## Public Affairs Council

## 2019 Corporate PAC Benchmarking Report

Webinarfor Survey Participants
October 9, 2019

- YearFounded: 1954
- Total Members: Over 750 organizations
- Total Active People: Over 8,000 professionals
- Total Staff: 23
- Office Locations: Washington \& Brussels
- Politics: Nonpolitical \& Nonpartisan
- Focus: PACs, Govemment Relations, Grassroots Advocacy, Policy Communic ations, Digital Advocacy, Comorate Social Responsibility, Issues Management


## Survey Overiew

- Comprehensive benchmarking report covering trends and best practices in PAC mana gement, inc luding
- Management and staffing
- Govemance
- Executive engagement
- Fundraising and recognition strategies
- Participation and contribution rates
- Disbursement strategies a nd politic al involvement
- 160 participating coporations
- Conducted every otheryear



## How to Use This Report

## Benc hmark your activities

- Staffing and operating budgets
- CEO and senior executive engagement
- Participation rates and growth
- Fundraising and recognition strategies
- Disbursement planning and execution

Benchmark trends

- Transparency, leadership engagement, peer-to-peer, incentives

Conduct a comparative analysis (a dditional fee, starts at \$500)

- Compare results with a survey subsample (ex. Industry, PAC size)
- For more information, contact kbrackemyre@pac.org


## The Data Set Industry

- The following is a breakdown of participants by industry:



## The Data Set Corporate Annual Revenue

- The following is a breakdown of participants by their company's annual revenue for the most recent fiscal year:



## The Data Set PAC Size

## Percentiles:

25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$$50^{\text {th }}$ (median)
$75^{\text {th }}$$90^{\text {th }}$

## FEC 2016

Median Numbers by Percentile Size of responding PACs, 2016 (FEC-reported receipts)

## FEC 2018

Median Numbers by Percentile Size of responding PACs,
2018 (FEC-reported receipts)


## The Median <br> Comorate PAC: 1 professional staff and .5 administrative staff

| Activities Conducted by PAC Staff or Volunteers | 2019 | 2017 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conducting solicitation meetings | 98\% | 94\% | 94\% |
| Selecting candidates or disbursement strategy | 98\% | 97\% | 94\% |
| Solicitation planning or development | 96\% | 99\% | 96\% |
| Writing or editing communications materials (newsletters, annual reports, etc.) | 93\% | 96\% | 96\% |
| PAC ambassador recruitment and/or training | 88\% | 79\% | 82\% |
| Writing or editing website/intranet content | 84\% | 90\% | 85\% |
| Administering donor benefits or incentives (e.g., PAC match) | 79\% | 77\% | 62\% |
| Designing PAC materials | 76\% | 84\% | N/A |
| Check writing | 56\% | 65\% | 66\% |
| Maintaining contributor database | 49\% | 72\% | 73\% |
| FEC reporting | 26\% | 50\% | 47\% |
| Other | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |

Other activities include: Staff/volunteers, Advocacy organization operations, Attending fundraising events.

Corporate PAC Benchmarking

## Activities that are Outsourced

| Activities Conducted by <br> External Consultants/Vendors | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FEC reporting | $73 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Maintaining contributor database | $50 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Check writing | $44 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Designing PAC materials | $23 \%$ | - | - |
| Writing or editing website/intranet content | $13 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Administering donor benefits or incentives <br> (e.g., PAC match) | $10 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Writing or editing communications materials <br> (newsletters, annual reports, etc.) | $8 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Solicitation planning or development | $4 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Selecting candidates or disbursement strategy | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| PAC ambassador recruitment and/or training | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Conducting solicitation meetings | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| other activities include: Lobbying reporting Attending fundraising events, Website management. |  |  |  |

## Budgets

ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET


## Budget <br> Allocation

| 9\% | 39\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| PAC website services | Outsourcing (professional |
| 16\% |  |
| Gifts and member benefits |  |
| 13\% |  |
| Fundraising/ event management | 23\% |
|  | Administration/ PAC management database management |

## CEO

TRENDS IN CEO INVOLVEMENT

## Engagement



## PAC <br> Govemance

- Senior management level

JOB FUNCTIONS OF THE PAC BOARD


- $90 \%$ of PACs have a

PAC Board of Directors

- Median board size: 9


## PAC <br> Govemance

| Trends in PAC Board Activities | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Approve changes to bylaws | $90 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Provide general PAC oversight/input | $80 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Attend PAC events | $70 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Approve contributions to candidates | $69 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Attend candidate fundraisers | $44 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Manage strategic planning/goal setting | $42 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Sign/send solicitation letters | $39 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Provide internal budget planning/oversight | $39 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Conduct in-person fundraising or give PAC presentations | $35 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Host PAC donor appreciation events | $30 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Recruit PAC ambassadors/champions | $22 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Select candidates or manage disbursement strategy | $18 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Manage transparency activities | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Plan solicitations | $15 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Manage communications activities | $4 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Other | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

## Corporate PAC Benchmarking

## Receipts and Fundraising

- What was the total dollar amount of all PAC contributions from ALL of your donors for the 2017-2018 election cycle?

| 10 th <br> Percentile | 25 th <br> Percentile | 50 <br> (median) | Percentile <br> (5ercentile | 90 <br> Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 77,700$ | $\$ 176,216$ | $\$ 462,500$ | $\$ 1,200,000$ | $\$ 2,206,165$ |

■ What was the average or "typical" individual contribution dollar amount to your PAC for the 2017-2018 election cycle?

|  | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Up to $\$ 200$ | $17 \%$ |
| $\$ 200-\$ 500$ | $22 \%$ |
| $\$ 501-\$ 1,000$ | $33 \%$ |
| $\$ 1,001-\$ 2,500$ | $24 \%$ |
| $>\$ 2,500$ | $4 \%$ |
| Average (from midpoints) | $\$ 876$ |

## Receipts and Fundraising

How many employees were ELIGIBLE for your federal PAC in the 2017-2018 election cycle, |regardless of whether they were solicited?

| $\mathbf{1 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> (median) | $\mathbf{7 5}$ <br> Percentile | 90 <br> (h <br> Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 560 | 1,500 | 3,100 | 10,078 | 22,907 |

Of the eligible employees listed above, how many were SOLICITED for a contribution in the 2017-2018 election cycle?

| $\mathbf{1 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 25 <br> th <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> (median) | $\mathbf{7 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 90 th <br> Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 200 | 1,000 | 2,550 | 7,310 | 21,000 |

## Receipts and Fundraising

■ Of the eligible employees listed above, how many were SOLICITED for a contribution in the 2017-2018 election cycle?

| 10 <br> th <br> Percentile | 25 <br> th <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> (median) | $\mathbf{7 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 200 | 1,000 | 2,550 | 7,310 | 21,000 |

■ Of the solicited employees listed above, how many CONTRIBUTED to your federal PAC in the 2017-2018 election cycle?

| 10 th <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> (median) | $\mathbf{7 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 56 | 112 | 306 | 1,000 | 2,368 |


|  | $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25 } \\ & \text { Percentile } \end{aligned}$ | $50^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile (median) | $75^{\mathrm{th}}$ <br> Percentile | $90^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of eligible individuals who were solicited | 12\% | 73\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Percentage of solicited individuals who contributed | 4\% | 8\% | 17\% | 32\% | 65\% |

Please indicate the percentage and amounts of total PAC contributions for the 2017-2018 election cycle that are attributable to the following four groups:

| Percentage of <br> Total Donations <br> Received | 10 <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 50 <br> Percentile <br> (median) | 75 <br> Percentile | 90 <br> (h <br> Percentile | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senior management | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| Restricted class/salaried <br> employees | $10 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Corporate board <br> of directors | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| All other donors | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

## Corporate PAC Benchmarking

## Receipts and Fundraising

■ How frequently did your company's federal PAC solicit its eligible class during the 2017-2018 election cycle?

| Trends in Solicitation Frequency | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Short campaign once per year | $41 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Continuously | $19 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Periodically, but on a schedule not listed | $16 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Short campaign once per cycle | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Semi-annually | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Quarterly | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{n}=$ |  | 140 |

## Fundraising - Top PAC Solicitors

- Which of the following people conduct solicitations for your company's federal PAC, and which three are most effective?

| PAC Solicitors | Most Used | Most Effective |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senior management (not the CEO) | $77 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Head of government relations department | $74 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Government relations staff | $70 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| PAC manager | $64 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| CEO | $61 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| PAC board members | $54 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Peer solicitors | $41 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Corporate board of directors | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Consultants | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $n=$ |  | 145 |

## Fundraising Top Solicitation Approaches:

| Solicitation Approaches | Most Used | Most Effective |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Online solicitations (e.g., email) | $91 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Peer-to-peer solicitations | $67 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Small group meetings | $56 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Large organization events (e.g., leadership or shareholder meeting) | $48 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| New hire communication or orientation | $39 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Large group meetings | $38 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| PAC video | $35 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Fundraising events (e.g., dinner, reception, auction) | $34 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Regular staff meetings | $22 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Phone calls | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Interoffice mail | $13 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Mail to home address | $6 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Mobile solicitations via text or app | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Other | $3 \%$ | 143 |
| n = |  |  |

## Trends in Solicitation Approac hes

| Trends in Solicitation Approaches | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Online solicitations (e.g., email) | $91 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Peer-to-peer solicitations | $67 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Small group meetings | $56 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Large organization events (e.g., leadership or shareholder <br> meeting) | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $51 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| New hire communication or orientation | $39 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Large group meetings | $38 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| PAC video | $35 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Fundraising events (e.g., dinner, reception, auction) | $34 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Regular staff meetings | $22 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Phone calls | $17 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Interoffice mail | $13 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Mail to home address | $6 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Mobile solicitations via text or app | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Other | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

## PAC Size by Peer-to-Peer Use

## Peer-to-peer metrics by PAC size (FEC 2018)

|  | Median FEC 2018 | $\mathrm{n}=$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Use peer solicitors (Q28, $\mathrm{n}=59)$ | $\$ 627,993$ | 58 |
| Do NOT use peer solicitors $(\mathrm{Q} 28, \mathrm{n}=86)$ | $\$ 361,738$ | 85 |
|  |  |  |
| Use peer-to-peer (Q30, $\mathrm{n}=96)$ | $\$ 529,123$ | 95 |
| Do NOT use peer-to-peer $(\mathrm{Q} 30, \mathrm{n}=47)$ | $\$ 502,915$ | 47 |

## Use of Incentive Clubs



| Trends in the Number of Incentive Club Levels Offered by Companies | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| One | $31 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Two | $16 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Three | $15 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Four | $27 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Five or more | $11 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

## General Membership Benefits

| Trends in General Membership Benefits | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Special communications (e.g., issue updates or newsletters) | $86 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| Live events with politician, celebrity or other guest speaker | $52 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Annual gift | $43 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Virtual events with politician, celebrity or other guest speaker | $30 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Event with CEO and/or senior executives | $26 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Lapel pin | $21 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| PAC match | $21 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Raffles | $19 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Opportunity to attend candidate fundraiser | $18 \%$ | $21 \%$ | - |
| Trips to Washington or state capital | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Ability to deliver PAC checks to candidates | $6 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Incentive-club-only events | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Special name recognition | $4 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Upgraded services or special events at company meetings/events | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Trips to vacation destination | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Other | $2 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

## Incentive Club Benefits

| Trends in Incentive Club Benefits | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Event with CEO and/or senior executives | $63 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Annual gift | $60 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| Live events with politician, celebrity or other guest speaker | $45 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Special communications (e.g., issue updates or newsletters) | $43 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Incentive-club-only events | $37 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Virtual events with politician, celebrity or other guest speaker | $27 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| PAC match | $26 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Lapel pin | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Special name recognition | $21 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Opportunity to attend candidate fundraiser | $21 \%$ | $23 \%$ | - |
| Raffles | $15 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Trip to Washington or state capital | $12 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Upgraded services or special events at company meetings/events | $6 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Ability to deliver PAC checks to candidates | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Trips to vacation destination | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Other | $4 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

## Most Effective Benefits



## PAC Size by PAC Match Use

PAC match by PAC size (FEC 2018)

|  | Median FEC 2018 | $\mathrm{n}=$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Offer PAC Match (as either a general or <br> incentive club benefit), Q37/Q38, $\mathrm{n}=44$ ) | $\$ 607,227$ | 44 |
| Do NOT offer PAC Match (Q37/Q38, <br> $\mathrm{n}=93$ ) | $\$ 408,495$ | 93 |

## PAC Communications

| PAC Communication Strategies | PAC Donors <br> Only | All PAC <br> Eligibles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PAC newsletter | $57 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Live events (e.g., PAC education, issue overviews and meet-and-greets) | $52 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Webinars or teleconferences on issues or featuring guest speakers | $45 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Issue updates via email and/or web | $43 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| PAC annual report | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| PAC-specific social media activities | $12 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| PAC advertising/awareness campaign | $7 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Podcasts | $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Get-out-the-vote education | $2 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Other | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $n=$ |  | 124 |

## Strategic Support of Candidates

| Limited to Those with Formal Candidate Contribution Criteria | Percentage of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :--- |
| Membership on key legislative committees | $94 \%$ |
| Organization has facilities or locations in the candidate's district | $88 \%$ |
| Leadership position | $87 \%$ |
| Voting record consistent with your organization's goals | $75 \%$ |
| Candidate's political alignment with customers, employees or other stakeholders | $44 \%$ |
| Incumbent status | $40 \%$ |
| Likelihood of being reelected | $32 \%$ |
| Industry peers are supporting candidate/event | $28 \%$ |
| Recommendation of a PAC member | $17 \%$ |
| Financial need | $12 \%$ |
| Candidate's position on social issues (e.g., human rights, discrimination, etc.) | $8 \%$ |
| Party affiliation | $7 \%$ |
| CEO, senior management or board preference for candidate | $5 \%$ |
| Other | $3 \%$ |

Other responses include: Candidate's character and integrity, Caucus membership, New to Congress, Not politically charged, ex: Steve King, lowa.

- Which of the following criteria are the THREE most important in making decisions regarding PAC contributions to federal candidates?

| Criteria for Making Decisions | Percentage of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :--- |
| Membership on key legislative committees | $79 \%$ |
| Organization has facilities or locations in the candidate's district | $62 \%$ |
| Voting record consistent with your organization's goals | $51 \%$ |
| Leadership position | $51 \%$ |
| Candidate's political alignment with customers, employees or other stakeholders | $30 \%$ |
| Incumbent status | $7 \%$ |
| Industry peers are supporting candidate/event | $4 \%$ |
| Likelihood of being reelected | $4 \%$ |
| CEO, senior management or board preference for candidate | $1 \%$ |
| Party affiliation | $1 \%$ |
| Recommendation of a PAC member | $1 \%$ |
| Financial need | $0 \%$ |
| Candidate's position on social issues (e.g., human rights, discrimination, etc.) | $0 \%$ |

## Corporate PAC Benchmarking

## Strategic Support of Candidates

PAC DISBURSEMENT ALLOCATION


## Trends in Contributions by Party

TRENDS IN MEAN PAC CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTY AFFILIATION


## Contributions at the State Level

■ Please indicate how your company manages contributions at the state level:

| All Responses | Percentage of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :--- |
| My company makes contributions at the state level from the same account as the federal <br> PAC, where legal and feasible | $54 \%$ |
| My company makes corporate political contributions at the state level, where legal and <br> feasible | $48 \%$ |
| My company has separate state-level PAC(s) | $22 \%$ |
| N/A - my company does not make contributions at the state level | $19 \%$ |
| $n=$ | 144 |

## Corporate PAC Benchmarking

## Check Provision Methods

| Check Provision Method | Percentage of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :--- |
| Check mailed to campaign office | $93 \%$ |
| Check brought to fundraising event | $57 \%$ |
| Check presented in-person at an event hosted by your organization | $37 \%$ |
| Check presented in-person at a large group event hosted by another organization | $33 \%$ |
| Check presented during a small group meeting with the candidate in Washington | $22 \%$ |
| Check delivered by PAC donor(s) in district | $13 \%$ |
| Other | $1 \%$ |
| $n=$ | 143 |

[^0]
## Super PAC Involvement

LEVEL OF SUPER PAC INVOLVEMENT
6\%

| My company has contributed |
| :--- |
| to a super PAC in the |
| $2017-2018$ cycle |


| 36\% |
| :--- |
| My company has a policy |
| prohibiting contributions |
| to super PACs |

$n=133$

## Corporate PAC Benchmarking

## Super PAC Involvement by Revenue

| Super PAC Involvement by Corporate Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Overall | $\leqslant 1 \mathrm{~B}$ | \$1-\$3B | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 3.1- \\ & \$ 50 \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5.1- \\ & \$ 10 \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10.1-1 \\ & \$ 20 \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20.1- \\ & \$ 50 \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 50.1-1 \\ & \$ 100 \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | \$100B |
| My company contributed to a super PAC in the 2017-2018 cycle | 6.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 6.7\% | 3.6\% | 8.3\% | 14.3\% |
| My company has contributed to a super PAC in the past, but not in the 2017-2018 cycle | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| My company has a policy prohibiting contributions to super PACs | 35.3\% | 33.3\% | 14.3\% | 33.3\% | 38.9\% | 43.3\% | 28.6\% | 50.0\% | 42.9\% |
| My company doesn't prohibit contributions to super PACs , but we have never made a contribution | 57.9\% | 50.0\% | 85.7\% | 66.7\% | 50.0\% | 46.7\% | 67.9\% | 41.7\% | 42.9\% |
| Other | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| $\mathrm{n}=$ | 133 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 30 | 28 | 12 | 7 |

## Major Conclusions

- Staffing has not changed much. The median corporate PAC still has 1 professional staff member and . 5 administrative staff member(s) spending at least $50 \%$ of their time managing the PAC program.
- CEO and senior leadership engagement in the PAC continues to rise and indicate the health of the PAC program.
- Communications strategies are becoming more diverse and transparency is increasingly expected by donors and intemal stakeholders.
- PAC donors a re incentivized by unique opportunities and experiences, such as PAC match, exc lusive events, access to information and lea ders above all else.



## Comparative Analysis

## Example subsamples:

- Industry
- PAC size
- Location of corporate headquarters
- Corporate a nnual revenue

Can run the whole survey or specific questions (ex. receipts, solic itation approaches, govemance)
Fee: starts at \$500
Timing: typic a lly takes 3 - 4 business da ys


## Kristin Brackemyre

## Contact Information

Director, PAC and Govemment Relations
kbrackemyre@pac.org
202.787.5969


[^0]:    Other responses include: Check presented during a small group meeting in our HQ city.

