

---

---

OFFICE OF  
CAMPAIGN  
and  
POLITICAL  
FINANCE

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Commonwealth  
of Massachusetts

---

---

---

---

**Report on the  
Limited Public Financing System  
for Candidates for Statewide Office  
in the 2010 Election**

---

---

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

---

## **I. Introduction**

*“On or before January thirtieth of any year next following a year in which elections are held for statewide elective office, the director shall prepare and submit a report relating to the matters entrusted to him under this chapter to the clerk of the senate and to the commission established by section three of chapter fifty-five....” [M.G.L. c.55C, s.3]*

To the Clerk of the Senate and the Commission to Select the Director of Campaign Finance:

In accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 55C, Section 3, I hereby submit this report summarizing the Commonwealth’s system of limited public financing of campaigns for statewide elective office during the 2010 election.

Chapter 774 of the Acts of 1975 established the public financing system in Massachusetts by creating the State Election Campaign Fund (SECF) and outlining the statutory responsibilities of the five agencies involved in administering the system. The system has been modified over the years and was replaced for the 2002 election by the Clean Elections program, which also offered public financing to candidates for the Legislature and Governor’s Council. The Clean Elections Law was repealed in 2003, and the system that had been in effect in 1998 was restored for the 2006 election.

This report outlines the workings of the public financing program and provides specifics on its operation in the 2010 election, including the availability and distribution of funds to participating candidates.

More than \$1.4 million was distributed to seven candidates running for statewide office. The total outlay is about \$300,000 less than the 1998 figure, which was a record high for this program.

The public financing system was effectively implemented in a professional and efficient manner during the 2010 election, due in large part to the coordination between the Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF), the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, the Department of Revenue, the Office of the Comptroller, and the Office of the Treasurer and Receiver General. The work of each of these agencies contributed to the system’s effectiveness and, therefore, each deserves recognition for its efforts.

An extra word of thanks also goes out to the candidates and the political committees, who cooperated with this office by making early submissions of qualifying candidate statements which made the task of certification that much easier.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Sullivan  
Director  
Office of Campaign and Political Finance

January 28, 2011

## II. Historical Overview

The system for partial public financing of campaigns for statewide office has been in place for every election since 1978, with one exception. That was in 2002, when the Clean Elections program covered candidates for statewide office, as well as those running for the Legislature and the Governor's Council. That system was repealed in 2003 and the previous program, for statewide candidates only, was reinstated.

The current system offers limited funds to candidates for the six statewide offices: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Treasurer and Receiver General, Secretary of the Commonwealth and Auditor. The funds are provided from voluntary contributions of \$1 by state income tax filers.

In the eight statewide elections since its institution, public financing has provided more than \$10.7 million to candidates, most recently more than \$1.4 million in 2010.

### Disbursements to Candidates from the State Election Campaign Fund 1978-2010 Statewide Elections

<i>Year</i>	<i>Amount Available</i>	<i>Amount Disbursed</i>
1978	\$175,161	\$162,521
1982	\$679,930	\$489,912
1986	\$888,498	\$865,412
1990	\$450,003	\$380,356
1994	\$358,438	\$256,758
1998	\$1,753,463	\$1,719,614
2002	\$4,088,405	\$4,088,405
2006	\$1,613,689	\$1,361,222
2010	\$1,563,839	\$1,419,852
<b>TOTAL:</b>	\$11,571,427	\$10,744,055

Note: Any funds remaining after the election are carried over to the next statewide election.

The largest outlay of public financing was in 2002, when almost \$4.1 million was distributed during the Clean Elections program. That program provided partial funding to 10 candidates. Not counting the Clean Elections funds, the limited public financing program has distributed \$6,655,650 to candidates since 1978.

A total of 106 candidates have received public funds since 1978: 96 under the limited financing system, and the other 10 under the Clean Elections program. The number of candidates in each election cycle who received money has varied over the years, depending on such factors as each candidate's particular circumstances and the changing criteria for receiving

funds. The law now stipulates, for example, that candidates for governor are eligible to receive full funding before other statewide candidates may receive funds. In addition, starting with the 1998 election, candidates wishing to be eligible for public financing are required to agree to statutory spending limits.

### **Candidates' Eligibility for and Receipt of Public Funds 1978-2010**

<b>Year</b>	<i>Primary</i>		<i>General</i>		<b>Total recipients</b>
	<b>Eligible for funds*</b>	<b>Received funds</b>	<b>Eligible for funds#</b>	<b>Received funds</b>	
1978	22	12	10	8	16
1982	12	12	16	3	13
1986	11	9	10	10	16
1990	17	15	14	8	19
1994	19	10	16	8	14
1998	13	4	7	5	8
2002	12	10	6	6	10
2006	14	2	4	3	3
2010	6	4	8	5	7

\*Denotes candidates who agreed to observe spending limits, a requirement for receiving public funds that started with the 1998 election.

# Candidates who won their primaries or otherwise reached the November ballot, such as unenrolled candidates.

### **III. The State Election Campaign Fund**

The sole source of funding for limited public financing in Massachusetts is the State Election Campaign Fund (SECF), which was established under M.G.L. Chapter 10, Section 42. Under Section 42, taxpayers may direct \$1 of their tax liability on their annual income tax returns to the SECF (\$2 for joint returns). Such a designation does not increase a filer's tax liability or decrease the amount of a refund. From 1976 to 1993, however, the funding was by an "add-on" system, by which taxpayers could contribute to the SECF only by adding \$1 or \$2 to their tax liability.

Throughout its history, the SECF has been hindered by limited participation. Before 1994, when designating money to the fund meant an increase in a taxpayer's liability, less than 5 percent of the tax returns included a contribution to the fund. The switch to a check-off in 1994 meant a substantial increase in participation, with the rate of donations moving closer to 10 percent. In the most recent tax year for which figures are available, 2009, 5.7 percent of tax returns designated funds to the SECF. This percentage rate has consistently decreased since 2002.

**State Election Campaign Fund  
Taxpayer Participation Rates and Amounts Collected**

<b>Tax Year</b>	<b>Number of donations</b>	<b>Participation rate</b>	<b>Amount Collected</b>
1993	42,587	1.5 %	\$56,648
1994	279,523	9.9%	\$394,150
1995	247,097	8.5%	\$351,705
1996	291,872	9.9 %	\$417,791
1997	320,284	10.4 %	\$449,991
1998	279,600	8.8 %	\$382,270
1999	326,599	10.2%	\$447,283
2000	325,878	9.9%	\$445,798
2001	341,008	10.3%	\$465,545
2002	305,810	9.2%	\$419,308
2003	265,373	8.1%	\$365,895
2004	247,744	7.5%	\$341,128
2005	231,576	7.0%	\$321,389
2006	221,241	6.5%	\$308,467
2007	213,183	6.1%	\$296,489
2008	200,895	5.8%	\$280,672
2009	190,738	5.7%	\$266,675

Chapter 43 of the Acts of 1994 changed the funding mechanism for the SECF from a voluntary \$1 taxpayer donation (add-on) to a \$1 taxpayer designation (check-off), or \$2 for a joint return, effective tax year 1994.

Source: Massachusetts Department of Revenue

A total of \$1,563,839 was available to candidates last year, which was not enough to provide the full statutory amounts of matching funds to all candidates – if all had agreed to observe spending limits in return for public money.

## IV. Candidates' Participation in the 2010 Program

Statewide candidates may only receive limited public financing if they agree to observe spending limits throughout the entire campaign. Party-affiliated candidates, for example, must observe limits in both the primary and general elections. Candidates who are not enrolled in a party cannot participate in a primary, but must observe limits starting with the date nomination papers are due in August and running through the general election.

The statutory spending limits vary according to the office sought:

### Expenditure Limits for Public Financing Participants

	<b>Primary</b>	<b>General</b>	<b>Total Limit</b>
<b>Governor</b>	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000
<b>Lt. Governor</b>	\$625,000	*	\$625,000
<b>Attorney General</b>	\$625,000	\$625,000	\$1,250,000
<b>Treasurer</b>	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$750,000
<b>Secretary of State</b>	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$750,000
<b>Auditor</b>	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$750,000

In return for agreeing to limits, candidates who have opposition in the primary are eligible to receive money for both the primary and, if they are successful in the primary and are opposed, the general election. The amounts for which they are eligible are equal to half of their statutory spending limits:

### Maximum Distributions for Public Financing Participants

	<b>Primary</b>	<b>General</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Governor</b>	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$1,500,000
<b>Lt. Governor</b>	\$312,500	*	\$312,500
<b>Attorney General</b>	\$312,500	\$312,500	\$625,000
<b>Treasurer</b>	\$187,500	\$187,500	\$375,000
<b>Secretary of State</b>	\$187,500	\$187,500	\$375,000
<b>Auditor</b>	\$187,500	\$187,500	\$375,000

\* Because the nominees for governor and lieutenant governor run as a "candidate team" after the primary, they are both included in the gubernatorial candidate's general election spending limit and maximum matching funds amounts.

For example, participating candidates for Auditor are limited to expenditures of \$375,000 for the primary election campaign (which was June 2 to Sept. 14 in 2010) and \$375,000 for the general election campaign (which was Sept. 15 to Nov. 2 in 2010, and Sept. 1 to Nov. 2 for unenrolled candidates), for a total of \$750,000. In return, those candidates were eligible for up to \$187,500 in matching funds for each of the two periods, for a total of \$375,000. If opposed by a non-participating candidate, a participating candidate is still eligible to receive funds.

A total of 22 candidates for statewide office were required to file declarations with OCPF stating whether they agreed to observe statutory spending limits in 2010. Candidates on the ballot in a party primary filed when they submitted nomination papers to the Secretary of the Commonwealth in June, while candidates who were not enrolled in a party did so when they filed their papers in August.

## **Participation in Public Financing 2010 Statewide Candidates**

<b><u>Office/statutory limit*</u></b>	<b><u>Agreed to limits</u></b>	<b><u>Did not agree</u></b>
<b>Governor</b> (\$1.5 million primary/ \$1.5 million general)	Timothy Cahill (U) Jill Stein (U)	Charles Baker (R) Deval Patrick (D)
<b>Lieutenant Governor</b> (\$625,000 primary**)	Paul Loscocco (U) Richard Purcell (U)	Timothy Murray (D) Richard Tisei (R)
<b>Attorney General</b> (\$625,000 primary/ \$625,000 general)	Martha Coakley (D)	James McKenna (R)
<b>Treasurer</b> (\$375,000 primary/ \$375,000 general)	Stephen Murphy (D)	Steven Grossman (D) Karyn Polito (R)
<b>Secretary</b> (\$375,000 primary/ \$375,000 general)	William Campbell (R) James Henderson (U)	William Galvin (D)
<b>Auditor</b> (\$375,000 primary/ \$375,000 general)	Suzanne Bump (D) Mary Connaughton (R) Nathanael Fortune (U) Mike Lake (D)	Guy Glodis (D) Kamal Jain (R)

\* Statutory limit is subject to increase depending on self-imposed limit set by any opponent who did not agree to statutory limits.

\*\* Because the nominees for governor and lieutenant governor run as a “candidate team” after the primary, they are both included in the gubernatorial candidate’s general election spending limit and maximum matching funds amounts.

Note: Unenrolled candidates do not have a primary and were on the general election ballot only.

To become eligible to receive public funds, candidates filed disclosure reports with OCPF listing contributions received that qualified under the matching funds formula, in amounts depending on the office sought. Qualifying contributions include only the first \$250 of individual contributions that were received during 2009 and 2010 and deposited into a



candidate's depository bank account. Candidates also were required to obtain a bond for the amount they received from the SECF and were subject to penalties if they misused public funds. Matching funds were wired into a candidate's depository account by the Commonwealth and, like all campaign receipts and expenditures, were disclosed in the regular disclosure reports filed on behalf of their committees.

## **V. Statutory Responsibilities**

The distribution of funds to candidates who apply for funding in the manner described above involves the coordination of the efforts of five state agencies.

The Treasurer is responsible for the management and investment of the State Election Campaign Fund as well as the disbursement of any funds to certified candidates. As noted below, funds collected by the Department of Revenue through state income tax returns have provided the sole source of revenue for the SECF.

On June 30 of each year in which elections are held for the six statewide offices, the Comptroller determines the balance in the SECF and the Treasurer is required to make all invested funds available for immediate withdrawal. The total amount that is available for public financing that year is apportioned on a 50/50 basis, with half available for the Primary Election Account and half available for the General Election Account. The total amount in 2010 was \$1,563,839.

On or before the eighth Tuesday before the primary, the Secretary of the Commonwealth certifies to OCPF the names of those candidates who qualify for the primary ballot and who are opposed by one or more candidates. (Unopposed candidates are not eligible for public financing in the primary election.) Once the Secretary has certified the number of names to the Director, and the Director has completed the certification of participating candidates, the Comptroller subdivides the Primary Election Account into accounts for each participating candidate, based on a formula provided for by M.G.L. Chapter 10.

As noted earlier, the law calls for candidates for governor to receive full funding first, then for candidates for the other five statewide offices to receive money, based on availability. For example, the Primary Election Account would first be divided to allow each certified gubernatorial candidate to be eligible to receive the full primary share for that office of \$750,000, or as close to that amount as possible if there were not enough money to do so. If there was any money left over, it would be divided proportionately among other certified candidates.

The Director of OCPF is responsible for certifying to the treasurer that each candidate has met the statutory obligations necessary to receive the public funds.

## VI. The Primary Election

### Spending Limit Declarations

The first filing deadline for candidates concerning the public financing system for 2010 was June 1, the same day nomination papers were due with the Elections Division of the Secretary of the Commonwealth. On or before that date, a total of 15 candidates who were seeking their parties' nomination for statewide office filed statements declaring whether they intended to limit their spending in the 2010 primary and general elections.

Failure to file a statement would have meant a candidate could not be on the primary ballot. Due to coordinated advance notification by both OCPF and the Elections Division, however, every candidate filed form CPFA 20: Statement on Campaign Expenditure Limits – Primary and General Campaign.

### Participation in Public Financing Statewide Candidates on the Primary Ballot 2010

<u>Office/primary limit</u>	<u>Agreed to limits</u>	<u>Did not agree</u>
<b>Governor</b> \$1.5 million		Charles Baker (R) Deval Patrick (D)
<b>Lieutenant Governor</b> \$625,000		Timothy Murray (D) Richard Tisei (R)
<b>Attorney General</b> \$625,000	Martha Coakley (D)	
<b>Treasurer</b> \$375,000	Stephen Murphy (D)	Steve Grossman (D) Karyn Polito (R)
<b>Secretary</b> \$375,000	William Campbell (R)	William Galvin (D)
<b>Auditor</b> \$375,000	Suzanne Bump (D) Mary Connaughton (R) Mike Lake (D)	Guy Glodis (D) Kamal Jain (R)

Of the 15 candidates that filed and were eligible for the ballot, six agreed to abide by spending limits, which were binding for both the primary and general elections (candidates who were not enrolled in a political party and were therefore not on the ballot in a September primary were not required to file limit declarations in June. Rather, their filings were due on Aug. 31, the deadline for unenrolled candidates to submit nomination papers with the Secretary of the Commonwealth.)

At the time of the filings, OCPF estimated the amount of money in the State Election Campaign Fund that would be available to participating candidates at about \$1.5 million, which by statute was to be divided evenly between the primary and general election campaigns. The program calls for gubernatorial candidates to receive funds first, if they agree to limit spending and have a primary opponent. Both Gov. Deval Patrick (D) and Charles Baker (R) did not agree to limit spending in their race, so funds available for the primary election were made available to candidates for the Auditor and Treasurer races. Candidates for Attorney General and Secretary of the Commonwealth did not face opposition in the 2010 primary election and were not eligible to receive public financing for the primary election.

### **Self-imposed Limits**

Candidates who chose not to participate in the public financing system but were opposed by at least one participating candidate (i.e., those who had agreed to limits) in their primary were still required to observe a spending limit, though the exact amount in each race would be self-imposed. Those non-participating candidates were required to file by June 4 a statement with OCPF stating the maximum amount that they would spend in the primary campaign.

The spending limits of the participating candidates in those races were then increased to the amounts specified by their non-participating opponents. The amount of public funds for which those participating candidates were eligible, however, did not change.

The candidates who declined to accept statutory expenditure limits and were opposed in the primary by at least one candidate who had agreed to limit spending were Guy Glodis (candidate for auditor), Steven Grossman (treasurer) and Kamal Jain (auditor). All three candidates filed the required statements declaring the maximum amounts of their expenditures for the primary, which resulted in the adjustment of the spending limit for each race.

The self-imposed limits declared by each of the three filers were:

- Glodis: \$1,300,000. The limits of Glodis' two primary opponents, Suzanne Bump and Michael Lake, were increased to \$1.3 million from their previous statutory limit of \$375,000.
- Grossman: \$3,500,000. The limit of Grossman's primary opponent, Stephen Murphy, increased to \$3.5 million from his previous statutory limit of \$375,000.
- Jain: \$26,930,143,000. The limit of his primary opponent, Mary Connaughton, increased to \$26.9 billion from her previous statutory limit of \$375,000.

With the filing by the three non-participating candidates, the spending limits for all candidates in the primary were set:

**Primary Election Candidates  
and Their Spending Limits**  
(statutory or self-imposed)  
**June 2 – Sept. 14**

	<b>Democrat</b>		<b>Republican</b>	
	<u><i>Candidates</i></u>	<u><i>Limit</i></u>	<u><i>Candidates</i></u>	<u><i>Limit</i></u>
<b><i>Governor</i></b>				
	None		None	
<b><i>Lt. Governor</i></b>				
	None		None	
<b><i>Attorney General</i></b>				
	Martha Coakley	\$625,000		
<b><i>Treasurer</i></b>				
	Steven Grossman*	\$3,500,000		
	Stephen Murphy	\$3,500,000		
<b><i>Secretary</i></b>				
	None		William Campbell	\$375,000
<b><i>Auditor</i></b>				
	Suzanne Bump	\$1,300,000	Mary Connaughton	\$26,930,143,000
	Guy Glodis*	\$1,300,000	Kamal Jain*	\$26,930,143,000
	Mike Lake	\$1,300,000		

\* Candidate set new limit for race by filing a self-imposed limit that was higher than the statutory figure.

**Certification and Release of Funds**

In July, the Comptroller certified the amount that was available in the State Election Campaign Fund for distribution to candidates in 2010 at \$1,563,839. Under law, that amount was split in half: \$781,919 for the primary campaign and the same amount for the general election campaign. Any funds that remained after the primary would be added to the general election amount.

Each candidate who agrees to observe a spending limit and submits the minimum amount of required contributions is eligible to receive matching funds for the primary. As noted earlier,

gubernatorial candidates are funded first and remaining funds, if any, are distributed to other statewide candidates. However, no gubernatorial candidates in the primary agreed to spending limits, making them ineligible to receive matching funds. Because no gubernatorial candidates qualified to receive matching funds in the primary, the funds were made available to candidates running for other statewide offices.

Four statewide candidates were certified and received funds for the primary election.

### **Funds Disbursed in the 2010 Primary Campaign**

<i>Candidate</i>	<i>Office sought</i>	<i>Amount disbursed</i>
Stephen Murphy	Treasurer	\$160,018
Suzanne Bump	Auditor	\$143,640
Mary Connaughton	Auditor	\$137,288
Mike Lake	Auditor	\$84,217
<b><i>TOTAL</i></b>		\$525,163

Because \$781,919 was set aside for the primary election, and only \$525,163 was disbursed to candidates, the \$256,756 balance was reverted to the general election.

## **VII. The General Election**

The general election campaign did not officially start until the day after the Sept. 14 primary, though all candidates had previously made their intentions known regarding whether they would comply with spending limits. The statements filed by Democratic and Republican candidates in June stating whether they agreed to spending limits were binding for both the primary and general elections. Six unenrolled candidates who were seeking statewide office filed statements by Aug. 31 indicating whether they intended to limit their spending in the general election.

All six unenrolled candidates – Timothy Cahill and Jill Stein for governor, Paul Loscocco and Richard Purcell for lieutenant governor, James Henderson for secretary of state, and Nathanael Fortune for auditor – agreed to observe spending limits. Stein, Purcell and Fortune were running under the Green-Rainbow Party political designation. Cahill, Loscocco and Henderson were unenrolled.

Prior to setting the general election expenditure limits, statewide candidates who were not participating in the public financing program, but were opposed by participating candidates, were required to file maximum spending declarations by Sept. 20.

Four candidates (two of the filers were governor/lieutenant governor candidate teams) filed the required statements of maximum expenditures for the general election by the Sept. 20 deadline. If applicable, participating candidates' limits for the election period (Sept. 15 to Nov. 2, and Sept. 1 to Nov. 2 for unenrolled candidates) were raised to the highest amount cited by a non-participating candidate in that race.

As a result of the filings, the spending limits for all candidates in three races – governor/lieutenant governor, attorney general and secretary – were increased to the amount of the voluntary limit by the non-participating candidate. Because no candidates for state treasurer participated in the public financing program, there was no spending limit in that race. Both candidates for state auditor agreed to the statutory spending limit of \$375,000.

## Spending Limits for the 2010 General Election Period

<i>Candidate/team</i>	<i>Declared/statutory limit</i>
<b>Governor/Lt. Governor</b>	
Deval Patrick / Timothy Murray (D)	Self-imposed limit of \$9,900,000
Charles Baker / Richard Tisei (R)	Self-imposed limit of \$8,000,000
Timothy Cahill / Paul Loscocco (U)	Statutory limit of \$1,500,000
Jill Stein / Richard Purcell (U)	Statutory limit of \$1,500,000
<b>Limit for each team: \$9.9 million</b>	
<b>Attorney General</b>	
Martha Coakley (D)	Statutory limit of \$625,000
James McKenna (R)	Self-imposed limit of \$750,000
<b>Limit for each candidate: \$750,000</b>	
<b>Treasurer</b>	
Steven Grossman (D)	No Limit
Karyn Polito (R)	No Limit
<b>Limit for each candidate: No Limit*</b>	
<b>Secretary</b>	
William Galvin (D)	Self-imposed limit of \$2,900,000
William Campbell (R)	Statutory limit of \$375,000
<b>Limit for each candidate: \$2.9 million</b>	
<b>Auditor</b>	
Suzanne Bump	Statutory limit of \$375,000
Mary Connaughton	Statutory limit of \$375,000
<b>Limit for each candidate: \$375,000</b>	

\*Because no candidates for state treasurer participated in the public financing program, there was no spending limit in the race.

### Release of Funds

Half of the State Election Campaign Fund – \$781,919 – was made available to candidates for the general election, plus the unused balance of \$256,756 from the primary election, for a total of

\$1,038,676. Six candidates remained who were on the general election ballot and had agreed to spending limits, and were therefore eligible to receive funding – if they ultimately submitted qualifying contributions for matching funds.

One of those eligible candidates, Timothy Cahill, was running for governor and was therefore eligible to receive funding first, under the provisions of Chapter 55C. Cahill was eligible to receive up to \$750,000. The remaining balance of \$288,676 was split between the four other eligible statewide candidates. The sixth eligible candidate, gubernatorial candidate Jill Stein, agreed to limits but did not submit the required number of qualification contributions for matching funds.

Running mates for lieutenant governor are considered eligible to receive public funds if they agree to spending limits and are in a contested race. However, public funds for the general election are distributed to a gubernatorial candidate team and wired to the depository account of the gubernatorial candidate. For the purpose of this report, the gubernatorial candidates are considered the recipients of the money.

The following are the allotments of public funds for the general election and the overall totals:

### **Total Public Funds Received in 2010**

<i>Candidate/Office</i>	<i>Primary</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>
Timothy Cahill, Governor	--	\$661,532	\$661,532
Suzanne Bump, Auditor	\$143,640	\$72,169	\$215,809
Mary Connaughton, Auditor	\$137,288	\$59,903*	\$197,191
Stephen Murphy, Treasurer	\$160,018	--	\$160,018
Michael Lake, Auditor	\$84,217	--	\$84,217
Martha Coakley, Attorney General	--	\$72,169	\$72,169
William Campbell, Secretary	--	\$28,916	\$28,916
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$525,163	\$894,689	\$1,419,852

\*Mary Connaughton qualified for \$72,169 for the general election, but the total was reduced because her campaign committee was required to return unused primary election funds to the Commonwealth. By agreement with OCPF, the Connaughton Committee did not write a check for \$12,266. Instead, the committee's general election distribution was reduced by that amount.

A total of \$1,419,852 was distributed to seven candidates from the SECF, which contained \$1,563,839. The balance of \$143,987 in unused funds is now retained for use in the statewide election in 2014, in accordance with Chapter 55C.

There are several reasons why all funds were not used. Four candidates agreed to spending limits but did not submit enough qualifying contributions to receive the money – Jill Stein for governor, Richard Purcell for lieutenant governor, James Henderson for secretary and Nathanael Fortune for auditor. Additionally, no primary election candidate qualified to receive the full eligible amount of \$195,479 each. In the general election, Timothy Cahill for governor and

William Campbell for secretary received funds, but not their total qualifying amounts, because they did not submit enough qualifying contributions to receive matching amounts.

Chapter 55C also requires that after the general election, candidates return any unused public funds. Three candidates reported surplus funds that were paid to the Commonwealth in late November:

<b><u>Candidate</u></b>	<b><u>Funds Returned</u></b>
Timothy Cahill	\$20,625
Martha Coakley	\$8,654
Mary Connaughton	\$1,021
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$30,300</i>

That amount was returned to the SECF by the candidates for use in 2014, bringing the total carried over to \$174,287.

## **VIII. Conclusion**

The SECF was a reliable source of funds for several statewide candidates, two of whom were ultimately successful in the 2010 election.

However, several issues can be considered to determine whether the SECF can be improved. Among the revenue issues are whether additional funding sources should be designated to augment the checkoff or whether the checkoff itself should be increased from its current \$1 per filer. By comparison, the federal checkoff amount is \$3. Another issue to be considered is how funds should be allocated, especially if the longstanding revenue shortfall continues. Should the spending limits and the statutory payments be increased to account for inflation? Should the current 50/50 division of SECF funds for the primary and general elections be modified to provide more money for one election over the other?

As always, OCPF is ready to take part in any discussion of the future of the limited public financing program or any other campaign finance issue.