

## **Common Council: Fundraising Patterns Across Time**

The total number of individual contributions given in Common Council races rose significantly during the 2000s. Between 2003 and 2007:

- The number of small dollar (\$0-\$20) contributions remained relatively constant
- The number of midsize contributions (\$20.01-\$99.99) rose by 83 percent, from 978 to 1,789
- The number of large contributions (\$100-\$250) rose by 87 percent

These trends were paralleled in the dollar amount of these contributions, with the amount coming from small donations remaining constant and the amounts coming from midsize and large donations increasing by over 80 percent.

These two findings together also suggest that the average and median contributions from individuals are unlikely to have changed dramatically across time. This was indeed the case, as between 2003 and 2007:

- The average contribution rose only from \$59.39 to \$62.81 (an increase of five percent)
- The median contribution remained flat at \$50

The majority of individual donations came from just four ZIP codes within the city: 53703, 53704, 53705, and 53711. Over 61 percent of individual donations to Common Council candidates came from these areas.

The total amount raised by candidates rose from an average of \$4,551.93 in 2003 to \$6,133.53 in 2007 (an increase of 35 percent).

This aggregate pattern disguises important differences based upon the nature of the race, as between 2003 and 2007:

- Challengers' average fundraising declined from \$8,982.50 to \$8,315.90 (a seven percent decline)
- Incumbents' average fundraising remained relatively flat (increasing from \$4,102.96 to \$4,424.49, only a eight percent increase)
- Candidates in open seats increased their average fundraising from \$4,175.54 to \$6,278.82 (a 50 percent increase)

It is important to note that in all three cycles between 2003 and 2007, challengers on average outraised incumbent candidates.

Political action committee (PAC) donations were far less consequential in Common Council races than donations from individuals. They also experienced less change across time, between 2003 and 2007:

- The average PAC contribution declined from \$188.46 to \$166.58 (a 12 percent decline)
- The average PAC contribution to incumbents declined from \$200 to \$173.04 (a 13 percent decline)
- The average PAC contribution to challengers rose from \$150 to \$160.71 (a 7 percent increase)
- The average PAC contribution to open seat candidates declined from \$185.71 to \$165.15 (a 11 percent decline)

## **Common Council: Spending Patterns Across Time**

The average level of spending in Common Council races has risen across time from \$4,090.95 in 2003 to \$5,762.58 in 2007 (a 41 percent increase). This aggregate pattern also disguises important differences based upon the nature of the race, as between 2003 and 2007:

- Challengers' average spending decreased from \$10,818.39 to \$8,351.35 (a decrease of 23 percent)
- Incumbents' average spending increased from \$2,251.18 to \$3,475.76 (an increase of 54 percent)
- Open seat candidates' average spending increased from \$4,312.60 to \$6,284.92 (an increase of 46 percent)

Paradoxically, there appears to be a negative correlation between average levels of spending and average vote totals. As incumbents spent more across time, their average share of the vote declined from 72 percent to 58 percent (a decrease of 19 percent) in contested races. For challengers, as their average spending declined, their average share of the vote increased from 28 percent to 42 percent (an increase of 50 percent) in contested races.

In terms of electoral outcomes, in contested races, the higher spending candidate only won 51.4 percent of the time. Compared to races at the state legislative level and the Congressional level, this is a very low percentage. There are important across time trends, however:

- In 2003, only 14 percent of the candidates who spent the most in contested races won
- In 2005 and 2007, these percentages were in 67 and 64 percent, respectively

The bulk of the money raised by Common Council candidates during the 2000s was spent on get out the vote (GOTV) related activities. Just under-70 percent of the funds spent by these candidates was used for printing and postage. In contrast, only 6 percent was spent on consulting and 4 percent on advertising.

This distribution of spending suggests that although the amount of money raised and spent in these races has increased over the last decade, they remain relatively un-professionalized affairs that feature small, relatively direct campaigns.

## **Mayor: Fundraising Patterns Across Time**

The total dollar amount of individual contributions given in mayoral races declined between 2003 and 2007:

- The amount of small dollar (\$0-\$20) contributions decreased from \$13,959.15 to \$4,219.17 (70 percent)
- The amount of midsize contributions (\$20.01-\$99.99) declined by 36 percent, from \$266,977.30 to \$169,961.50
- The amount of large contributions (\$100-\$250) dropped by 14 percent, from \$300,997.60 to \$259,639.40

These aggregate trends suggest a greater reliance on large dollar donors in 2007 than in 2003. They also likely are due to the presence of four major candidates in 2003 (incumbent Sue Bauman, former mayor Paul Soglin, eventual winner Dave Cieslewicz, and council member Bert Zipperer) and only two major candidates in 2007 (incumbent Cieslewicz and school board member Ray Allen).

Average and median contributions from individuals did not change dramatically across this time period; however, they did not behave as the aggregate trends would suggest. Between 2003 and 2007:

- The average contribution rose from \$91.60 to \$118.76 (an increase of 23 percent)
- The median contribution remained flat at \$50

The majority of individual donations came from just four ZIP codes within the city: 53703, 53704, 53705, and 53711. Over 58 percent of individual donations to mayoral candidates came from these areas. This pattern is similar to that for the Common Council; however, it is also important to note that almost one-quarter of individual donations in mayoral campaigns come from outside of Madison (this percentage is only 18.5 for the Common Council).

Political action committee (PAC) donations declined notably between 2003 and 2007. The average PAC contribution dropped from \$1,048.46 to \$686.11 (a decrease of 35 percent), and the median contribution dropped from \$1,000 to \$500 (a 50 percent decrease).

## **Mayor: Spending Patterns Across Time**

Spending in the mayoral race totaled \$487,383.45 in 2003 and \$783,429.65 in 2007. In 2003, three candidates (Bauman, Cieslewicz, and Soglin) spent more than \$100,000. In 2007, both Allen and Cieslewicz spent over \$300,000. (Candidates were able to spend more despite raising less in 2007 by carrying over funds from previous campaigns).

- In 2003, incumbent Bauman spent the least of the three highest spending candidates, finished fourth in the primary, and did not advance to the general election. Former mayor Soglin spent \$28,524.50 more than Cieslewicz, but lost the general election by 2.02 percent of the vote.
- In 2007, Cieslewicz outspent Allen by \$114,702.20 and won the general election by over 24 percentage points

These data fail to provide us a clear picture as to the specific effects of both incumbency and spending, as there are only two elections to analyze and they produce contradictory results.

The largest expenditure of the money raised by mayoral candidates during the 2000s was spent on printing and postage (36 percent of total spending). In contrast to Common Council candidates, mayoral candidates spent far more on consulting and advertising (23 percent and 26 percent, respectively).

In combination with the larger amount of donations to mayoral candidates that come from outside of Madison, this distribution of spending suggests that mayoral campaigns are far more professionalized affairs than Common Council races and that these races feature more modern campaign techniques and strategies.