

30th April, 2012



# CAMPAIGN FINANCE

IN THE 2011 WORCESTER ELECTIONS



Robert Boatright  
Bil Carter  
Eric Cochran  
Matt Fields  
Benjamin Fine  
Dan Hall  
Dexter Heeter  
Mrinaal Maewell  
Darko Mitrovic  
Amelia Najjar  
Rebecca Paradis  
Mai Pham  
Chelsea Salmonsen  
Alicia Sanchez  
Matt Sandler  
Matt Savino  
Andrew Schuschu  
Tenzin Shaydrup

Robert Boatright  
Bil Carter  
Eric Cochran  
Matt Fields  
Benjamin Fine  
Dan Hall  
Dexter Heeter  
Mrinaal Maewell  
Darko Mitrovic  
Amelia Najjar  
Rebecca Paradis  
Mai Pham  
Chelsea Salmonsen  
Alicia Sanchez  
Matt Sandler  
Matt Savino  
Andrew Schuschu  
Tenzin Shaydrup



A PROJECT OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE 235:  
MONEY IN POLITICS CLASS

Clark University

Worcester, MA

## Campaign Finance in the 2011 Worcester Elections

A project of the Political Science 235: Money and Politics class  
Clark University, Worcester, MA  
April 30, 2012

Robert Boatright (corresponding author, [rboatright@clarku.edu](mailto:rboatright@clarku.edu))

Bil Carter

Eric Cochrane

Matt Fields

Benjamin Fine

Dan Hall

Dexter Heeter

Mrinaal Maewell

Darko Mitrovic

Amelia Najjar

Rebecca Paradis

Mai Pham

Chelsea Salmonsén

Alicia Sanchez

Matt Sandler

Matt Savino

Andrew Schuschu

Tenzin Shaydrup

*Note:* This is the third in a series of reports on the financing of Worcester elections. For prior reports, see the Worcester Campaign Finance Project website, at <https://www.clarku.edu/faculty/rboatright/>.

## Campaign Finance in the 2011 Worcester Elections

This is the third in a series of studies of campaign finance in municipal elections in Worcester, Massachusetts. We have embarked upon these studies because of our contention that the financing of local elections merits careful study for two reasons. First, our understanding of the role of money in elections is drawn from studies of candidates for high-profile offices – candidates for the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, the presidency, or for state office. Data on the fundraising practices of these candidates have been available for more than three decades, and there is a substantial body of literature on how money is raised and spent in campaigns for these offices. The human element is often missing from such studies. Candidates for these offices tend to be seasoned campaigners, and they tend to use veteran campaign operatives in their campaigns. We can know what money buys in part because these candidates make few mistakes. They know how to raise and spend money efficiently; there is less room for a good but underfunded candidate to triumph, or for a well-funded candidate to stumble. In these studies, we may know how important money is in general, but we have less insight into how a good campaign can overcome the lack of money. While we can know a lot about these campaigns in the aggregate, we cannot necessarily speak to the candidates themselves about their fundraising in any systematic way. It would be futile, for instance, for a researcher to expect to talk to all members of Congress about their fundraising, or even to expect a representative sample of candidates to speak frankly about how they ran their campaigns. Looking at local candidates can add the human element to studies of campaign finance.

Second, municipal campaign finance is important in its own right. Municipal elections, some have argued, are far less democratic than are federal elections (see Hajnal 2010). Voter turnout tends to be light in many cities, and name recognition and incumbency can matter far more than policy issues. In his 2010 book *Campaign Finance in Local Elections: Buying the Grassroots*, political scientist Brian Adams argues that incumbent city officeholders tend to enjoy an advantage comparable to that of U.S. representatives, that the contributor pool in local elections is even wealthier than that of congressional elections, and that business interests tend to dominate local elections. Precisely because so few citizens are paying attention and because in most cities voters lack obvious cues such as partisanship, candidates who can raise a threshold amount of money easily from the local business community are able to win local office – and then can easily stay there. While this may sound like an adequate sketch of many urban elections – including some of the elections that have taken place in Worcester – Adams’s study is limited by its size (eleven cities) and by the fact that so many cities have different election laws, types of populations, and so forth. Adams’s study builds upon other work of the past decade that has taken on individual cities or small numbers of cities (for a review, see Boatright et al. 2008). In order to gain a fuller understanding of local campaign finance, we simply need to look at as many cities as possible (see Adams 2011). We see our study of Worcester elections, then, as our contribution to this effort.

In this paper, we present data on Worcester elections, drawn from the Massachusetts database of contributions and expenditures of candidates in city-wide and district elections for the state’s five largest cities. We also present case studies of city-wide and district candidates. These case studies show substantial variation in fundraising practices and in the relationship

between fundraising and electoral success. By looking at local campaign finance, we are also able to address the human element – to incorporate the views of most of the candidates and to draw conclusions not only from the raw dollar amounts, but from the comments of the candidates on how they raised their money and how important money was to them in their campaigns. This paper builds on our first two in that we now can measure trends over a longer period of time, are able look more carefully at all of the races on the ballot than we were in the initial two papers, and we are also able to turn our focus to the strategies of individual contributors and interest groups in local elections.

Our earlier papers on this subject (Boatright et al 2008, 2010) summarized research on municipal campaign finance and sought to place our study of Worcester within that body of research. Here, we dispense with that context and instead seek to present a comparison of trends in the financing of Worcester elections across the past four election cycles. We move directly to consideration of the aggregate campaign finance data for Worcester’s 2011 city council elections and place them in the context of Worcester’s electoral system and the politics of its council elections. We then explore the comments of six out of fourteen candidates for citywide council seats, and six of the twelve district council candidates. We also provide a separate discussion of school committee candidates, a discussion of the motivations of political action committees and individual donors, and a comparison of campaign finance in Worcester to the financing of municipal elections in other large Massachusetts cities. We close by drawing some conclusions about the role money plays in Worcester’s elections. It is our hope that these conclusions can be generalized to provide insights into elections in similar locales.

## The 2011 Election

### *Worcester*

Worcester is the second-largest city in New England. As of the 2010 census, Worcester has a population of 181,045; whites constitute 69.4 percent of the population (down from 77 percent in the 2000 census). The city has experienced a growth in its immigrant population, with increases among African, Vietnamese, and Latin American immigrants; as of 2010, the city’s African/African-American population was 11.6 percent (up from six percent in 2000); its Asian population was 6.1 percent (up from five percent), and its Latino population (including Latinos identifying as white) was 20.9 percent, up from fifteen percent in 2000. Although it is within fifty miles of Boston and includes some residents who commute in to Boston for work, Worcester has always been a city in its own right. Although Worcester County is currently growing in population much faster than the rest of Massachusetts, Worcester is not a particularly wealthy city and it is surrounded by several more prosperous suburbs. Worcester elections are held in odd-numbered years, and tend to feature a voter turnout of slightly less than 25 percent.<sup>1</sup>

Worcester elections, like those in many American cities, are nonpartisan. They do, however, feature a process that resembles party primaries and serves to winnow the number of

---

<sup>1</sup> Many have argued that turnout in off-year elections tends to be lower than turnout in municipal elections held in even-numbered years, in conjunction with state and federal elections.

candidates to two competitors for each position. For the five city council districts, the preliminary election narrows the field to the two top vote-getters. In the case of at-large elections, the field is winnowed in the preliminary election to twelve candidates for the six at-large council slots. The preliminary election, held on the second Tuesday of September, thus produces at most twelve at-large candidates and no more than ten district candidates. The same rules apply for the six-member school committee. Preliminary elections are not held in every election cycle; they were not held in 2009 but they were held in 2011. The general election is held on the first Tuesday in November.

Worcester has a weak mayor system; the council appoints a city manager, who serves as the chief executive of the city, overseeing city departments and staff, managing the city's finances, and ensuring service delivery for city residents. The mayor's responsibilities include collaboration with the rest of Council to create meeting agendas, oversight of council meetings, and chairing the school committee. One of the mayor's most significant powers is the ability to veto legislation brought forth by Council. The mayor's job is part-time, and is viewed by some as largely a ceremonial position. Yet the city's mayor from 2002 to 2006, Timothy Murray, was widely viewed as having expanded the prestige of the job, and in 2006 Murray became the first Worcester mayor in decades to use the job as a springboard for higher office, running successfully for Lieutenant Governor. In part as a consequence of Murray's success, the mayoral election has been far more contentious than council elections. The mayoral candidate must win one of the six at-large council slots. Voters choose their council members, and then vote separately for mayor. Any one of the twelve at-large candidates may run for mayor. In practice, some at-large council candidates declare their candidacy for mayor before the preliminary election, but may reconsider their decision after the preliminary election.

The outcomes of council races depend largely on turnout. Voter registration forms are offered in a variety of languages. In the event that voters miss the registration deadline for one phase of the election, they are still encouraged to register to vote in the next phase of the election. City Clerk David Rushford, whom we interviewed for our paper on the 2007 elections, described two ways in which the city encourages voters to vote: formal and informal techniques. Formal techniques include advertising elections on talk radio, in newspapers, and paid advertisements sponsored by the candidates. Informal techniques include strategically placing polling locations around the city. Mr. Rushford commented on the fact that Worcester is an extremely "neighborhood oriented city. People identify themselves with their neighborhood and are loyal to it." As a result, polling locations are placed in each unique neighborhood, near places of worship, in community centers, and near schools. Candidates tend to think about their campaigns with reference to the city's neighborhoods or to particular ethnic groups.

### *The Election in Context*

In order to understand the 2009 election, some background on the past three elections is in order. In 2005, incumbent mayor Tim Murray was re-elected by a wide margin. Murray, however, resigned his position as mayor when he won the Lieutenant Governorship in 2006. Konstantina Lukes, a frequent critic of Murray, was his only opponent for mayor in 2005. According to the rules of the city charter, Lukes became mayor when Murray resigned.

Although council races are officially nonpartisan, and although Lukes is nominally a Democrat, Worcester County Democratic leaders sought to coalesce behind a candidate who could defeat Lukes in 2007.<sup>2</sup> Because any candidate for an at-large council seat can also run for mayor, there was some concern that there would be multiple mayoral candidates, and Lukes could win in a multi-candidate race. Because Worcester had a larger-than-usual number of at-large council candidates in 2007, there was a preliminary election. Candidates in the preliminary election do not have to formally announce that they are running for mayor, but three candidates (besides Lukes) announced their intention to run for mayor before the preliminary election. Of these three, the two with the fewest votes in the preliminary election subsequently dropped out of the mayoral race; this was, according to many observers, evidence of an agreement among the candidates to clear the field. The top vote-getter among these three, Rick Rushton, went on to garner the endorsements of most of the major Democratic politicians in the area and to raise over \$80,000 in his campaign. Unfortunately for Rushton, however, a third candidate, incumbent councilor Gary Rosen, entered the mayoral race after the preliminary election. Although Rosen ran a distant third, he may have siphoned off enough votes to deny Rushton the head-to-head race he had wanted. In a bitterly fought race, one that ended in a recount, Rushton ultimately lost to Lukes by 116 votes, a 36.1 percent to 35.5 percent margin. Rushton did, however, win an at-large seat on the council. The two other incumbent councilors who had filed to run for mayor in the preliminary election wound up losing their council seats.

2009 featured far less intrigue than did 2007. Like 2007, however, the mayoral race centered more around the personality and leadership style of Mayor Lukes. Again, two strong candidates ran against her. Joe O'Brien, the former district director for U.S. Representative Jim McGovern, garnered the endorsements of Murray, McGovern, and many other area Democrats, while veteran council member Kate Toomey was endorsed by the Worcester County Sheriff and one of the city's State Senators. Both O'Brien and Toomey argued that Lukes was not an active enough mayor, was unable to effectively advocate for the city at the state or federal level, and was not able to bring about consensus among council members (Sutner 2009). O'Brien, in addition, called attention to his commitment to inner-city neighborhoods and his residence in the less affluent Main South region of the city. O'Brien sought to run a movement-style campaign, soliciting small donations on the internet and using the internet to organize campaign events. Lukes responded by touting her independence from the Murray/McGovern "machine" and her conviction that her model of leadership was appropriate – that the job of mayor was not a full-time job and Worcester residents did not want an activist mayor of the sort O'Brien and Toomey were proposing. Lukes also drew comparisons between O'Brien and Murray, alleging that the 42-year-old O'Brien saw the job of mayor as a step towards seeking higher office, while Lukes had no such aspirations. Although Toomey's decision not to drop out in deference to O'Brien (or vice versa) raised the possibility that the vote again would be split, O'Brien ultimately won 51 percent of the vote to Lukes' 28 percent and Toomey's 18 percent. Both Lukes and Toomey were re-elected to the council.

Worcester elections over the past decade have, then, taken on a distinctly partisan dimension, as Lukes has taken on the role of opponent to the city's Democratic establishment and the Democratic Party leaders have sought to informally coalesce behind a candidate in order to avoid splitting the vote. They were not able to do this in 2007, but they were largely

---

<sup>2</sup> Lukes publicly announced her support for Republican Senator Scott Brown following the 2011 election.

successful in 2009. As late as the week before the preliminary election, the 2011 election promised to be a repeat of 2009, albeit without a competitive third candidate. There had been occasional complaints that O'Brien was using the mayoral office to champion liberal causes (Spencer 2011). He had been a prominent supporter of Governor Deval Patrick's reelection in 2010, of Martha Coakley's unsuccessful Senate campaign in 2010, and of Democratic candidates in other races. And O'Brien had championed an unsuccessful effort to join the national effort to boycott Arizona on account of the state's strict anti-immigration law. Whether or not the public was on O'Brien's side on these issues, he was expected by many to win reelection comfortably. Lukes announced her mayoral bid on September 15, shortly before the September 20 preliminary election, but no other candidates announced before the preliminary. O'Brien, however, abruptly announced on September 16 that he would not run again for mayor, citing family reasons. He did still pursue an at-large council seat. Mayoral candidates are required to announce their candidacy within one week after the preliminary election, so O'Brien's decision set off a week of speculation about which of the other four incumbent councilors might run for mayor. Ultimately, only one incumbent councilor, Joseph Petty, decided to run for mayor; two nonincumbents also announced their candidacies. Although neither of these two had done particularly well in the preliminary election, one (William Coleman) was African-American, and the other (Carmen Carmona) was a Latina. Although neither Coleman nor Carmona appeared to have the necessary support to win, their decisions did raise the possibility that they might draw enough votes to affect the race.

From this point on, however, the mayoral race and the at-large council races were relatively sleepy affairs. Petty secured the endorsements of local Democratic leaders, including Murray and US Representative James McGovern. The local media often presented the mayoral race as a pitched battle between Lukes and Petty, and Lukes criticized Petty for his connections to local power brokers and for the fact that he has a job in Boston. In the end, however, Petty won by a relatively comfortable 48 percent to 36 percent margin, with the two other candidates each garnering approximately eight percent. As we shall see below, Petty raised a substantial amount of money while Lukes had enough money available to match Petty but chose not to spend much more than half of it.

Despite vigorous campaigns by some of the nonincumbent at-large council candidates, all six council incumbents were reelected; only one incumbent came close to losing, and only one nonincumbent came close to winning. On average, the six incumbents received almost twice as many votes as the six nonincumbents. Some news stories before the election had touted the "young and diverse" crop of nonincumbent candidates (see Shulkin 2011), but other local columnists alleged that none of these candidates had managed to excite voters or to identify issues that might turn the election into a referendum on the city's leadership or prompt a desire for change among voters (Rosen 2011a). In 2009, the O'Brien campaign likely inspired high (for a municipal election) voter turnout; 22.9 percent of the electorate voted in 2009, and a comparable number of voters voted in the competitive 2007 race. In 2011, voter turnout was 19.8 percent (Kotsopoulos 2011c).

As the above discussion shows, although there is a partisan element, Worcester mayoral races have also revolved as much around personality as around policy issues. This is a well-established feature of nonpartisan races. The remaining at-large council candidates did raise

several issues, including commercial and residential tax rates, the city's efforts to reduce tobacco advertising, traffic cameras, and the city's response to the Asian Longhorned Beetle infestation (see Foskett 2011b, Rosen 2011b). At-large council candidates, because they had no incentive to target individual incumbents, tended to run more issue-oriented campaigns; this was particularly the case for nonincumbents. Although the mayor and the mayoral aspirants received some criticism from council candidates, the at-large election system makes it difficult to run against individual incumbents; nonincumbents must either make a general call for change or identify issues which can be used against most incumbents.

Worcester's district elections, however, were somewhat more exciting than its city-wide elections. District seat races, again because they tend to be focused on the personality of the incumbent, often revolve around personality as well. Of Worcester's five districts, four had competitive races, in which the winner was held to sixty percent of the vote or less. This was a change from previous years. One open seat race drew four candidates, each of whom received at least fifteen percent of the votes in the preliminary election. In the city's first district, the wealthiest area of the city, Joff Smith, a two-term incumbent councilor, was ousted in the preliminary election; this defeat followed an unsuccessful run by Smith for a state representative seat and featured allegations by both opponents that he had neglected constituency work. In the city's fourth district, a poor area of the city where minority population growth has been most noticeable, Barbara Haller, a community activist who had represented the district for ten years and had been a particularly visible presence in the district, was soundly defeated by a Latina community activist, Sarai Rivera.

While one might expect school committee elections to draw less attention than council races, the city's school committee elections actually may have sparked more controversy than the council elections. Shortly before the election, the council had narrowly renewed the contract of the city's School Superintendent, Melinda Boone. Boone was criticized by some school committee members for an alleged lack of transparency in administration of the schools and for her response to a scandal regarding cheating on the state-mandated standardized tests. The vote in early November (days before the election) to renew her contract was four to three, and, according to the committee's rules, a subsequent vote on the same issue was required after the election (see Rosen 2012). Ultimately one sitting school committee member, a Boone supporter, was defeated by Donna Colorio, who had run with support from local Tea Party activists; the race was close enough that a recall was held before Colorio was declared the winner. Boone's contract was, however, renewed after the election by the same narrow margin.

The 2011 elections thus are a bit of a paradox – a status quo election at the city-wide level with heated competition in a few district races, and an election in which grass roots movements such as the Occupy movement and the Tea Party were visible and yet (with the exception of one school committee race) failed to bring about substantial change at the ballot box. As we shall see below, there were substantial financial disparities between winners and losers, but it is hard to say that they were decisive. Incumbency arguably mattered more than money at the city-wide level, yet this has not always been the case, nor was it clearly the case at the district level. Worcester is not an expensive city in which to run – in the recent past, candidates who have spent scarcely more than \$10,000 have won city-wide office. To the average city resident, the most visible campaign events are the “stand outs” held by candidates



and their supporters at major traffic intersections during rush hour. Apart from the cost of signs to wave, these events cost virtually nothing for candidates. Worcester has no network television stations, and few candidates advertise on the radio. According to one candidate, the major expense for candidates is their signs, and repeat candidates can drive around on election night, picking up their yard signs and reusing them in the next cycle. Nonetheless, as we shall see below, at least a threshold amount of money is essential for all serious candidates.

### *Massachusetts Campaign Finance Law*

In Massachusetts, the Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF) regulates political contributions to state and municipal candidates. Guidelines for all candidate types are distributed through the OCPF website. Candidates running for mayoral and at-large council seats in cities of more than 100,000 residents (Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester) are considered “depository” candidates, and are subject to a set of regulations detailed below (Commonwealth of Massachusetts OCPF n.d.). This means that they must designate a bank in Massachusetts to be the depository for their campaign funds and they must appoint a chairman and a treasurer for their committee. The same person can be the chair and the treasurer, as long as the Treasurer is not the candidate. All receipts must be deposited into this account and all expenditures must be made from it, using a special check provided by the OCPF. Periodic reports are filed by the campaign with the bank, which forwards the information to the OCPF. During non-election years and the first six months of an election year in which that candidate’s name is on the ballot, the bank forwards these reports to the OCPF once a month, during the last six months of the election year the reports are submitted every two weeks. Regardless of whether a depository candidate intends to raise money in the course of their campaign, he or she must still appoint a bank.

Contributions may not exceed \$500 per year and must be deposited into the candidate’s depository account in the same form in which they were received. For example, if a \$200 check is received, that check must be deposited, if \$200 in cash is received, that cash must be deposited. Additionally, when the candidate deposits a contribution, he or she also files the contributor’s name and address with the OCPF. Contributions under \$50 do not need to be itemized in this way and may be combined into a single deposit unless a contributor’s aggregate, non-itemized contributions to a candidate or committee exceed the \$50 threshold in a calendar year. Massachusetts also prohibits public employees from soliciting political contributions as well as banning the solicitation or receiving of political contributions in any building occupied for government use. This means that public employees running as depository candidates must form a candidate committee to handle their fundraising in addition to appointing a bank as the location of their depository account.

In contrast to many other states, which allow virtually unregulated money to be spent on political campaigns, Massachusetts has strict limits on a contribution’s size and origin, restrictions which apply to municipal races as well as state races. As discussed, an individual over 18 may contribute a maximum of \$500 to depository candidate in a calendar year, up to a limit of \$12,500 in aggregate contributions per year; individuals under 18 are limited to an aggregate of \$25 in contributions per year. Political action committees (PACs) are also held to a

\$500 per year limit on contributions to a depository candidate or their committee. Registered lobbyists are limited to a smaller total of \$200 per year to a candidate or candidate committee. Local party committees, such as ward or town party committees are limited to \$1,000 per year in contributions per candidate while state party committees may contribute up to \$3,000 per year per to a candidate. There are no limits on in-kind contributions from local or state party committees to a candidate or their candidate committee. Similarly, there are no limits on independent expenditures, but such expenditures (along with their intended beneficiary) must be reported. All contributions from business or professional corporations are prohibited, whether cash, in kind, or any other form, although unincorporated businesses may be used to make contributions, provided they are attributable to an individual proprietor of that business (e.g. John Smith D.B.A. Smith's Auto Shop) and are applied to their individual contribution limit. Candidates may, however, contribute unlimited funds to their own campaigns. Beyond this, municipal depository candidates may also make unlimited loans to their campaigns. Finally, candidates or their committees must ask any contributor who has given more than \$200 in a calendar year for their employment information twice, once when the contribution was solicited and in at least one written follow up.

In the previous elections we considered, the city of Worcester required district-level candidates and school board candidates to file campaign finance reports with the city, and the city made these reports available on its website. In contrast to the city-wide candidates, candidates who file with the city but not the state are not required to file their data electronically. While state-level filings can easily be sorted or converted into spreadsheet format, those who file with the city submit reports on paper, which are then scanned by the city and made available as pdf files. While we have total fundraising amounts for these candidates, then, we were not able to analyze data on individual contributions. A change in Massachusetts law for the 2011 election, however, required district candidates to file with the state; we thus for the first time have the ability to analyze contributions to district candidates (although our ability to compare district candidates across election years remains limited). School committee candidates, however, still file with the city only.

### Campaign Finance in City-Wide Races

Table 1 lists the candidates for at-large seats according to their vote share. It seems here that there are four classes of candidates. First, there are the incumbent mayor and the two competitive mayoral candidates, each of whom raised over \$30,000 (although Lukes's sum, as discussed in the table's footnote, was largely a carryover from the past election). Second, Toomey and Rushton, the two incumbent councilors *not* running for mayor but relatively certain of reelection, raised less than \$15,000, well below the average for incumbent councilors and well below what each had raised in past elections. Third, the most threatened incumbent, Michael Germain, and the strongest nonincumbent, Stephen Buchalter, both raised slightly over \$30,000. And fourth, there are the remaining nonincumbents, who raised little money.

[Table 1 about here]

Table 2 shows the sources of funds for the at-large candidates. Reading across the table, it is evident that three candidates, Petty, O'Brien, and Germain, received the bulk of the PAC money; most PACs active in the election were labor unions, as discussed below. There was little self-financing in 2011, especially in comparison with previous elections. Incumbent Mayor Joe O'Brien and councilor Kate Toomey have far smaller contributions, on average, than other candidates, while nonincumbent Stephen Buchalter has much larger contributions than average. Petty and Buchalter also received 39 of the 56 individual contributions of \$500 or more. And on average, the candidates received approximately one-third of their campaign funds in individual donations from outside Worcester; Petty, O'Brien, and Buchalter received far more than most other candidates, but as a percentage they relied only slightly more on donors residing outside of Worcester than did Lukes, Toomey, Rushton, or Germain.

[Table 2 about here]

It can be difficult to make meaningful comparisons across elections, given the small number of seats in the city's at-large elections. Petty raised more money than any candidate had in 2009, although he raised substantially less than the establishment-supported 2005 and 2007 mayoral candidates. Average receipts for incumbent council members were slightly lower in 2011 than in any of the previous three cycles; averages for successful candidates were also lower than in any of these cycles. Average receipts for nonincumbents were also lower than in the past three cycles, and were barely half what they were in 2009. Clearly some of the variation for incumbents and for winners is driven by the number of strong mayoral candidates; in 2007 and 2009 at least three incumbent councilors ran for mayor or planned to run, while in 2011 there were only two candidates from the council running for mayor. There is also variation from year to year in the number of competitive nonincumbents; in each year there have been some candidates who raised little or no money, but there were more such candidates in 2011. A more accurate way to measure changes over time, then, is to look at repeat candidates. The six council incumbents had all run before, and all but one had run for mayor at some point. As Table 3 shows, mayoral candidates tend to raise about twice as much as council candidates who are not running for mayor; amounts for mayoral candidates and for non-mayoral candidates are relatively constant from one year to the next. Three of the at-large incumbents – Toomey, Lukes, and Rushton – have shown an ability to raise substantial sums of money in past elections even though they raised rather modest sums in 2011.

[Table 3 about here]

Yet another way to make comparisons, of course, is to get the input of the candidates themselves. Below we discuss the comments of some of the individual at-large candidates about the role of money in their campaigns.

*Kate Toomey:* In the 2011 race for Worcester city council, Kate Toomey raised a total of \$15,280 for her reelection. With that amount she was able to garner 12.5 percent of the vote, totaling 9,571 votes. Toomey has a wide range of individuals that support her political career for a variety of reasons. She receives money from the Worcester area and also from areas outside of

Worcester as well. Her endorsements from businesses are not a large part of her fundraising technique. However, she does employ certain methods in order to raise her funds.

According to Toomey, those that have supported her in her past bids for reelection to city council have done so out of support for her as an individual and her ideology. Voters seem to be most concerned with her views on how the council can improve Worcester. They are also concerned about bringing business to Worcester and how Worcester can become more favorable for businesses. Increasing the quality of life in Worcester is another issue that Toomey cites as important to those that vote for her. Teachers support Toomey because of her views on education in the city. Law enforcement individuals also support her because of the work she has done in the past on the safety committee. There are some businesses that have supported Toomey in an attempt to gain access. However, those that have wanted her to conform to their will were promptly offered a refund on their donations. As a political official for the city of Worcester, Toomey does not advocate for anything other than what is best for the city and its inhabitants.

Those that are most likely to vote for Toomey are middle aged individuals in Worcester. She cites this age range as those that she is close to. A great deal of her support politically and financially comes from friends and family in the area. She has been in office for thirteen years allowing her to meet and get to know many of her constituents. Many of the donations that she receives from outside of Worcester are individuals that have supported her in the past, but have moved out of Worcester. The amount that she receives from outside of Worcester is right in line with the amounts received by other candidates. Recently she has been gaining greater support from younger individuals. This could be attributed to her Facebook presence. Much of the information regarding her office and campaigns can be found on her Facebook page allowing for another way in which voters can identify with Toomey and learn more about her.

Some of Toomey's largest contributors include attorneys in the city of Worcester. She does not cite many other industries from which she receives larger contributions. Political Action Committees are also not very active at the local level. They are reserved for state level politics, at least in Massachusetts. She has received important endorsements in the past. However, she says that in the end they are not as important as the endorsement that you receive in the voting booth. The voters are the ones that put you in office and it is important to represent what they want from their local government. It is very important for her to connect with the voters. They have to be able to identify with her as a candidate. Without this connection, voters are less likely to vote for her come election day. There are certain methods that she employs in order to make these connections.

Councilwoman Toomey uses basic fundraising techniques in order to raise money for her campaigns. She holds fundraising events in order to solicit donations. The race in which she ran for mayor, she employed the use of the internet in order to gain more support. She cites herself as being a frugal individual. For her campaigns, she has designed her own mailings and had them printed by a local printer. She also had previously printed large signs that she would distribute. However, in more recent elections, she has moved more to bumper stickers for supporters. This has allowed her to be able to conserve her funds and use them efficiently.

Toomey does not spend excess time fundraising. She, like most candidates, does not like fundraising. However, it is a necessary evil. The message that she wishes to convey to the voters cannot be distributed without money. As a political candidate who wishes to run for reelection, you cannot stop fundraising. Fundraising takes time, dedication, and perseverance. On her last election, Toomey did not spend as much as she had in the past. Over the last thirteen years, Toomey has had to use her own money in order to sustain her campaign. She estimates the use of her own funds throughout her campaigns for city council as close to forty thousand dollars of self-financing.

In 2012, Kate Toomey is running for State Representative of the 15<sup>th</sup> Worcester District. This is a new campaign for Toomey. She has run for reelection several times as a city councilor. However, this will be her first state representative race. Her strategy for fundraising has to evolve in order to run a successful state representative race. She has to hire professionals that have experience in raising funds at this level of politics. For her new race, she expects to have to raise close to \$35,000 in order to be competitive. This is different from the amount that she has had to raise in the past to win reelection to city council. In her last election, she was able to be reelected with less than half of the amount she expects to need for her run for State Representative.

*Joseph Petty*<sup>3</sup>: In 2011, Joseph Petty was elected to his eighth term on the Worcester City Council, and his first term as City Mayor. The mayor of Worcester chairs the City Council and School Committee and is also considered the ceremonial and political leader. While campaigning, Petty highlighted his position as executive secretary to the Employees' Retirement System of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency, and stressed his experience at this position and his record of making significant accomplishments. Petty also played on his tenure as a seven-term Councilman and his accomplishments on the Council, such as the construction of two high schools, the CitySquare project, the bio-technology industry growth in Worcester, and the emerging Blackstone Canal District.

Overall, Petty ran a positive campaign that focused on his record and the city's issues, despite Konnie Lukes' negative advertisements against him. He explained, "people look at Washington these days and they are getting frustrated; they want someone coming in who is going to be positive for the city and be a cheerleader" (Foskett 2011c). Petty claimed that his campaign would focus on four topics: public education, job growth, public safety and neighborhoods. Petty also claimed that change needed to occur with Worcester's tax arrangement because of the diminishing commercial tax foundation. Petty had been deemed the "quiet man" of the City Council, but claimed during his mayoral-election that he would be louder and more direct in his approach.

The previous Mayor Joseph O'Brien's announcement that he would not be seeking reelection (discussed above) caught many people by surprise, including Joe Petty. Petty announced his mayoral candidacy through the same article in the *Telegram and Gazette* that announced the news of O'Brien. Petty had not yet assembled a team for his mayoral campaign,

---

<sup>3</sup> We were not able to interview Mayor Petty; the description below is drawn from news accounts and our own analysis of Petty's campaign finance filings.

and the team had their first meeting the night before the preliminary election. Congressman James P. McGovern (D-MA) endorsed Petty's candidacy in October 2011. McGovern explained that Petty would be a great leader for the Worcester community and the groundbreaking projects underway. The Congressman also stated, "but he won't get the award for being the flashiest guy" (Kush 2011a). Petty acknowledged that the Congressman's reputation and support in the area was responsible for the financial boost late in the campaign. Petty also explained that other endorsements, such as those from previous Mayor O'Brien, and labor and business groups were also extremely beneficial. Petty obtained a significant amount of support from other political leaders in Massachusetts; the election committees of James P. McGovern, James O'Day, Mary Keefe, Joseph Early, Michael Moore, Vincent A. Pedone and John Binienda made contributions to Petty's campaign. Petty received more contributions outside of Worcester than any other candidate, a total of \$16,420. This could be explained by his endorsements from prominent political figures that garnered attention from donors outside of the area. Joseph Petty raised the most of all City Council candidates, a total of \$49,325. He also received more financial support from political action committees (PACs) than any other candidate, a total of \$6,050. Most of these PAC contributions came from unions in the Worcester area. His tenure on the Council along with significant endorsements from political leaders garnered a lot of attention from donors and PACs in the Worcester area and ultimately led to a successful campaign.

*Steve Buchalter:* The 2011 election was Steve Buchalter's second time running as a candidate for Worcester City Council. He narrowly lost the sixth seat on the Council both in 2009 and 2011. Buchalter considered his first year running as a huge learning experience after exhausting his campaign treasury and having to donate personal funds to his campaign. After taking some time off after the 2009 election, he developed new strategies for his 2011 campaign.

Buchalter presents a unique perspective of bringing change to the Worcester community. He believes that Worcester's success is dependent on attracting businesses and benefitting from the tax revenue they create. Due to his reputation as CEO of Enterprise Cleaning Corporation and his pro-business views, Buchalter received a great deal of support from the business community. He also received the most in large donations, a total of 21 contributions of \$500 or more. According to Buchalter, these large contributions were mainly from businesses owners. Buchalter targeted influential business and political leaders as captains for his "campaign kick off." He received support from Guy Glodis, then Worcester Sheriff, and Massachusetts State Senator, Michael Moore. Glodis spoke at many of Buchalter's events, and Moore gave constructive advice for his campaign. He believes that building a fundraising team is essential for the success of a campaign. The "kick off" was a big push for his 2011 campaign.

In 2011, Buchalter raised more than any other successful candidate, a total of \$31,645 compared to the average \$26,448 for incumbents. He explained that his contributors were a diverse group of people, but that he obtained a great amount of support from seniors. He visited several senior homes where the elderly loved his ideas of bringing back an energized business community to Worcester.

Unions in the Worcester community presented opposition to Buchalter's campaign, mainly because Enterprise Cleaning Corporation is a non-union shop. It was common for him to

witness unions picketing outside of his work and campaigning events. Unions also ran negative advertisements against him. Although this opposition hurt his business and campaign in some ways, the publicity presented his name to the public and allowed Buchalter to explain and personalize himself. Buchalter only received \$200 in political action committee (PAC) contributions. This is extremely low in comparison to other candidates. Opposition from unions can explain Buchalter's low support from PACs. Unions are a potent political force in the Worcester community. Not only can unions contribute directly to candidates, but they can also contribute indirectly. Buchalter explained how other candidates benefitted from unions picketing, campaigning, and mobilizing constituents on their behalf.

Running for City Council proved to be a more confusing process than Buchalter had originally anticipated. He explained that there is a lot of "grey area" when trying to be creative with a campaign, but he found that the campaign finance office was extremely helpful with explaining the rules. He also explained that campaigning is extremely financially demanding. He stated that raising funds is a "necessary evil", and recommended that a City Council candidate raise no less than \$30,000. Fundraising costs even on a local level, such as mailings, radio advertisements, and printing out signs are extremely expensive.

When running for an at-large race, Buchalter explained that it is impossible to go to every door and talk to constituents. In 2009, Buchalter focused a lot of his energy in door-to-door campaigning. He obtained a list of people who voted in the last 2 elections, and went after their votes because he viewed these voters as the most politically interested. He tried limited his time to one or two minutes for every doorstep, but quickly discovered that the stops could easily turn into an hour. Buchalter was enthusiastic about his platform, and found it hard to limit his time discussing his ideas with constituents that were interested. He advised that a candidate always go with someone else so that they can maintain quick stops from door to door. Unfortunately, Buchalter did a lot of his door-to-door campaigns by himself; his only availability was after work hours, and he did not have a large family base in Worcester that could help like other candidates.

Buchalter found that going door to door was not an extremely effective strategy for his second time running. He saw it as a lot of work for a "little touch." In 2011, he decided that being visible was the most effective strategy. He held up signs at intersections with the most traffic. He wanted to "create the appearance of being everywhere," and found this very effective after constituents began recognizing him outside of campaigning activities. Buchalter found that websites and the use of social media is not an effective tactic in campaigning on the local level. While it can be a useful tool for communicating with interested constituents, the most effective tool is appearing visible in constituents' everyday lives.

Buchalter was extremely hopeful for his 2011 campaign after experiencing such a narrow loss in 2009. He understands the power of incumbency, and learned from experience the toll that campaigning had on his business. While Buchalter is unsure of the future, he is considering another run in 2013.

*Michael Monfredo:* While most candidates will spend time raising money while running for office, Michael Monfredo did not raise any money whatsoever. This is because Monfredo, who

believes in grassroots politics, feels that money has caused politics to lose its natural way, corrupting the system and people involved in it. When we interviewed Monfredo, he told us he raised no money for his campaign, spending only \$500 of his own money. Monfredo used this money to make about 100 lawn signs and to print flyers. Monfredo also refused to advertise his campaign in *the Worcester Telegram & Gazette*. When several people tried to donate to his campaign, Monfredo gave the money back to the donors, explaining that he would not take any campaign contributions.

Despite having very little money, Monfredo's campaign did receive a few endorsements. The most well-known group to endorse him was the Worcester AFL-CIO. The only other endorsements Monfredo mentioned during the interview were those from the African Coalition, as well as one of the churches in Main South, near Crystal Park.

Monfredo stated in his interview that money and campaign finance is the main reason why he decided to campaign for a seat on the city council. He feels that, even on a local level, restrictions for campaign finance is necessary, as he feels that spending on politics has gotten out of hand. Monfredo also mentioned a comment that Joe O'Brien said back when he was mayor. O'Brien once stated that you need to have about \$20,000-30,000 in order to win a city council seat, something which Monfredo does not agree with. Monfredo claims that with that kind of mindset in the system, politicians will owe too many favors to their donors, which he feels is a waste of taxpayer dollars, particularly with the bad economy. Despite the feeling that money has overrun the system, Monfredo did point out that the candidate who finished in seventh place in the primary (Buchalter, discussed above) raised approximately \$35-40,000, while Monfredo finished eighth while spending only \$500. Nevertheless, Monfredo feels that the Worcester City Council does not represent the city very well.

*William Coleman:* William Coleman, a nutrition educator for the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, has made numerous bids for various offices since 1979. Although he hasn't won any yet, he still believes that there is chance. Coleman said, "Abraham Lincoln ran sixteen times unsuccessfully but then won the recognition and position." Coleman is familiar to many Worcester voters because of his track record of being part of various political causes, his regular column for a local newsweekly, *In City Times*, and his involvement with the local cable-access television channel WCCA. In 2003, when Worcester had no money to open up its pools and beaches Coleman initiated a campaign that raised over \$400,000 from private donations to provide summer recreation activities. As a member of the Commission on Elder Affairs, he was part of a team that advocated for the building of the Worcester Senior Center.

In our interview with him, Coleman noted that there have been well over twenty African American candidates that ran for office in Worcester, but each time they were unsuccessful. He also remembered being referred to as "that black guy who runs for office" during the 1980s and the "colored man with good ideas" in the 1990s, and being told then that Worcester was not ready to elect a black man. Coleman said that initially back in the days, his donors sent checks below \$50 so their names would not be reported. There were actual backlashes against those who support him. But, Coleman says, money isn't the only issue, that the media not only ignores but instills the notion that support for Coleman is wasted because he is going to lose. It is hard to



break that image. He said campaign fundraising is a different animal from campaigning, and that he prefers to dedicate his time to learning the issues, and giving speech at church, mosque, synagogue, and various other events to educate and hear the needs of Worcester's people.

Coleman claims that his biggest supporters are senior citizens and those who are over fifty years of age. However, in terms of finance, he believes he has to take that burden given that most of the people he speaks to have no money to give. He sees the need for them to have political path to voice their concern.

In terms of his overall perspective on campaign finance law, Coleman has no problem with anyone giving anyone money, however, government must take initiatives to first by educating citizens, and removing the various restrictions on how, where, and when voters vote.

*Devin Coleman:* Devin Coleman brought a unique and youthful aspect to the 2011 Worcester City Council elections. As a 21-year-old running for an at-large seat, Coleman was one of the youngest candidates to ever throw his hat in the ring. While his bid for election was ultimately unsuccessful, Coleman was able to do an admirable job of raising funds and disseminating his message that regardless of how old you are, if you know what you are talking about you should be taken seriously.

Early on, Coleman acknowledged that he had a difficult time raising money. The campaign began in earnest by setting up a PayPal account on the newly established website. The website alone did not garner much attention, and only raised about thirty dollars. Next, Coleman tried to take advantage of his connection to the Masonic temple of Worcester where he is a member. Coleman noted that a lot of big promises were made, but few came through.

The turning point for Coleman was being invited to a fundraising party for district council candidate Tony Economou. There he was introduced to the various union heads that donate heavily to city council campaigns, and have great influence over Worcester city politics. Some of the notable unions that gave to Coleman's campaign were the Teamsters, Central Massachusetts AFL-CIO, and the Plumbers and Pipefitters Local #4. Coleman was able to attract the attention of Sean Maher, the head of the largest union of governmental employees in the area. Coleman's campaign was able to impress potential supporters with its hard work and determination. Coleman was able to collect 1,100 signatures to get him on the ballot when only 300 was needed; this, according to Coleman, represented the largest number of signatures collected in Worcester city council history. Coleman explained that gaining the support of the unions was a domino effect, as he had to prove he could get the smaller unions on board as he worked his way up. Coleman also mentioned that it was important to keep returning to the unions throughout the campaign and asking them to kick in more money, and the final totals donated represent a number of multiple donations.

In total Coleman was able to raise slightly better than \$4,000 through his campaign, and every penny was spent. Much of the money was spent on 250 lawn signs, which were placed at various points throughout the city. Campaign funds also went towards palm cards as well as two large signs, and much of it went toward entrance fees for forums hosted by various influential

groups like the Worcester Senior Center, which required a donation. Lastly, a large portion went toward a *Worcester Magazine* advertisement that was purchased in the days leading up to Election Day.

Coleman explained that while he felt proud of his fund raising efforts, he believes that about \$15,000 would have been the ideal amount for developing name recognition. Overall, Coleman mentioned that he felt the election laws were fair and wouldn't say that was the reason he wasn't able to raise more money.

## Campaign Finance in District Elections

2011 marks the first election cycle in which district candidates also filed their contribution information with the state of Massachusetts. It is apparent in the district data (shown in Table 4) that district elections are as expensive, if not more so, than citywide elections. It is also easy to identify the labor-supported candidates in these data; in each race there is one candidate who substantially outraises the others in PAC money. The district data present a wide range of different fundraising profiles, however. We have one race (the First District) in which the incumbent's fundraising totals reflect an unsuccessful 2010 run for state representative; Smith had substantial PAC support and support outside of Worcester but this was not enough to help him to win the preliminary election. The two candidates who went on to run in the general election were evenly matched financially, although one candidate relied primarily on her own checkbook. In the city's third district, an open seat, the victorious candidate actually spent more than all but one of the citywide candidates, en route to a narrow victory. That candidate, George Russell, raised nearly \$20,000 in individual contributions and also spent \$14,000 of his own money, while his opponent received heavy labor support. In this city's fourth district, the two candidates were evenly matched financially in a race that was ultimately not very close. And in the city's fifth district, the incumbent raised almost ten times as much as his opponent yet won with less than sixty percent of the vote. Clearly, there are many different stories at work here.

[Table 4 about here]

Table 5 considers the recent history of competition in each of the five districts. At the district level, 2011 was clearly the most expensive and most competitive of the past three elections. This competition was driven in part by the open third district, but the first and fourth districts, which had been competitive in each of the past two cycles, saw somewhat more spending than in past years – spending which led to the defeat of both incumbents.

[Table 5 about here]

As was the case for the at-large candidates, we focus here on the comments of several of the individual district council candidates:

*Joff Smith:* Joff Smith served three terms as the Representative of Worcester's First District until his defeat in the 2011 elections to challenger Tony Economou. As the youngest person to ever be elected to the Worcester city council, Smith broke from the usual demographics of city politicians. In 2010 Smith ran for state representative as well as reelection on the city council in 2011. Smith raised \$32,000 in contributions for his reelection campaign. Of this money, \$5,950 came from PAC contributions and the remaining balance came from individual contributions. Smith raised \$12,250 from family, friends, and business associates outside of Worcester. He received many large donations. Of his total receipts, 26 were donations of \$500 or more. Smith said that this was not a strategy of his campaign. He said networking allowed him to raise large donations, which gave him the ability to reach out to smaller donors too, and ultimately, a diversity of support.

Smith's operation was a multifaceted approach to campaigning. He tried to run his campaign from a grassroots level by going door-to-door and meeting with members of his district, campaigning as if he did not have money, while simultaneously using his money to reach every member of his constituency. The money that he raised went to mailings, printings for door-to-door campaigning, a campaign software system, and inserts in a local newspaper. Smith also utilized fundraising events to receive a concentration of donations at one time. Smith felt that as a councilor and candidate that money could be a distraction, but is a necessary evil in politics. Smith said that a great message and position is for naught if there is no money for promotions.

*Tony Economou:* Tony Economou is now in his first term on the city council, having defeated incumbent Joff Smith in the preliminary election and another candidate, Virginia Ryan, in the general election. As a local realtor, housing contractor and Worcester native, Economou amassed support largely from small individual donors. By the end of the 2011 filing period, the Economou Committee raised a total of just over \$25,000, nearly \$7,000 less than Smith. According to Economou, the vast majority of his campaign contributions came from individuals, nearly all of which came from Worcester residents, with a select few coming from family and friends outside of the city. Of his total receipts, only \$1,150 came from unions and PACs, and Economou only received six donations of \$500 or more, as opposed to the incumbent's 26 \$500 donations. Economou believes that his ability to raise small donations came from his capacity to present himself to his constituents as a city councilor who will look at two sides of an issue rather than make decisions for the municipality out of haste.

Economou noted that people did ask what his party affiliation was, but he was able to successfully garner support and donations by his ability to make connections with people that transcended party affiliation. Economou said that he raised his money from individuals by going door to door and into the community to tell people what he was doing and what his positions were as a candidate. Economou received donations from two unions, which he believes spoke to his standing in the community as a realtor/housing contractor and someone who will try to improve Worcester's infrastructure.

Although the incumbent, Joff Smith, outraised him, Economou acknowledges that his ability to raise as much money as he did aided his success in running for office. Economou said that although he thinks people voted for him based on his merit and his positions, it is expensive to get that message out to Worcester residents. Economou spent money on advertisements and mailings to inform people of his candidacy and what he intended to offer his constituents as a city councilman. Economou is comfortable with the state of campaign finance in Worcester. He believes that although raising money takes time, it is part of the process of running for office, and it allows candidates to meet with their constituents and convey their message.

*Phil Palmieri:* While last year was a competitive one for the various districts, Phil Palmieri did not have an opponent, and has not had one for roughly 6 years, which he attributes to his high success as councilor of District Two and his constituency service. He has not held a fundraiser in over two years, but yet he has still, as he worded it, “outraised every other City Councilor in Worcester” due to the lack of an opponent and his continued success at his position. Palmieri does maintain a respectable balance in his campaign treasury and clearly could raise money if he had the need.

District Two contains a mixture of different types of neighborhoods, including some poor and moderate income neighborhoods and the campuses of the University of Massachusetts Medical School and Worcester Polytechnical Institute. With such a diverse area, Palmieri has many competing demands from constituents. However, throughout his twelve years of working as city councilor, Palmieri stressed that his constituents were the “number one priority” of his job description. Palmieri has worked hard towards various street and sidewalk repair throughout his district, believes that revitalizing Green Hill Park is high on the city’s to-do list and has worked towards various improvements to Union Station and a build-out.

*George Russell:* George J. Russell is a licensed Real Estate broker, and the owner of George Russell Realty. He also served eight years on the Worcester Planning Board, including three years as Planning Board Chairman. He helped write the City’s Zoning Ordinance. He is serving his first two-year term as District 3 Councilor after garnering enough votes to beat our Arthur Ellis in 2011. District 3, one of Worcester’s less wealthy districts, includes several neighborhoods in the south east section of Worcester.

Asked for his general impression of the finance system in Worcester he conceded that money played a big role in his election. He argued that being able to finance a campaign was a necessity and that this was a “very difficult” task. Inevitably, he said special interests played a role and that anybody donating would more than likely look to fulfill some sort of agenda. However, Russell was fortunate due to his occupation and his vast network of childhood friends that still live in Worcester and contribute to local campaigns. Through these connections, along with a personal loan of \$14,000, Russell was able to raise enough money to be competitive in his race while avoiding large donations from political action committees and out of state contributions.

Russell held two large fund-raising events throughout the course of his campaign which helped bolster support amongst his “conservative democratic” supporters. Because of his successful realty business along with close personal ties to members of his constituency Russell was able to spread his name very quickly and garnered name recognition relatively easily. However, powerful city-wide labor unions and political action committees chose to support his opponent, Arthur Ellis.

Midway through the race, the district’s retiring incumbent, Paul Clancy, endorsed Russell helping to cement his victory for the council seat. Russell says that this helped his campaign tremendously and was “very important.” He does not believe that the mayor's race had any impact on his council campaign. Asked how much money he thinks one needs to run an effective race in the city of Worcester he said that for him this number was \$35,000, the amount that he raised. When asked if he was satisfied with campaign finance laws surrounding council races in the city he said yes.

*Sarai Rivera:* Sarai Rivera, a community activist, a first-generation Puerto Rican-American, and a Worcester native, ousted incumbent Barbara Haller in the District 4 city councilor race. According to the *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, Rivera won eight out of the ten precincts in the district. During her campaign, Rivera raised \$17,701 by the end of the election. Rivera’s fundraising mainly consisted of speaking to constituents and asking for donations. However, she also utilized social media as a means of not only reaching out to voters, but also to ask for donations as there were links on her website and social media pages which allowed people to donate directly. Besides Internet and other media resources, Rivera also turned to telephoning voters across the district. Not only did Rivera receive donations from Worcester residents, she also received contributions from individuals in other Central and Eastern Massachusetts cities. Since Rivera is a certified therapist, various Psychiatric offices and organizations donated to her campaign generously. She also received donations from local businesses, such as Liberty Construction, whose CEO gave Rivera the maximum donation of \$500.

Given Rivera’s unique background as a first-generation Puerto Rican American and her district’s multiethnic demographics, Rivera was able to generate funds from the large Hispanic community in Worcester as well as other minority communities such as the Vietnamese residents in the area. Overall, Rivera’s fundraising comprised of small donations from individual voters and some local businesses in the area. Additionally, most of Rivera’s constituents had progressive views.

Rivera’s view of campaign financing and regulation echoes that of other candidates in the area. While Rivera acknowledges the necessity of money in campaigns, she understands the difficulty of fundraising, specifically of having to ask people for money since there are always individuals who are less inclined to donate than others.

*William Eddy:* William Eddy was first elected to City Council for District 5 in 2007. Since that very close victory, Eddy has had the good fortune of not having an opponent in 2009 and has been able to build a reputation in his district. This has translated to Eddy’s donations changing

from close friends and business associates, mostly from Boston, in 2007 to a larger donation base within the district in 2011. This phenomenon and the type of opponent he has gone up against in 2011 have resulted in Eddy raising about \$10,000 more in his initial bid for City Council in 2007 than in the previous election. The aforementioned lack of an opponent in 2009 also allowed Eddy to take a somewhat unpopular position within the city, opposing the lowest residential tax rate. Eddy stands by his position and states that he did not break any campaign promises in 2009 and claims the large residential tax laws put a majority of the burden on businesses. However, he understands the unpopularity of the opinion and expected the decision to produce an opponent in 2011.

Eddy's 2011 opponent, James Kalogeropoulos is a graduate of Worcester Polytechnic Institute and a successful realtor. His occupation as a realtor inspired his campaign, as he believes the Council should have looked at home assessment questions months ago. Like most other politicians in the city, he favors the lowest residential tax law and criticizes Eddy's position on it. Kalogeropoulos has clearly stated that he respects Eddy, but he has not been shy about criticizing Councilman Eddy's for his alleged spotty attendance record his reluctance to debate Kaleogeropoulos.

One of the influential aspects of Councilor Eddy's political career was his presence on the Worcester Democratic Committee Chair for multiple years. He claims this helped him in two ways. First, he was able to connect with many people and organization that understood the political arena and would later become potential resources during his City Council campaigns. Second, this position provided Eddy with the opportunity to run campaigns for other candidates, which allowed him to gain a deeper understanding of the fundamental and intricate features of being a candidate.

In respect to campaign finance laws, Eddy claims he is in support of local and Massachusetts laws, but opposes the national trajectory and *Citizens United*. Eddy believes the local laws require more organizational skills. His own personal experience with campaign financing is mixed. His long history in politics has left him capable of running a campaign, but he claims that he does not enjoy fundraising because he finds it hard to ask people for money.

Eddy's approach to campaigning is a traditional and realistic one. He champions raising and spending only what is necessary. Councilor Eddy perceives money as a vehicle to get your message across and only that. The 5<sup>th</sup> District has a relatively large turnout rate, usually in the neighborhood of 25 percent, but that still leaves most of the district out. Eddy approaches this phenomenon as do most local politicians. Very early in the campaign Eddy attempts to set his sights on the potential voters and only target them. These may be individuals with a history of voting or involvement in political causes. True to his doctrine, Eddy has spent almost all that he raised in his 2011 campaign.

In 2009, Eddy had no opponent and raised little money. In the 2011 election, Councilor Eddy believed he would be unopposed once again due to the lack of a candidate as late as May. Most candidates file their papers by April due to the time constraints. His opponent, James Kalogeropoulos, entered the race very late, allowing little time for himself and for Eddy to raise money and execute a campaign. Eddy voiced his displeasure in having to run a campaign and

raise money to fund it at the same time. He has stated that he will never allow himself to be put into this situation again.

Apart from his initial bid for office, Eddy raises money for his campaigns by holding events and mail solicitation campaigns. The events are executed as either \$100 or \$1 events, with the latter usually being executed in the fall of a non-election year and before summer of an election year. But, due the late start, Eddy was forced to run these events as necessary throughout the summer and fall of 2011. He was also forced solicit money by mail later in the campaign and more often than he would have liked. This is demonstrated in the data by the fact that 78 of the total 138 donations came in a four-month period.

When he ran for the first time in 2007, Eddy spent about seventy percent of the roughly \$31,000 he raised on voter contact in order to get his message across and build a reputation and name recognition. This voter contact spending was characterized by face-to-face contact, paid media, and telephone calls. Since then, Eddy has had the ability to rely more on his record and reputation, while focusing his funds on other things. Eddy has not utilized social media at all, but is planning to pursue this outlet shortly. One example of paid media that Eddy utilized was advertisement in a local Jewish magazine. Eddy has invested long term into picket signs since the cost per sign decreases as he purchases more. The cost per sign is about \$5 to buy enough for one election, but he has purchased signs for 2013 and 2015 to drive the price closer to \$3. Eddy spends roughly \$1000 on his mailings.

In the 2011 campaign, Eddy raised \$21,360 to Kalogeropoulos's \$3,700. Although the Councilman did not know every donor on a personal level, he recognizes a majority of the names and is able to form an educated guess as to why they contributed to his campaign. As mentioned earlier, Eddy received more donations from inside his district than he did in previous years. An indicator of the decreased reliance on Boston is shown by the fact that \$6,075 of the total \$21,360 came from outside Worcester. Like most others, Eddy also received other donations coming from either friends or family from the surrounding areas. Several of Eddy's relatively large donations came from politically active individuals who regularly contribute to candidates. Among these are Paul Giorgio, the Krock family, David Coyne, and other local individuals who may not know Eddy on a personal level, but recognize his message. Eddy received \$2,375 in PAC contributions and a couple donations from local roofing and plumber unions. Overall, he received four donations of \$500 or more. Three of these came from the Krock family and one came from the Plumbers and Pipefitters Local #4. Apart from these, only one donation broke \$400 and only three donations broke \$300. Kalogeropoulos received 16 donations with only three of them breaking the \$300 mark. These individuals were local residents and first time contributors. The contributors' occupations ranged from realtors to donut shop owners to auto care shop owners.

Eddy captured 59 percent of the vote and beat his opponent by almost 800 votes, the largest margin of victory among the contested district races. In its election preview, *Worcester Magazine* claimed that it would take a "laser-focused campaign to oust him" and in 2011 that seems to have been the case. He captured 8 of the total 10 precincts. Kalogeropoulos was able to capture a heavily Greek precinct and was barely able to hang on to his home precinct (under

twenty votes separated them). A friendly surprise for Eddy came in the form of unexpected support from the traditionally turnout-light part of the district surrounding Webster Square.

### Campaign Finance in School Committee Elections

Tables 6 and 7 show data for Worcester School Committee elections. In both tables, it is evident that money plays a very different role than in council elections. Incumbents, on average, raise less money than do nonincumbents. In 2011, three of the six incumbents raised virtually no money, and two of these three won easily. Each of the four nonincumbents outraised all but one of the incumbents. The one victorious nonincumbent candidate, however, raised far more than any other candidate. This candidate was Donna Colorio, who was the only Worcester candidate with extensive Tea Party support. Table 7 shows that the fundraising of incumbents in 2011 was not an aberration; in each of the other two years in our data, nonincumbents substantially outraised incumbents, yet the fundraising of nonincumbents appears to have little correlation with success. It does seem that victorious nonincumbents tend to raise more money than do most other candidates, but many of the best-financed nonincumbent candidates do not win.

[Tables 6 and 7 about here]

A broad review of the financial contributions received and of the expenditures made by candidates during the 2011 Worcester School Committee elections shows that School Committee fundraising follows a different logic than the financing of other political campaigns in the city and the conventional view of campaign finance in other types of elections. During this election cycle ten candidates campaigned for six at-large positions. According to the *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, “spending on this year’s School Committee race has so far ranged from \$0 to \$6,400, depending on the candidate, and that figure (gross amount of funds spent) doesn’t seem to have much to do with electability” (Reis 2011). For example, by the October 31, 2011 filing date, candidates Brian O’Connell and Mary J. Mullaney had both spent no money at all, and candidate Jack L. Foley had spent only \$927. Candidates O’Connell and Foley, though they both received and spent significantly limited funds compared to other candidates, experienced great electoral success as they maintained their positions and polled in the top tier of candidates. To expand upon this point, O’Connell has been the top vote-getter in each of the last eight School Committee election cycles, and is yet is without a campaign expenditure as of that filing date. Overall, in 2011 fundraising and spending generally lagged behind that of years past. As in other years, challengers outspent incumbents, and incumbents have generally had more cash-on-hand in the later phases of the election cycle than non-incumbents. Many candidates opted to self-finance portions of their elections and currently owe themselves money. A review of these data likewise reveals that name recognition and previous experience on the committee translated into more electoral success than did money.

*Jack L. Foley:* The electoral success of candidate Jack L. Foley, incumbent Worcester School Committee member and Vice President of Government and Community Affairs at Clark University, shows that incumbency is more important role than the gross amount of contributions



received. Throughout our interview with him, Foley poked fun at the notion of the importance of contributions in the election process. When asked to speak broadly on how contributions were gathered and to describe the demographics of campaign donors, Foley stated, “well they were mostly super PAC’s, you know, \$20,000 cash donations that appeared miraculously.” Following this remark, Foley began to explain the small network of donors, mainly family members, friends, and coworkers that donated the “few hundred dollars” needed to sustain his 2011 campaign. In regards to donors, Foley stated, “I received three donations, two \$50 donations and one \$200 donation, all unsolicited. In years past I have put out a mailer to the 100 potential donors I know and I normally received donations of about \$100 per person who donated.” In regards to fundraisers, Foley stated, “We have done fundraisers in the past, normally at friends’ houses, but not this past year. We normally raised \$1,500 to \$2,000 at those as well.” For Foley, similar to his fundraising efforts, his campaign staff and volunteers consisted largely of friends and “friends of friends,” and functioned with no campaign manager and no full-time staff. Foley has had limited campaign staff expenditures as close family members have assumed those positions and not requested payment.

Returning to the ongoing theme of the power of incumbency, Foley stated, “When I first ran in 1999, I raised about \$18,000, and what I did at that time as a new candidate, with some name recognition though work at Clark, was . . . spend a lot of that on signs, bumper stickers, and I bought far too many then I really needed, and they’ve lasted me 14-15 years.” In regards to fund raising, Foley said, “I was stunned initially when I ran, stunned that people would just give you money. . . but it’s a necessary evil to any campaign even school committee campaigns which are traditionally pretty low stakes.” Overall, a review of the data lends legitimacy to the claim that following the initial fundraising phase of first-time candidacy, as name-recognition and experience on the committee increase, the need to raise large amounts of funds through fundraisers and solicited donations decreases.

In regards to campaign expenditures and spending investments, Foley stated, “for this campaign I raised a couple hundred dollars, I didn’t do any fundraising at all, I had a couple thousand dollars left in my account, and I spent maybe \$400 of that on events, probably, buying ads, school programs.” Expenditure data from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance shows that Foley spent approximately \$120 on advertising at Doherty High School and \$100 on advertising at the Tatnuck Magnet School. Foley stated, “that year we also completed a four-page mailing, spent a sum on a four-page mailing and sent that to targeted voters, your super-voters, a cross tabulation of people who have voted in Presidential elections, primaries, municipal elections. . . and invest funds in attracting those voters.” In respect to expenditures, Foley stated, “I also did (in 1999) inserts in the *Telegram and Gazette*, again, targeting where people vote, rather than going city wide. . . along with a series of radio ads.” In regards to subsequent elections, Foley stated, “I’ve raised maybe two to four thousand dollars for each campaign since then. . . spending funds at Burncoat (High School), or Doherty High School, because there are an amount of visibility efforts that (one) needs to do (to maintain a presence).” Effectively, Foley utilized his initial investments in materials, combined that with his increasing experience on the committee after each successful election cycle, and invested in targeted advertising, especially in schools, which would attract potential voters (parents, teachers, administrators, and possibly some students) who held strong positions on education related issues.

In regards to the role of money in the 2011 election as a whole, Foley stated, “well, the thing is there that Mary Mullaney [the lone defeated incumbent] has not spent a dime in the past few races and decided to run on her record alone. . . (Donna) Colorio [the lone successful nonincumbent] spent approximately \$15,000, and raised a significant amount of energy around her campaign.” Further, Foley stated, “If she [Mullaney] would have raised maybe a thousand dollars, you know, and got out a bit, she maybe would have won, (funding) would have probably made a huge difference in the race as well as if she campaigned a bit.” Summing up this dynamic, Foley stated, “after four, six years of service, people either like your views or they don’t like your views, and they are (in the city of Worcester) going to vote for you or not based on your performance, not how much money you have behind your campaign.” Overall, an examination of Foley’s campaign finances supports this claim. Although money is a necessity early on in a candidate’s career in Worcester politics, campaign finance becomes increasingly less significant per election cycle, and amounts raised or spent per election cycle do not always exist as accurate indicators as to who will experience electoral success.

In regards to campaign finance regulation and the national trend toward deregulation, Foley stated, “I have concerns about (campaign finance) and how these Super PACs are driving some of these national campaigns, and beginning to reach into some of the more local campaigns. It’s not what I thought was intended for campaign finance.”

*Tracy O’Connell Novick:* Tracy Novick, one-term incumbent member and Vice-Chair of the Worcester School Committee, benefited from her incumbency during the 2011 election cycle and was hailed as a “watchdog” and proponent of further transparency during the Goddard School MCAS scandal, further boosting public support for her campaign. Similarly, as a mother of three, avid blogger on the topic of the connection between national and state educational policy on local Worcester schools, and former teacher herself, Novick has gained popular support and connection with voters as potential voters view her multiple experiences as an indicator of a wider sense of perspective on educational issues. However, in contrast to Foley and other candidates, money was still relevant to her campaign, as she continued to try to increase her name recognition. As of the October 31, 2011 reporting date, as reported by the *Telegram and Gazette*, Novick had similar to Foley, raised \$1,038, however she only had \$408 on hand.

Novick, like Foley, received the majority of her few donations from teachers, librarians, and parents of school-age children. In our interview, Novick stated, “(my) contributions came almost entirely from (the City of) Worcester, and of the surrounding community. . . meaning friends, family members. . . but (for the most part) a huge portion of my money came from within the city.” Furthermore, Novick stated that she has not had to raise as much money as other first-time candidates, and even during the 2009 election cycle raised the lowest amount of any nonincumbent candidate to gain a seat. As to the reasoning behind contributions received, Novick stated that, “in regards to the out-of-town contributions there were people who were just interested in the fact that I was running, or old friends from college that had learned of my candidacy through Facebook and wanted to donate due to those connections.” Similarly, Novick stated that she received donations from individuals who excited by the fact that she had elementary-age children of her own and understood the on-the-ground effects of certain policies

and practices, such as the elimination of librarian jobs, or through the loss of recess. Novick noted that campaign did receive a significant portion of small contributions that were below the Massachusetts mandated reporting amount of \$50.

In regards to Worcester campaign finance regulations, Novick stated “I don’t see the harm in telling everyone that donates (both cash and in-kind) they have to disclose that donation. Also, comparing Massachusetts to spending in School Committee elections which has skyrocketed, in places like Denver, Colorado, Massachusetts’s cap on donations at \$500 has been successful” for the most part in keeping out outside and interest group run-away spending. With the question of reform in mind, Novick noted that the practice of having to tie a campaign account to one of only a few banks can be intimidating for prospective candidates, and that a push should be made to allow candidates to use local banks or credit unions to maintain their campaign accounts because, as this is a part-time job for most candidates, the chance to make it to another bank before it closes during the day my logistically be difficult for certain candidates and campaign treasurers.

Novick said that she spent slightly more money overall during the 2011 election cycle due to the “purchase of a larger banner that was placed on (Interstate) 290.” According to Novick, the majority of campaign related expenditures were “\$20 here and \$20 there, and a small segment spent on fundraising and a couple of coffees [chances for possible voters or contributors to meet with the candidate].” In regards to fundraising, Novick stated, “we didn’t really have the need for a major fundraising push, but we did need to raise funds in certain cases that we wanted to hold events that cost money. We always tried to make our events very local.” In further discussion of the topic, Novick, similar to Foley, stated, “I loathe it . . . but it’s a necessity, I hate asking people for money, but that’s one of the difficult thing about politics. From a question of visibility you have to do it. I’d rather give speeches in front of thousands of people, but it’s just something that has to be done.”

On incumbency, Novick, like Foley, stated that, “the main power of incumbency is that people actually know you name.” Further, Novick stated that, “In the case of School Committee elections most people come in looking to vote for Mayor or for City Council and happen to vote for School Committee simply because it’s already on the ballot. Then they look down and say whom do I know? And vote accordingly.” Expenditures on media coverage in the forms of signage, radio and news paper ads, and visibility events helped foster this sense of name recognition for candidates. As Novick noted, “Worcester is the second largest city in New England, but in the case of voters in School Committee elections it behaves more like a small town. You receive contributions from people and groups you are friends with and meet, and people associated with them.”

## Individual Donors and PACs in Worcester Municipal Elections

Some of the questions one must ask to understand the role of individual contributors in Worcester are: who are the top individual contributors and who are they contributing to? Why do

they contribute? What are their interests? Do they contribute to candidates in state and federal elections as well? Do they contribute to more than one candidate, and if so, why? How much money comes from outside of Worcester, and why? All of these inquiries will add to our understanding of where political money comes from and how it influences the Worcester political system. Similar questions can be proposed for the role of PACs in local elections. Who are the top PAC's who are spending money on behalf of candidates? To what extent do they support them? Which candidates do they support? What are their interests? Has PAC spending increased dramatically since Citizen's United? Do PACs contribute more to incumbents, for access? What do the public/media think of PACs in Worcester? Answering these questions allows one to build a better understanding of campaign finance.

*Individual Contributions:* For information on individual contributions, data was retrieved from the Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF). Those who constitute a "top contributor" had donated over \$500 and had given to at least 3 candidates. Top contributors tend to be those who are in the upper class of Worcester voters, and have stable, reputable jobs. They are presidents and CEO's of companies, owners of businesses, attorneys, insurance agents, directors of programs and organizations, lobbyists, and among others. Homemakers who are donating large sums of money are almost always the wives of prominent business leaders. For example, Maritza Domaleski, a homemaker, donated \$500 to Joff Smith, and her husband, Richard Domaleski, the CEO of World Energy Solutions, donated \$500 to Smith as well. It is likely that the total of \$1000 coming from the Domaleski's address is actually coming from Mr. Domaleski, but it submitted separately under the wife and the husband's name. Therefore, while it may look like there is a decent amount of everyday, non-working voters giving to candidates, it is more likely that it is really the same prominent members of the community who are giving the money, but under their wives' names. While not everyone lists their occupation, those who have made it clear that there is an elite class who provides the fuel for candidates' campaigns.

These contributors also tend to be fairly (if not more than fairly) political people. They are aware and care about politics, at least to the extent that it affects them, and they find value in contributing to a candidate. One example of this is David Coyne, a resident of Worcester's fifth district, and the Director of Hillel at Clark University. Mr. Coyne considers himself a politically involved person, and has volunteered for, contributed to, and even professionally staffed political campaigns since the 1980s. It is safe to say that not every voter in Worcester can claim this level of political activity; Mr. Coyne's profile is unique to that of a top contributor in Worcester. They are much more politically aware and active than the average voter. Even if they are not as active in volunteering for campaigns today, they were likely fairly active when they were younger and had more time to devote to volunteer work. Sean Murray, a lawyer in downtown Worcester, has a similar profile to that Mr. Coyne's. Mr. Murray has volunteered for city council, mayoral, and statewide elections since the early 1990's, and would consider himself a political person. While politics does not necessarily drive his everyday life or his career, he is very politically aware and attuned to those who align with his ideology and values. Mr. Murray stated that he was very aware of the realities of campaigning—that campaigns need money in order to stand a strong chance in winning—which drives his willingness to give to those who he agrees with. This awareness is something that much of the community lacks, and therefore they lack the motivation to give.

Another aspect of individual contributions to examine is who these contributors give to. Do they tend to give to more than one candidate? The answer tends to be yes. This may be primarily because, unlike in state and federal elections in which the voters votes for one person for each seat (i.e. president, senator, governor, etc.), voters voter for multiple city council members. There is one councilor for a voter's specific district, and then there are six at large candidates which the voter must select. Since voters are selecting as many as seven candidates to support, it is not a surprise that we see them donating money to multiple people whom they support.

Since partisanship is not a directly labeled in Worcester city council elections, we don't necessarily see whether contributors giving solely to Democrats or Republicans by examining their loyalty to one candidate. Choosing who to contribute to is based much more on which councilor you think is doing a good job, which candidate you know or like personally or believe to have good character, and which one will potentially give you access or benefit you or your business in some way. More than one candidate is likely to satisfy one or more of these characteristics, so contributors tend to give accordingly. Incumbency plays a role in who contributors donate to, but only to an extent. A contributor may be more inclined to give to an incumbent, but more so because the incumbent has a record that one can refer to and if one likes what the incumbent has been doing, he may see no reason not to give to him. Conversely, the contributor may not dislike a challenger, but since there is no record to look at, and they may not have any problems with the incumbent, they maintain the status quo and contribute to the incumbent.

Most voters have an interest in electing good candidates because they live in Worcester and will reap the benefits or feel the consequences of those councilors. It is fairly simple to explain why someone would contribute money to a candidate who will impact them directly; however, it is slightly more complicated to understand why someone living outside of Worcester would contribute money to Worcester city council elections. There are contributions from people who live in towns and cities outside of Worcester, and they generally tend to come in large amounts. However, this is less than half of the total contributions that came from Worcester. Most donations to Worcester city council elections come from inside Worcester itself, but there are a few key contributors from outside Worcester who provide a large chunk of money in the elections (\$11,275). This shows that there is a very select group of people from outside of Worcester, who have interests in Worcester, and therefore donate their money. These people may work in Worcester, may do business with people or other businesses in Worcester, may have family there, or may know the politician running on a personal or professional level. Most people giving to Worcester elections are those who live within Worcester and would be concerned with the results of an election in their city for obvious reasons.

Top contributors in Worcester often give or haven given to elections outside of Worcester. Both David Coyne and Sean Murray have given to campaigns outside of Worcester, either because they know the candidate personally, or they want to elect one more member to Congress who will vote in a way they favor. This reasoning may help to explain why those from cities outside of Worcester contribute to Worcester elections.

*Political Action Committees (PACs):* The other piece to the puzzle is PACs. While PACs have been huge players in federal elections, we also see them increasing their sway in local elections. These PACs tend to be committees formed by businesses, labor unions and organizations, and candidate committees. These include PACs for the United Steelworkers Association, the Roofer's Union, the Worcester Police Officials union, the Voter Education Fund, the Worcester-Fitchburg Building Trades Council, Renaissance Adult Health Care Center, and a variety of candidate committees such as the Committee to Elect Harriet Chandler. There are few ideologically driven advocacy/interest groups contributing to local elections in Worcester. This may be because the elections are not partisan, so ideology-centered interests groups may not find a candidate they are passionate about supporting. Additionally, interest groups may not be concerned with who is on the city council, because the city council does not deal with issues that the interest groups are concerned with. Social movements tend to pick up speed at the state and federal level, and local politicians are not so concerned with issues such as affirmative action, gay rights, abortion, and immigration policy in respect to their role as a city councilor. Since most interest or advocacy groups are focused around these big issues, and city council members do not generally deal much with these issues, interest groups may not have the incentive to contribute to them.

The individual contributors whom we interviewed did not seem to be concerned about PACs infiltrating the system. The media does not tend to focus much on PAC activity in Worcester, and it is mostly the unions and trade organizations giving money, not more controversial groups. They said that in local elections, at least, too much money has not been a problem. Both interviewees recognized that money has been overwhelmingly influential in federal and state elections, but they also realize that money is important for political success, and so they contribute. They did not have a problem with PAC contributions at the local level, as they are also subject to contribution limits, and do not tend to have high independent expenditures. In fact, the International Brothers of Police Officers (IBPO) is the only PAC that has reportedly any independent expenditures in the 2011 election. The IBPO has an optional political action fund for its members, which lobbies for legislation in favor of the organization, and campaigns for those who supports collective bargaining and is pro-labor and pro-law enforcement. But aside from the IBPO, the PACs in Worcester have limited themselves to contributing money to the candidates directly, and not spending more of their own money campaigning for or against candidates.

PACs contributing to the 2011 Worcester city council election are located in a variety of cities and towns in Massachusetts, including Worcester, Auburn, Boston, Dedham, Canton, Brighton, Cambridge, Dorchester, Farmington, Hopkinton, Holden, Leicester, Malden, Medway, Millbury, Northborough, Paxton, Peabody, Providence, Quincy, Revere, Roslindale, Scituate, Shrewsbury, South Boston, Springfield, Sterling, Stoughton, West Boylston, Waltham, and Watertown. In fact, PACs represented in the contribution data came from more different cities than did individual contributors. One reason for this may be because the membership base of these organizations is spread out over multiple cities/towns. In the case of labor unions, a union in Auburn probably has many members living in Worcester, so they would be concerned with Worcester elections. Additionally, many businesses in surrounding towns probably do business in Worcester, and want a city council that is favorable to businesses.

The amount of money PACs give ranges from \$20 to \$1800 (many giving \$100-\$300, and several giving in the \$500 range). Since PACs are made up of funds given by multiple contributors, they usually have more money to give than average individuals do. However, we do not see local PACs giving money in the amounts we see on the federal level. The top recipients of PAC contributions in 2011 were William Eddy, Arthur Ellis, Michael Germain, Joe O'Brien, Joe Petty, and Fredrick Rushton. These are the candidates who received money from the most number of PACs (not necessarily the highest amount of money total). The PACs giving to them may want access, or may be ideologically driven. PACs, for reasons like those of individual contributors, often give to more than one candidate.

Overall, one can see that in city council elections in Worcester, money plays a role, but is not necessarily out of hand. The public perception, at least, is that while money is pouring into the state and federal election systems, local systems remain clean of most of that. Top contributors see an importance in giving money to candidates, and in being politically active. PAC giving is driven by whichever candidate will be favorable to their interests, and not necessarily by strong ideologies and large-scale social movement agendas.

### Comparing Worcester to Other Massachusetts Cities

Table 8 shows trends in campaign finance across all five of the Massachusetts cities sufficiently large to file with OCPF. Table 9 shows comparisons of these cities' governments. As the averages for these cities show, Worcester was the only one of these five cities where fundraising was clearly down from 2009 for all candidate types. The other cities present a more mixed picture. Below, we explain some of the other cities' elections.

[Tables 8 and 9 about here]

*Lowell*<sup>4</sup>: Out of Lowell's population of over 106,000, only 9,946 people voted in 2011, approximately 19.8 percent of eligible voters. In 2011, seventeen candidates competed for the nine at large council seats. Unlike Worcester, the councilors chose a mayor among themselves. In Worcester, candidates run for both councilor and mayor. In the 2011 election the seat for mayor was contested mainly by two incumbents Rodney Elliot and Patrick Murphy. Elliot ran on the platform of cutting property taxes by 2.5 percent and cutting government spending. Lack of support from the other councilors on the tax front may have given Murphy the advantage and their votes. In addition, for the first time in recent history a sitting mayor, James Milinazzo, was ousted from office.

Table 10 shows fundraising for the 2011 Lowell candidates. Like 2009, six of the nine candidates that won were incumbents: Rita Mercier, Rodney Elliot, Kevin Broderick, Patrick Murphy, Joseph Mendonca, and William Martin. The newcomers this year include Martin Lorrey, Vesna Nuon, and Edward Kennedy Jr. The top candidates Rita Mercier and Rodney Elliot secured 9.12 percent and 7.08 percent respectively. These candidates did not have many

---

<sup>4</sup> This section draws in part on Favot 2011, *Lowell Sun* 2011a, *Lowell Sun* 2011b.

\$500 donors. Rita Mercier did not have any and Elliot had three. Rita Mercier raised a total of \$15662.04 between itemized contributions, unitemized contributions, and loans or starting balance. She had over \$6,000 from the election in 2009. Elliot raised \$17,187. Non-incumbent Edward Kennedy borrowed over \$10,000 in loans to have a total of \$18,200 with other contributions. The only other candidate that raised a comparable amount was John MacDonald, but he lost with only 5.57 percent of the vote.

[Table 10 about here]

The three newcomers, Marty Lorrey, Vesna Nuon, and Edward Kennedy may have secured their spots for different reasons. Marty Lorrey held several fundraising events earlier in the campaign season. Through these efforts he amassed \$11,305 in itemized contributions. Edward Kennedy took out over \$10,000 in loans. Nuon did not have any itemized contributions, but had over \$12,000 in unitemized donations. The candidates that lost were not successful in fundraising such as Vandoeun Pech raised no money and took out \$2,300 out in loans.

It was noted in the local newspaper that these non-incumbents were not visible to the public. Despite November 8<sup>th</sup> being a beautiful day, polls were not as busy as in years past. In some precincts where 1,000 votes were expected only 300 people showed up. The manager of the city's Election and Census Commission cited the reason for lower voter turnout to the lack of awareness and not having hot-button issues on the table. This could also account for the lack of contributions.

*Cambridge:* The City Council in Cambridge consists of nine members, who make up the legislative branch of the Cambridge government, as well as running various sub-committees within that branch. The Cambridge election system is distinct from the usual set-up of local governments in that it uses the single transferable vote method. Voters in Cambridge do not vote for the mayor; rather they solely vote for members of the City Council, who in turn elect a Mayor on their own.

As in most cities across America, incumbents have an edge in political races in Cambridge. Incumbents are already well known and have an easier time raising more money than challengers. Challengers tend to raise more money outside of Cambridge than incumbents, which probably does not help them as much as money coming from their voters. In Worcester, similarly, challengers sometimes raise a greater proportion of their money from outside of Worcester than do incumbents. This could explain why challengers have a disadvantage in the race. Worcester and Cambridge have similar rates of fundraising for their candidates, although Cambridge has a significantly smaller population. This is most likely due to the fact that the average wealth per person in Cambridge is considerably higher than that in Worcester. This excess money can be more readily used as campaign contributions, to make up for the smaller population. Eighteen candidates ran for the nine seats on the Cambridge City Council. The top six in terms of fundraising were all incumbents and all raised over \$30,000, as is the norm over recent years for Cambridge. Most of the incumbents have served multiple terms, some even have been on the City Council for over a decade and continue to be re-elected in each cycle, with a



good sum of campaign money each election. Other candidates have been known to reject contributions, instead telling potential contributors to donate their money to charity.

An especially noteworthy City Council member is Leland Cheung, who in 2009 won a seat on the City Council with less than \$8,000, far below the average elected member. In 2011, he raised over \$53,000 for his campaign and had an unprecedented victory in the polls. Cheung is a good example of how although incumbents do have an advantage, a great politician can quickly become well known for doing a good job. It is not the money that gets people elected; rather it is the grassroots campaigning that leads to both votes and money. Cheung is the youngest member of the City Council, and probably got a lot of support for having the image of being a young, fresh, and enthusiastic character intent on bettering the city.

As in 2009, the candidate who raised the most money was Marjorie Decker. Decker is serving her twelfth year on the City Council, and has been the top or near-top fundraiser for most of those election years. This election cycle she raised over \$56,000, not quite as much as the \$70,000 in 2009. In 2009 she had plans to run for the senate, but since then has withdrawn from those plans. Decker is known for being a good City Councilwoman and over the years has worked up a reputation of working hard to get things done to help the city. This reputation certainly helps her maintain her popular support. As with Cheung, her image is of greater importance to her campaign than her money. This is a trend that can be found throughout Cambridge and Worcester.

The candidates in Cambridge show many trends that tend to be true in most cities. The races are largely not all that competitive, but sometimes a challenger with the right campaign can rise quickly. Generally, incumbents are reelected many times in a row and are able to raise a lot more money than challengers. However, the money does not lead to the support. The support itself, based on image and reputation, leads to the reelection and the money.

*Springfield:* The 2011 Springfield municipal elections were significant because they marked the second time that the city's new system for electing its city council was used. Springfield previously elected its councilors at-large, but since 2009 has elected five councilors at-large and eight more councilors from specific wards of the city. The election was thus an opportunity to determine what effects the new system might have on the way elections were run.

The at-large election saw no surprises. Of the five winners, four were incumbent candidates and the fifth, Bud Williams, had ran unsuccessfully for mayor in 2009. Williams was able to win his seat without needing to unseat an incumbent, however, as the fifth incumbent, Jose Tosado, ran for mayor (Tosado was also unsuccessful). All five winners won relatively easily, with Williams, who came in fifth, receiving more than 1,000 votes more than his nearest competitor, Justin Hurst. All of the losing candidates except for Amaad Rivera had not run for any office in the last election and appear to be political newcomers. Rivera had served as councilor from Ward 6. The winning candidates all spent at least \$5,000, but there was not a direct relationship between the amount of money that candidates spent and the number of votes they receive. The leading vote getter, Thomas Ashe, spent the least money of the successful candidates and was also outspent by at least \$2,000 by three of the five unsuccessful candidates. Ashe first won his seat in 2009 and prior to that had served three terms on the Springfield School

Committee. His relatively limited amount of time spent in public office in Springfield indicates that there is only a threshold amount of money that a candidate needs to spend in order to be competitive in an election in Springfield, and after that point money becomes less important.

The ward elections also had few surprises, at least in part because they had few candidates. Every ward except for Ward 8 saw an uncontested election take place. This was a marked departure from 2009, when the ward system was new and every election was contested and many contests were quite close. As a result of the lack of challengers, there was very little money spend in these seven elections, although slightly more money was spent in Ward 6, where Kenneth Shea was running unopposed, but was not an incumbent. Shea likely felt like he should spend a little more money than most unopposed candidates to ensure that his name was recognizable to his Ward's voters. The Ward 8 election was significantly more competitive. The election was a rematch of John A. Lysak and Orlando Ramos, who had run against each other in 2009, with Lysak winning by less than 100 votes. Ramos and Lysak each spent roughly the same amount of money in 2011, and Lysak again won, this time by fewer than 50 votes. This race seems to confirm the notion that money is only a factor up to a certain point in Springfield elections.

Overall, Springfield's elections in 2011 had very few surprises. No incumbent that ran for the same seat in any race lost. The financial returns indicate that money only had a marginal impact on a candidate's ability to be successful. The election showed that after candidates reach a certain level of funding, they were going to be competitive enough and then needed to win the election based on a combination of other political factors.

## Conclusions

It is difficult to use one election to gauge the health of a city's politics – there are simply too many idiosyncrasies. Nonetheless, Worcester's 2011 election presents a mixed picture of changes in city elections, when we compare it to prior elections and when we compare it to elections in other cities. The 2011 election was particularly uncompetitive at the citywide level. Candidate spending in the aggregate was down, which may be a function of a lack of competition. Only one nonincumbent candidate raised money at the level incumbents did, and this candidate did not win. Many incumbents clearly could have raised more money had they tried. At the district level, however, there was more money in the past and more competition. Although we have not given school committee elections as much scrutiny in the past as we did this year, the school committee data show that the value of incumbency is much higher there than it is in council races. Many incumbents raise no money at all, and nonincumbent candidates tend to substantially outraise incumbents, often to no avail. And while, again, we have not studied individual contributors or PAC contributors in the past, we suspect that there are fewer major contributors than was the case in past elections.

Our look at elections in other large Massachusetts cities, however, shows that in some regards Worcester elections remain more competitive than those of other cities. If we take

incumbent fundraising as a sign of concern on the part of incumbents, it seems that Worcester incumbents at least have reason to expect competition and show signs of raising money just in case. At the federal level, many have noted the prevalence of “warchests” put together by incumbents – substantial amounts of cash raised in the hope of deterring opponents from running. While some may contend that this is something that deters opponents and reduces competition, the funds raised by incumbents and the correlation between fundraising and electoral success in Worcester – something not evident in cities such as Lowell and Springfield – indicates at the least that incumbents in Worcester need to raise money. On the other hand, there is little evidence of successful nonincumbents who can run a grassroots campaign that does *not* require money. Elections in Worcester have not gotten more expensive over the past eight years, but knowing how (and from whom) to raise at least a threshold amount of money remains pivotal for local politicians.

## Interviews

Buchalter, Stephen. Interviewed by Rebecca Pardis, April 2012.  
Coleman, Devin. Interviewed by Matt Fields, April 2012.  
Coleman, William. Interviewed by Tenzin Shaydrup, April 2012.  
Coyne, David. Interviewed by Amelia Najjar, April 2012.  
Economou, Tony. Interviewed by Matt Sandler, April 2012.  
Eddy, William. Interviewed by Darko Mitrovic, April 2012.  
Foley, Jack. Interviewed by Andrew Schuschu, April 2012.  
Monfredo, Michael. Interviewed by Eric Cochrane, April 2012.  
Murray, Sean. Interviewed by Amelia Najjar, April 2012.  
Novick, Tracy. Interviewed by Andrew Schuschu, April 2012.  
Palmieri, Phil. Interviewed by Bil Carter, April 2012.  
Smith, Joff. Interviewed by Matt Sandler, April 2012.  
Rivera, Sarai. Interviewed by Mai Pham, April 2012.  
Russell, George. Interviewed by Matt Savino, April 2012.  
Toomey, Kate. Interviewed by Chelsea Salmonsens, April 2012.

Cambridge data compiled by Benjamin Fine.  
Lowell data compiled by Alicia Sanchez.  
Springfield data compiled by Dan Hall.

## Bibliography

- Adams, Brian. 2010. *Campaign Finance in Local Elections: Buying the Grassroots*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Adams, Brian. 2011. "Financing Local Elections: The Impact of Institutions on Electoral Outcomes and Democratic Representation." *Political Science* 44 (1): 111-12.
- Boatright, Robert G., et al. 2008. "Campaign Finance in Municipal Elections: The 2007 Worcester City Council Candidates." Worcester, MA: Clark University. On line, <https://www.clarku.edu/faculty/rboatright/>.
- Boatright, Robert G., et al. 2010. "Campaign Finance in Municipal Elections: The 2009 Worcester City Council Candidates." Worcester, MA: Clark University. On line, <https://www.clarku.edu/faculty/rboatright/>.
- Favot, Sarah. 2011. "Come on In, You've Got the Polls to Yourself." *The Lowell Sun*, 9 November.
- Foskett, Steven H. 2011a. "Low Turnout, Few Surprises at the Polls." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, September 21.
- Foskett, Steven H. 2011b. "Incumbent At-Large Councilors Deny any Disparity of Services." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, October 13.
- Foskett, Steven H. 2011c. "Voice of moderation rises; Petty's election as hizzoner caps steady council tenure." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, November 13.
- Hajnal, Zoltan L. 2010. *America's Uneven Democracy: Race, Turnout, and Representation in City Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press

- Hammond, Lee. 2011. "Smith Out; Economou, Ryan to Face off." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, September 21.
- Kotsopoulos, Nick. 2011b. "In Mayor's Race, No Clear Leader." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, October 23.
- Kotsopoulos, Nick. 2011c. "Low Turnout Surprises, Disappoints Officials." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, November 10.
- Kotsopoulos, Nick. 2011a. "Mayor O'Brien Ends Re-election Bid." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, September 17. *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, October 21.
- Kush, Bronislaus B. 2011a. "McGovern Backs Petty for Mayor."
- Kush, Bronislaus B. 2011b. "Newcomers Using Grass-Roots Strategies." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, November 6.
- Lowell Sun*. 2011a. "Newcomers Shine in Lowell City Election; Mayor Ousted." *The Lowell Sun*, 8 November.
- Lowell Sun*. 2011b. "Bitter Battle in Offing for Mayor." *The Lowell Sun*, 13 November.
- Reis, Jacqueline. 2011. "In Worcester, Rivals Outspend School Incumbents." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, November 2.
- Rosen, Gary. 2011a. "At-Large Council Challengers Haven't Excited the Voters." *Worcester Magazine*, September 15.
- Rosen, Gary. 2011b. "Meddling of City Council Might Keep Some Voters Home." *Worcester Magazine*, October 20.
- Rosen, Gary. 2012. "Novick and Boone Must Advocate for the Taxpayers." *Worcester Magazine*, February 1.
- Shulkin, Jeremy. 2011. "In With the New? Young and Diverse Candidates are Running for Office this Year, but Change is Hard to Find." *Worcester Magazine*, July 20.
- Spencer, Susan. 2011. "Lukes is Running for Mayor Again." *Worcester Telegram and Gazette*, September 16.

Table 1: Vote Share and Receipts per Vote, City-Wide Candidates, 2011

Candidate	Status	Council Votes	Council Percentage	Mayoral Votes	Mayoral Percentage	Result	Receipts
Petty, Joseph	Incumbent	10,206	13.33	9,008	48.35	Won Council, Won Mayor	\$49,325
Toomey, Kate	Incumbent	9,571	12.50			Won Council	15,280
O'Brien, Joseph	Incumbent Mayor	9,316	12.17			Won Council	33,955
Lukes, Konnie	Incumbent	8,721	11.39	6,708	36.01	Won Council, Lost Mayor	12,630*
Rushton, Rick	Incumbent	6,541	8.54			Won Council	14,680
Germain, Michael	Incumbent	6,077	7.94			Won Council	32,818
Buchalter, Stephen	Nonincumbent	5,697	7.44			Lost Council	31,635
Monfredo, Michael	Nonincumbent	4,857	6.34			Lost Council	996
Coleman, William	Nonincumbent	4,678	6.11	1,382	7.42	Lost Council, Lost Mayor	310
Kersten, James	Nonincumbent	4,152	5.42			Lost Council	9,955
Carmona, Carmen	Nonincumbent	3,610	4.72	1,531	8.22	Lost Council, Lost Mayor	1,582
Coleman, Devin	Nonincumbent	3,135	4.09			Lost Council	4,189
Beaudoin, Timothy	Nonincumbent					Lost Preliminary	2,962
Perez, Ralph	Nonincumbent					Lost Preliminary	0
Mean , Incumbents		8,405	10.98				26,448
Mean, General Election Challengers		4,355	5.69				8,111
Mean, Preliminary Candidates							1,481
Mean, Winners		8,405	10.98				26,448
Mean, General Election Losers		4,355	5.69				8,111
<b>Total</b>		<b>18,900</b>		<b>18,629</b>			<b>207,355</b>

All candidates but Lukes spent approximately what they raised. \* Lukes had substantial cash on hand from prior elections; she carried a \$34,194 balance into the 2011 calendar year and spent \$19,436 in the election..

*Table 2: Receipts, City-Wide Candidates, 2011*

Candidate	Status	Result	Total Money Raised	Itemized Individual Contributions	PAC Contributions	Contributions /Loans from Candidate	Mean Itemized Contribution	Number of \$500+ Donors*	Contributions from outside of Worcester**
Petty, Joseph	Incumbent	Won Council, Won Mayor	\$49,325	\$41,543	\$6,050	\$2,500	\$118.36	18	\$16,520
O'Brien, Joseph	Incumbent Mayor	Won Council	33,955	24,431	8,969	1,180	86.94	2	10,980
Germain, Michael	Incumbent	Won Council	32,818	15,504	5,600		116.57	5	5,630
Buchalter, Stephen	Nonincumbent	Lost Council	31,635	27,310	200		208.47	21	13,415
Toomey, Kate	Incumbent	Won Council	15,280	11,575	2,275		82.09	2	5,100
Rushton, Rick	Incumbent	Won Council	14,680	10,210	3,050		129.24	3	3,150
Lukes, Konnie	Incumbent	Won Council, Lost Mayor	12,630	9,200			129.58		2,775
Kersten, James	Nonincumbent	Lost Council	9,955	5,200	1,450		152.94	2	3,650
Coleman, Devin	Nonincumbent	Lost Council	4,189	1,800	800	1,375	360	3	800
Beaudoin, Timothy	Nonincumbent	Lost Preliminary	2,962	1,728	0	67	123.43		1,100
Carmona, Carmen	Nonincumbent	Lost Council, Lost Mayor	1,582	1,662	1,800***	761	166.2		450
Monfredo, Michael	Nonincumbent	Lost Council	996			996			
Coleman, William	Nonincumbent	Lost Council, Lost Mayor	310	310					
Perez, Ralph	Nonincumbent	Lost Preliminary	0						
<b>Total</b>				150,163	30,194	6,879	120.13	56	63,570

\* Aggregates 2010 and 2011 contributions.

\*\* Individual contributors only.

\*\*\* In kind contribution.

Table 3: Changes for Repeat Candidates, 2005-2011

Candidate	First Elected	2011 Receipts	2009 Receipts	2007 Receipts	2005 Receipts	Pct. Change 2007-2009	Pct. Change 2009-2011	Notes
Germain, Michael	2007	\$32,818	\$27,801	\$34,010		-18	18	
Lukes, Konnie	1995	12,630	33,895	31,381	13,700	8	-63	Ran for Mayor each year; won in 2007.
O'Brien, Joseph	2009	33,955	43,300				-22	Ran for Mayor in 2009.
Petty, Joseph	1997	49,325	26,920	30,275	26,520	-11	83	Ran for Mayor in 2011.
Rushton, Rick	2007	14,680	13,506	86,662		-74	9	Ran for Mayor in 2007; held District Council seat before 2007.
Toomey, Kate	2005	15,280	33,633	23,953	28,745	40	-45	Ran for Mayor in 2009.
Buchalter, Steven		31,635	27,614				15	Ran unsuccessfully in 2009 and 2011.
Coleman, William		310		854				Ran unsuccessfully for council and mayor.
Irish, Dennis	1999			39,839	23,685			Lost seat in 2005, but regained it when Tim Murray left office. Declared for Mayor in 2007 but dropped out after preliminary election.
Perotto, Michael	2001			60,520	33,390			Declared for Mayor in 2007 but dropped out after preliminary election.
Rosen, Gary	2005			19,861	23,499			Had served previously; ran for Mayor in 2007.



Table 4: District Races, 2011

Candidate	Preliminary Election Vote Pct.	General Election Vote Pct.	Total Money Raised	Itemized Individual Contributions	PAC Contributions	Contributions/Loans from Candidate	Mean Itemized Contribution	Number of \$500+ Donors*	Contributions from outside of Worcester**
<b>District 1</b>									
Smith (Incumbent)	25.38		\$32,001	\$22,426	\$5,950		\$260.76	23	\$12,250
Economou (Challenger)	37.29	51.22	25,139	25,088	1,150	\$2,005	76.96	6	5,005
Ryan (Challenger)	37.11	48.78	20,515	2,935	750	15,209	127.61		1,075
<b>District 2</b>									
Palmieri (I)		100.00	6,420	4,450	800		134.85		1,750
<b>District 3 (Open)</b>									
Ellis	27.29	47.05	19,934	8,385	5,825	2,500	190.57	6	4,175
Peters	15.35		1,215	700	300	207	116.67		800
Russell	39.37	52.95	34,448	19,948	500	14,000	115.98	13	5,615
Taylor	17.77			3,310			100.30	2	1,440
<b>District 4</b>									
Haller (I)		39.99	13,320	9,995	365		104.15	4	2,695
Rivera (C)		60.01	17,701	10,541	1,774		138.70	5	2,721
<b>District 5</b>									
Eddy (I)		58.72	21,360	20,055	2,375		159.16	4	6,075
Kaleogeropoulos (C)		41.28	3,700	2,850			167.65		900
Mean, Incumbents			17,973	13,456	2,082	861	233.97		6,494
Mean, Incumbents in Contested Races			17,340	15,025	1,370	\$0	131.66		4,385
Mean, General Election Challengers			16,764	10,354	919	4,304	510.92		9,701
Mean, Preliminary Candidates			8,989	2,005	300	207	108.49		1,120
Mean, Winners			21,014	16,016	1,320	3,201	125.13		4,233
Mean, Winners in Contested Races			24,503	16,848	1,550	4,667	137.95		4,804
Mean, Losers			14,858	7,229	2,198	2,986	153.00		3,334
Mean, General Election Losers			14,367	6,041	1,735	4,427	147.50		2,211
Total			195,753	130,682	19,789	33,922	125.90	63	44,301

\* Aggregates 2010 and 2011 contributions.

\*\* Individual contributors only.

Table 5: Repeat District Candidates, 2007-2011

Candidate	2011		2009		2007	
	General Election Votes	Receipts	General Election Votes	Receipts	General Election Votes	Receipts
<b>District 1</b>						
Smith	N/A	\$32,001	52.5%	\$11,299	55.8	\$28,610
Strongest opponent	51.22	25,139	47.1	9,125	43.8	6,976
<b>District 2</b>						
Palmieri	100.0	6,420	84.0	11,730	95.6	0
Strongest opponent			10.8			
<b>District 3</b>						
Clancy			65.7	6,627	68.2	14,250
Strongest opponent			33.8	4,835	31.4	0
<b>District 4</b>						
Haller	39.99	13,320	61.8	8,985	61.9	13,215
Strongest opponent	60.01	17,701	37.6	11,594	37.6	5,162
<b>District 5</b>						
Eddy	58.72	21,360	96.9	6,745	52.0	30,170
Strongest opponent	41.28	3,700			47.7	9,985
Mean, Incumbents		17,793		9,077		14,019
Mean, Incumbents in Contested Races		17,340		8,970		18,692
Mean, Challengers		16,764		8,518		4,046
Mean, Winners		21,014		9,077		17,249
Mean, Winners in Contested Races		24,503		8,970		21,561
Mean, Losers		14,858		8,518		5,531
Total		195,753		70,940		131,539

*Table 6: School Committee Races, 2011*

Candidate	Status	General Election Vote Percentage	Receipts	Carryover from 2010	End Cash on Hand	Expenditures
Foley, Jack (Incumbent)	Won	13.33	\$245	\$2,356	\$1,349	\$1,252
O'Connell, Brian (I)	Won	13.32	50	658	708	0
Biancheria, Dianna (I)	Won	12.12	8,230	428	527	8,131
Monfredo, John (I)	Won	11.15	4,005	3,871	4,983	2,793
Novick, Tracy (I)	Won	10.27	1,895	202	132	1,964
Colorio, Donna	Won	9.95	10,986		542	10,441
Mullaney, Mary (I)	Lost	9.91	0	21	1	20
Ramirez, Hilda	Lost	8.55	6,694		-509	7,204
Salmonsens, Todd	Lost	6.24	3,137		0	3,137
Trobaugh, John	Lost	5.16	1,070		-4,149	5,119
Mean, Incumbents			2,404	1,256	1,283	2,360
Mean, Nonincumbents			5,472		-1,029	6,475
Total			36,312	7,536	3,584	40,061

Table 7: School Committee Races, 2007-2011

Candidate	2011		2009		2007	
	General Election Votes	Receipts	General Election Votes	Receipts	General Election Votes	Receipts
Foley, Jack	<b>13.33</b>	\$245	<b>15.39</b>	\$150	<b>14.56</b>	\$4,850
O'Connell, Brian	<b>13.32</b>	50	<b>16.01</b>	150	<b>16.50</b>	225
Biancheria, Dianna	<b>12.12</b>	8,230	<b>12.87</b>	10,950		
Monfredo, John	<b>11.15</b>	4,005	<b>12.74</b>	6,373	<b>14.00</b>	6,850
Novick, Tracy	<b>10.27</b>	1,895	<b>11.80</b>	3,285		
Mullaney, Mary	<b>9.91</b>	0	<b>12.36</b>	0	<b>12.31</b>	0
Colorio, Donna	<b>9.95</b>	10,986				
Ramirez, Hilda	<b>8.55</b>	6,694				
Salmonsens, Todd	<b>6.24</b>	3,137				
Trobaugh, John	<b>5.16</b>	1,070				
Diaz, Robert			<b>9.41</b>	4,170		
Bogigian, Robert			<b>9.19</b>	125	<b>9.96</b>	2,655
Hargrove, Dorothy					<b>14.15</b>	11,415
Hill, Calvin					<b>9.62</b>	6,270
Condon, Christopher					<b>8.65</b>	15,256
Mean, Incumbents		2,404		1,360		2,981
Mean, Nonincumbents		5,472		6,135		8,899
Total		36,312		25,203		47,521

Winners' vote percentages in bold.

Table 8: Changes in Candidate Fundraising for Massachusetts At-Large Municipal Candidates, 2007-2011

	2007			2009			2011			Change '07-'09	Change '09-'11	Change '07-'11
	Average Receipts	High	Low	Average Receipts	High	Low	Average Receipts	High	Low			
<b>Worcester</b>												
Incumbents	\$34,304	\$60,520	\$19,861	\$27,081	\$33,895	\$13,506	\$26,448	\$49,325	\$12,630	-21%	-3%	-23%
Nonincumbents	34,705	86,607	1,369	16,091	43,300	0	8,111	31,635	310	-54	-34	-69
Winners	37,681	86,607	19,861	29,784	43,300	13,506	26,448	49,325	12,630	-21	-11	-30
Losers	31,329	60,520	1,369	10,649	27,614	0	8,111	31,635	310	-66	-24	-74
<b>Lowell</b>												
Incumbents	20,330	33,015	9,530	17,339	27,020	11,440	11,318	24,984	1,419	-15	-35	-44
Nonincumbents	20,802	66,535	3,590	4,747	14,928	0	10,985	16,794	2,300	-77	131	-47
Winners	26,594	66,535	9,530	14,625	22,300	3,626	12,254	24,984	1,419	-45	-16	-54
Losers	15,838	26,464	3,590	5,733	27,020	0	9,807	16,794	2,300	-64	71	-38
<b>Springfield</b>												
Incumbents	22,149	44,590	1,135	19,977	22,905	18,488	24,985	38,925	7,335	-9	25	13
Nonincumbents	7,955	28,555	100	3,468	8,585	0	**	24,687	201	-44	**	**
Winners	22,862	44,590	1,135	17,699	22,905	8,585	24,925	38,925	7,335	-23	41	9
Losers	3,584	9,868	100	1,762	5,287	0	**	10,865	201	-51	**	**
<b>Cambridge</b>												
Incumbents	54,507	95,968	29,810	40,330	71,080	11,711	52,161	94,880	13,307	-26	29	-4
Nonincumbents	17,370	34,560	2,460	10,003	34,409	0	8,413	29,260	0	-42	-16	-52
Winners	52,050	95,968	28,392	37,332	71,080	11,711	52,901	94,880	29,260	-28	42	2
Losers	12,638	34,560	2,460	9,631	34,409	0	7,674	22,601	0	-24	20	-39
<b>Boston</b>												
Incumbents	202,899	353,558	47,129	238,994	373,355	104,633	375,813	577,051	206,564	18	57	85
Nonincumbents	167,278	497,543	363	143,788	**	**	71,595	185,215	11,602	**	**	-57
Winners	353,037	497,543	208,010	186,410	373,355	104,633	375,813	577,051	206,564	-47	102	6
Losers	17,139	47,129	363	78,202	**	**	71,595	185,215	11,602	**	**	318

\*\* Not all disclosure reports were filed.

*Table 9: Election Systems for Major Massachusetts Cities*

City	Population	Number of at-large Council Members	Description of Election System
Worcester	181,045	6	Modified “Plan E” government – six at-large councilors, five district councilors. Mayor is one of the at-large councilors, but must run for both offices. All councilors serve two-year terms.
Lowell	106,519	9	“Plan E” government – all nine councilors elected at-large; one of the nine is elected by the other councilors to serve as mayor. All councilors serve two-year terms.
Springfield	153,060	9	Modified “Plan E” government – all nine council members are elected at-large; one of the nine is elected by the other councilors to serve as council president. Mayor is elected separately. All councilors serve two-year terms.
Cambridge	105,162	9	“Plan E” government – all nine councilors elected at-large; one of the nine is elected by the other councilors to serve as mayor. All councilors serve two-year terms.
Boston	617,594	4	Modified “Plan E” government – four at-large councilors, nine district councilors. Mayor is elected separately. All councilors serve two-year terms, mayor serves a four-year term.

Population data from 2010 census.

Table 10: Lowell City-Wide Candidate Fundraising

Candidate	Status	Result	Total Money Raised	Itemized Individual Contributions	Unitemized Individual Contributions	Contributions/Loans from Candidate	Number of \$500 Donors	Vote Percentage	Cost per vote
Martin,Bill	Incumbent	Won	\$20,717	\$7,175	\$6,945	\$6597	0	6.38	\$5.58
Kennedy, Edward	Non-incumbent	Won	18,200	7,850	250	10,100	1	6.15	5.08
Elliot, Rodney	Incumbent	Won	17,187	5,310	3,487	8,381	3	7.08	4.17
MacDonald, John	Non-incumbent	Lost	16,720	11,090	2,630	3,000	6	5.57	5.16
Lorrey, Marty	Non-incumbent	Won	16,375	11,305	3470	1,600	1	6.38	4.41
Mercier, Rita	Incumbent	Won	15,662	9,230	0	6,432	1	9.12	2.95
Leahy, John J.	Non-incumbent	Lost	13,640	7,165	6,415	60	0	5.82	4.03
Mercier, Armand P.	Non-incumbent	Lost	13,483	4,500	7,681	1,302	0	5.85	3.87
Broderick, Kevin	Incumbent	Won	13,184	6,875	0	6,309	0	6.67	3.40
Belanger, Corey A.	Non-incumbent	Lost	12,442	0	3,559	8,883	0	5.65	3.70
Nuon, Vesna	Non-incumbent	Won	12,130	0	12,130	0	0	6.21	3.65
Milinazzo, James	Incumbent Mayor	Lost	11,825	10,520	0	1,305	4	5.78	3.52
Mendonca, Joe	Incumbent	Won	10,175	5,500	2,395	2,280	5	5.95	2.94
Belley, Paul N.	Non-incumbent	Lost	6,142	4,670	740	732	0	4.27	2.41
Doyle, Frederick J.	Non-incumbent	Lost	3,102	2,076	1,015	11	1	3.25	1.64
Pech, Vandoeun	Non-incumbent	Lost	2,300	0	0	2,300	0	3.26	1.21
Murphy, Patrick	Incumbent	Won	1,419	0	1,300	119	0	6.42	0.38
<b>Total</b>			<b>204,704</b>	<b>93,266</b>	<b>52,018</b>	<b>59,411</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>\$3.42</b>