \$69,105, a drop in the bucket compared to the more than \$200,000 committees made in independent expenditures opposing Sheldon.

Republican incumbent Sen. Luke Esser was the target of \$244,700 of the \$330,046 in independent expenditures spent on the District 48 race. Esser was defeated by then-House Rep. Rodney Tom, a former Republican turned Democrat,<sup>58</sup> who was the target of \$85,736 worth of independent expenditures, 55 percent in support. It’s Time For A Change spent almost \$52,000 in support of Esser and \$38,186 in opposition to Tom. The Roosevelt Fund spent \$111,299 opposing Esser. Tom was on the receiving end of \$26,681 in expenditures from the Education Voters Political Action Fund, a public school advocate that is an arm of the League of Education Voters.<sup>59</sup>

House candidates were targeted with \$1.3 million in independent expenditures. Independent expenditures in support of candidates dominated giving, accounting for over \$1.1 million or 84 percent of the total. Eleven races garnered over \$50,000 each in spending, accounting for \$976,737 or 73 percent of expenditures to House candidates.

#### HOW THE MONEY WAS SPENT

More than half of all independent expenditures in Washington — nearly \$3.4 million — were spent on direct mail, while 28 percent paid for radio and television buys. Expenditures to get-out-the-vote accounted for more than \$700,000.

#### CATEGORIES OF SPENDING IN WASHINGTON, 2006

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>SUB-CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Message Support	Direct Mail	\$3,356,400
	Get-Out-the-Vote	\$702,780
	Consultants	\$38,047
	Other Campaign Support	\$18,421
	Salaries/Wages	\$19,036
	<b>MESSAGE SUPPORT TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,134,684</b>
Advertising	Broadcast Media	\$1,800,680
	Print Media	\$262,701
	Other Media	\$186,285
	<b>ADVERTISING TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,249,666</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,384,350</b>

Seattle communications company Moxie Media was paid over \$450,00 for production, design and

<sup>57</sup> “Who We Are,” *Progressive Majority* [on-line]; available from <http://www.progressivemajority.org/whoweaare/>; Internet; accessed July 31, 2007.

<sup>58</sup> Alex Fryer, “State Sen. Rodney Tom Enters Congressional Race,” *The Seattle Association*, July 17, 2007 [newspaper on-line]; available from [http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/localnews/2003793099\\_webtom17m.html](http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/localnews/2003793099_webtom17m.html); Internet; accessed July 24, 2007.

<sup>59</sup> “About League of Education Voters,” *League of Women Voters* [on-line]; available from <http://www.educationvoters.org/about.htm>; Internet; accessed June 28, 2007.



media buys for Citizens to Uphold the Constitution, Democratic candidates and several committees representing Democratic causes. On the Republican side, Dresner, Wickers & Associates, a political consulting firm located in San Francisco, received nearly \$800,000 from It's Time For A Change, paying mostly for direct mail production and media placement.