## The Chicago Municipal Election February 22, 2011 A Vote Analysis

- I. Chicago Turnout A Ward Analysis
- II. Chicago Mayor
- III. Chicago City Clerk

Roosevelt University
Institute for Politics
430 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Paul M. Green – Director April – 2011

Research Assistance
Ms. Jearlean Fleming
Ms. Kathy Murphy

This report is a non-partisan analysis of the February 22, 2011 Chicago Municipal Election. It is produced by the Institute for Politics at Roosevelt University – in cooperation with the Chicago Board of Elections and is funded in part with a grant from AT&T Illinois. It's author is Institute Director, Paul Green. Comments on this report are welcomed.

Email - pgreen@roosevelt.edu Fax - 312-341-4325

#### Preface -

Much <u>has</u> and <u>will</u> be written about the February 22, 2011 Chicago Municipal election – especially for the office of Mayor. However, this report will center mainly on the election returns analyzing how Rahm Emanuel was elected mayor and Susana Mendoza – City Clerk. Obviously, this report cannot avoid examining how the candidates campaign strategies and performances impacted their vote returns. Still the emphasis here will be on numbers – where the votes came from – where each candidate did best or worst and lastly what do these results portend for Chicago's political future.

## I. Chicago Turnout: A Ward Analysis

The February 22, 2011 municipal election voter turnout continued a trend that has the real potential to change campaign strategy, tactics and perhaps even the types of candidates for future city elections. As was seen in the November, 2010 general election, a new voter city powerbase has been established – it is the north lakefront wards and the wards that border them on the west and south.

As Table 1 clearly shows —eight— of the top twenty turnout wards in the February 22<sup>nd</sup> election are part of this new vote bastion (#42 - #47 - #2 - #43 - #46 - #32 - #48 - #44). To be sure some of the old stalwart south side middle class African-American wards remain in the top tier (#8 - #21 - #6 - #34 - #7) as well as the racially mixed Hyde Park/Kenwood 4th ward, but the <u>big</u> story is where are the other five.

Thirty years ago the huge northwest and southwest side predominantly white ethnic wards were significant vote producers. No doubt #41, #45, and #36 on the northwest side and #19 (top gun on 2/22/11) - #23 on the southwest side still have solid voter turnouts. However, gone from the top 20 turnout list are former southwest side vote powerhouses #13 (barely) — Illinois House Speaker Michael Madigan, #11 — Daley family and #14 (sixth from the bottom) Ald. Ed Burke and on the northwest side #38, #50, #39, #40.

The key factor in the above wards vote muscle decline centers on the influx of Hispanics into these communities. Simply put, Hispanic Chicagoans do not vote their numbers. Obviously, these residents may have legal, cultural or even language issues causing this city population/vote total mismatch — still the numbers do not lie.

On February 22<sup>nd</sup> eighteen wards had vote turnouts that were under 10,000 votes and of these half were heavily Hispanic. Moreover, five of these Hispanic wards tallied less than 7000 voters with two of them #12 and #22 coming in under 5000 votes.

## II. Chicago Mayor

#### The Candidates:

- 1. Rahm Emanuel
- 2. Gery Chico
- 3. Miguel Del Valle
- 4. Carol Moseley Braun
- 5. Patricia Van Pelt Watkins
- 6. William Walls

There is an old Chicago campaign saying "Fish where the fish are". In 2011 Chicago's mayoral election Rahm Emanuel did just that. As tables 2 and 3 reveal Emanuel won forty wards – including every lakefront and African-American ward in the city.

Before launching into the ward analysis for this contest – a few general comments are in order.

First – this race was the first truly <u>contested</u> mayoral election under the relatively new non-partisan law that had eliminated mayoral primaries. Starting in 1999 and subsequently in 2003 and 2007 Chicago mayoral candidates ran with no party affiliation next to their name. Little was made of this new election law passed by the Illinois General Assembly - since in all three of the above contests incumbent mayor Richard M. Daley won landslide victories.

Second – having a non-partisan mayoral election (now like Chicago aldermanic contests) meant that if a candidate received 50% + 1 of the vote in round one, there would be <u>no</u> round two. However, if no candidate won a vote majority – the top two finishers would face-off in a run-off election.

Third – in 2011 the mayoral opponents of the early established front runner Emanuel had to campaign with a dual strategy. First – they had to deny Emanuel a round one majority and second – each had to try and get into the runoff as the second place finisher. This dual strategy complicated the campaigns of Emanuel's three main challengers – Chico/Del Valle/Braun. How? In candidate debates or "forums" they could unofficially unite to gang up on Emanuel (a factor which persuaded Emanuel to skip most of these events) but they also had to separate themselves from each other as they each sought the campaign's "silver medal." This dual strategy made the challengers appear at times uncertain about their overall message since they were running two campaigns at the same time.

Fourth – finally one cannot over estimate how important Braun's campaign was to Emanuel's round one victory. Her selection as the black "consensus" candidate by a group of unelected designators was 1980's Chicago politics revisited. However, Braun was not Harold Washington, Rich Daley was not Jane Byrne and Barack Obama not Ronald Reagan was living in the White House. This "back to the future" racial politics plus her series of amateurish campaign mistakes minimized Braun's political appeal – even in the African –American community. Moreover, it is possible and even likely to suggest - if Braun could have run just a mediocre and not a disastrous campaign, her vote totals especially in the black wards – would have upped her citywide black vote percentage thereby reducing Emanuel's African/American support and thus denying him a round one victory.

## II-A. Rahm Emanuel's Campaign

Tables 2 and 3 reveal that Rahm Emanuel carried forty of fifty Chicago wards, defeated his nearest challenger Gery Chico by over 185,000 votes while capturing 55.27% of the city vote. Most important - his margin over 50% + 1 was 31, 135 votes. How did he do it?

In only fourteen wards did Emanuel not receive a majority vote and in four of these wards he won a plurality. The ten wards he lost (all to Chico) were overwhelmingly Hispanic wards, heavily Hispanic southwest side wards (#11, #13 #14) led by previous named non-Hispanic political leaders and the city employee laden 19<sup>th</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> and 41<sup>st</sup> wards.

Emanuel ran best along the lakefront. Percentage wise, three of these wards (#43 - #42 - #44) gave him 70%+ of their vote. Five other lakefront and border lakefront wards produced two-thirds of their vote for the former congressman. In all seventeen wards including some west and south side black wards gave him 60%+ of their vote. However, the most startling statistic of this entire election was the fact that Emanuel won a <u>majority</u> of the vote in <u>every</u> African/American ward in the city.

The big political question looming for Mayor-elect Emanuel is – "Can he hold this coalition together?" In his 1989 mayoral victory Richard M. Daley's winning coalition consisted of white ethnics, Hispanics and lakefronters. Daley's coalition never wavered in supporting his subsequent re-election campaigns – even as the mayor added significant numbers of African/Americans to his banner.

It will be a test of Emanuel's vaunted political skills to see if he can keep his coalition united for future campaigns. However, the new "north side" mayor has one heck of a "south side" friend and ally – Barack Obama. The president's popularity is unmatched in the black community and as long as the Obama/Emanuel alliance remains firm – it is likely that the new mayor's black support will remain firm also.

## II-B. Gery Chico's Campaign

The former mayoral chief of staff and Chicago public school board president ran a solid campaign. He garnered nearly a quarter of the city vote, beat the winner in ten wards, and clobbered his other two main rivals – Del Valle and Braun – in total votes. Blame for not stopping Emanuel's first round victory clearly does not rest with him. Chico performed well – but the inability of Braun to limit Emanuel's black support cost him a chance at a one-on-one runoff.

As mentioned previously Chico's ten ward victories centered on the city's Hispanic wards and those wards with significant city workers – especially police officers and fire fighters. Four wards (#14 - #23 - #10 - #12) gave Chico a vote majority. His other six winning wards (#41 - #13 - #19 - #11 - #22 - #25) provided him plurality victories. Unfortunately for Chico, in every one of his winning wards – Emanuel came in second which limited Chico's ability to prevent a 50% + 1 Emanuel win. Marginwise only three wards gave Chico 2000+ vote victories over Emanuel (#19 - #23 -#14).

Overall Chico received +20% of the vote in twenty-two wards however in eleven predominantly black wards he received less than 10% of the vote.

## II-C. Miguel Del Valle's Campaign

Miguel Del Valle was unable to win any city ward. In fact, in only three wards (#26 - #35 - #49) was he able to top second place finisher Chico. City-wide only the heavily Hispanic (Puerto Rican) 26<sup>th</sup> ward gave the City Clerk more than a third of its votes while just five other wards (#35 - #31 - #22 - #30 - #1) produced 20%+ votes for him.

Del Valle's appeal in other parts of the city was even more limited. In thirty-one other wards he received less than 10% of the vote. Perhaps the only glimmer of enjoyment for him on election night was the fact that citywide he outpolled Braun by 1627 votes to gain a third place finish.

## II-D. Carol Mosley Braun's Campaign

Carol Moseley Braun's campaign was a disaster from the start. Her fourth place finish reflected her campaign's ineptness. The former U.S. Senator could not win a single ward and garnered less than 9% of the citywide vote.

Braun's <u>best</u> showing was in the south side African/American 6<sup>th</sup> ward where she won only 23.9% of its vote. In seven other mainly black wards she topped 20%.

On the downside in <u>twenty</u> wards she won less than 2% of the vote and in <u>six</u> of these (#47 - #11 - # 14 - #45 - #38 - #41) she was below 1%. Enough said.

## II-E. Patricia Van Pelt Watkins and William Walls

Watkins and Walls combined for a little more than 2.5% of the city vote. Neither candidate was competitive in any ward. Watkins' best showing was in the 17<sup>th</sup> ward (4.8%) – Walls' high point was 2.2% in the 8<sup>th</sup> ward.

In twenty-nine wards Watkins received less than 1% of the vote while Walls failed to top 1% in thirty-two wards.

The only impact either candidate had on the campaign was Watkins receiving a unwarranted tongue-lashing from Braun in a south side forum. It was "the crack heard around the city".

## III. Chicago City Clerk

#### The Candidates:

- 1. Susana Mendoza
- 2. Patricia Horton

Susana Mendoza easily defeated Patricia Horton in the city clerk contest. Table 4 reveals Mendoza won by over 100,000 votes while garnering near 60% of the vote.

This contest between two women – one Hispanic (Mendoza) the other African/American broke as expected. Twenty wards with large to significant Hispanic populations gave Mendoza 70%+ of their vote. However, marginwise it was the northwest and southwest sides and the lakefront that gave her the biggest vote push (once again demonstrating low Hispanic turnouts). Though comparisons from past elections are sometimes tenuous (given the office – candidates involved and issues) Mendoza's coalition of Hispanics, ethnics and lakefronters resembled Richard M. Daley's original 1989 victory coalition.

Horton won eighteen predominantly black wards. However, her winning percentages in these wards were far less than Mendoza's Hispanic ward numbers.

## Summary

Rahm Emanuel has won a mandate to be Chicago's next Mayor. He out-worked, out-fundraised and out-foxed his known and unknown opponents. In winning his election easily – Emanuel demonstrated a calm and thoughtful persona which clearly played against his publicized aggressive and no-prisoner reputation. It was perhaps one of the shrewdest political makeovers in Chicago electoral history. Once in office it will be interesting to see if the "new Rahm" personality remains as Mayor Emanuel faces a myriad of critical policy and political issues.

### Chicago Mayoral Election 2011 Total Ballots Cast Ranked by Ward

#### TABLE 1

Rank	Ward	BALLOTS CAST	
4	19	24,007	
2	41	20,398	
3	42	18,900	
4	47	17,345	
5	23	16,638	
6	В	16,148	
7	45	16,148	
8	21	16,031	
9	18	15,709	
10	6	15,353	
11	2	15,241	
12	43	15,015	
13	46	14,611	
14	34	14,587	
15	36	14,447	
16	32	14,096	
17	4	13,757	
18	48	13,457	
19	44	13,114	
20	7	12,823	
21	13	12,545	
22	38	12,494	
23	5	12,325	
24	50	11,656	
25	11	11,385	
26	9	11,346	
27	29	10,933	
28	10	10,848	
29	39	10,844	
30	40	10,629	
31	1	10,564	
32	17	10,279	
33	49	9.929	
34			
35	27	9,895	
36	3	9,633	
		9,324	
37	35	9,070	
38	25	9,057	
39	37	8,977	
40	28	8,497	
41	33	8,175	
42	26	7,934	
43	20	7,775	
45	15	7,282	
46	30	6,590	
47		6,511	
	31	6,490	
48	18 12	6,356	
50	22	4,954	
30		4,802	

594.734 — Total All Ballots Cast 590,357 — Total Ballots Cast for Mayor

TABLE 2
February 2011 Municipal General Election -- Mayor

Ward	Votes Cast	RAHM EMANUEL	. %	MIGUEL DEL VALLE	· %	CAROL MOSELEY BRAUN	%	GERY J. CHICO	· %	PATRICIA VAN PELT WATKINS	%	WILLIAM WALLS, III	%
1	10498	5703	54.32%	2263	21.56%	152	1.45%	2303	21.94%		0.44%		0.30%
2	15137	9754	64.44%	978			9.64%		16.42%		2.23%		0.81%
<u>3</u>	9232	5374	58.21%				21.37%		11.32%		3.00%		1.58%
4	13671		59.51%	1154	<ul> <li>1 12</li> </ul>		17.80%		9.65%		2.47%		2.14%
<u>5</u> .	12244		62.42%	÷			16.78%	1124			2.90%		1.64%
<u>5</u>	15255		58.65%	463			23.92%	1315			3.66% 3.50%		2.12% 1.82%
7	12516		59.63%		3.76%		21.32% 22.97%	1248 1455			3.34%	-	2.22%
<u>8</u>	16056	1323	59.01%		3.39% 2.67%		22.89%		9.79%		3.72%		1.97%
9	11277		58.97% 35.29%				3.03%		52.71%		0.68%		0.47%
<u>10</u> 1	10739 11305		42.56%			111			46.82%		0.31%		0.28%
11 12	4904		28.61%		17.05%		1.73%		51.53%		0.61%		0.47%
12 13	12450		36.94%	1 1000	10.95%	203			49.65%		0.43%		0.40%
14	6535	4	24.53%	ts +	13.18%		0.96%		60.77%		0.38%		0.18%
15	7212	·	53.52%		6.09%	1409	19.54%	1151	15.96%	241	3.34%	112	1.55%
<u>16</u>	6283		51.19%		6.03%	1266	20.15%	1146	18.24%	181	2.88%	95	1.51%
17	10194		60.23%		2.32%	2343	22.98%	800	7.85%	490	4.81%	184	1.80%
18	15622	8188	52.41%	673	4.31%	2790	17.86%	3193	20.44%	510	3.26%	268	1.72%
19	23898	8994	37.63%	1477	6.18%	1263	5.28%	11815	49.44%	215	0.90%	134	0.56%
20	7706	4320	56.06%	378	4.91%	1632	21.18%	943	12.24%	273	3.54%	160	2.08%
21	15933	9448	59.30%		2.67%	3698	23.21%	1409	8.84%	642	4.03%	310	1.95%
22	4751	1292	27.19%	1188	25.01%	147	3.09%	2082	43.82%	33	0.69%		0.19%
23	16516	6119	37.05%	1140	6.90%		1.70%		53.63%		0.44%		0.29%
24	9528		59.61%		3.27%		22.17%		9.07%		4.28%		1.60%
<u>25</u>	8814	<ul> <li>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</li></ul>	36.66%	Service and the service of	19.03%		2.43%		40.87%		0.61%		0.41%
<u> 26</u>	7852		38.83%	y	35.70%		2.71%	į.	21.69%		0.79%		0.28%
<u>27</u>	9816		63.43%	4	8.29%		10.70%		14.26%	•	2.43%		0.89%
<u>28</u>	8386	£ 10 00 000	60.33%		3.86%		20.75%	) in the	9.44%		4.19%	,	1.43%
<u>29</u>	10840	in the second	60.40%				18.73%		11.67% 31.18%		2.86% 0.62%		1.37% 0.31%
<u>30</u>	6460		42.14% 37.89%	×	24.30% 25.85%		1.46% 1.12%		34.57%		0.62%		0.15%
<u>31</u>	6456 14008		67.18%	3	11.00%		1.19%		19.87%		0.44%		0.33%
32 33	8139	4	55.29%		19.83%		1.36%		22.62%		0.54%		0.36%
34	14495		59.79%	to the second	2.39%		22.88%		8.94%		3.88%		2.12%
35	9025		44.16%		30.99%		1.43%		22.55%		0.57%		0.31%
36	14365	1	50.11%	V.	9.51%	_	2.38%		37.03%		0.54%		0.43%
37	8888		60.56%		5.87%	1648	18.54%		11.26%	234	2.63%	100	1.13%
38	12426	Annual Control of the	53.68%		11.11%	92	0.74%	4175	33.60%	61	0.49%	47	0.38%
39	10778		58.42%	1218	11.30%	137	1.27%	3041	28.21%	46	0.43%	39	0.36%
40	10579		61.61%	1664	15.73%	195	1.84%	2090	19.76%	71	0.67%	41	0.39%
41	20290	8583	42.30%	1306	6.44%	138	0.68%	10129	49.92%	73	0.36%	61	0.30%
42	18828	14118	74.98%	818	4.34%	356	1.89%	3413	18.13%	63	0.33%	60	0.32%
43	14914	11197	75.08%	788	5.28%	233	1.56%	2571	17.24%	75	0.50%	50	0.34%
44	13077	9703	74.20%	1077	8.24%	134	1.02%	2090	15.98%	43	0.33%	30	0.23%
<u>45</u>	16062	8223	51.20%	1516	9.44%		0.90%	1	37.58%		0.48%		0.41%
46	14436	10062	69.70%	1381	9.57%	576			15.18%		0.99%		0.57%
47	17274		66.83%		14.37%	170			17.05%		0.41%		0.36%
48		D	68.34%	A CONTRACTOR	11.97%		3.92%		14.57%		0.80%		0.39%
49	9837	1	61.24%		16.13%		5.16%		15.48%		1.02%		0.97%
<u>50</u>	11472		62.91%		10.96%		2.99%		21.77%		0.68%		0.69%
Total	590357 Votes	RAHM	55.28% %	MIGUEL DEL	9.26% - %	53062 CAROL MOSELEY	8.99% %	GERY J		PATRICIA VAN	1.64% %	WILLIAM	0.91%
	Cast	EMANUEI	L	VALLE	2044	BRAUN	<u> </u>	CHICO		PELT WATKINS		WALLS, III	1

February 2011 Municipal General Election -- Mayor

## TABLE 3

## February 22, 2011 – Chicago Municipal Election <u>Mayor</u>

## **Vote Breakdown**

	Rahm	Gery	Miguel	Carol	Patricia	William
	Emanuel	Chico	Del Valle	Moseley Braun	Van Pelt Watkins	Walls
Votes	326331	141228	54689	53062	9704	5343
*Margin	185103					
**Margin	31,135					
%	55.27%	23.92%	9.26%	8.99%	1.64%	0.9%
Wards Won	-40-	-10-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

<sup>\*</sup> Margin – Emanuel v. Chico

<sup>\*\*</sup>Margin – Emanuel v. 50% + 1

## **TABLE 4**

# February 22, 2011 – Chicago Municipal Election <u>City Clerk</u> Vote Breakdown

## Patricia Horton Susana Mendoza

Votes	217993	324742
Margin		106749
%	40.17%	59.83%
Wards Won	-18-	-32-