

# Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance

## Report on the Limited Public Financing System for Candidates for Statewide Office in the 2014 Election



One Ashburton Place, Room 411  
Boston, MA 02108  
617-979-8300  
[www.ocpf.us](http://www.ocpf.us)

## 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 2014 election.

**This report outlines the workings of the State Election Campaign Fund and provides specifics on its operation in the 2014 election, including the availability and distribution of funds to participating candidates.** More than \$1 million was distributed to three candidates running for statewide office in 2014. The total outlay is about \$350,000 less than the 2010 figure.

The public financing system was effectively implemented in a professional and efficient manner during the 2014 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 their political committees, who cooperated with this office by making early submissions of qualifying candidate statements.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Sullivan  
Director  
Office of Campaign and Political Finance

January 30, 2015

## 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 potentially 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 nine statewide elections since its institution, public financing has provided more than \$11.8 million to candidates, most recently more than \$1 million in 2014.

### **Disbursements to Candidates from the State Election Campaign Fund 1978-2014 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
2014	\$1,235,905	\$1,065,704

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 \$7,721,354 to candidates since 1978.

A total of 109 candidates have received public funds since 1978: 99 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 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 1978-2014**

<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
2014	12	2	10	2	3

\*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. Candidates for governor and lieutenant governor run as candidate teams.

### **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, 2013, 4.89 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	1.50%	\$56,648
1994	279,523	9.89%	\$394,150
1995	247,097	8.45%	\$351,705
1996	291,872	9.86%	\$417,791
1997	320,284	10.39%	\$449,991
1998	279,600	8.82%	\$382,270
1999	326,599	10.22%	\$447,283
2000	325,878	9.89%	\$445,789
2001	341,008	10.32%	\$465,545
2002	305,810	9.24%	\$419,308
2003	265,373	8.08%	\$365,895
2004	248,744	7.50%	\$343,790
2005	231,579	6.98%	\$321,393
2006	222,241	6.51%	\$308,467
2007	213,183	6.16%	\$296,489
2008	200,895	5.78%	\$280,672
2009	192,549	5.68%	\$269,131
2010	195,037	5.59%	\$272,463
2011	184,808	5.24%	\$258,910
2012	176,555	4.93%	\$247,366
2013	175,552	4.89%	\$245,108

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 \$1,235,905 was available to candidates last year, which was not enough to provide the full statutory amounts of matching funds to all candidates who agreed to observe spending limits in return for public money.

## IV. Candidates' Participation in the 2014 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 governor are limited to expenditures of \$1.5 million for the primary election campaign (which was June 4 to Sept. 9 in 2014) and \$1.5 million for the general election campaign (which was Sept. 10 to Nov. 4 in 2014, and Aug. 27 to Nov. 4 for

unenrolled candidates), for a total of \$3 million. In return, those candidates were eligible for up to \$750,000 in matching funds for each of the two periods, for a total of \$1.5 million. If opposed by a non-participating candidate, a participating candidate is still eligible to receive funds. Additionally, their expenditure limit would be increased to the highest amount set by a non-participating candidate.

A total of 32 candidates for statewide office were required to file declarations with OCPF stating whether they agreed to observe statutory spending limits in 2014. 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 2014 Statewide Candidates**

<u>Office / Statutory Limit*</u>	<u>Agreed to limits (participants)</u>	<u>Did not agree to limits (non-participants)</u>
<b>Governor</b> \$1.5 million per election**	Joseph Avellone (D) Donald Berwick (D) Martha Coakley (D) Evan Falchuk (U) Mark Fisher (R) Scott Lively (U) Jeffrey McCormick (U)	Charles Baker (R) Steven Grossman (D) Juliette Kayyem (D)
<b>Lieutenant Governor</b> \$625,000 Primary**	James Arena-DeRosa (D) Leland Cheung (D) Angus Jennings (U) Stephen Kerrigan (D) Michael Lake (D) Tracy Post (U) Shelly Saunders (U)	Karyn Polito (R)
<b>Attorney General</b> \$625,000 per election		Maura Healey (D) John Miller (R) Warren Tolman (D)
<b>Secretary</b> \$375,000 per election	David D’Arcangelo (R) Daniel Factor (U)	William Galvin (D)
<b>Treasurer</b> \$375,000 per election	Thomas Conroy (D) Ian Jackson (U)	Barry Finegold (D) Deborah Goldberg (D) Michael Heffernan (R)
<b>Auditor</b> \$375,000 per election	Suzanne Bump (D) M K Merelice (U) Patricia Saint Aubin (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 2013 and 2014 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 2014 was \$1,235,905.

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.) 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 2014 was June 3, 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 23 candidates who were seeking their parties' nomination for statewide office filed statements declaring whether they intended to limit their spending in the 2014 primary and general elections.

Failure to file a statement would have meant a candidate could not be on the primary ballot. However, every candidate filed the statement, form CPFA 20.

### Participation in Public Financing Statewide Candidates on the 2014 Primary Ballot

<u>Office / Statutory Limit*</u>	<u>Agreed to limits and will participate</u>	<u>Did not agree to limits and will not participate</u>
<b>Governor</b> \$1.5 million per election**	Joseph Avellone (D) Donald Berwick (D) Martha Coakley (D) Mark Fisher (R)	Charles Baker (R) Steven Grossman (D) Juliette Kayyem (D)
<b>Lieutenant Governor</b> \$625,000 Primary***	James Arena-DeRosa (D) Leland Cheung (D) Stephen Kerrigan (D) Michael Lake (D)	Karyn Polito (R)
<b>Attorney General</b> \$625,000 per election		Maura Healey (D) John Miller (R) Warren Tolman (D)
<b>Secretary</b> \$375,000 per election	David D'Arcangelo (R)	William Galvin (D)
<b>Treasurer</b> \$375,000 per election	Thomas Conroy (D)	Barry Finegold (D) Deborah Goldberg (D) Michael Heffernan (R)
<b>Auditor</b> \$375,000 per election	Suzanne Bump (D) Patricia Saint Aubin (R)	

Of the candidates who were eligible for the primary ballot, 12 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 the September primary were not required to file limit declarations in June. Rather, their filings were due on Aug. 26, 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 \$1.2 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. Because candidates for governor with primary opponents agreed to participate, no funds were available for other races.

### **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 6 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 gubernatorial candidates Charles Baker (R), Steven Grossman (D) and Juliette Kayyem, (D); and candidates for treasurer Barry Finegold (D) and Deborah Goldberg (D). All five 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.

#### **Governor**

- **Charles Baker: \$5 million.** The limit for Baker's Republican primary opponent, Mark Fisher, increased to \$5 million from his previous statutory limit of \$1.5 million.
- **Steven Grossman: \$9 million.** The limit for Grossman's Democratic primary opponents, Joseph Avellone, Donald Berwick, Martha Coakley and Kayyem, increased to \$9 million. The statutory limit was \$1.5 million.
- **Juliette Kayyem: \$5 million.** Because Grossman set the limit at \$9 million, all Democratic gubernatorial candidates were subject to the higher amount.

### Treasurer

- **Barry Finegold: \$2 million.** The limit for Finegold and his primary challengers, Thomas Conroy and Goldberg, was \$2 million.
- **Deborah Goldberg: \$1.7 million.** Because Finegold submitted a limit of \$2 million, the limit for all Democratic primary candidates was the higher amount.

In other races, spending statements were not required because those contests either had no candidates who agreed to participate in the public financing program, or had candidates that agreed to participate but did not face primary opponents who chose not to participate.

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

### ***Spending Limits for the 2014 Primary Election***

#### ***Statutory or Self-Imposed***

***(June 4 to Sept. 9)***

<b>Race</b>	<b>Democratic Primary Election Spending Limit*</b>	<b>Republican Primary Election Spending Limit*</b>
Governor	\$9 million	\$5 million
Lt. Gov.	\$625,000	No Limit
Attorney General	No Limit	No Limit
Secretary	No Limit	\$375,000
Treasurer	\$2 million	No Limit
Auditor	\$375,000	\$375,000

***\*Per candidate***

***Note: "No Limit" means no candidate for that race agreed to participate in the public financing program***

### **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 2014 at \$1,235,905. Under law, that amount was split in half: \$617,952 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 qualifying contributions are 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. Because gubernatorial candidates qualified to receive matching funds in the primary, no funds remained for candidates running for other statewide offices.

Two gubernatorial candidates were certified and received funds for the primary election. They each received the maximum amount available.

### **Funds Disbursed in the 2014 Primary Campaign**

<i>Candidate</i>	<i>Office sought</i>	<i>Amount disbursed</i>
Donald Berwick (D)	Governor	\$308,976
Martha Coakley (D)	Governor	\$308,976
<b>TOTAL</b>		\$617,952

## **VII. The General Election**

The general election campaign did not officially start until the day after the Sept. 9 primary (Aug. 27 for unenrolled candidates), 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. Unenrolled candidates who were seeking statewide office filed statements by Aug. 26 indicating whether they intended to limit their spending in the general election.

All nine unenrolled candidates – Evan Falchuk, Scott Lively and Jeffrey McCormick for governor; Angus Jennings, Shelly Saunders and Tracy Post for lieutenant governor; Daniel Factor for secretary of state; Ian Jackson for treasurer; and M K Merelice for auditor – agreed to observe spending limits.

Prior to the general election, 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. 12. The candidates who filed statements with OCPF by the deadline were Charles Baker (R), candidate for governor; Secretary of the Commonwealth William Galvin (D); and Deborah Goldberg (D) and Michael Heffernan (R), candidates for state treasurer. Baker and his running mate for lieutenant governor, Karyn Polito (R), filed one statement as a candidate team.

If applicable, participating candidates' limits for the election period (Sept. 10 to Nov. 4, and Aug. 27 to Nov. 4 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 were increased to the amount of the self-imposed limit by the non-participating candidates. Because no candidates for attorney general 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.

Charles Baker (R), William Galvin (D), Deborah Goldberg (D) and Michael Heffernan (R) were all opposed in the general election by candidates who agreed to the statutory limits – Attorney General Martha Coakley (D), Evan Falchuk (U), Scott Lively (U) and Jeffrey McCormick (U), candidates for governor; David D’Arcangelo (R) and Daniel Factor (U), candidates for secretary; and Ian Jackson (U), candidate for treasurer. The spending limits for those participating candidates increased to the amounts specified by Baker and Galvin, and the higher of the limits set by Goldberg and Heffernan.

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

- **Baker/Polito: \$8 Million.** The spending limit for Baker’s general election opponents, Coakley, Falchuk, Lively and McCormick, increased to \$8 million from the statutory limit of \$1.5 million. Spending by lieutenant governor candidates also counted toward the gubernatorial cap of \$8 million. The lieutenant governor candidates were Polito, Angus Jennings (U), Stephen Kerrigan (D), Tracy Post (U) and Shelly Saunders (U).
- **Galvin: \$2 million.** The spending limit for Galvin’s general election opponents, D’Arcangelo and Factor, increased to \$2 million from the statutory limit of \$375,000.
- **Goldberg: \$2 million.** The spending limit for Goldberg’s general election opponents, Heffernan and Jackson, increased to \$2 million from the statutory limit of \$375,000.
- **Heffernan: \$1 million.** Because Goldberg declared a higher limit, Heffernan’s limit was also raised to \$2 million.

**General Election Spending Limits for all Statewide Races**

Governor/Lt. Governor Team	\$8 million
Attorney General	No Limit
Secretary of the Commonwealth	\$2 million
Treasurer	\$2 million
Auditor	\$375,000

## Release of Funds

Half of the State Election Campaign Fund – \$617,952 – was made available to candidates for the general election. Ten 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.

State law calls for candidates for governor to be funded first, with any remaining funds to be distributed to other statewide candidates who are eligible to receive public financing. Because the fund contained \$617,952 for the general election, and because two candidates for governor qualified for public financing, the total was split in half for each candidate (Martha Coakley and Jeffrey McCormick) and there was no money available for other candidates.

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 deposited 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 2014

<i>Candidate/Office</i>	<i>Primary</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>
Donald Berwick	\$308,976	--	\$308,976
Martha Coakley	\$308,976	\$296,868*	\$605,844
Jeffrey McCormick	--	\$150,884	\$150,884
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$617,952</b>	<b>\$447,752</b>	<b>\$1,065,704</b>

\*Martha Coakley qualified for \$308,976 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 Coakley Committee did not write a check for \$12,107. Instead, the committee's general election distribution was reduced by that amount.

A total of \$1,065,704 was distributed to three candidates from the SECF, which originally contained \$1,235,905. The balance of \$170,201 in unused funds is now retained for use in the statewide election in 2018, in accordance with Chapter 55C.

Not all the funds were used for several reasons. Jeffrey McCormick did not submit enough matching contributions to receive the full amount available of \$308,976 for the general election. Chapter 55C requires that after the primary and general elections, candidates return any unused public funds. One candidate, Donald Berwick, returned \$10,583 in surplus funds to the state. Martha Coakley was required to refund \$12,107 in surplus funds from the primary election, but

instead of making the payment, that amount was withheld from the campaign's general election funding. Due to the unused public funds, the total carried over for 2018 is \$180,783.

## **VIII. Conclusion**

The SECF was a reliable source of funds for three gubernatorial candidates, none of whom were ultimately successful in the 2014 election.

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.