President-in-waiting

Stan Rosenberg brings insider experience, outsider’s profile to top Senate job
For half a century, the University of Massachusetts Boston has been actively engaged in the community and has helped to shape the Commonwealth's future by making available a high-quality affordable education to the most diverse student population in New England. Boston's only public university is and will always be a research university with a teaching soul.

– PRESIDENT ROBERT L. CARET
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With National Health Care Reform, many things are changing and it’s affecting everyone differently. It’s a lot to digest, especially on your own. You need a partner who not only understands the reform, but also what it means for you. That's where we come in.
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UMASS ENDOWMENT STORY OFF MARK

CommonWealth Magazine was correct in pointing out that the University of Massachusetts endowment has grown dramatically, from $38.5 million in 1995 to today’s nearly $750 million. But the article’s premise that the university’s investment strategy has been overly conservative in today’s financial markets defies the facts and misses what is truly a success story.

Despite significant volatility in the financial markets, UMass achieved an average gain of 3.9 percent for the five-year period ending in 2013, virtually matching the national average of 4 percent gain. Contrary to CommonWealth’s story, in each of those years except 2011 and 2013, the university’s endowment return was actually above — not below — the national average for all endowments.

The article also erroneously states that UMass has kept the endowment out of such investments as emerging stocks and hedge funds (and CommonWealth’s own chart accompanying the article actually shows that the UMass endowment had 26 percent of its assets invested in alternative investments, which are largely hedge fund holdings). The UMass endowment also had 4.2 percent of its assets in emerging market equities as of June 30, 2013.

We look forward to the investment opportunities afforded by the growth in our endowment, particularly with respect to top-tier private equity and venture capital funds for which larger sums are required. The university and the UMass Foundation remain committed to sound investment management practices that balance the need and desire for a significant return on investment against the equally important need to protect endowment gifts and the financial future of the institution.

To do otherwise would be a dereliction of our fiduciary and moral responsibility to our donors, students, and faculty — as well as the entire Commonwealth, which relies on this premier public research university to produce scientific discovery and innovation while providing an affordable, high quality education.

Charles J. Pagnam
Executive vice president
UMass Foundation
Boston

JACK SULLIVAN RESPONDS

The wording of my story should have been more accurate. I reported that between 2009 and 2013, UMass had only one year — 2009 — where its investment performance exceeded the national average for all endowments and for endowments of similar size. Pagnam is correct that the performance of the UMass endowment exceeded the national average in 2009, 2010, and 2012, but it exceeded endowments of similar size only in 2009.

Pagnam cites the school’s five-year average of 3.9 percent as “virtually matching” the national average, but he rounds the national average down from 4.2 to 4 percent. Each percentage point represents more than $6 million for an endowment of UMass’s size, so a difference of 0.3 represents a difference of close to $2 million.

Contrary to Pagnam’s assertion that the story “erroneously states” the fund did not have investments in emerging markets and hedge funds, the story and the accompanying charts both state that it does. The point of the story is that UMass invested in those areas, just at a much smaller and slower rate than its cohorts.

UPDATE PAYING TEACHERS NOT TO TEACH

The Boston Public School system is paying 115 tenured teachers not to teach this year, a roughly $10.1 million cost that officials hope will improve the quality of teaching in the city’s schools.

The numbers are in line with estimates made in a feature article this summer on the system’s new open hiring process, which sidesteps seniority and tenure rules and allows principals to hire whomever they want to fill open positions (“The hiring man,” Summer ’14).

Previously, hiring rules required that teaching spots be found for every tenured teacher, a process that often required principals to take tenured teachers they didn’t want.

Officials said the so-called excess teachers left over at the end of the hiring process will work as assistants to lead teachers. Most of them worked in elementary education and were assigned to 33 schools in groups of three.
Announcing the 2014 Gateway Cities Innovation Award Winners

MassINC and the Gateway Cities Innovation Institute are proud to present the 2014 Gateway Cities Innovation Award Winners. This year’s honorees are advancing educational excellence in their communities by working collaboratively to build new learning models that take advantage of unique Gateway City educational opportunities.

Greater Lawrence Advanced Manufacturing Academy
Superintendent John Lavoie and NECC President Lane Glenn

Holyoke Early Literacy Initiative
Mayor Alex Morse and Superintendent Sergio Paez

Mount Wachusett Community College/Fitchburg High School GEAR UP
Mt. Wachusett & Fitchburg High Team Members

Revere High School Advisory Program
Principal Dr. Lourenço Garcia and former Guidance Director Maureen Lenihan

Worcester Arts Magnet School
Founding Principal Margaret Vendetti and current Principal Susan O’Neil

To view the full agenda, register, or purchase tickets for the awards luncheon, please visit massinc.org
For sponsorship or questions, contact Rachel Fricke at rfricke@massinc.org
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Names and faces

A FORMER EDITOR of mine often used to remind me that names sell newspapers. What he meant was that people like to read about interesting people. At CommonWealth, we sometimes forget that adage, focused as we are on issues of policy. But we didn’t forget with this issue; it’s full of stories about some of the state’s most interesting people.

Our cover story is about Stan Rosenberg, a long-time Senate insider who is poised to take over as Senate president in January when Therese Murray leaves office. Rosenberg will instantly become one of the three most powerful people on Beacon Hill, and Michael Jonas’s story sheds some light on who he is and how he might wield power. I say some light because Rosenberg’s politics are not easy to categorize. He may live in the liberal bastion of Amherst, but it’s hard to say whether he really is a hard-core liberal. For example, he favors a graduated income tax, but he also brokered the passage of the state’s gaming legislation.

Ralph Whitehead, a University of Massachusetts Amherst journalism professor and longtime Rosenberg confidant, says the senator is not your typical Beacon Hill power broker. “An openly gay, Jewish guy from a college town in the western part of the state. Gee, sounds like a standard Massachusetts Senate president,” he says.

Gov. Deval Patrick sits down with Jack Sullivan and talks about what he’s learned the last eight years in office. It’s an interesting discussion with one of the more skillful politicians in the country. He’s still as cagey as ever (he would only say that he voted for the Democrat in the three-way Democratic primary for governor), but his thoughts on race, impatience with government bureaucracy, and the relationships he developed with his predecessors in the Corner Office, most of whom are Republicans, are fascinating.

John Henry, the owner of the Boston Red Sox, the Boston Globe, and, until May, the Worcester Telegram & Gazette, wouldn’t talk to me about his decision to sell the newspaper in New England’s second-largest city. Henry had promised T&G employees and residents of Worcester that he would find a local buyer for the paper and, if one couldn’t be found, keep it himself. But he went back on that pledge, cutting a quarter of the newspaper’s staff and selling to the Halifax Media Group of Daytona Beach, Florida, which may be the antithesis of a local buyer. Tim Murray, the former lieutenant governor and now head of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce, summed up local reaction well: “The way it was handled was bush league.”

John Fish, the emerging leader of the state’s business community, argues passionately that we should explore bringing the Summer Olympics to Boston. The construction executive’s argument is heavy on inspiration and short on facts and figures, but it makes the case that it’s time for

Some making entrance, others head for exits.

Bostonians (and, presumably, the rest of Massachusetts) to start thinking big. A quartet of young turks (Chris Dempsey, Liam Kerr, Kelley Gossett Phillips, and Conor Yunits) make the opposite argument just as strongly. They say it’s time to think smart and leave the Olympics boondoggle to others.

Finally, there is Gabrielle Gurley’s One on One conversation with Mike Firestone. Who’s that, you say? He is an emerging superstar political operative, the mastermind behind Maura Healey’s upset win in the Democratic primary for attorney general, and someone who has played similar roles in the upstart campaigns of US Sen. Elizabeth Warren, Boston City Councilor Michelle Wu, and Gov. Patrick. Indeed, he has such a good track record of turning political unknowns and outsiders into elected officials that his world is coming full circle. During the primary race for attorney general, Patrick endorsed Healey’s opponent, former state senator Warren Tolman. Firestone didn’t miss a beat; the campaign issued a statement calling the endorsement by the governor (Firestone’s old boss) a backroom deal designed to protect the “Beacon Hill club.”

Bruce Mohl

BRUCE MOHL
Leaders in both the public and private sectors rely on The MassINC Polling Group for accurate, unbiased results.

You can too.

Call today to find out how we can help your organization.
More grandparents raising their grandchildren

LINDA ENERSON

LORI FORTIN of Athol thought the joys and stresses of raising kids were behind her, but when her daughter got caught in the undertow of opiate addiction, Fortin found herself once again changing diapers, seeking out playgroups, and ultimately gaining custody of her grandchildren through probate court.

Fortin is just one of thousands of grandparents across Massachusetts who are taking a second turn at parenting. US Census data indicate the number of Massachusetts grandparents raising their grandchildren increased by 30 percent over the last decade, twice as fast as the rate nationwide. In 2012, roughly 36,000 grandparents were raising their grandchildren.

Bette Jenks, who is organizing a support group for grandparent caregivers in the North Quabbin region of Massachusetts, says opiate addictions are driving increasing numbers of grandparents in Massachusetts to take custody of their grandchildren. Mental health issues and other addiction problems also press grandparents into service as caregivers.

John Lepper said he and his wife took custody of their two small grandchildren nearly 30 years ago because their daughter was involved with drugs. “I thought this was something to do with the 1960s counterculture, and it would go away, but it didn’t go away and it isn’t going to go away,” he says.

A former state representative, Lepper chairs a state commission dedicated to raising the awareness of the unique needs of grandparents raising grandchildren. Lepper said the Census statistics probably undercount the number of custodial grandparents. “There’s thousands and thousands of people who are doing the work but don’t want to be involved with the Census survey as they are afraid the (government) will impede what they want to do with their families,” he says.

The grandparents who are open about raising their grandchildren typically gain custody by petitioning probate court or through the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the state’s embattled child welfare agency. The agency, when it removes children from a parent’s home, tries to place them with a relative in what’s called a kinship foster home. According to the DCF website, about a third of all DCF foster homes are kinship homes.

For grandparents serving as kinship foster parents, the DCF route offers a lot more support. They receive monthly stipends as well as clothing, birthday and holiday allotments, child care vouchers, therapy, and other services.

Erin Deveney, DCF’s interim commissioner, says the agency is committed to placing children with relatives and, if those relatives are grandparents, providing help. “In many cases, grandparents are taking on the role of the parents,” she says.
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As caregiver for their grandchildren, and the department remains committed to assisting them with support and services,” she says.

Lepper says the bulk of grandparents gain custody of their grandchildren the way he did, by petitioning probate court. These court placements don’t provide nearly as much support as DCF, and Lepper says grandparents, with their physical challenges and limited incomes, face a lot of stress.

“In your mid-fifties, you just don’t have the same physical ability,” Lepper says. “My wife and I were doing it together and we were economically OK, but for folks who are doing it by themselves, and particularly those grandparents who are living in the inner city or who are on public housing and don’t have any money or any legal support, these people have tremendous pressure on them.”

Jenks says the financial, emotional, and physical health of grandparents and other family members is profoundly impacted by the support they get from community professionals. “Some caseworkers get it and are well-equipped to support grandparents,” she says. “They help grandparents find resources and benefits. But a lot of staff aren’t fully aware of the impact that taking the grandkids will have on these families. Without support from DCF, many grandparents jeopardize their own well-being to help out.”

She adds: “It’s not just a DCF issue. The systems grandparents have to access are very complex and complicated. All the agencies that work with families should be paying more attention to this.”

Laura and Gail, whose names were changed to protect the identities of their grandchildren, are both participants in Jenks’s support group. Gail and her husband took her grandson in when his father started abusing drugs. “DCF has been wonderful,” she says. “They are very helpful, and I am so happy I have my grandson in my life. He’s my pride and joy.”

When Laura’s daughter was abusing drugs and unable to care for her children, a DCF worker advised Laura to take custody of the children through probate court. “She told me they would end up in a foster home if I didn’t take them,” she says.

She soon regretted her decision. “She didn’t tell me that I could have applied to be a foster parent. I could have gotten benefits that could have really helped,” she says.

Caring for four traumatized grandchildren while holding down a full-time nursing job proved impossible. “I had a big job. I needed to stay late but I had to run out to pick the kids up in the afternoon at daycare and school,” she says. Her need for flexibility didn’t go over well at work and she ended up being laid off just as she was moving into a new home in Orange to accommodate her growing grandchildren.

As an older worker, she found it difficult to secure a new job. Once her unemployment benefits ended, she exhausted her retirement savings in order to qualify for welfare and other benefits. Her quality of life also suffered.

“I love my grandkids but I haven’t been able to go out for years,” she says. “It’s hard to go anywhere when you have four kids who are behaving badly. Just as soon as I get the 2 year old calmed down, the 5 year old goes off.”

Linda Enerson is a freelance writer living in Montague.

Boston’s PILOT program lagging

THREE YEARS AFTER the city of Boston launched a concerted effort to convince 49 of its largest nonprofit landholders to voluntarily make payments to the city in lieu of taxes, the program appears to be losing steam. The amount of money the city is collecting continues to rise, but the increase is due primarily to the escalating payment schedule and not greater compliance. Overall, the nonprofits are paying a smaller percentage of what the city is asking them to pay and the number of nonprofits paying nothing at all is rising.

More than half of Boston’s land is owned by either nonprofit institutions or government bodies, both of which are exempt from municipal property taxes. With property taxes accounting for two-thirds of the city’s revenue, the so-called payment in lieu of taxes, or PILOT, program has become a mechanism for Boston to help pay for the services it provides.

Until fairly recently, the city tended to separately negotiate PILOT arrangements with individual nonprofits. In 2011, following a report from a task force, the city asked every nonprofit owning property valued at more than $15 million to make standardized payments based on a formula using the assessed value of their property and the cost of providing city services to them. A deduction is allowed for the community services provided by an institution.

The city’s PILOT collections shot up nearly 30 percent in fiscal 2012, and should continue to grow, although at a slower pace, through 2016 as the program is phased in. As the amounts being sought have increased, the participation by nonprofits has actually declined.

In fiscal 2014, the city took in $24.9 million from its PILOT program. That amount was up compared to 2013 ($23.2 million) and 2012 ($19.5 million), but as a percent-
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Age of the amount the city was seeking it was down. The city collected 72 percent of what it was asking for in 2014, 82 percent in 2013, and 91 percent in 2012.

The number of nonprofits paying the full amount sought by the city has also declined. This year, 20 nonprofits are fully complying and 16 are paying nothing, compared to 22 making the full payment and 13 paying nothing a year ago. The number paying a portion of what municipal officials say they should has held relatively steady at 14.

The city’s nonprofit medical institutions as a group have tended to pay nearly all of what the city says they owe (95 percent), but compliance by educational and cultural institutions has fallen over the last three years. Educational institutions paid 89 percent of what the city said they owed in 2012, but that percentage fell to 56 percent in 2014. For cultural institutions, the percentage has fallen from 54 percent to 30 percent.

In 2014, Boston University was billed a little over $6 million – far more than any other single institution – and paid 92 percent of it. BU President Robert Brown is up front on why he does it. “It’s enlightened self-interest,” he says. “Boston University thrives only if the city thrives. It’s clearly a win-win situation.”

Harvard University, the nation’s wealthiest educational institution with a $36 billion endowment, paid 51 percent of its $4.3 million PILOT bill, or $2.2 million. Kevin Casey, a university spokesman, says Boston’s PILOT calculation doesn’t count all of the university’s financial contributions to the city.

“Harvard has been among the highest contributors of voluntary PILOT over many decades,” he says. “Harvard’s level of maintenance for the Arnold Arboretum, a public jewel, is over $9 million a year that otherwise would have to be borne by the city’s parks and recreation department. That alone greatly offsets the entire PILOT request.”

Partners HealthCare’s four Boston hospitals (Massachusetts General, Brigham and Women’s, Faulkner, and Spaulding Rehabilitation) contributed their full combined PILOT total of $8.2 million.

“The city’s ability to thrive makes it a much better place for our institutions to be able to grow and to be strong,” says Gary Gottlieb, president and CEO of Partners. “The city deserves credit for having developed a standardized process that works well, and the not-for-profits deserve credit as well for working in partnership with the city.”

The cultural institutions in Boston are the lowest payers in the PILOT program. The Museum of Fine Arts, for example, was billed $645,667, but paid only 9 percent of that amount, or $60,399.
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mission,” he says.

Northeastern University, after making payments for many years, dropped out of the PILOT program this year and did not pay any of its $2.5 million bill. “A new administration is a reset moment,” explains university spokeswoman Renata Nyul.

Wheelock College, which didn’t pay any of its $92,000 PILOT bill, says making the payment would jeopardize the school’s educational mission. “We do not plan to divert or reallocate resources in a way that would jeopardize our students, many of whom have increased financial aid needs,” spokesperson Beth Kaplan says.

In addition to Northeastern and Wheelock, 14 other nonprofits are not complying with the city’s PILOT requests. They include Emmanuel College (billed $367,000), Shriners Hospital ($212,000), Joslin Diabetes Center ($166,000), the New England Aquarium ($128,000), Franciscan Hospital ($82,000), the Institute of Contemporary Art ($52,000), the Museum of Science ($46,000), and the Children’s Museum ($37,000).

Samuel Tyler, the president of the Boston Municipal Research Bureau, a business-backed group that monitors city finances, says officials need to move cautiously in trying to collect the unpaid funds, noting that nonprofits contribute enormously to the city’s economic and cultural life. “The last thing we want to do is kill the goose that laid the golden egg,” he says.

Boston Mayor Martin Walsh seems to agree. “While the PILOT program remains a priority for my administration, it is a voluntary payment,” he says in a statement. “The city maintains an ongoing dialogue with these institutions on a range of topics, including PILOT. We will continue to work with these community partners and review their commitments as the program moves forward.”

Tapping driver phones for traffic updates

> JACk SULLIVAN

recognizing that drivers need real-time information about the road ahead, state transportation officials are preparing to spend $10 million over the next year building out a high-tech system to provide time-and-distance traffic updates to Massachusetts drivers.

A pilot program using portable electronic signs to provide the traffic updates on some of the state’s busiest highways has been deemed a success, so state officials are now starting to roll out permanent signs covering more than 678 miles of Massachusetts roads. The project will be the first publicly owned and operated, real-time traffic system in the country. It will cost about $500,000 a year to maintain.

“We’ve gotten a very good response,” says Rachel Bain, assistant secretary for performance management and innovation for the Massachusetts Department of Transportation. “It’s made people a lot calmer.”

The signs appear to be far more accurate in predicting the length of rides than traditional traffic updates, mainly because the system uses Bluetooth-enabled devices inside the cars of commuters to anonymously track travel.

In each of the current and planned signs, there is a receptor that picks up Bluetooth signals from cellphones or other cellular-transmitting devices in new model cars as they pass. Each device contains a unique identifier called a Machine Access Code (MAC) address that the transponder picks up and is then fed into the MassDOT’s computer system. The system tracks each of those MAC addresses and when the vehicles pass another sign with a Bluetooth receptor/transmitter, the addresses are run through an algorithm that then estimates the time it took to travel the distance between the two signs. The system then transmits the time-and-distance information back to the original sign, which continually updates a screen so drivers know how long it will take to get from Point A to Point B, C, or D.

Russ Bond, the director of Information and Technology Services for MassDOT, says the data collection is completely anonymous so someone driving, say, 85 in a 60
mile-per-hour zone, will not get an unexpected speeding ticket in the mail later on. Speeders, or people driving particularly slowly, would not even be included in the data used to provide the travel updates. Bond says the algorithm is programmed to weed out “anomalies” such as someone who drives above the speed limit or someone who pulls over at a rest area, delaying when they reach the next receptor point.

“Any anomaly, the algorithm will determine it is not useful,” says Bond. “If it’s outside of a certain statistical range, it throws it out. The data is taking an average from all of the vehicles.”

The receptors can also be adjusted to separate cars that travel in a High Occupancy Vehicle lane such as on Interstate 93 south coming into the city or the zipper lane on the Southeast Expressway. The antenna on the device has a range of 300 feet but Bond says it can be reduced and directed only at the general purpose lanes, where most commuters travel. Bond also says it’s not necessary for every car to have a phone or even to have the Bluetooth turned on.

“We only need about 5 percent of the traveling public to have their Bluetooth-enabled device on,” he says. “Regardless of behavior, we’ve always been accurate with the data.”

The accuracy claim comes with one caveat. The system posts time-and-distance information based on data collected from vehicles that passed a certain point several minutes earlier and are miles away by the time their data appears on the sign, so any accidents or breakdowns that occur in the meantime may not be included.

Bain says the federal government will pick up 80 percent of the $10 million cost to buy the technology equipment and install the 138 signs and 131 receptor points. While the current signs usually flash time and distance to just one or two points, all the permanent markers will have travel time to three destinations. Drivers getting on the Mass Pike at the New York border, for instance, will see travel time to Boston and two points in between.

The data collection will also be shared with app and website developers, though Bain insists it is completely anonymous with no identifying information. The whole idea, says Bain, is to give commuters options, such as taking alternate routes or even opting for public transportation if a ride is going to take too long.

“The more information you have as motorists, the more options you have on your drive,” she says. “We’re looking to give you your time back.”

inquiries
UMass system racking up patents

> JESS ALOE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS is emerging as a powerhouse research institution, ranking among the world’s elite in turning ideas into patents.

The five-campus UMass system received 57 patents in 2013, ranking it 37th in the world. In 2012, UMass ranked even higher, but received only 54 patents. The University of California was the top patent recipient both years, ranking in 399 in 2013. MIT ranked second in 2013 with 281; Harvard had 69.

The annual rankings are compiled by the National Academy of Inventors, using US Patent Office data. The group counted every patent granted in 2013 where the University of Massachusetts is listed as the first assignee. Patents are typically filed when a researcher’s idea has the potential to be commercialized.

Most UMass patents are in the biological and life sciences, and come out of the Worcester-based medical school. The med school is a hub of RNA research. One RNA-related patent, issued to Jeanne B. Lawrence, is entitled “Nucleic acid silencing sequences.” According to Bill Rosenberg, who directs the UMass Office of Commercial Ventures and Intellectual Property, the patent could lead to a new treatment for Down Syndrome.

The research that leads to patents is typically funded by grants. One of the biggest funders of biomedical research is the National Institutes of Health, which granted nearly $159 million to UMass in 2013, or about 6.6 percent of all NIH funding flowing into Massachusetts, which gets a large share of funding overall.

While many patents don’t yield profits for the university system, some do. Dr. Thomas Shea spent decades researching cognitive impairment as the director for the Center for Cellular Neurobiology and Neurodegeneration at UMass Lowell. He filed a patent for a combination of vitamins and supplements that can increase cognitive function in people with neurogenerative diseases such as Alzheimer’s.

The patent was licensed to a Waltham-based startup, which based an over-the-counter “nutraceutical” called Perceptiv on Shea’s technology. Now commercially available, the supplement provides UMass Lowell with its first running royalty from an intellectual property license since Rosenberg’s office was founded.

If a patent does generate a profit, a third of the profit goes to the university’s central fund, a third goes to the inventor, and a third goes to the lab.
Giant slayer

Mike Firestone, the 31-year-old campaign manager behind Maura Healey’s runaway win in the Democratic primary for attorney general, talks strategy.

BY GABRIELLE GURLEY | PHOTOGRAPH BY FRANK CURRAN

You’ve guided the successful campaigns of newbie candidates such as Deval Patrick, Elizabeth Warren, Boston city councilor Michelle Wu, and now Maura Healey. What’s your secret? It’s all about doing the same direct, person-to-person voter contact that’s been done for 150 years in American campaigning, but doing it smarter. If Maura was going to be, let’s say, appearing at an event in the South Coast, we’d do door-knocking and phone calls into that community and work with our press team to maximize free media coverage in the area. We’d work over social media to engage, not just through Maura Healey on Facebook and Twitter, but with allies and supporters who live in those communities. We’d use our email list the same way.

What’s your get-out-the-vote strategy? You’ve got to be organized, have a clear plan, and be able to communicate that to a huge number of people.

How do you pick the candidates you’ll work with? I like smart, passionate progressives who are in it for the right reasons. I am a big champion for women candidates. I believe that our democracy is better when there are more perspectives involved, and, to do that, you have to have people who are willing to work on the campaigns. So I took a leave from law school to be part of the [Warren] campaign. When I graduated last year, I had some offers to go and do legal work, but I met Maura and I said to myself, she’s running for attorney general: that’s a lawyer.

You have a law degree and an undergraduate degree in history, both from Harvard. What sparked your interest in politics? My grandmother was a housing rights activist. She was a great believer in getting out there and speaking with people in her community, Allston-Brighton, which has had challenges with affordable housing and tenants’ rights. She would go door to door and she would take me along. I remember leafleting apartment buildings all around Commonwealth Avenue and Cleveland Circle, even when I was little. That’s really where I got my start.

Was Warren Tolman’s “unbecoming” comment the turning point in the Democratic primary race? I would really point to a couple of different moments. The first big one for us was that Maura nearly won the Democratic convention in Worcester in June, because she didn’t start with any base of support, even among grassroots activists. We focused laser-like on the delegates to the Democratic convention in the months before the event. So that was a big “wow!” The second was the response to our [Healey spinning a basketball] television ad. We didn’t have the money to run ads as long as our opponent did. But we thought that, if we could run two very strong weeks of television right when voters were starting to pay attention that were eye-catching and really conveyed the vibrancy of Maura’s personality and the strength of her experience, we would be in good shape.

After Healey’s big primary win, how do you keep up the momentum? The advice that I got when I started as a volunteer on campaigns and all the way up has been to run like you are 10 points down every day.

So what happened in the tiny Berkshire County town of Hinsdale, the only place outside metro Boston that Healey lost big? Man, I do not know. A lot of staff just want to go out there, meet those folks, and make our case more directly.
U.S. News & World Report recently recognized two Partners HealthCare hospitals as being among the very best in the nation: Mass General (ranked #2) and Brigham and Women’s (ranked #9). Additionally, for excellence in specialized medicine, McLean ranked nationally for psychiatry and Spaulding Rehab for rehabilitation. Regionally, Newton–Wellesley Hospital and North Shore Medical Center each earned top marks.

It’s an accomplishment resulting from an unyielding commitment to exceptional care throughout the Partners HealthCare System — from our hospitals and community health centers to the dedicated individuals who provide care to our patients and their families. As the only city in the country to have two hospitals in the nation’s Top 10, it’s a distinction we can all be proud of as Bostonians.
Tracking student migration

Massachusetts is a winner under the Regional Student Program, while New Hampshire is a loser BY JESS ALOE

A PROGRAM SET up to provide more educational opportunity for New England college students is proving to be a brain gain for some states and a brain drain for others.

Massachusetts and Maine are big winners, while New Hampshire and Connecticut are losing more students than they’re taking in. For Vermont and Rhode Island, the program is largely a wash.

The Regional Students Program allows a student in New England to attend a public university anywhere in the region at a discount off of the standard out-of-state tuition rate as long as the academic program the student is pursuing is not available in his or her home state. A separate but related program allows students who live in one state but are in close proximity to a school in another state to attend the out-of-state school at the discounted rate. For that program, there are fewer restrictions on the academic program being pursued.

During the last school year, 9,533 students participated in the two programs and more than half of them attended schools in Massachusetts.

Overall, state schools in Massachusetts attracted 4,935 students from other New England states, while 2,430 Bay State residents attended state schools elsewhere in the region.

Within Massachusetts, community colleges attracted 2,504 students from out of state who were participating in the program. Another 1,369 ended up at state universities and 1,062 attended one of the campuses in the UMass system. Northern Essex Community College, with campuses in Lawrence and Haverhill, was the biggest winner overall, attracting 1,160 students from other states. UMass Lowell was second, pulling in 790 students.

New Hampshire experienced the largest brain drain of any New England state, with 809 students coming into the state and 3,176 leaving to attend schools in other states. More than half of the students leaving New Hampshire — 2,633 — ended up at public schools in Massachusetts.

Connecticut also was a net loser, importing 1,018 students from other New England states and exporting 1,660 of its own residents. Of the
students leaving Connecticut, 974 — nearly 60 percent — came to Massachusetts.

The Regional Students Program does not capture all student migration within the region, but it provides some insight into the potential strengths and weaknesses of the various state university programs. Within the regional program, the number of students moving between states has steadily increased over the last decade, but the pattern of student movement between states has remained fairly steady.

New Hampshire policymakers are worried about that pattern. A recent study issued by the New Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Connecticut</th>
<th>University of Maine</th>
<th>UMass Amherst</th>
<th>University of New Hampshire</th>
<th>University of Rhode Island</th>
<th>University of Vermont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>Regional Student Program</td>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>Regional Student Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: New England Board of Higher Education
Center for Public Policy Studies reported that, if current enrollment trends continue, the number of degrees issued to state residents could start declining by 2025. The report said a falloff in state graduates could hinder the state’s future economic growth.

“As the state’s population ages in coming years, developing a highly skilled, flexible workforce will be essential to ensuring continued economic prosperity and competitive advantage,” the report said.

The same report also identified a possible correlation between declining enrollment and increasing tuition rates.

On that score, New Hampshire faces real problems. After funding for the New Hampshire higher education system was slashed in 2011, the University of New Hampshire raised tuition and fees for state residents to a level that ranks the school among the highest in the country, on a par with the University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University. New Hampshire recently instituted a tuition freeze to halt that trend, but there’s been no downturn in rates.

New Hampshire doesn’t fare well in most regional price comparisons between public universities. For a student participating in the Regional Student Program, the annual tuition to the University of New Hampshire is $26,805, well above the $15,457 that UMass Amherst charges, a figure that’s even less than the $16,552 in-state rate that the University of New Hampshire charges.

UMass Lowell benefits from the Regional Student Program because it is close to border towns such as Nashua and Pelham and also because it targets New Hampshire students. The school’s staff actively looks for students eligible for the regional and proximity programs, going to school fairs and hockey games to make the case. “Southern New Hampshire has always been a principal market,” says Kerri Johnston, the director of undergraduate enrollment at UMass Lowell. 

---

**STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students from Regional Student Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMass Amherst</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Boston</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Dartmouth</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass School of Law</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Lowell</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Worcester</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community Colleges</td>
<td>2,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All State Universities</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Big Ideas, Locally Grown

Join Tom Ashbrook, host of NPR’s On Point on WBUR, and leading-edge thinkers across the region for IDEAS UMass Boston, on October 29, 2014, in the Campus Center.

See the complete speaker lineup at www.umb.edu/ideas.
Guest workers

Comprehensive immigration reform is a long-shot, but a Republican takeover of the Senate could mean more visas for Massachusetts.

By Shawn Zeller

Most of the attention on the immigration bill that is now foundering in Congress is on the 11 million or so immigrants who live in this country without the government’s permission. The bill the Senate passed last year—the focus of the debate on so-called comprehensive immigration reform in Washington—would provide them with an arduous pathway to citizenship, a pathway that many Democrats view as the most crucial aspect of the legislation. Most Republicans, however, oppose the pathway.

For Massachusetts, though, the pathway debate is not as important as it is elsewhere in the country. The state has between 100,000 and 200,000 illegal immigrants, according to a study by the Pew Research Center’s Hispanic Trends Project, placing the Bay State well behind the country’s leaders: California, Florida, New York, and Texas.

But Massachusetts is among the leading states in welcoming guest workers each year, immigrants who come to work on temporary visas, then return to their home countries. And the good news for Massachusetts employers is that whatever happens to the Senate bill—and it’s almost certain now that it will not be enacted this year—there’s a decent chance that Congress could return in 2015, with a new Republican majority in both the House and Senate, and enact a scaled-back immigration bill that increases guest worker visas.

“If Republicans retake the Senate, I can see both chambers passing bills that would include lots of guest workers,” says Mark Krikorian, who leads the Center for Immigration Studies, a Washington think tank. “It would be loaded with guest workers.”

There are some potential roadblocks. First and foremost is Democrats’ willingness to go along. President Obama would have to sign the bill and he and congressional Democrats might not be willing to increase guest worker visas if Republicans refuse to do anything to help the illegal immigrants already in the country. Coupling the issues of guest worker visas and illegal immigrants has been a key tenet of their comprehensive approach.

Even if the Democrats lose their Senate majority, they could block any bill next year if they stick together. Meanwhile, there are a few high-placed Republicans who could put up roadblocks, including Charles Grassley, the Iowa senator who would chair the Senate Judiciary Committee if Republicans take the Senate. He’s a longtime critic of the guest visa program for high-tech workers.

But there are good reasons to think a guest worker bill could have legs. Most Republicans are eager to help American companies, but don’t want to give citizenship to people here illegally. Guest worker legislation fits the bill. Republicans can pass whatever they want in the House with their majority there; in the Senate, all a Republican majority will need is a few Democratic defections.

And Democrats have hinted they might be willing to compromise on the comprehensive approach to immigration reform that’s now been bandied about on Capitol Hill for a decade, with little to show for it. Earlier this year, President Obama told CNN that he was flexible on immigration and might not insist that illegal immigrants be placed immediately on a path to citizenship if Republicans were willing to give undocumented workers something short of it, such as work permits, and not ban them from ever pursuing citizenship.

If Obama is willing to make a deal with Republicans, it will be difficult for congressional Democrats and labor unions to say no. After all,
they signed off on the Senate bill that passed last year, which would have increased the number of H-1B high-tech visas from 65,000 a year, with additional visas available to foreign graduate students studying in the United States, to a figure between 115,000 and 180,000, depending on the needs of the market. The bill also would have allowed foreigners who obtain doctoral degrees in science, technology, or engineering to apply immediately for permanent residence, allowing them to stay in the country indefinitely and apply to become citizens. And the bill would have increased the number of unskilled, seasonal H-2B visas for hotel, resort, and restaurant employees by exempting workers who come back year after year from the current cap of 66,000.

According to Labor Department statistics, Massachusetts ranks high among the states for hosting both high-tech guest workers and unskilled seasonal ones. This year, state employers brought 3,032 unskilled, seasonal workers on H-2B visas into the country, more than 41 other states. Massachusetts was eighth in the number of high-tech jobs certified by the Labor Department with 27,311.

Though the Labor Department slashed the number of guest workers it would allow to enter the country following the 2008 financial crisis, the numbers have been creeping back up. In 2007, the department certified 5,863 seasonal work positions and 75,364 high-tech positions for Massachusetts, though not all those jobs were filled because of the nationwide cap.

Labor unions wonder why companies insist they need the visas, since the unemployment rate remains high. In fact, only about half of high school and college students, the type of people well suited for unskilled seasonal work, are employed, near the record low. At the same time, a July report by the Census Bureau found that three in four Americans who graduate from college with a degree in science, technology, engineering, or math did not take a job in a related field.

Even so, the unions haven’t pressed the issue and have tried to trade increases in guest worker visas for other priorities, such as more green cards for immigrants who might become citizens and then join unions.

“In each of these cases, both for the high-tech workers and the seasonal ones, there’s no one organized to oppose it,” says Ross Eisenbrey, vice president of the Economic Policy Institute, a think tank in Washington.

In exchange for their support for last year’s Senate bill, unions did secure language in the legislation requiring employers to first try to hire American workers and to pay their guest workers the prevailing wage for their occupations. Eugenio Villasante, a spokesman for the Service Employees International Union in Boston, says unions took the best deal they could get. “There’s such a need for reform to allow people who’ve been here for
years to live in peace and continue working that unions were willing to compromise on guest workers,” he says.

In 2012, the House passed a bill that would have increased the availability of green cards for foreigners studying science, technology, engineering, and math in the United States. Last year the House Judiciary Committee approved a bill to increase the annual cap on the H-1B high tech visas beyond where the Senate’s immigration bill would go, to 235,000. Neither advanced because Senate Democrats insisted on their more comprehensive approach.

Massachusetts employers argue that there simply are not enough Americans applying for the jobs they have. Paul Sacco, a lobbyist for the hotel industry in Massachusetts, says Americans don’t want to work in menial jobs anymore. He says hoteliers in the state might have to close without guest workers. “What I have observed is that people are more educated and they are less inclined to do this type of work.” he says.

Bob Luz, who leads the Massachusetts Restaurant Association, says the size of the tourist influx to resort areas is now so much larger than in decades past that there just aren’t enough people to fill restaurant jobs in the high season.

Better pay might make a difference, but employers have fought hard to limit increases, which are set by the Labor Department. When the department tried to increase pay for seasonal guest workers last year, employers successfully fought back. Led by the Edgartown hotelier Island Holdings, which operates the beachside Winnetu Inn Resort, they protested at the Labor Department’s Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals that the wage increase—nearly 24 percent in the case of Island Holdings’ housekeepers—would have caused some of them to shut down. The board agreed, forcing the Labor Department to agree to more specific rules about when it can raise guest worker pay.

Meanwhile, employers have the upper hand in convincing lawmakers of the need for more H-1B technology visas. Todd Schulte, the executive director of Fwd.us, a group formed by Facebook chairman Mark Zuckerberg to rally support for H-1B visas, says it’s foolish for lawmakers to say no. “We’re saying to educated people, ‘Go start the next Silicon Valley, but don’t do it here.’”

It’s a powerful argument that could resonate in 2015 if Obama finds himself dealing with a Republican Congress. Instead of Democrats trying to convince Republicans to do something about illegal immigrants, it will be Republicans trying to convince Democrats to accept an immigration bill that doesn’t go nearly as far as they would like, while also assuaging their own conservative supporters that any increases in guest workers are tied to tougher border enforcement. If enough compromises are made, it could work.
President-in-waiting

Liberal State House veteran Stan Rosenberg is about to become one of the most powerful players in state government as president of the Massachusetts Senate. He’ll bring decades of insider experience to the post — and an outsider’s profile that’s atypical for a Beacon Hill pol.

BY MICHAEL JONAS

IF LIFE HAD taken a different turn, Stan Rosenberg might be an Orthodox Jewish rabbi today. That was his ambition while studying for his bar mitzvah in the early 1960s at Temple Israel in Malden. Had he followed that path, his days would be filled leading prayer services, wrestling with complicated questions posed by religious texts, and helping people with seemingly intractable dilemmas in the manner rabbis have done for generations.

When he didn’t get accepted to Yeshiva University in New York, Rosenberg struck out instead for Amherst, where he enrolled at the University of Massachusetts and has lived ever since. He found his way into politics, and has spent nearly his entire adult life in that world. Now, after 28 years in the state Legislature, where he has earned a reputation as one of its sharpest policy minds and a go-to guy for handling politically thorny assignments, Rosenberg is poised to take the reins in January as the new president of the state Senate.

Though he traded prayer for politics, the skills that have taken him far in that world are not all that different from those he would have honed in a life of religious practice and study.

Delving into the Talmud and other ancient Jewish writings, says Rosenberg, is “an exercise in raising questions and trying to assess the efficacy of the information or the answers and the relationships between competing things, competing ideas. And politics is a lot like that.”

It is especially like that for him.

Though often pegged as an “Amherst liberal,” Rosenberg takes a measured approach to many issues and has a reputation for brokering compromise. That deliberative style sometimes frustrates advocates looking for a more forceful champion, but it has often been key to getting initiatives approved — and to building the broad support
Rosenberg has made a mark by taking on difficult assignments and as a consensus-builder who hears out all sides.
that made him the choice of his colleagues to lead the Senate. “People come to him with issues and problems because they feel confident of his ability to find a solution that they hadn’t thought of,” says Sen. Harriette Chandler, a Rosenberg ally.

In an extraordinarily early flurry of behind-the-scenes moves, the jockeying for the job played out during the summer of 2013, a full 17 months before the expected transition of power, with a solid majority of senators lining up behind Rosenberg. If formally elected, as expected, in January, Rosenberg will become one of the three most powerful figures on Beacon Hill, sharing the agenda-setting stage with a new governor and House Speaker Robert DeLeo.

The 64-year-old Rosenberg is both an entirely logical choice for the post and a somewhat unlikely one. He is the longest continuously serving member of the Senate, first elected in 1991 after serving five years in the House, and he has an unrivaled mastery of the details of legislative and parliamentary maneuvering. But he is hardly the conventional picture of a backslapping Beacon Hill pol. Rosenberg is something of a political paradox: a consummate insider, with a background that marks him as the ultimate outsider.

“An openly gay, Jewish guy from a college town in the western part of the state. Gee, sounds like a standard Massachusetts Senate president,” says Ralph Whitehead, a University of Massachusetts journalism professor and longtime Rosenberg confidant, with a laugh.

To that decidedly not-standard profile of a State House power broker, add the fact that Rosenberg grew up in foster care and was completely on his own at age 18, with no familial or financial ties to his biological family or the foster home where he spent most of his youth.

In a 2009 newspaper column, Rosenberg wrote, “I understand what it’s like to be cast as ‘the other.’”

He will be the first Jewish legislator and first openly gay member to lead the Senate or House. He’ll also be the first leader from Western Massachusetts since the 1970s, when David Bartley was House speaker and his Holyoke neighbor Maurice Donahue served as Senate president.

Rosenberg’s experiences and his ability to identify with “the other” line up with a generally liberal policy outlook. But he eschews the idea of “identity politics,” and is known more for his role mediating disputes than for combative rhetoric of the left. “I’m pragmatic,” he says. “I want to find the common ground to build the best solutions, and that often blends a range of policies coming from various directions. So I don’t label myself.”

But others certainly do, and liberal lawmakers who formed the base of Rosenberg’s support for the Senate presidency are, in the words of one State House wag, “licking their chops” at the prospect of one of their own at the helm. There is also lots of talk among senators of all stripes of a more open Senate, where members have a greater role than has been true under the more centralized power dynamic that has dominated both legislative branches in recent years.

A robust give-and-take and healthy debate of ideas is very much in keeping with Rosenberg’s leadership style and his appetite for digging into the substance of policy. But guiding a more freewheeling Senate, while making sure it also stays on track and gets things done, will be the ultimate test of his reputation for letting everyone have their say while also bringing resolution to issues in the often contentious world of State House politics.

POLICY WONK
It’s a sun-dappled August afternoon as Rosenberg arrives in Northfield, a picturesque Franklin County town in his district nestled against the Vermont and New Hampshire
border. The occasion is the annual senior citizen picnic, and the tables under the shade of an open-air pavilion behind the town hall are already full. Rosenberg, along with the Franklin County sheriff and area district attorney, are the guest chefs, and they get to work grilling hamburgers and hot dogs. Once lunch is served, the officials each take a turn greeting the seniors.

Rosenberg tells his constituents that it’s been a busy and productive session at the State House. He remarks that there are open races this fall for four of the statewide constitutional offices, and then tells them not to overlook the four ballot questions, providing a helpful summary of each one.

A gathering of seniors is an irresistible opportunity to most politicians, a captive crowd of reliable voters there for the schmoozing. But after offering his ballot primer, Rosenberg doesn’t dive in and work the tables in classic fashion, but retreats to the lawn outside the pavilion.

He is warm and approachable, but he has a reserved manner that makes him a better policymaker than retail glad-hander. “He’s not the typical image of a politician, of the hale fellow well met,” says Jerome Mileur, a retired UMass political science professor who was Rosenberg’s first mentor in politics as chairman of the Amherst Town Democratic Committee in 1980.

“Most politicians are gregarious people, they love crowds, they want to be loved,” says one State House lobbyist. “I think he thrives on intelligent policy and gaining trust that way more than by personality.”

A self-described “policy wonk,” Rosenberg has made his mark less by big personality than by diligently applying himself to the business of legislation and governance. But with his low-key manner, he has played an outsized role in some of the biggest issues the Legislature has faced in recent years.

He was tapped as the Senate chairman of the Legislature’s joint committee on redistricting following both the 2000 and 2010 census. The decennial redistricting of state representative and senate seats, along with the state’s US House districts, is among the most thankless tasks on Beacon Hill. The potential to anger colleagues is great, and the process across all states has been fraught with legal minefields, with advocacy groups regularly filing suit alleging violations of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Massachusetts has an even more troubled recent history, as former Speaker Tom Finneran wound up pleading guilty to obstruction of justice charges after admitting he lied while testifying in a federal case brought against the 2001 House redistricting plan.

But the Senate plan that year, and the redistricting of both branches as well as the congressional seats after the 2010 census, came off without a hitch. The more recent effort, which Rosenberg co-chaired with Rep. Michael Moran of Brighton, involved an unprecedented degree of transparency, with 13 hearings statewide and an interactive website that invited citizens to try to their own hand at reconfiguring districts.

“We were extremely happy with the process and the outcome,” says Pam Wilmot, executive director of Common Cause Massachusetts, which has closely monitored redistricting.

Rosenberg led the effort with Moran even as he was undergoing sometimes debilitating radiation and chemotherapy treatment for a serious form of skin cancer. He says he feels good and has been cancer-free for three years.

The flipside of Rosenberg’s high regard for the legislature’s deliberative process is a wariness he has long had toward the initiative petition process by which citizens can bring a question directly to the voters. “Making law on the ballot is not the best,” says Rosenberg, who has filed legislation several times that would dramatically increase the signature-gathering requirements to place a question before voters. He says an up-or-down vote on a measure by the electorate is a poor way to deal with often complicated issues, with lawmakers often skittish about making even minor adjustments to laws passed by voters.

Barbara Anderson, the veteran anti-tax activist, thinks Rosenberg’s approach is elitist. “He’s out to kill the initiative petition process,” she says. “With all the corruption, mismanagement, waste and inefficiency, and abuses of power we have in a one-party state, it’s the only thing we have.”

Rosenberg says there is a limited role for the ballot question option as a “release valve” when the Legislature refuses to even take up an issue, as is the case with the question on this November’s ballot to expand the bottle bill, a measure that House leaders have repeatedly blocked from even coming to the floor for a vote.

Janet Dominetz, executive director of the advocacy group MassPIRG, which spent years pushing the bottle bill, says the initiative petition process has been used appropriately and sparingly over the 100 years it’s been in place. “It’s a solution for a problem that doesn’t exist,” she says of Rosenberg’s efforts to make it harder to get questions on the ballot.

Earlier this year, Rosenberg helped broker a com-
promised that a ballot campaign by mediating a long-standing battle over nurse staffing levels between the state’s nurses unions and hospitals. The issue arose otherwise heading for the November ballot, where both sides would have mounted costly campaigns.

“He had the right combination of policy acumen, the power of persuasion, a real perseverance, and a good sense of politics,” says Timothy Gens, executive vice president and general counsel of the Massachusetts Hospital Association.

Lou DiNatale, a veteran Democratic operative who, along with Whitehead, served as an informal Rosenberg advisor during his push for the Senate presidency’s post, puts it less delicately. “Stan’s not a fuck-you guy,” he says. “He’s a negotiator. He’s a what’s-the-problem guy, and how do we fix it?”

That measured approach wins lots of praise, but doesn’t always leave everyone happy. He was the Senate’s point man on gambling, and ended up helping craft the bill that authorized three casinos and one slot machine parlor.

To Rosenberg, the casino issue is a classic case where stridency doesn’t fit in the face of a complicated set of facts. He voted previously against bills to expand gambling, and says he is not a huge fan of casinos. But Rosenberg says he became convinced that the Mashpee Wampanoag would eventually get tribal land put in trust by the federal government, the key remaining step necessary for them to operate tribal gaming facilities with no state approval and without sending any revenue to state coffers.

“I absolutely see the downsides,” Rosenberg says of the arguments that casinos promote economic inequality. But he thinks they are coming whether the state legislates their arrival or not. “I’d rather it be regulated and taxed,” says Rosenberg.

Tom Vannah, longtime editor of the Valley Advocate, an alternative weekly based in Northampton, thinks the casino saga captures a less high-minded side of Rosenberg’s careful approach to issues. “I’m not insensitive to the idea that politics is about compromise,” he says. But Vannah is not persuaded that tribal gaming is on the horizon. He saw Rosenberg’s stand on casinos, which had the support of Gov. Deval Patrick, House Speaker Robert DeLeo, and Senate President Therese Murray, as “capitulation to the three most powerful people in Boston.”

Though Rosenberg’s inclination is to see issues more in gray than black or white, not everything comes down to a search for middle ground.

After the Supreme Judicial Court’s landmark 2003 decision made Massachusetts the first state to sanction same-sex marriage, supporters of the decision were not looking for compromise with gay marriage opponents. Instead, the plan was to try to block efforts to adopt a constitutional amendment overturning the decision — by whatever means it took.

“Stan played a lead, if not the lead, role in that fight,” says Arline Isaacson, longtime co-chair of the Massachusetts Gay and Lesbian Political Caucus. “He was the go-to guy on procedural and parliamentary questions.”

“We desperately needed someone who would work through the details and the options for how to try and thwart DOMA,” she says, referring to the Defense of Marriage Act that would have banned same-sex marriage.

“And Stan was the guy, with a capital T, who was willing and, more importantly, able to do it.”

Gay marriage supporters saw the tide turning in their favor, so they played a delay game while the votes continued to shift. The maneuvering went on for three years, until gay marriage supporters were finally able to put the issue to rest, in 2007, as opponents failed to muster the 50 votes needed to advance their cause in a constitutional convention, a joint meeting of the 200 members of both legislative branches.

Rosenberg says the Massachusetts same-sex marriage battle was a highlight of his career. “You’d be hard-pressed to find someone who didn’t think that they were part of history,” he says. But it was also an awkward moment for Rosenberg, then in his late 50s and still not openly gay.

“That was very conflicting,” he says. “I was fighting for this because I knew it was the right thing to do. It was kind of odd standing in those meetings and those rallies and sort of being private at the same time as being in the middle of that very public debate.”

In his personal life, Rosenberg says he had led a solitary existence, and hadn’t expected that to change. “I had never planned to come out,” he says. “I had never planned to develop a long-term relationship. And when that started to develop, I realized, well, this is the point I’m either going to have to turn the corner or give up on the relationship and just go back to focusing on my work.”

The relationship that developed was with Bryon Hefner, whom Rosenberg met in May 2008, a year after the marriage-equality battle ended. Hefner, who had been working as an intern in two other State House offices, was hired by Rosenberg’s chief of staff for a temporary, paid job over
the summer. Rosenberg and Hefner discovered that they shared a background as former wards of the state’s foster system, but both say their interaction over the summer was, as Rosenberg puts it, “a typical employee-employer relationship, no socializing or anything like that.”

Shortly after Hefner, then 21, left the job at the end of August, they say they began socializing, and their relationship took off from there. They have now been together for six years in what both describe as a serious, committed relationship. In 2009, Hefner, who works at Regan Communications, a well-known Boston public relations firm, moved into Rosenberg’s Amherst condo. They generally spend weekends there and weekdays at Rosenberg’s Beacon Hill condo.

Hefner has taken an active role in Rosenberg’s political life, chairing and planning a 2011 fundraising gala marking Rosenberg’s 25th year in the Legislature. Hefner conceived of the idea for a set of 25 short videos on Rosenberg’s accomplishments that were shown on Amherst public access television. He’s also helped to up Rosenberg’s social media presence on Facebook and Twitter.

Of the 37-year gap in their ages, Rosenberg says, “I’m not going to get into stuff like that.” Hefner, now 27, says people have looked beyond any “stereotypes or prejudices” they may have about the issue, and that he and Rosenberg have been welcomed and accepted in Rosenberg’s Amherst-based district and by his Senate colleagues.

Rosenberg handled the issue of coming out in a characteristically low-key way. He wrote a column titled “The Bay State’s Road to Equality” for the July 4, 2009, edition of Northampton’s Daily Hampshire Gazette.

The piece chronicled the long, often difficult march toward freedom and equality by various groups that have been marginalized, and often worse, throughout American history. Midway through the column, he wrote, “As a foster child who grew up as a ward of the state, as a gay man, as a Jew, I understand what it’s like to be cast as ‘the other.’ I rarely discuss these facets of my character because I don’t practice identity politics. I practice policy politics.”

And that was it.

“I’ve always been kind of understated when it comes to personal things,” says Rosenberg.

He takes much the same approach to the searing experiences of his childhood raised in foster care. “I don’t run from it when people raise it,” he says. “But I don’t like dwelling on those sorts of things. Everybody has their experiences, and everybody’s got their backgrounds and everybody’s got their life shaping experiences.”

He was one of five children in a Dorchester family. At age four or five, he says, he was moved into a foster home in Malden. Three of his four siblings, including a twin brother, were ultimately placed in foster care. Two siblings eventually returned to their biological family, but Rosenberg did not. He stayed with the same foster family until he left for UMass at age 17. The family moved to Revere when he was a teen, and Rosenberg graduated from Revere High School in 1967.

Rosenberg says he does not know to this day what issue split up his family. “I have no idea,” he says, “I’d have to have investigated it, and I’ve never investigated it.” In a 1996 Boston Globe article, one of the few instances where he has publicly gone into further detail about his childhood, Rosenberg said: “I recall one kind of circuitous conversation with a social worker when I was 13 or 14 that, looking back on it, perhaps was designed to allow me to ask the question. But I didn’t ask. I was very young.”

He never reconnected with his biological parents, and lost touch with his foster family a year after starting at UMass. He had some fleeting interaction with a couple of his siblings in more recent years, but says there was no real bond made.

Rosenberg says he had to create his own community to take the place of family. “The connections were by being part of organizations,” he says. That included his involvement in the religious community at the Malden synagogue he attended and, after arriving at UMass, his participation in a number of arts organizations at UMass, including the
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“Stan was the kid who helped everybody do their homework and get a good grade.”

marching band, where he played tuba.

“I think arts became my outlet for dealing with having grown up in the foster care system, and subconsciously trying to identify paths for connections,” he says. “I was never the best of anything in those organizations. But the point was that it was a place to be that you could be part of, and be yourself and grow with the experience.”

It took Rosenberg 10 years to obtain his B.A. in community development and arts management. He says he wasn’t a stellar student and, since he was entirely on his own, also had to take time off several times simply to work and save money to keep up with tuition costs and living expenses.

While at UMass, he helped found an arts extension service program and then directed a community development initiative that helped communities use arts programming as a way to also strengthen their civic fabric.

In 1980, he landed a job on the staff of then-state Sen. John Olver of Amherst. He went on to serve a stint as executive director of the Democratic State Committee and as a staff member for then-Congressman Chet Atkins.

In 1986, he was elected to the House of Representatives, and five years later he won a special election to fill Olver’s state Senate seat when his former boss was elected to Congress.

MAKING HIS MOVE

Choosing a new Senate leader nearly a year and half before the official transition was unprecedented, but also explicable. Therese Murray was poised to be the first leader to serve the full eight years allowed in the top job since the Senate adopted term-limit rules for its president in 1993. Technically, she could have remained at the helm until March of next year, two months into the Legislature’s new session, but nearly everyone expected her to not seek reelection to her Plymouth-based Senate seat and leave when the session ends at the beginning of January, which is what she is doing.

The approaching end of her eight-year term removed the uncertain timing that has accompanied recent transitions for Senate president and House speaker. But there was no template for when the race should begin.

By the spring of 2013, Rosenberg and Stephen Brewer, chairman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee, were in competition to succeed Murray. Neither Rosenberg, Brewer, nor other senators asked about it can pinpoint exactly what set the competition in motion. Some say the swirl of rumors that Murray might depart earlier, if she landed a post-State House job, figured in the mix.

Rosenberg, who has served as the Majority Leader under Murray, has long coveted the president’s post, having made an unsuccessful bid for the job in 2002. “You have to calculate when you think momentum is heading in your direction,” is all he says about last year’s move. His side decided they did not want to wait past the break
Rosenberg has sent clear signals that he is committed to a more open process.

colleagues think through a particular bill or issue. A long history of that kind of quiet counsel bred a lot of good will that came back to him in the quest for the Senate’s top post.

It helped him “earn the trust and support of members,” says Sen. Anthony Petruccelli of East Boston, a key moderate Democrat who got behind Rosenberg’s bid.

Rosenberg also sent clear signals that he was committed to a more open and inclusive process. Decision-making and control over the legislative agenda have been increasingly concentrated in the offices of the Senate president and House speaker. A turn away from that would run “counter to how things have gone in the State House over the last 20 years,” says Sen. Ben Downing of Pittsfield.

“The message he conveyed is that his leadership and the Senate are going to be very open, and it’s going to be information-based public policy,” says Sen. Dan Wolf of Harwich. “People realized that, for Stan, it’s really about establishing a process and a structure that is mindful of having all members have a place at the table and a voice.”

On issues, liberals are hoping the Senate takes up a more aggressive agenda on everything from climate change to income inequality and criminal justice reform. “I worry a little for Stan, because every progressive that I know is looking toward his ascension as the panacea,” says Isaacson, the gay rights leader. “All these progressives I know have these heightened expectations of the wonderful world Stan will usher in, legislatively. He can’t wave a magic wand and make everything happen.”

A lot will also depend on who is elected governor. Will it be another three-way dance of Democrats among the governor, House speaker, and Senate president? Or will Republicans reclaim the corner office, which would probably position the Senate under Rosenberg as the clear left flank of state government?

Rosenberg says he wants to wait until January before going into any specifics of a legislative agenda or details of his vision for how the Senate will operate. But, as he wrote in his 2009 newspaper column on the long road to equality, “Our past, I believe, is prologue.”

Between his nearly 30 years in office and his formative experiences building community arts organizations before that, Rosenberg has left a considerable trail of policy and process breadcrumbs.

Support for higher education has been a priority of his, as befits a lawmaker representing the flagship campus of the state university. Environmental and energy issues have also long been on his radar, and Rosenberg convened a series of meetings over the spring and summer in which experts met with a group of senators to discuss climate-change issues. The meetings could foreshadow new legislative initiatives in the coming term.

If there’s an overarching issue that has had Rosenberg’s attention it is fiscal and tax policy questions. He has pushed unsuccessfully several times over the years for a graduated income tax. “Changing our tax policy and making it simpler and fairer and more progressive would be a big help,” he says of the problem of growing income inequality.

As for the talk of a more decentralized power structure, he says, “We have a lot of talent in the institution, and we need to make sure that they are fully engaged in using that talent.”

That sort of talk is common at the time of leadership transitions in the Legislature. If his past truly is prologue, the clearest sign that Rosenberg means it may come from the work he did back in his 20s to build community arts organizations. “The whole objective,” he says, “was to create capacity in the people who were there to be able to build an organization, to make their own decisions, become effective leaders within the organization, and be seen by the community as potential leaders.”
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The man who lied to Worcester

John Henry’s stewardship of newspapers didn’t extend to the Telegram & Gazette

**BY BRUCE MOHL**

**SHORTLY AFTER BUYING** the Boston Globe last year, John Henry wrote a 3,000-word essay for the newspaper explaining why he bought it. The purchase wasn’t about profits, Henry explained, it was about finding a way to sustain the newspaper for the long run. The Globe, he said, is the eyes and ears of the region and, in some ways, its heartbeat. Henry vowed that the newspaper, which had been on a
long decline under the New York Times, would return to private, local ownership with an allegiance to readers and local residents, not to distant shareholders.

“Truth is, I prefer to think that I have joined the Globe, not purchased it, because great institutions, public and private, have stewards, not owners,” Henry wrote. “Stewardship carries obligations and responsibility to citizens first and foremost — not to shareholders.”

Henry’s journalistic manifesto was greeted with glee at the home of the Globe on Morrissey Boulevard and across Greater Boston. But in Worcester — New England’s second-largest city and the home of the Telegram & Gazette, the other newspaper Henry acquired as part of a package deal from the New York Times Co. — there was a sense of foreboding. Henry never mentioned the T&G in his manifesto, and that omission was noticed.

“He writes that long essay in the Globe without a mention of the Telegram. It left people buzzing,” says Tim Murray, the former lieutenant governor and the current head of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce. “What’s he going to do with it? After all, it’s as important to Worcester and central Massachusetts as the Globe is to Boston and eastern Massachusetts.”

But Henry soon moved to put those fears to rest. Just before Thanksgiving last year, he showed up with almost no advance notice at the Telegram & Gazette’s offices in downtown Worcester. At separate meetings with the business and editorial staffs, Henry confirmed rumors that he planned to sell the Telegram & Gazette, but said his goal was to find a local owner for the paper.

“You need a local owner,” he said. “A local owner can sit down with advertisers, readers, and community leaders and ask for their support. I’m looking for someone with tremendous energy and a passion for this newspaper.”

At his talk in the newsroom, Henry went even further, saying that he wouldn’t abandon the newspaper if a local owner failed to turn up. “This is not a forced sale,” he said. “If we don’t find the right owner, you’re stuck with me.”

That quote, which was reported in the Telegram, was exactly what many people in Worcester wanted to hear. Many reporters at the paper worried the paper might be sold to a chain such as GateHouse Media, the owner of the Quincy Patriot Ledger, the Herald News in Fall River, the Enterprise of Brockton, and a long list of weekly newspapers. Many Worcestersites thought it would be good for the region if the Telegram was owned by someone local, someone like them. Henry by no means is a local — the billionaire businessman is officially a resident of Florida — but he owns a home in Brookline and his ownership of the Red Sox and the team’s past success have made him something of an honorary New Englander.

But as the sale process for the Telegram kicked into high gear, the local groups interested in the Telegram found themselves on the outside looking in. They thought Henry was asking way too much money. They were put off by his hired-gun representatives, who were portraying the newspaper as a bloated organization in need of steep staff cuts. Henry himself never met with locals, even to do a courtesy meet and greet. Instead, Henry sold the newspaper to Halifax Media Group of Daytona Beach, Florida, the antithesis of local ownership. The company’s headquarters is 1,200 miles away from Worcester. The Telegram is now one of 36 newspapers owned by the chain. All of them are located in the southeast except for the Telegram.

The chain’s major shareholders are three private equity firms, Stephens Capital Partners, JAARSSS Media, and Redding Investments, who tend to be more interested in profits than stewardship. As a condition of the sale, Henry laid off a quarter of the Telegram’s staff.

The sale rubbed a lot of people in Worcester the wrong way. They felt as if Henry had lied to them, and no one was calling him on it. In its coverage of the sale, the Globe never mentioned Henry going back on his word or ordering layoffs. Telegram stories did note Henry’s positions had changed, but didn’t press the issue. The newspaper’s new management also tried to conceal the staff cuts.

Commonwealth offered Henry a chance to explain his change of heart, but he declined. Instead, he issued a terse, two-sentence statement through the Globe’s spokesperson that made clear how far his role as a steward extended.

“My focus is clear — a Boston Globe that is known for its journalistic excellence and sustainable business model,” he says. “The Worcester Telegram & Gazette was outside that focus, so I sold it after a thorough process in which no local parties chose to participate.”

LUCKY AND SMART

John Henry has an uncanny knack for being in the right place at the right time and making the most of it. When his father died in 1975 and he took over the family farm
in Arkansas, Henry stumbled into futures trading and ultimately made a fortune at it. When he was desperate to get out of Miami and his ownership stake in the Florida Marlins, Major League Baseball and commissioner Bud Selig gave him a way out. That way out led to Les Otten and Tom Werner, who were trying to buy the Boston Red Sox and had just lost their biggest financial backer. Henry stepped into that role in 2002, and the group, despite being viewed as a bunch of outsiders by many die-hard Sox fans, succeeded in purchasing the baseball team for $695 million. The Red Sox went on to win the World Series in 2004, 2007, and 2013, and the team is valued at $1.5 billion today, according to Forbes magazine.

In 2013, before the start of the baseball season, another business opportunity presented itself. The New York Times was shedding assets unrelated to the Times newspaper brand and decided to sell its New England Newspaper Group, which consisted of the Globe, the Telegram & Gazette, the newspapers’ websites, and a 49 percent stake in a free subway newspaper called the Metro. Henry, who had begun analyzing the newspaper business several years before, was interested. According to one source, Henry approached his Red Sox partners about buying the newspapers, but they practically laughed him out of the room. What did they want with newspapers? The business is dying.

But Henry once again saw value where others saw nothing. He had never read the Telegram & Gazette, and had little interest in it. But he considered the Globe, like the Red Sox, an important community asset. Some have portrayed Henry as a sugar daddy riding to the rescue, but he never saw himself that way. He wanted to figure out a way to put the newspaper on solid financial footing, but he wanted to do it without putting a lot of his own money at risk.

He started by negotiating an incredibly good deal with the New York Times. Henry paid $70 million for everything — two newspapers, two websites, two printing facilities, and, most important, the Times retained all the pension obligations. It was a monumental write-down for the Times Company, which had paid $1.1 billion for the Globe in 1993 and $296 million for the Telegram & Gazette in 2000.

The Times sold to Henry even though other bidders were ready to pay more — as much as $40 million more. No one at the Times ever explained why Henry got the nod. The Globe reported it was because Henry was paying in cash and didn’t have a lot of partners. Others suggested Henry was given a hometown discount, perhaps because the Times and Henry had some history. The Times was one of Henry’s original partners in the Red Sox deal, and made out quite well. The company invested $75 million for a 17.75 percent stake in the club in 2002. Eight years later the Times began selling its shares, recouping more than $210 million in all for a pretax gain of nearly $129 million.

Henry is now selling off some of the assets he acquired...
from the Times, and it seems likely he will recoup all of his original $70 million investment. Henry has already sold the *Telegram & Gazette* for an estimated $17.5 million. He is now preparing to sell the *Globe* property on Morrissey Boulevard in Dorchester and preparing to move the *Globe’s* printing operation to the former *Telegram & Gazette* printing facility in Millbury. The Morrissey Boulevard property, located across from Boston College High School and near UMass Boston, is assessed at $40 million, but many believe it will fetch far more.

As Henry puts the deal together, folks in Worcester are looking on in stunned disbelief. Michael Angelini, a partner at Bowditch & Dewey, a Worcester law firm, and one of a group of local executives who tried to broker local ownership of the *Telegram & Gazette*, says Henry is coming out ahead on the deal. "He got something for nothing," he says.

Murray, the former lieutenant governor now helming the Worcester Chamber, says it would have been nice if Henry had treated potential buyers of the *Telegram & Gazette* the way the Times treated him. "He went with the highest bidder in Worcester when he was given a hometown discount by the New York Times," Murray says.

**STAYING LOCAL**

Harry Whitin probably knows more about the *Telegram & Gazette* than anyone else. He worked at the newspaper for more than 40 years, serving as a general assignment reporter, a State House reporter, an editorial writer, a regional editor, the executive news editor, the managing editor, and, for 20 years, the editor. He also worked stints as assistant to the publisher, director of employee relations, and director of circulation and marketing services.

Whitin says the paper carries enormous value for central Massachusetts, but its value as a going business is limited. He should know. He came close to buying the newspaper in 2009 and registered as a bidder again last year. In 2009, Whitin partnered with Ralph Crowley Jr., the CEO of Polar Beverages in Worcester. The two men saw great potential in the *Telegram’s* printing plant in Millbury. Crowley, whose company produces all the private label soda products sold by the region’s supermarket chains, felt his contacts in the supermarket business would allow them to grow the *Telegram’s* business printing insert ads and supermarket flyers. Whitin says he and Crowley thought the printing business could keep the *Telegram* afloat while they figured out a way for the newspaper to survive the shift from print to digital.

With Crowley shuttling Times executives back and forth between New York and Worcester on his corporate jet, a deal seemed close. Whitin says he bought a new suit, something befitting the owner of a newspaper. "We honestly thought we had bought the paper," he says. But at the last minute the Times called the sale off. "What has become abundantly apparent is that the T&G is making
substantial progress in transforming every part of its journalistic and business operations,” Times executives said in a memo to employees.

Four years later the Times changed its mind again, selling the Globe and the Telegram to Henry. The following year Henry put the Telegram on the market, but the newspaper up for sale in 2014 was very different from the newspaper that Whitin and Crowley tried to buy in 2009. Gone was the Telegram’s office building, sold for $300,000 in 2011. Gone was the Millbury printing plant, which Henry was keeping because he saw it as key to the Globe’s own printing business. The Globe prints the Boston Herald, the Herald News, the Patriot Ledger, and the Telegram & Gazette. The Globe also handles most of the Telegram’s human resources and advertising functions, which meant any new buyer would have to spend a considerable amount of money just to reestablish the newspaper’s independence.

Henry set the minimum bid for the Telegram at $14 million, but Whitin thought that was way too high given the newspaper’s stripped-down state. Even the Times seemed to agree. As part of a lawsuit brought by news carriers of the Telegram, the Times in December 2013 had to state how much of the $70 million paid by Henry should be allocated for the sale of the Worcester newspaper. The analysis is convoluted, but it concludes the Telegram was worth just over $7 million, even though its assets (principally the Millbury printing plant) were worth nearly $15 million. With those assets removed from the sale by Henry, what he was selling was essentially a brand name, leased office space, a bunch of computers, and office furniture.

Whitin, who personally reviewed the Telegram’s sales documents, says the newspaper was profitable. But without the printing plant, he says, it couldn’t remain profitable for long. “I, frankly, didn’t see a sustainable business without a secondary source of income,” he says.

Mark Henderson, the Telegram & Gazette’s former online director, was part of a group of employees that made presentations about the newspaper to those interested in purchasing it. He says no presentations were ever made to any Worcester people, which he thought was strange given Henry’s professed interest in selling to a local owner. He said he approached James Hopson, the interim publisher brought in by Henry to sell the paper, about briefing interested local parties on the potential for saving $1.5 million a year by having someone other than the Globe print the newspaper and handle other business functions. Henderson said Jepson told him not to worry about it.

Whitin wasn’t the only local interested in the newspaper. A group including Fred Eppinger, the president of Hanover Insurance, and Michael Angelini, the Bowditch & Dewey attorney who also served as chairman of the Hanover board, wasn’t interested in buying and running the T&G, but they were interested in keeping it going, preferably under local ownership. Angelini says a representative of the group — sources say it was Eppinger — called Henry to encourage him to sell to a local owner. If no local owner stepped forward, Eppinger asked Henry to circle back with him to see if some local bidding group could be put together. Henry never called back.

Whitin wrote a letter to Henry in late February, predicting no local buyer would materialize and reminding Henry of his civic responsibilities.

“Your sales agents are marketing the T&G as a bloated organization that seems to be making a profit in spite of itself,” Whitin wrote in his letter. “They are telling potential owners that cost-cutting, including staff reductions of between 20 and 30 percent, will produce a sustainable business model with a stronger bottom line. That’s really putting a lot of lipstick on the pig. It actually means a diminished product, which in turn means erosion of advertising and circulation and the eventual loss of a strong independent newspaper in New England’s second-largest city.”

Whitin urged Henry to hang on to the paper, to use it as a laboratory for his efforts to find a sustainable business model. “It’s simply the right thing to do,” he wrote. “Your message to readers of the Globe applies equally to readers of the T&G. If you sell to out-of-towners who will implement massive staff and product cuts in search of short-term profit, you will have broken faith with those Worcester readers and have established an ugly double standard.”

Whitin never heard back from Henry. “He never talked to us,” he says. “He never wanted to talk to anyone out here. Everyone just got the cold shoulder.”

**SLASH AND BURNED**

Halifax Media, the new owner of the Telegram & Gazette, won’t discuss its plans for the newspaper. Officials at the Florida headquarters referred questions to the newspa-
per’s new publisher, James Normandin, but he wouldn’t return phone calls. He held an hour-long meeting with the staff on his first day at work in early September, but disclosed little new information. Many suspect Halifax bought the Telegram with the notion of building a nucleus of newspapers in New England. Halifax also reportedly bid on the Providence Journal, but that newspaper was sold to GateHouse Media for $46 million in July. GateHouse owns a slew of newspapers in the area, including the Herald News in Fall River, the Standard-Times in New Bedford, the MetroWest Daily News, the Enterprise of Brockton, and the Cape Cod Times.

Beyond the 28 layoffs at the Telegram & Gazette initiated by Henry, there have been few visible changes at the newspaper. A few reporters have been hired, but it’s unclear whether the staff expanded or the new people just replaced people who left. Halifax eliminated the T&G’s 401K match, increased the employee cost for medical benefits, trimmed vacation time, and implemented a no-jeans policy. The company also increased the length of the work week from 37.5 to 40 hours, which increased each worker’s paycheck slightly.

“This is a company that takes advantage of the law to the utmost. If they don’t have to provide something, they don’t,” said one employee, who asked not to be identified because Halifax officials have instructed workers not to talk to the press.

James Dempsey, a former columnist at the Telegram & Gazette and currently a professor at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, says there have been repeated staff cuts over the years as the Telegram has adjusted to lower and lower print revenues. But Dempsey, like others in town, says he has a hard time pinpointing how the newspaper has changed.

“It’s hard to quantify,” he says. “You don’t see what isn’t there.”

With Halifax’s arrival, the newspaper no longer has a reporter at the State House in Boston and political coverage overall is now minimal. The newspaper has moved away from investigative reporting and only one editorial writer is left.

Murray says he misses the way the old Telegram & Gazette would localize stories for a central Massachusetts audience. He said the Legislature this year was considering a bill to expand the Boston Convention and Exhibition Center, and local officials were pushing for inclusion of more funding for the DCU Center in Worcester. Murray says the Telegram in the past would have done a story on the legislation and Worcester’s interest in it, but not this year. “That’s a big deal and nobody up there was asking, where does this stand?” he said. “That presence at the State House is gone.”

Whitin, the former editor of the Telegram, is very disappointed with how everything turned out, but he’s moving
on. As for Henry, Whitin says the Red Sox owner’s manifesto on newspaper ownership didn’t amount to anything. “As far as Worcester goes, it turned out to be nonsense,” he says.

Henderson, the former Telegram employee, is also disappointed. “I share the feeling of a lot of people in Worcester that John Henry did not do right by the city,” he says.

Angelini, the attorney and Worcester power broker, says his opinion of Henry was changed by what happened. “Someone who makes a promise and breaks it is suspect. That’s my personal view,” he says.

Murray is the most outspoken, particularly when shown the short statement Henry gave to CommonWealth. “Mr. Henry is entitled to his own opinions, but not his own facts,” Murray says. “He looked in the eyes of the Telegram staff and the rest of the community and said he wanted to keep this local or it would stay with him. A lot of people when he made that statement breathed a sigh of relief, but he never talked to the potential local bidders or tried to work with them. The way it was handled was bush league. There was an indifference or an arrogance that is just unfortunate.”

On the Worcester skyline, the Telegram & Gazette rents space in the tower on the right.

Why do we invest in Massachusetts? We live here too.

At Citizens Bank, we believe the most important investment we can make is in our communities. Whether it’s supporting an affordable housing project, providing a small business loan or having our colleagues volunteer at a local food pantry, it’s all a part of a larger goal - to build stronger communities and facilitate growth. It’s good citizenship and it’s good business.

Member FDIC. Citizens Bank is a brand name of RBS Citizens, N.A. 380557.
Battling for the urban vote

Suburbs are losing their clout as the road to the governor’s office now runs through the state’s cities

BY PAUL McMORROW | ILLUSTRATION BY JOHN S. DYKES

ROBERT LEWIS JR. stood on a stage in Dorchester, gripping a podium and firing up the crowd in front of him, hollering, "Isn’t it so great to be with a winner?"

There wasn’t anything unusual about the setting Lewis found himself in. He runs a foundation that uses baseball to mentor city kids. Before that, he held high positions at the Boston Foundation, and in ex-Boston mayor Tom Menino’s administration. He’s a political and civic fixture in Boston neighborhoods.

The guy Lewis was with this September evening was another story. Four years ago, Charlie Baker got drubbed up and down Boston. He lost the city to Gov. Deval Patrick by 47 points, and trailed Patrick in Boston’s majority-minority precincts by 77 points. Baker’s 2010 gubernatorial campaign was politically toxic in the neighborhoods Lewis works in. Yet here was Lewis, kicking off Baker’s general election sprint in Dorchester,
and trading energetic high-fives with the Republican gubernatorial hopeful. “Charlie shows up,” Lewis roared. “He’s there, in the batting cages, on the fields, walking the streets. This guy is in the boardroom and on the block.”

Most of the comparisons between Charlie Baker’s current run for governor and the one that fell short against Patrick four years ago jump straight to Baker’s sunny new demeanor. But the overhaul of Charlie Baker’s gubernatorial bid goes far deeper than the question of whether he acts gregarious, or prickly. The real difference is where Baker is campaigning, and whose votes he’s chasing. That’s what put Robert Lewis Jr. on stage alongside Charlie Baker in September.

Baker launched his campaign in Lowell. He’s repeatedly barnstormed through Lawrence, Springfield, Chelsea, and Worcester. He marched in the annual Dorchester Day parade sporting a “Dorchester Strong” T-shirt. Baker held more than 100 campaign events in Boston before ringing in his Republican primary victory with Lewis, in Dorchester. As he races toward Election Day, Baker is taking the fight to Martha Coakley, his Democratic opponent, in the urban communities where Massachusetts Democrats usually shine.

Bill Weld, Paul Cellucci, and Mitt Romney strung together 16 straight years of Republican control of the governor’s office by mining the bedroom communities surrounding Route 128 and Interstate 495 for votes. The last three significant statewide races — Scott Brown’s 2010 US Senate win over Coakley, Patrick’s successful 2010 reelection bid against Baker, and Elizabeth Warren’s 2012 tilt against Brown — broke the mold Weld, Cellucci, and Romney established. All three races hinged on voting in urban communities, not the suburbs. Brown topped Coakley by making a raid across Democratic lines. Patrick largely erased the urban gains Brown had made, and two years later, a relentless Warren get-out-the-vote operation blew Brown’s doors off in the same cities that had handed him his Senate seat in 2010.

The Brown, Patrick, and Warren victories all speak to a changed electoral landscape. Urban communities are now handing Republicans far more lopsided defeats than they were when Baker’s old bosses, Weld and Cellucci, were winning their races for governor. So it’s not enough anymore for Republicans seeking statewide office in Massachusetts to crank away in the suburbs. They also have to pay serious attention to their margins in the cities, where demographic shifts are making Massachusetts urban centers increasingly hostile places for Republicans.

The state’s changing political geography leaves Martha Coakley and Charlie Baker in very different places, as they head toward November’s election. Coakley is hoping
to harness the rising Democratic tide, while Baker has to
find a way to reverse it.

**CITIES GETTING MORE DEMOCRATIC**

Scott Brown swept past Martha Coakley in 2010 by roll-
ing up enormous margins in the suburbs, and eroding
Coakley’s margins in Democratic-leaning cities. He turned
heads when he won Lowell by 5 percentage points. But in
most cases, Brown didn’t have to win cities; all he had to
do was keep things close enough to let his strong showings
in the suburbs carry the day. He did well by only losing
Worcester by 5 points, and staying within 10 points of
Coakley in Brockton. In Fall River, losing by 16 points was
still good enough to put Brown 21 points ahead of the pace
Romney had set in that city in 2002.

The victory map Brown established in January 2010
isn’t just remarkable because Brown ran strongly in cities
that had backed Deval Patrick in 2006, and would line
up behind Patrick again that November. Brown’s real
accomplishment was winning in a state where the politi-
cal climate simply is less welcoming to Republicans than
it was in the 1990s.

The past two decades have seen Massachusetts politics
swing in a partisan direction. State election returns once
looked like a quilt, with patches of Republican red and
Democratic blue towns scattered from the Berkshires to
Cape Cod. Now, however, Massachusetts has sorted itself
into three distinct electoral blocs: solidly Democratic towns
run from the New York border to the Quabbin Reservoir,
and from Boston out to a ring of well-to-do suburbs, with
little but solidly Republican towns in between the two.
(See “The Red-Blue Color Divide in Massachusetts,” CW,
Winter 2014.) This regional partisan sorting means relative-
ly few towns swing between the Republican and Democratic
columns anymore. Statewide elections in Massachusetts
now mostly hinge on turnout and margins of victory.

The state’s new political polarization hasn’t just carved
out partisan regions, like the Democratic west and the solid-
ly Republican southeastern suburbs. Municipalities in these
newly polarized regions are now far more partisan than they
were when voters sent Weld, Cellucci, and Romney to the
governor’s office. Towns that vote Democratic are getting
bluer, and Republican towns are getting redder. This is a
looming problem for Massachusetts Republicans, because
in two of the last three major statewide elections, bigger wins
in the suburbs haven’t been enough to offset ever-widening
Democratic margins in the cities.

To size up local partisanship, *CommonWealth* looked
not just at the winners and losers of individual towns in dif-
ferent elections, but also how far from the overall electoral
margin an individual town’s votes fall. This approach strips
away the effects of a Democratic or Republican win in any
given year, and measures how Democratic or Republican a
given town voted relative to the state at large.

In 1998, for instance, Paul Cellucci beat Scott Harsh-
barger by 3.4 points statewide. Harshbarger beat Cellucci
by less than 2 percentage points in Worcester. So, in that
case, Worcester was roughly 5 points more Demo-
cratic than Massachusetts as a whole. Cellucci lost Boston
by 20 points, a result that put Boston 24 points outside the
statewide margin.

The chart to the left shows widening partisanship among
both Democratic- and Republican-voting towns. The move-
ment matters most in densely-packed cities, where a shift of
a few percentage points equals scores of votes.

While Worcester voted more Democratic, by 5 points,
than the state as a whole when Cellucci won the governor’s
office, when Elizabeth Warren stormed past Scott Brown
two years ago, Worcester was 16 points more Democratic
than the rest of Massachusetts. Similar swings toward
Democrats from the 1998 election to the 2012 election
took place in other cities: in Springfield (from a 16-point
Democratic lean to 40 points), Chelsea (14 to 42 points),
Holyoke (12 to 32 points), Lawrence (7 to 50 points), and
Boston (24 to 41 points). Brockton went from being 2
points more Republican than the Massachusetts elector-
ate in 1998, to being 28 points more Democratic in 2012.
Most of these cities were already Democratic-leaning
communities, but now Democrats are running up the
score by brutal margins, like Elizabeth Warren’s 58-point
plastering of Scott Brown in Lawrence.

Some Massachusetts cities, such as Fitchburg, Chicopee,
Taunton, and New Bedford, now tilt Democratic by smaller
margins than they did in 1998. They’re the exceptions,
though. Most urban areas in Massachusetts are moving
deeper into the Democratic column, and it’s complicating
Republicans’ electoral math.

**SUBURBS LOSE THEIR CLOUT**

Scott Brown’s 2010 Senate victory marked the end of the
familiar suburban-centric political map in Massachusetts,
and the emergence of a victory map running through
urban areas. Brown’s 2010 win was remarkable because he carved out a statewide majority, despite some serious Democratic headwinds in cities.

The campaign strategists behind Patrick’s 2010 reelection campaign and Warren’s 2012 Senate run recognized these headwinds, and exploited them. Warren and Patrick’s campaigns were built on the same premise: Scott Brown had run relatively well in 2010 in cities where he shouldn’t have, and if Democrats turned out their voters in those cities, Republicans wouldn’t have an answer.

Patrick invested enormous amounts of time and money building his campaign on the South Coast, while his running mate, Tim Murray, pushed hard in and around Worcester. A half-hour after the polls closed in November 2010, a friend called Doug Rubin, Patrick’s senior political strategist, with returns from Taunton. Scott Brown had taken the city by 15 points the previous January; Patrick flipped the city back to the Democratic column. “At that point, I didn’t know whether we were going to win or lose,” Rubin recalls, “but I knew that our strategy had paid off.” The Taunton results foreshadowed big Patrick wins in Fall River, New Bedford, and Worcester.

Two years later, Warren’s Senate campaign built on Patrick’s urban strategy. She put together a formidable get-out-the-vote operation that swamped Brown in cities like Lowell, Lawrence, Holyoke, Chelsea, and Springfield.

Demographic changes are helping drive Massachusetts cities toward Democrats. Charlie Baker’s 77-point loss in Boston’s majority-minority precincts in 2010 was indicative of broader Republican struggles to win over nonwhite voters.

One-fourth of all Massachusetts residents live in the state’s 10 largest cities: Boston, Springfield, Worcester, Lowell, Cambridge, New Bedford, Fall River, Brockton, Lynn, and Quincy. Most of these cities have turned sharply against Republicans. They are becoming tougher ground for Republican candidates as they become less white.

Between 2000 and 2010, the 10 most populous cities in Massachusetts grew as quickly as the entire state did. But the state’s largest cities experienced tremendous demographic churn. These cities were already home to a disproportionate share of nonwhite Massachusetts residents, but between 2000 and 2010, the state’s largest cities became both less white in absolute terms, and less white in relation to the rest of the state. The white population in the state’s 10 largest cities dropped from 60 percent in 2000, to 53 percent in 2010. (Roughly one in four Massachusetts residents are nonwhite.) The Commonwealth’s overall minority population grew between 2000 and 2010, but it grew far more quickly in large urban areas.

Large minority populations have delivered increasingly lopsided margins to Democrats in recent years. In 2010, Baker suffered defeats of at least 20 points in 10 cities with significant minority populations (Boston, Brockton, Cambridge, Chelsea, Holyoke, Lawrence, New Bedford, Randolph, Springfield, and Worcester). Scott Brown won in 2010 despite losing seven of those same communities by at least 20 points; in 1998, Cellucci had been blown out in just two of them: Boston and Cambridge.

COAKLEY, BAKER GO WHERE VOTES ARE

Even Martha Coakley’s most fervent supporters will admit that speeches aren’t the attorney general’s thing, that something in Coakley goes flat when she gets behind a microphone and starts speaking to a crowd. But, standing on a sun-drenched lawn behind a Baptist church in Jamaica
Plain, surrounded by members of the black clergy, Coakley has a noticeable spark in her. She’s come to this church outside Jackson Square to receive the endorsement of a number of Boston ministers, including Gregory Groover, the head of the city’s Black Ministerial Alliance, and Ten Point Coalition co-founder Jeffrey Brown. She seems to feed off them. In a populist riff on her standard stump speech, Coakley touches on predatory lending, early education, health care disparities, street violence, and criminal justice. She kicks Wall Street banks, and tells the ministers, “I’m a fighter. I will be a fighter.”

After Coakley’s speech, reporters ask Groover about Coakley’s standing in the polls. “Polls are alright,” Groover replies, “but it’s the people on the ground,” not polls, who deliver votes. “We’re concerned about the people in our community,” Groover says, vowing that “they will be out in large numbers” for Coakley.

Neighborhoods like this represent the teeth of Democratic strength in Massachusetts. They paced Deval Patrick to his 2010 reelection victory over Charlie Baker, and lifted Elizabeth Warren over Scott Brown two years ago. Coakley can’t beat Baker this November without repeating Patrick’s and Warren’s performances in places that look like Jackson Square in Jamaica Plain. And both she and Baker know it.

Coakley fell far short of expectations when she won the Democratic primary in September. She topped Steve Grossman by 6 percentage points, when most public polls had given her a 20-point edge over her closest Democratic rival. But if the primary balloting unnerved Democratic insiders who have been suspicious of Coakley since her 2010 Senate campaign, it also showed that the Democratic nominee was strongest in the places where she’ll need to be.

Baker has spent inordinate amounts of time campaigning in areas he lost handily 4 years ago.

strongest in November. Coakley shone in Springfield, New Bedford, and Fall River. She won Boston by 13 points overall, but 33 points separated her from Grossman in Boston’s majority-minority precincts. The state Democratic Party is looking to press this advantage; one of the first fundraisers it had after the primary was held exclusively to boost its communities of color machinery.

Boston city councilor Ayanna Pressley is a longtime Coakley supporter. She’s taken Coakley to Sunday church services in Dorchester during the campaign, and believes those trips bode well for November. “She’s at ease in that environment,” Pressley says. “I appreciate that she wanted to meet people where they are, and engage with them in a meaningful way. There wasn’t anybody who didn’t know who she was, and a lot had met her before. People know her, and they know who she fights for.”

And while Democrats acknowledge that Coakley doesn’t have the charisma that Patrick and Warren harnessed to drive turnout in the cities, they feel they have something equally potent: a ballot campaign, sponsored by labor, community activists, and faith groups, with its base of support in urban communities. There’s little formal opposition to the ballot question granting paid sick time to workers who don’t receive sick time benefits from their employers. But Baker opposes the question, Coakley’s campaign hopes to turn it into a wedge issue, and Democratic Party officials are counting on the pro-sick time campaign to help drive turnout in the cities.

“In this campaign, no one has a better field organization than the earned sick time campaign,” says Steve Crawford, a spokesman for the ballot question campaign. “We’re hiring people and putting them on the street. We’re registering people to vote, identifying them, following up, and making sure they vote. This isn’t something we’re creating now. It’s been over a year, and it’s statewide.”

For their part, Republicans have been attacking the Democrats’ strength since Baker entered the governor’s race last year. Kirsten Hughes, the state Republican Party chair, launched a tour of urban neighborhoods by bluntly telling the Boston Globe, “It’s no secret that the reason we lose on Election Day is because we lose in urban cities.” Baker has spent inordinate amounts of time campaigning in areas he lost handily four years ago, and when he’s not in the Lowells and Lawrences and Dorchesters of the state, he’s talking about them. He rolled out his economic development plan flanked by supporters from Springfield and Worcester. Before arriving at his primary night party in Dorchester, he stood outside Florian Hall, the Boston firefighters’ union hall, shaking every hand he could.

“I’ve campaigned in a lot of Democratic communities, and we’ve gotten a very positive reception in these kinds of places,” Baker said on primary day, standing outside Holy Name parish school in West Roxbury, a high-turnout Boston polling place. “I said in the beginning of the campaign, I’m going to chase 100 percent of the vote. If you’re going to do that, you have to show up in a bunch of places Republicans don’t usually go.”

Baker seems determined to reverse the grim math facing Republicans with the sheer force of his physical presence. “You need to show up and make the case,” he says. “You have to make the sale. But you can’t make the sale if you don’t show up.”
Workers lay down asphalt on Union Street in Hingham, one of many road projects using asphalt containing recycled engine oil.
Laying it down, testing it later

State transportation officials take an unusual U-turn on use of a controversial asphalt additive

BY JACK SULLIVAN | PHOTOGRAPHS BY WEBB CHAPPELL

TRANSPORTATION AND ENGINEERING officials from across New England gathered at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth in June for what was being called an emergency “pavement summit.” The officials had learned a major asphalt provider had been adding recycled engine oil to its product as a binder for several years without telling anyone.

The asphalt company insisted the recycled oil worked just as well as other binders, saved money, and was good for the environment. But many state officials at the summit said they were hearing reports that recently paved roads were cracking prematurely. There was little definitive information tying the road breakdowns to the recycled oil in the asphalt, but some studies out of Canada said the product couldn’t stand up to cold weather.

Officials from Bitumar, the Montreal-based asphalt provider, and Norwell-based Clean
Harbors, the parent company of the Texas firm providing the recycled engine oil, told the group their product was perfectly safe. Their own studies showed no ill effects from using recycled engine oil. They also pointed out that a ban could be devastating for their businesses because the asphalt was already mixed for the paving season. One official from New Hampshire didn’t want to hear it, telling the Bitumar official that he should have been upfront about using the new asphalt additive from the beginning. “Had you asked us first, we would have told you not to do it,” the woman said, according to one of the attendees.

After hearing all the presentations, highway officials from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine caucused among themselves and decided to ban the asphalt containing recycled engine oil. The officials felt a ban was the prudent thing to do. They were spending millions of dollars repaving roads, and they didn’t want to lay any more of the new asphalt until they knew it was effective. They asked the Pavement Research Institute of Southeastern Massachusetts, based at UMass Dartmouth, to run extensive tests on the product. Until they received assurances of the product’s durability, the decided to require asphalt suppliers to use more traditional binders.

Bitumar responded by suing all four states, seeking to block the product bans that were scheduled to take effect August 1. The company argued nothing in state regulations prevented the firm from adding recycled engine oil to their asphalt mix, which is made of refined crude oil to begin with. The firm also claimed a four-state ban would be financially disastrous, costing the company an estimated $30 million for this year alone.

The company won an injunction in Vermont, but the bans in Maine and New Hampshire were put into place. Massachusetts was the lone state to go in a different direction. One day before the ban was scheduled to take effect, state Highway Administrator Frank DePaola decided to call it off. His action was so unexpected that the lawyer representing the state in the lawsuit brought by Bitumar wasn’t even told of the change in course.

Industry officials and state engineers suspect politics played a role in the decision, but DePaola denies that. William Geary, the politically connected legal counsel for Clean Harbors and the former head of the Metropolitan District Commission, says he made some calls to state transportation officials and engineers to arrange meetings on the asphalt issue but did no lobbying.

“This is an environmentally friendly product,” says Geary. "If there’s a suspicion that there’s some political persuasion here, I don’t know anything about it.”

DePaola says he rejected the advice of his engineers because there was no proof the product was defective. He says the recycled product was also in line with the state’s commitment to green technology. "I thought it was a somewhat arbitrary decision in the middle of the paving

"This is the first time I’ve ever seen us throw anything down and say, ‘Let’s see how it works,’” says a state engineer.
season,” DePaola says. “We don’t have any evidence on our roadways that it has caused premature failure.”

But his engineers say it’s too soon for any defects to appear; the new asphalt has been used on state roads for only a year. One longtime state engineer says DePaola’s decision turns the state’s test-first policy on its head. “This is the first time I’ve ever seen us throw anything down and say, ‘Let’s see how it works,’” says the engineer, who asked that his name not be used because he is not authorized to speak to the media. “The performance drives the decision, not the fact you’re saving the environment.”

THE RISE OF REOB
Asphalt is produced by refining crude oil. For the most part, it is a byproduct of oil refining rather than the intent. With the cost of oil skyrocketing in recent decades, asphalt producers are constantly looking for ways to reduce costs. One area where they’ve had some success is with the binders used to stabilize the product. Worn-out rubber tires, reclaimed asphalt, and old roofing shingles are just some of the materials that have been used as binders to keep costs down.

About 30 years ago, refiners began experimenting with adding recycled engine oil to asphalt, but its use was limited and confined to warmer climates. The binder, labeled Recycled Engine Oil Bottoms, or REOB, by industrial officials, is what sinks to the bottom when waste engine oil is re-refined. The lighter oil at the top can be used for other products, including engine oil. But there wasn’t much use for REOB until it was added to asphalt as a cheaper alternative to existing binders.

Safety-Kleen of Texas appears to be the first company to market recycled engine oil as an asphalt binder. The company collects waste oil from around the country and Canada and sends it off to its refining plants, including one in Ontario. Asphalt containing recycled engine oil was used primarily in the south initially, and then slowly made its way north over the last decade.

Details on the spreading use of the product are sketchy because Bitumar, the company that first incorporated recycled engine oil into its asphalt, didn’t tell anyone what it was doing. Bitumar asphalt containing the recycled engine oil began showing up in Massachusetts in 2013, shortly after Clean Harbors bought Safety-Kleen.

“This product is new to New England, and I understand that, but it’s not new to the industry,” says Francis O’Brien, who ran the Hudson Asphalt plant in Providence for more than 30 years before the company was purchased by Bitumar. O’Brien now works as a consultant to Bitumar and filed affidavits on the company’s behalf in the lawsuits against Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts.

O’Brien says there is no evidence indicating recycled engine oil weakens asphalt. He says the recycled oil actually makes for a cheaper and better product. “It helps lower the cost of asphalt, which allows us to sell it cheaper to contractors who pass the savings on to their customers, and, in fact, all the evidence is positive,” he says.

The evidence cited by O’Brien of the recycled engine oil’s performance comes from tests paid for by Safety-Kleen with little independent verification of the results. There are no prohibitions on what binders an asphalt producer can use unless a state specifically bans an additive. The asphalt’s overall performance, however, must meet a state’s specifications. In Massachusetts as well as in the other New England states, asphalt has to meet a performance grade called 64-28, which means the product must
be able to withstand temperatures ranging from 64 degrees Celsius (147 degrees Fahrenheit) to minus-28 degrees Celsius (minus-18 degrees Fahrenheit).

Massachusetts did some routine performance grade tests on the Bitumar product when it was first delivered for use on projects, but those tests indicated the chemical composition of the asphalt hadn’t changed. Officials say the tests couldn’t distinguish between the petroleum products used in the asphalt from the petroleum-based recycled engine oil. Since Bitumar never disclosed that it was using a different binding agent, further tests were not conducted.

Paul Montenegro, an asphalt consultant from Providence who attended the pavement summit at UMass Dartmouth, says the industry’s concern about recycled engine oil stems partly from the way Bitumar started using the additive without telling anyone. “When people have good products, they’re out there telling you what the benefits are,” says Montenegro, who has worked in the asphalt business for 45 years. “These guys kept it a secret... What are the benefits?”

The state engineer who asked not to be identified says Bitumar’s secrecy amounts to a bait and switch. “It’s like someone’s selling you a hot dog and telling you it’s a steak,” he says.

Montenegro says industry officials aren’t opposed to a new product that saves money, but they want proof that the new product works before laying it down. If there is a problem with the recycled engine oil, he says, it can be fixed in a cost-effective manner with different additives if it doesn’t get out of hand. “I would rather err on the side of caution,” he says. “Let’s not go out and cause a lot of damage that we’ll have to pay for later.”

EVIDENCE OF PROBLEMS

About a decade ago, fairly new roads in Ontario began failing. Simon A.M. Hesp, a professor of chemical engineering at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, was hired by the province to find out what was causing all the cracks, cuts, and other defects. It was a phenomenon that he was familiar with, having seen it on a number of roads in Kingston.

Hesp and his colleagues at the Hesp Research Group at Queen’s University began testing samples from the failed roadways and discovered metals such as zinc present in the asphalt mix. The zinc and other materials were consistent with old engine oil, which had previously not been used in asphalt. In research papers published in 2009, Hesp concluded that the engine oil was the cause...
of the road problems because it was failing to hold the asphalt together.

“In Ontario we have found extensive early failure,” says Hesp. “There was engine lubricant and zinc, things that should never be in asphalt. We have found it in very high concentrations in roads that have failed.”

Transportation officials in Vermont and Maine were experiencing similar problems with their roads. They read the Hesp study and became concerned that REOB-infused asphalt might be the cause. Richard Bradbury, the director of materials testing for the Maine Department of Transportation, submitted an affidavit in the Bitumar lawsuit that laid out the state’s response to the “premature failure” of roads using asphalt containing the recycled engine oil.

“[Maine DOT] has never approved the use of REOB in…paving projects and, until recently, had no knowledge it was used as a modifier by Bitumar,” Bradbury said in his affidavit. The department “determined it would not place highway projects and the environment at risk without a better understanding of the long-term effects of the REOB additive.”

Nancy Singer, a spokeswoman for the Federal Highway Administration, says the agency is currently undertaking tests on recycled engine oil in asphalt. She says federal officials became aware of the use of recycled engine oil and potential problems with it “approximately four years ago.” She says the view that there is scant knowledge about the product’s properties and sustainability, despite Bitumar and Safety-Kleen’s claims, is “an accurate assessment of the current state of knowledge.”

O’Brien, Geary, and DePaola all dismiss the Hesp studies and instead point to Safety-Kleen’s experts, who say they have found no evidence of negative effects from using recycled oil. O’Brien insists the amount of recycled engine oil Hesp used in his study — between 15 and 30 percent of the asphalt — far exceeds what Bitumar puts in its asphalt, which he says is less than 8 percent.

“It’s like when you take aspirin for blood pressure problems,” says O’Brien. “Aspirin is probably good for you if you take two of them. If you take 30 of them, it’s not so good.”

But Hesp said he didn’t create the formula — it was what he found in the samples he took off the roads. He says no matter how he has run his tests, every indication in his lab shows asphalt with recycled engine oil cannot hold up to the freeze-and-thaw cycles that can wreak havoc with oil-based products in the north. There are concerns it
cracks at high temperatures as well, he says.

“You can recycle, but if your roads last half the normal cycle, that’s not a good outcome, is it?” asks Hesp. “It’s hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers’ money that goes down the drain. No one benefits.”

RISKS FOR MASSACHUSETTS

UMass Dartmouth expects to finish running tests on the asphalt with recycled engine oil early next year, but until then the industry isn’t holding still. Bitumar is selling the product across the state and some of its competitors are also jumping on the bandwagon, virtually guaranteeing that the product will show up on hundreds of miles of roads across Massachusetts.

All States Asphalt in western Massachusetts, one of the largest asphalt producers in New England, is now putting recycled engine oil into its mixes. There are at least six other independent producers in Massachusetts, but none has yet informed the state if they will add recycled oil to their mix.

Richard Miller, the All States president, says he resisted using recycled oil because he was unsure if it was an effective additive. He wanted to wait until more testing was done. But with Bitumar continuing to use it, Miller says, his hand was forced.

“As long as the state accepts it, we have to get in the game,” says Miller, pointing to lowered costs with the use of recycled engine oil. “There’s additives to asphalt that have always been used, but they’ve always been approved before. This has never been approved, but what’s my choice?”

The state’s decision also means cities and towns, which account for nearly two-thirds of the paved roads in Massachusetts, are laying down asphalt with recycled engine oil in it. Harry Sylvester, assistant projects manager for the Hingham Department of Public Works, says local DPWs have to accept whatever asphalt is supplied as long as it meets state specifications. He says Hingham should be unaffected whatever the state’s test uncovers because the municipality always applies a micro-surface topcoat — a thin sealant coat — to its roads designed to seal and protect the asphalt from the elements. It’s an expensive process and not one every town — or state — can afford to do.

“We’re at the mercy of that spec,” says Sylvester, whose town has had a bevy of projects this season, using about 2,600 tons of asphalt purchased from a supplier who buys from Bitumar. “I’ve heard rumors, [the asphalt industry has] been playing games with the oil for 20 years... But if they’re producing a product that meets state specifications, that’s our standard.”

The testing will determine whether the product can stand up over time. State engineers and transportation officials elsewhere in New England say roads should last
at least 20 years. Hesp thinks they should last 30 years. DePaola says he is counting on the roads lasting only 12 to 15 years, a vast difference from most other experts.

The situation is eerily similar to a problem the MBTA had with concrete railroad ties that began showing up five years ago. The state bought concrete railroad ties that were supposed to last 50 years but crumbled and broke after less than 10 years because of a substandard mix. Taxpayers ended up footing the nearly $100 million bill to replace all the ties.

One major concern is what happens if the UMass lab or the Federal Highway Administration determine that asphalt with the recycled engine oil will not withstand New England’s harsh winters. DePaola says if the tests indicate the recycled engine oil doesn’t measure up, the state will reinstitute the ban. But, he admits, “we don’t have much recourse” for the asphalt that has already been laid down.

If the lab testing in Dartmouth “corroborates the Canadian results, then we’ll probably impose the ban at least for a year,” DePaola says. “The impact would be, the hope is, we get 12 years out of it before it fails.”

O’Brien says while he is confident the test results will uphold his company’s findings, Bitumar is prepared to resume using older, more expensive binders if a problem is uncovered. But as for the asphalt that has already been laid down, O’Brien says there is little the company can or will do. He says there are too many other factors involved — such as the quality of the contractor’s work or additional additives in the asphalt after it’s delivered to another supplier — to attribute any failure specifically to the use of recycled engine oil.

“Safety-Kleen will pay for the cost of all the testing and we’ll live and die with the results,” he says. But when asked if Bitumar would offer a warranty for the asphalt that was laid down last year and this year, he says no. “That’s impossible,” he says. “It would be crazy for us to warranty stuff we have no control over.”

The state decision means communities are also laying down asphalt with REOB in it.

If Massachusetts were a country, its eighth graders would rank second in the world in science.*

Celebrating our 11th year, the Massachusetts STEM Summit would like to acknowledge the focus and dedication, investment and vision that the state’s STEM community has brought to the students, workforce, and citizens of Massachusetts. You are the gateway to the future.

OCTOBER 22, 2014   |   DCU CENTER, WORCESTER   |   MASS-STEM-SUMMIT.ORG

*Results of the 2011 International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement’s Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)
Life savers

This drug is conquering hepatitis C but, at $1,000 a pill and $84,000 per treatment, can we afford it? Health plans are already restricting access to the drug and the state prison system is not prescribing it at all

BY BRUCE MOHL | PHOTOGRAPHS BY MICHAEL MANNING

CHERYL WAXMAN WAS healthy all her life. The 57-year-old Charlestown resident caught colds from time to time, but nothing more serious. Then last year the colds became more frequent, followed by bouts of bronchitis and pneumonia. Her primary care doctor couldn’t figure out what was wrong, so he suggested a number of tests. One of those tests came back positive for the hepatitis C virus.

The diagnosis was a shock to Waxman, in part because
she didn’t know much about the disease. Its name conjured up images of needles, drug use, and unprotected sex, but that didn’t make sense to her. “I had never lived what you would call a high-risk lifestyle,” she says.

Hepatitis C is a virus that attacks the liver and often leads to liver failure or cancer. The virus spreads through contact with infected blood. Drug users who share needles and other paraphernalia are particularly prone, but any sort of blood exchange carries risks, from using an infected person’s razor or toothbrush to getting a tattoo or ear piercing with equipment not properly sanitized.

Drug users are the most susceptible to infection. Charles Faris, president and CEO of Worcester-based Spectrum Health Systems, which runs a number of residential drug treatment facilities and methadone clinics around the state, says the rocketing use of intravenous drugs has triggered a near-epidemic of hepatitis C cases. “Of the people we’re seeing that are coming into our facilities, north of 50 percent are testing positive for hepatitis C,” he says.

Aging baby boomers are the other major group carrying the virus. Health officials say roughly one of every 30 people between the ages of 40 and 60 are infected. They typically contracted the disease when they were much younger, before the HIV epidemic prompted medical officials to pay much closer attention to instrument sterilization and to screening blood for contagious diseases.

What makes the disease particularly insidious is that you can contract it and not exhibit any outward symptoms for years and sometimes decades, even as the virus attacks the liver. Some people call it the silent epidemic.

“It doesn’t show itself, but in the meantime it’s destroying your liver,” says Waxman, who lost 70 percent of her liver function because of the disease. She believes she contracted the virus around the age of 20, but isn’t sure how. There are several possibilities, including giving blood in high school, getting her ears pierced, and having her wisdom teeth removed. “I was probably a victim of the times,” she says.

What saved her life is a wonder drug called Sovaldi that, used in conjunction with other medicines, eradicates the hepatitis C virus but comes with a price tag that is ravaging the budgets of insurance companies and government agencies. The company selling the drug is charging $1,000 a pill, or $84,000 for a typical, 12-week course of treatment and $168,000 for a harder-to-treat strain of the virus. In developing countries, such as Egypt and India, the company is charging a tiny fraction of that amount. There are many other drugs that cost more than Sovaldi, but they typically address fairly rare diseases. What’s unique about Sovaldi is that it’s a very expensive drug from which an enormous number of people can benefit.

The numbers are scary: hepatitis C affects an estimated 150 million people worldwide and 3 to 5 million in the United States. In Massachusetts, infectious disease specialists estimate as many as 200,000 people could have the virus. Treating just the Bay State residents who are infected could theoretically cost $17 billion, an amount equal to nearly half of the entire state budget.

Waxman knows the price is high, but she wants everyone to remember that Sovaldi saves lives. She has reduced liver function, but she’s able to lead a normal life as long as she follows a strict diet that includes no salt or alcohol. She knows that if her doctor hadn’t recommended a test
WINNERS AND LOSERS

Sovaldi was developed by a New Jersey-based company called Pharmasset, which was bought by Gilead Sciences of California in 2011 for $11 billion. Some analysts thought the purchase price was way too high; Gilead was essentially betting a third of its value on a company with its most promising drug still in clinical trials. Some analysts told the New York Times that sales of Gilead’s hepatitis C drugs would have to reach $4 billion a year to make the deal profitable.

Sovaldi has not disappointed. The drug hit the market last December, and sales hit $2.3 billion in the first quarter, $3.5 billion in the second quarter, and are on pace to reach somewhere around $10 billion for the year, which would make Sovaldi one of the best-selling drugs ever. Companies that made previous hepatitis C drugs beat a hasty retreat. Vertex Pharmaceuticals of Boston, the maker of Incivek, announced its first layoff ever as Sovaldi came to market, letting 375 people go, 175 of them in Massachusetts.

For patients, the drug has been a godsend. Company officials say 70,000 patients were treated in the United States in the first half of 2014 and the cure rate was more than 95 percent with virtually none of the side-effects that plagued earlier hepatitis C treatments.

Gilead says the price of Sovaldi is not out of line with the cost of earlier treatment regimes that had much lower success rates. The price is also based somewhat on a country’s ability to pay. As it ramps up sales around the world, Gilead is adjusting the drug’s price based on a country’s gross domestic product. The company plans to sell Sovaldi for roughly 1 percent of the US price, or about $10 a pill, in developing countries such as India and Egypt where the incidence of hepatitis C is high. Gilead is also licensing the drug to generic drug manufacturers in India who are free to sell below that price.

In Massachusetts, state officials have remained strangely silent on Sovaldi and its price, other than to say they are conducting a cost impact review and are committed to providing the drug to people who need it. The state’s prison system, however, is not currently giving Sovaldi to inmates even though the incidence of hepatitis C inside prison walls is typically high, affecting an estimated 17 percent of prisoners.

Health insurers, particularly those who serve the state’s Medicaid patients, have been the most vocal about the cost implications of Sovaldi. Medicaid is the state’s health insurance program for the poor, a population that tends to be infected with the virus at a higher rate. The six health plans catering to Medicaid patients say their losses have been mounting, in part because they are not being reimbursed adequately by the state for the high cost of Sovaldi. BMC HealthNet, for example, says 152 of its patients took the drug during the first six months of the year, costing the plan $13.5 million that was not accounted for in rates. The six Medicaid plans estimate their Sovaldi losses will total $70 to $80 million this year. They say the 3.7 percent increase in rates approved by the state for the coming year is about half of the increase the plans needed to cover their costs.

Christopher “Kit” Gorton, the head of Medicaid/state-sponsored programs at Tufts Health Plan, says Sovaldi has hit his company particularly hard. He says Network Health, the Tufts plan that serves Medicaid patients, responded to the opiate addiction epidemic by instituting a number of programs to deal with drug abuse. The programs attracted drug abusers, who are more likely to have hepatitis C. As a result, Network Health’s Sovaldi costs have spiraled. Network Health is the third-largest insurance plan serving Medicaid patients, but its Sovaldi losses this year are the largest at $29 million.

John Fallon, senior vice president and chief physician executive for the state’s largest insurer, Blue Cross Blue
Shield of Massachusetts, say the company’s costs for Solvadi represent 5 percent of the company’s $1.5 billion in pharmacy spending. He says Solvadi is part of a larger, concerning trend: 1 percent of Blue Cross prescriptions are for high-cost specialty drugs, yet those drugs account for 20 percent of all pharmacy spending. And he says the percentage devoted to specialty drugs is growing quickly.

When he first saw the cost implications of Solvadi, Gorton at Tufts says he called his staff together and asked them to analyze the problem from every angle to see if there was a way to keep costs down. One staffer ran the numbers and demonstrated that the health plan could save money by sending all of its hepatitis C patients on vacation to Egypt for a week to visit the pyramids and, while there, pick up a $900 prescription for Solvadi. Gorton says the Egyptian vacation idea was never seriously considered because it would be illegal, but it brought home the immense cost of the drug.

Gorton says Solvadi cannot be viewed as just another drug. “It’s true we’re an insurance program and we signed up for liability, but this isn’t about insurance,” he says. “Just like the damage from a hurricane, you need to figure out how to pay for it.”

**WHAT TO DO?**

A section of this year’s Massachusetts budget requires every primary care doctor treating someone born between 1945 and 1965 to offer them a test for hepatitis C. Camilla Graham, co-director of the Viral Hepatitis Center at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, says anyone who tests positive should be treated with Solvadi.

“This is a very tricky business situation, but medically it’s very clear to all of us,” she says, noting that putting off treatment with Solvadi can lead to liver cancer or failure and often end up costing more in the long run. “For reasons of humanity and to limit downstream costs, you want to treat people before this happens,” she says.

But most Massachusetts health plans have put in place medication guidelines that require patients to exhibit some liver damage before they can be treated with Solvadi. The plans won’t say so publicly, but the goal is to contain costs while making sure those in most need of the drug receive it.

Gorton says the guidelines may make sense, but only on a temporary basis. “These restrictions do capture the most urgent patients, which is tolerable on a short-term basis, but is not sustainable longer-term,” she says. “You can’t make someone wait until they develop such advanced fibrosis that they require life-long screening for liver cancer.”

Massachusetts health officials have not objected to the restrictions on Solvadi prescriptions put in place by health plans serving Medicaid patients. Other states have been more outspoken. Oregon, for example, is limiting Solvadi prescriptions to only those with later stages of liver damage who are drug free and have been compliant with earlier treatments. California, Florida, and Louisiana have also restricted Medicaid access. Texas is not covering Solvadi prescriptions at all through its Medicaid program.

Prison systems across the country, many of them fearing lawsuits by inmates denied access to Solvadi, are beginning to prescribe the drug. Massachusetts prison officials declined comment, although a spokesman said the drug is currently not being prescribed. He said the matter is under study.

Most health plans are currently requiring some evidence of liver damage before prescribing Solvadi.
John Milligan, the president and CEO of Gilead, told financial analysts in September that he believes that a new drug under development, which will require treatment for eight instead of 12 weeks, may entice state Medicaid programs and insurers to lower the threshold for when to prescribe.

“If you wait too long, you may not be able to undo the damage, that’s what we’ve learned with HIV, that’s what we are seeing with the hepatitis C virus. You may not be able to undo all the damage that you have done, you may not be able to get as much benefit as you would have otherwise. So it makes perfect medical sense to try to treat earlier rather than later,” he said. “We forget that the hepatitis C virus is a terrible disease. What has been under-reported is the incidence of diseases and death associated with the hepatitis C virus. People die about 15 years earlier than average, they have much higher incidence of myocardial infarction, they have much higher incidence of diabetes, which is a major health cost driver these days.”

Insurance officials acknowledge that Sovaldi may be able to reduce health costs over the long run, but they say the savings often come years or even decades after the initial expenditure on the drug. By that time, many of the patients have moved on to other health plans or Medicare, and the cost of the initial drug outlays are never recouped.

Along with Gilead, several other pharmaceutical companies are readying new hepatitis C treatments that could hit the market later this year and next year. Graham says she hopes the competition will drive prices down, but insurance industry officials are skeptical. Some say they think prices may actually rise. They are urging state officials to get everyone around a table to develop a coordinated response to drugs such as Sovaldi that cost a lot and are also beneficial to a large group of patients.

“This is really a public health issue. We need a community standard,” says Deborah Enos, the president and CEO of Neighborhood Health Plan, a division of Partners Healthcare that serves Medicaid patients.

Fallon at Blue Cross thinks the debate about Sovaldi needs to take place at the federal level and involve all stakeholders, including government at all levels, pharmaceutical companies, and insurers. “We think this is deserving of a public discussion of how society should deal with this,” he says. SW

Jack Sullivan contributed to this report.
Updating his resume

Deval Patrick looks back as he prepares for life after Beacon Hill

PHOTOGRAPHS BY MARK OSTOW

Despite eight years as governor and rampant speculation that he some day will run for president, Deval Patrick still thinks of himself as a kid from the South Side of Chicago. That self-image, in many ways, is the connecting thread that runs through the core of Patrick’s being. It has shaped his personal and political styles, his public and private relationships, his drive to succeed, his defensiveness over failure, his personality, and his will. He came virtually out of nowhere eight years ago; his name recognition was in single digits when he jumped into the Democratic race for governor against better-known and better-financed candidates such as then-Attorney General Tom Reilly. On January 8, Patrick, now one of the state’s most popular political figures, will walk down the Grand Staircase in front of the State House, departing as the first full two-term governor in a quarter century.

For Patrick, who is at once gregarious but very private, it’s hard to separate the personal from
the political, though he rarely talks about the former. He came from a broken family, sometimes living on welfare, led by a single mother after his father abandoned him and his sister when they were young. Patrick and his sister slept in the same bedroom as their mother in a two-bedroom apartment they shared with his mater- nal grandparents. It may help explain why Patrick is so vocal and strident in his support for welfare benefits and a fierce proponent of letting families get and use their benefits with dignity.

As a 13-year-old, Patrick came to Milton Academy on a full scholarship, a chance to lift himself up from poverty and become the first in his family to go to college. Does it come as a surprise that he touts education as a central theme to economic advancement and that there’s not a second to waste?

“We have invested in education at historic levels, even when the bottom was falling out of everything else, not because you get an immediate return, but because, if you’re in the second grade, you don’t get to sit out the second grade until the recession is over,” he says passionately during our conversation. “Right now is your time.”

Unlike his friend and fellow South Sider, President Obama, Patrick is rarely pressed to wade into race-related topics, but he acknowledges his skin color is too obvi- ous to ignore. Patrick recalls his early “ugly days” in Massachusetts during busing, when he was a teenager, first at Milton and then at Harvard. He remembers trips into the city where he was called “all kinds of things in all kinds of neighborhoods.” And he says he had to weigh that when he decided to run for governor in 2006.

His protectiveness of his wife and daughters is also a reflection of his upbringing, the need to rely on each other against outside forces. The pain is obvious when he talks about what his wife, Diane, went through in her fight with depression and the surprise when his chief of staff told him his daughter’s sexual orientation was news, months after she came out to her parents.

Patrick remains close-lipped about his future plans, quite possibly because he doesn’t know himself. He’s proud of his accomplishments as governor, says the right things about unfinished agendas, but doesn’t always agree with what some perceive as his or his administration’s failures.

On a sun-splashed last day of summer, we sat out on the third-floor balcony of the State House just outside his office, overlooking the staircase down which Patrick will take his final walk as governor. We sat outside because the weather was nice, but also because his office’s recently installed bullet-proof glass prevented the windows from being opened and the air conditioning was not working.

The following is an edited transcript of my conversa- tion with the kid from the South Side of Chicago.

JACK SULLIVAN

COMMONWEALTH: In eight years what’s changed more — you or Massachusetts?

GOV. PATRICK: Some of both. You know, we’re at a 25-year high in employment, first in the nation in so many things. We’ve got the litany: student achievement, healthcare cover- age, veteran’s services, economic competitiveness, venture funding, entrepreneurial activity, you know the budget’s in great shape, got the highest bond rating in the history of the Commonwealth. I’m proud of that, and I thank all the people on the team and in the legislature and in the general public and in the business community who have helped.

I think my own skin is thicker — because it better be or else. I mean my wife, who’s a very private person, and has been a reluctant First Lady — she’s been a fantastic first lady — but you know she struggled some with the experience at the beginning and has sorted out how to balance her own professional life and her privacy with the things she wants to do and can do to help. She is a news junkie and used to take everything so personally. I finally told her stop reading, just put it down (laughs), but she’s continued to read and it doesn’t quite get to her in the same way, and that’s good for both of us.

CW: She had some very private and challenging mental health issues in a very public manner. Your daughter’s sexual orientation became the basis for some news stories. But they never ran for office, you did.

PATRICK: Yeah, you know what, I have said to many, many candidates or would-be candidates and their spouses and families to think hard because your family gets dragged along for the ride whether you like it or not. You know my sister and brother-in-law had their lives nearly destroyed in the first campaign over a really vicious and completely groundless attack. And I still love them and they still love me, all of us are stronger for it, but frankly you don’t think it’s news. When Catherine came out, she told us one week- end in the summer and we had a family hug and went off and had a family picnic. And I didn’t think about it again until I happened to mention it to my chief of staff and he said — and I’m talking about months later — and he said “Governor, that’s news.” And I said that’s a private family
Outside of government, I don’t think there’s anything more important to a city than its newspaper.

cw: Is that going to weigh on any decision for you to re-enter into politics after you leave office?

Patrick: Oh yeah, sure, you know we’re all seasoned and tested and what’s that term, vetted? Making politics personal is a part of the political experience today and, sure, it’s a factor. It’s not the central factor, but it’s a factor.

CW: You’ve already gotten over one milestone, in that you’re the first black governor of Massachusetts…

Patrick: I am?

CW: You are. You know the history of Massachusetts, you know the perception nationally of Massachusetts. What made you think back in 2006 that a black man from Chicago could be elected governor of Massachusetts?

Patrick: Well, first of all, I thought about whether race would be a factor, but I also thought that the change we were offering, which is this notion of governing with a sense of generational responsibility, was something that a lot more people than me were hungry for. I knew I wasn’t going to get to be governor by waiting for the establishment to say it was okay or for the pundits to say there was a path and all that sort of thing. We don’t have a large enough African-American population in the Commonwealth for that to be its own sort of voting bloc, even presuming that the community was monolithic. I had folks in the chattering classes and just regular old people saying it’s a long shot — you know you add to the lift by being black — but my experience in the Commonwealth, you know, I’ve experienced the ugly side. When I came, busing was hot and we were in the midst of all that. I’ve been called all kinds of things in all kinds of neighborhoods around the Commonwealth, and I’m sure I’ve been called things since I’ve been governor, too. But, overwhelmingly, I’ve been moved by how willing people are to listen to me or listen frankly to any candidate if the candidate is willing to listen to them.

CW: What do you think that your election and President Obama’s election, and re-election, frankly, for the both of you, say about the state of race relations both in Massachusetts and nationally?

Patrick: Well, I don’t think it means we’re in a post-racial society. I think that there are still people who vote, and they say they vote, I’ve seen interviews of people saying they voted against the president because there shouldn’t be a black president and so forth, but we’ve seen the majority doesn’t agree with that and that’s a good thing. We are a better country, you know, and one big, big issue I have with the whole dialogue on race in America is that we don’t seem to be able to strike the balance in the same
voice between acknowledging the extraordinary progress we have made, much of it in our lifetimes, and at the same time acknowledging how much work remains. Yet there are people who are in the one camp or the other and not willing to acknowledge both truths.

**CW:** Being governor, I would assume, is about on-the-job training. There’s not a course that you go to — How to be Governor 101. On top of that, you pretty much came out of nowhere eight years ago. Clearly you were pretty high up with the Justice Department, and you have some business background, but political and governance just weren’t on your resume. Was the job what you expected?

**PATRICK:** The job is full of surprises, some of it I expected and some of it actually was quite familiar. When you think about life in a big company, like Coca Cola or Texaco, there is very little that happens by edict. If you actually want to make stuff happen, you have to kind of persuade the middle management to, first of all, understand it and that takes time. I think governing, particularly the legislative part of the work, is slower than I’d like. I’m an impatient governor and impatient person and I have had to learn how to slow down and, you know, not to take my foot off of the gas but not to overwhelm the partners you need with stuff in order to get stuff done. That wasn’t obvious to me when I first came in. I think I’m a better governor today than I was yesterday, and I think I’ll be a better governor tomorrow than I was today. I continue to learn.

**CW:** What about your predecessors? You had the benefit when you first came in of having five living governors. Did you ever call any of them and ask for advice?

**PATRICK:** Yeah, actually they’ve been great. You don’t even have to pick up the phone for Mike Dukakis, because he’s calling all the time. He’s great, he’s so interested in good government and policy. We haven’t agreed on everything, but he’s been very involved. Less so Governor Romney because, of course, he was running for president, but in the transition and before the transition, he was always a gentleman to me. Governor Swift told me something that was probably the most poignant insight, when she said it’s the loneliest job she’d ever had, and I get that now. And Governor Cellucci, God bless him, we played golf, just us, once a year in the summer for two or three years, and he suggested it the first summer, and it was marvelous, and we just let our hair down. He was a great, great guy, just a lovely person.

**CW:** There’s a perception that your relationship with the Legislature has been somewhat cool over the eight years. Do you agree with that and, if so, how would you have changed that?

**PATRICK:** No, I don’t agree with that. I’m not much of a back slapper and all that stuff, but if you look at the results, I think we’ve had a couple of the most productive legislative sessions in decades. We don’t agree on everything and sometimes the disagreements bubble out into public view. I will say that one thing that I observe about the experience as a relative newcomer is that much, much more emphasis is placed on the personal dynamics among the legislative leadership, between them and between the governor, than is probably pertinent. It makes for good print, maybe, but it’s not necessarily real. I mean, their job is difficult, too. And so when I say I’ve been learning to slow down, it’s not necessarily real. I mean, their job is difficult, too. And so when I say I’ve been learning to slow down, it’s not that our agenda has been any less ambitious, but I do know you have to give them the time to arrive at a decision that works for their body. And so I proposed a lot of things. They’ve given me, you know, 95 percent of what I’ve asked for. Rarely in the form I asked for it — do you know what I mean? — but they’ve given it to me.

**CW:** Such as the transportation bond bill?

**PATRICK:** Yeah, and that’s a perfect example of what I’m
talking about in my own learning curve here, is to understand when you’ve won. And not feel like it’s got to be just the way you proposed it.

CW: Have you learned to take yes for an answer?

Patrick: Yeah, I suppose so. I push hard.

CW: Governing is about long-term, but it’s also about short-term, it’s about what’s happening now. Do you think that you were able to meet those immediate needs?

Patrick: I don’t think we got everything done as fast as either I wanted or, in some cases, the public wanted. But there are very immediate things, like responding to the Marathon attacks, a tornado in western Massachusetts, a water main break here in eastern Massachusetts that was supposed to deprive 2 million people of drinkable water for three or four months and we got it fixed in three days. I have begun to appreciate that the job is a combination of substance and performance art and, you know, I think I’m probably better at one than the other…

CW: Which one?

Patrick: The substance, I think. I’ve been trying not to be so carried away by the pressure you get on the performance art side that I lose focus on the substance side.

CW: Polls show people think you haven’t handled recent problems as well as you could. Is there anything about any of the high-profile problems you wish you could have handled differently?

Patrick: Well, what are you thinking of?

CW: Well, things such as the breakdown of the Health Connector, the Annie Dookhan scandal of the Massachusetts crime lab, and the IT problems at various agencies. Are those management issues or are they things that could pop up in any administration?

Patrick: Well, things such as the breakdown of the Health Connector, the Annie Dookhan scandal of the Massachusetts crime lab, and the IT problems at various agencies. Are those management issues or are they things that could pop up in any administration?

CW: One of the interesting things you just said about the IT problems at the Connector is that you got involved. And then you talked about both Annie Dookhan and DCF, how you got involved. Do you think you’ve been engaged as much as you needed to be?

Patrick: Well, it’s a big state and there are 30,000 people who work in state government. It’s not possible for a governor to be personally involved in everything. We’ve had really, really good cabinet leadership and really good agency leadership, but things come up, they happen. It’s horrible that a child was lost at DCF but I’ll tell you what, it helped the Legislature to step up and give us the resources that we need to fix the underlying problem. That’s a really, really good thing. It’s horrible that the Connector website failed milestone a year ahead of time, in time for the open enrollment season. But that took a lot of work and focus and a great team and a lot more of my personal involvement than an IT project ought to take, but I think that’s how you solve problems. Annie Dookhan, we were the ones who found that problem. We hadn’t gone around saying, by the way she was hired in the previous administration. We’re the ones who surfaced that and set about the hard work of fixing that problem. I thought you were going to ask about [Department of Children and Families.] That’s another, you know, big challenge. Interestingly, the issues at DCF have to do with insufficient staffing and out-of-date electronics, but that is not the thing that started the focus on DCF. It was losing that poor child, and that child was lost because individuals lied about what they were doing. And not only did that individual lie about it, but so did her supervisor and her supervisor’s supervisor. And all those people were fired right away. I didn’t have a public execution of the DCF commissioner at a time when our outside expert, and independent reviewer, was saying that it would further destabilize the agency. It didn’t make for good drama, but it made for better leadership. I told you earlier I’m impatient. I like for stuff to happen really quickly, but sometimes the issues are much more complicated and there is execution risk if you go in the direction that the mob is asking you to go in, and you’ve got to do it right, not just do it for show.

CW: One of the interesting things you just said about the IT problems at the Connector is that you got involved. And then you talked about both Annie Dookhan and DCF, how you got involved. Do you think you’ve been engaged as much as you needed to be?

Patrick: Well, it’s a big state and there are 30,000 people who work in state government. It’s not possible for a governor to be personally involved in everything. We’ve had really, really good cabinet leadership and really good agency leadership, but things come up, they happen. It’s horrible that a child was lost at DCF but I’ll tell you what, it helped the Legislature to step up and give us the resources that we need to fix the underlying problem. That’s a really, really good thing. It’s horrible that the Connector website failed
us, but the fact is not a single person lost their health insurance and we had workarounds so that people who needed health insurance thanks to the ACA [Affordable Care Act] got it. So we increased our already nation-leading level of insurance while were fixing the inconvenience of a broken website. So yeah, I hope it matters when a governor is personally involved, but a governor can’t be personally involved in everything all the time in the same way that a CEO can’t be personally involved in every dimension of a $34 billion enterprise.

**CW:** Are you going to campaign against the casino repeal effort in November?

**PATRICK:** I mean every time I’ve been asked, I’ve said repealing it is a bad idea and unnecessary. This is hardly central to our growth strategy or economic strategy, but my view has been that if we’re going to expand gaming, there’s a right way and wrong way to do it, and the right way was in limited fashion with destination resort facilities rather than just a gambling hall. I think the bill itself is good. I think it’s worth preserving. I think we’re far enough along now so that with a very thoughtful implementation by the Gaming Commission, that it’d be a mistake to turn back. Every time I’m asked that, that’s what I say.

**CW:** You have been a major proponent of green initiatives in Massachusetts. Do you think that being the champion of it for the state has caused you to make mistakes in the implementation? Take Evergreen Solar for instance, or the controversy over whether or not there was too much pressure applied to NSTAR and National Grid — as far as convincing them to buy power from Cape Wind.

**PATRICK:** Well, first of all, Evergreen Solar, what can you say, they don’t all work. But if you’re going to take a leadership role in a burgeoning industry, you can’t have a 100 percent success rate as the only acceptable success rate. We’re cleaner, our emissions are down, we’re No. 1 in the nation in energy efficiency, this is really, really, good stuff. And we have great partners now, not just around the country but around the world. You asked me about NSTAR and National Grid — they should take more! And they will. Forget about Cape Wind. The potential for the offshore blocks, the auctions for the offshore blocks south of Martha’s Vineyard are supposed to be in December, I think, and the projection from the US Department of Energy is that there’s enough wind energy there to supply the energy needs of half the households in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. That’s huge. That’s huge. So we’ll be looking back at National Grid and NSTAR purchases of portions of Cape Wind in a few years and be thinking what was all the fuss about?

**CW:** You had said that you’re frustrated at times because things have not happened always the way that you’ve wanted them to, that there are some things that you didn’t get accomplished. What didn’t you get accomplished that you wish you had?

**PATRICK:** For all the talk about cutting taxes, the tax that needs to be cut is the property tax because it’s so fundamentally regressive. It’s really tough. You know the term house rich, cash poor? You know seniors may be sitting on a valuable piece of property, but their earning potential or earning reality may be different because they’re retired. Having to pay that property tax bill is pretty difficult. So cracking that code is not something that we’ve been able to do and that’s frustrating to me. There are others, but that’s one thing.

**CW:** On the other side of the ledger, what singular thing have you accomplished in spite of opposition that’s now a part of either state law or policy that, even though there’s opposition, down the line you know it’s a good thing for the state. What would you stand by that you’ve done?

**PATRICK:** It’s interesting, the things that I feel that have been the highest impact accomplishments are ones where we arrived at the decision through collaboration, so I’m hesitating a little bit when you say in spite of opposition. I mean, when we started with the Achievement Gap Act, which I think is enormously important, we had the charter folks out in one field and we had the unions out in a different field, and we had the business community in a different place, and the educational establishment in still another place. Getting them all in the same place by doing more than simply saying everybody gets a little bit of what they want, but actually getting them to understand, agree on the nature of the problem we were trying to solve, and to have the focus be on the children instead of what was good for the adults, was huge. And we’ve seen the degree of innovation in our classrooms, all sorts of classrooms, really explode in the Commonwealth, by no means as much as I wish it could. But I’m really pleased with that and I’m pleased with the results. So I feel good about that.

Everybody is tired of the Big Dig because the tunnel works and we have a pretty park in downtown Boston, but the funding scheme for it was devastating for the
long-term interests of the Commonwealth. You ask people outside of Greater Boston about the impact on their roads and bridges and so forth and they can point you to examples of neglect. So the support of the Legislature in the bonding we’ve been able to do and now with the indexed increase in the gas tax as a way to deal with that funding gap, and then maintenance and the upkeep gap, is huge. And of course now it’s being challenged on the ballot, and I hope that folks vote no on the question, because I think this is another example of how we serve our long-term interests.

**CW:** Speaking of the Big Dig and votes, who’d you vote for in the primary?

**Patrick:** I voted for the Democrat.

**CW:** What are you going to do in January?

**Patrick:** I’m going to find a job, something in the private sector. I’m not being cute with you when I say I don’t know what it is because the rules are such that you can’t really have many conversations while you’re in this job for fear of crossing some line.

**CW:** Do you have a resume?

**Patrick:** I have a resume, yes. I have to update it.

**CW:** When’s the last time you updated it?

**Patrick:** Oh man…Long time ago now… Long time ago.

**CW:** Will you add lieutenant governor to that seeing as you’ve been doing the job for about a year now?

**Patrick:** I miss Tim [Murray], I really do. He was a great partner. It’s a funny job. In a way it’s the job whose substance depends entirely on the governor, in terms of how much you’re willing to share. And what I’ve found with Tim Murray was that we could so leverage the agenda by having him take real substance and run with it and he was incredible. The stuff that he did to repair relationships between state government and local government. The stuff he did around veterans services and military facilities, where we are now No. 1 in the nation. The stuff he did around the negotiation, vital negotiations, with CSX to acquire the rights of way for the rails, that’s what’s making possible not just the more
frequent runs out to Worcester, but South Coast Rail, which is critical.

CW: Think that will stay on track?

Patrick: It’s going to. It better. I mean, we’ve got a contract out now to finish the design now that we have a route that’s been approved, and we’ve done a lot of work already on bridges and rights of way, so we’re ahead of it. I hope, to close on moving the post office at South Station, because that has to happen in order to get more capacity there. But whether it stays on track is a lot up to the people of the South Coast and whether the next governor listens to the people of the South Coast. Previous governors have not. I have. Martha Coakley will.

CW: Do you think Charlie Baker will?

Patrick: No, frankly, I don’t. And I don’t have any reason to believe, based on his record, that he will.

CW: You’ve gone from no, never when people have asked you about running for president to recently, with [WCVB’s] Janet Wu, saying it’s a maybe. What’s changed?

Patrick: Actually, I’ve been saying the same thing all along. First of all, the amazing thing for me is, you know, I’m still a kid from the south side of Chicago. The notion that people put that kind of question to me and speculate about that sort of thing is mind-blowing, and humbling.

CW: There was another kid from the south side of Chicago who went into the White House…

Patrick: I know that, I know that. But it’s not something I’ve always wanted to be. I just wanted to be governor, and I just wanted to be governor recently because I didn’t think we were meeting our generational responsibility and I’ve wanted to focus on that and this job until the very end. I didn’t run for governor in order to be something else. I like and I respect public life, although we were talking about some of the costs, personally and on the family and so on, and so I’m really careful about saying yeah, I’m in, it’s definitely happening. But then again, I’m really careful about saying no, I’m not, because I really respect the work and I think I’m not alone in wanting people who are in it for the right reasons. And that’s what reduces it to a maybe. But I have zero plans. I’m not going to be a candidate in 2016. I don’t see how that’s possible. The future is the future. CW
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Let’s think big

Bringing the Summer Olympics to Boston would be a huge boon to the region. **BY JOHN FISH**

**HOSTING THE 2024** Olympics and Paralympics would be a historic moment for Boston and Massachusetts, and would be the opportunity of a lifetime for an entire generation of Bostonians. But the effort to bring the Olympics to Boston is not just about hosting the Games and sharing our city, stories, and people with the world. Our bid to host the Olympics is about our legacy and investment in the future.

We are in the midst of a unique moment in history — the requirements for hosting the Olympics and for ensuring our region’s future success are perfectly aligned. The questions we must ask ourselves about hosting the Olympics are the same questions we need to ask about the future of our city and Commonwealth. How can we improve our transportation and infrastructure for the Olympics, and how can we leverage that modern system to strengthen our competitive edge for years to come? How can we provide housing for the world’s athletes, and then utilize that additional housing to attract and retain the future leaders, innovators, and knowledge workers necessary to ensure sustainable growth for future generations?

The stars are aligned right now. We have the public-private partnerships and private investment available to make impactful and lasting decisions for Boston and Massachusetts, and nothing spurs individuals to act like a date circled on the calendar. Let us use the 2024 Olympics as a catalyst for real planning, collaboration, and action now, before it’s too late.

With the goal of elevating our collective thinking and actions as we plan through and beyond 2030, we adopted several guiding principles that will serve as our “true north” throughout our bid effort. These principles include our commitment to align our Olympic bid efforts with our long-term planning as a city and state through 2030; gain support from government, local businesses, and communities; avoid the diversion of funds from projects crucial to our health and competitiveness as a region; do our due diligence in an open, honest, and transparent manner; and only submit a bid we think we can win. We have every intention of staying true to these principles throughout our planning effort.

Boston thrives on collaboration, strong partnerships, and smart planning. And we believe the key to a successful Boston Olympics will be the strength of our public-private partnerships. The business community must have skin in the game. And so far, business leaders have shown incredible support — moral and financial — because they understand the sustainable, long-term benefits of using the Olympics as a spark to begin developing a thorough, well-thought-out plan to meet our most significant challenges. We will also engage the public in an open conversation about the Olympic bid because we know that a successful Olympics hinges on the support of the community.

In the spirit of collaboration, Boston 2024 convened urban planners and virtual modelers from Massachusetts and around the world to develop a regional smart model of Greater Boston that will allow us to predict the impact visitors and new Olympic facilities will have on vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns in and around the city. These state-of-the-art smart models will not only help our Olympic planning efforts but will also lead to smarter, more responsible urban planning that will join together and preserve the character of our city neighborhoods like never before. But just as important, this regional smart model will allow
ARGUMENT & COUNTERPOINT

us to “socialize the message” about our Olympics effort and answer the general public’s questions about the goals and long-term benefits of the bid process.

Our feasibility studies for the locations of the Olympic Village, new stadiums, and other Olympic facilities have been just as thoughtful and responsible. Regardless of their eventual locations, we recognize the importance of utilizing all new facilities not just for the Olympics but to address the most critical urban challenges facing our city — providing the housing and infrastructure improvements necessary to attract and retain a knowledge-based workforce, strengthen our brand and value proposition, and expand our economy.

Our feasibility studies for a Boston Olympics and Paralympics in 2024 have been exhaustive and comprehensive. As part of those studies, we listened to and learned from Olympic organizers from other successful host cities, particularly London. Those who point to London as an example of an unsuccessful Olympic host city have clearly never visited the city since the Olympics were held there in 2012. We personally met the London Olympics organizers, toured the city, and saw the impact of the Olympics with our own eyes.

Similar to our Boston 2024 effort, from the very beginning of its planning stages, Londoners realized that legacy, or the repurposing of Olympic investments for future uses, was critical to a successful Olympics. In fact, planners viewed legacy as a 10-year project and realized that their vision for a post-Olympics London was just as important as their vision for the Olympics themselves. There is no question the Olympic Games in London met their goals and were overwhelmingly successful in that regard.

The London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games led to significant benefits for the city of London and its citizens. The Games inspired a legacy of sport and healthy living — more than 1.4 million more people were playing a sport post-Olympics. The London 2012 Games also accelerated plans to regenerate East London, one of the most deprived areas of the city. An estimated 11,000 homes are planned and more than 10,000 new jobs will be created as part of the new 500-acre Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, which will be anchored by the Olympic venues in the midst of meandering park land complete with restored canals and rivers. Construction of many of these new homes began soon after the London Olympics ended. All eight Olympic Park venues were retained — there were no white elephants once the Olympics were over. And the 2012 Olympics was the catalyst for $10.6 billion of transportation investment that has supported development across London. Even London’s economic growth legacy was fulfilled as a result of the Olympics. So far, $16 billion in international trade and inward investment has been won because of the Games and pro-

motional activity during the Games, and 70,000 new jobs were secured for unemployed Londoners. There was also an impressive 1 percent increase in international visitor numbers to the United Kingdom and 4 percent increase in visitor spending as a result of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. By any measure, London’s ambitious Olympics vision of legacy was fulfilled and the benefits of the Games far exceeded expectations.

We also visited Barcelona, where planners admit that only the Olympic Games could have transformed their city into the modern, rebranded, and vibrant metropolis that it is today. But the Olympic successes are not limited to just Europe. The city of Atlanta lays claim to one of the strongest legacies in Olympic history, with former Olympic stadiums inherited by professional sports franchises and the former Olympic Village currently used as residence halls for Georgia Tech University. The regenerated inner-city neighborhood of Centennial Olympic Park, complete with major hotels, condominiums, and new office structures, now serves as the city’s centerpiece development, bringing significant economic development downtown. Why shouldn’t Boston at least study the possibilities of joining this list of successful Olympic host cities?

If Boston is fortunate enough to actually be chosen as the host city for 2024, we are confident our city would have a unique and compelling story to share with the world. Great stories excite people, stir emotion, and rally individuals to join together to make a positive difference in their communities. We believe in our city, and we believe our story and value proposition could strengthen the Olympic movement and have a positive influence on the world. Ours is a story of innovation. Nowhere in the world will you find a similar concentration of world-renowned healthcare, education, and research institutions and science and technology companies all in one region that could serve as a source of ideas, brain power, and innovations to forever transform the way Olympics are planned and executed.

Boston’s story is also driven by its people. We are a city that is home to a passionate, diverse, and progressive populace with high ideals that represent the very best that the cities and countries of the world have to offer. We are also a young city. The president of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) closes every Olympiad with the following statement: “I call upon the youth of the world to assemble four years from now in...” This invitation is directed at the youth of the world because they
are our best hope for a better tomorrow. Here in Boston, we assemble the youth of the world every year. Like a beacon, Boston draws hundreds of thousands of young students from around the globe to attend our colleges and universities. These able, ambitious, and imaginative individuals choose to come here because they believe Boston is a city that helps foster their dreams and plans for a better tomorrow. Our city and Commonwealth are magnets for the world’s most talented and inspired dreamers. So why not open our doors to the world’s greatest athletes as well?

Bostonians have an unparalleled and innate passion for competition that has been passed down from generation to generation. Sports have been, and always will be, an integral part of the fabric of our community. Bostonians understand better than anyone the far-reaching power and intangible benefits of a major sporting event. We have experienced this “pixie dust effect” in the past when our beloved sports teams have won national championships, and we felt a sense of spiritual rejuvenation and healing after the successful 2014 Boston Marathon, one year after the tragic Marathon bombings. Sport fuels a spirit of pride, joy, and camaraderie in Boston. Sport unites people. It is a contagious feeling that is impossible to describe. Why shouldn’t we channel our spirit of innovation, people, and passion for competition toward an ambitious goal that could unite our community and instill a sense of pride in our city that would be unparalleled in our history?

The 2024 Olympics and Paralympics would offer us a rare opportunity to shine the spotlight of the world on our story, ideals, and people. But, more importantly, it would provide an opportunity to improve our city and create a new Boston for the 21st Century. And it would strengthen our economy, reconnect the neighborhoods of our city and regions of our Commonwealth, and instill pride in our people.

I often say, “No two points in time are equal.” The world is changing, and we are now living in a global economy. We need to start thinking big, not for our sake but for the sake of our children and grandchildren. The bid for Boston to host the 2024 Olympics and Paralympics could be a defining moment for Boston and Massachusetts. Let us use this Olympics exercise as an opportunity to proudly look at ourselves in the mirror and consider what we want Boston and Massachusetts to be in 2024 and beyond. And then let’s be bold enough to take the first step toward that ambitious goal by exploring a bid for Boston to host the 2024 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games. Not exploring an Olympic bid would squander the opportunity of a lifetime.

John Fish, the chairman and CEO of Suffolk Construction, is the chair of the Boston 2024 Partnership.

COUNTERPOINT

Let’s think smart

A Boston Olympics would cost too much and distract from pressing priorities.

BY CHRIS DEMPSEY, LIAM KERR, KELLEY GOSSETT PHILLIPS, AND CONOR YUNITS

LET THIS BE a wakeup call to those who dismiss the dreams of Boston’s Olympic boosters as far-fetched or improbable: Boston is currently the global front-runner to host the 2024 Summer Olympic Games. John Fish himself admitted in early September that his Boston group is the United States Olympic Committee’s inside favorite to be the sole US bid — and with significant pressure on the International Olympic Committee to award the Summer Games to the US for the first time since Atlanta in 1996, Boston is primed to emerge as the host of the XXXIII Olympiad.

And why shouldn’t it be? We are blessed with an appealing and dynamic world-class city that rightfully occupies a proud place on the global stage. As home to some of the world’s most revered research universities, inventive companies with international reach, avid sports fans, and a rich and vibrant history, it is no surprise that Boston would garner the attention of Olympic pooh-bahs as they seek a host to foot the bill for their party — a three-week extravaganza of pageantry and athletic competition that comes with a head-splitting $10-$20 billion hangover. To avoid that bill, equivalent to the cost of the Big Dig, our civic leaders must reject the siren song of the Olympics and recognize that the Games are not a prize to be won, but rather a costly distraction from real priorities.

Boston’s Olympic boosters are asking the Common-
wealth to submit a bid in the world’s most expensive auction. As they strut their stuff for the judges over the next two years, they will contort themselves to meet the IOC’s lavish requirements for Olympic hosts: from gleaming stadiums designed by award-winning architects, to guarantees that host communities reserve highway lanes for the exclusive use of Olympic dignitaries, to promises to pick up the tab for hotel rooms for hundreds of Olympic VIPs.

For the boosters, this will all seem reasonable and rational — after all, they won’t be the ones on the hook for the inevitable cost overruns associated with these promises. Instead, that risk will be borne by the taxpayers of the host government, whose representative (likely the governor, in our case) signs a legally binding blank check to guarantee to the IOC that the Games will proceed as planned, no matter the cost.

And if the boosters’ approach to date is any indication, or if the history of bids in other cities serves as a guide, we will be signing that check without a genuine public process, without a complete and independent estimate of costs, and with only vague, unsubstantiated promises about the potential benefits and “legacy” of hosting the Summer Games. The unwillingness of Boston’s Olympic proponents to incorporate contrasting opinions has been troubling.

The recent “Exploratory Committee,” intended to be impartial but ultimately led by and stacked with boosters, curiously failed to include leading, local economists who reached out and offered to serve as committee members. No economists were invited to serve on the committee, nor were any asked to testify. And although the committee’s enabling legislation required it to investigate costs, any cost analysis was left out of its final report. Thus, after more than a year of planning and activity, Boston’s Olympic boosters offer lots of commentary on the benefits of hosting the Games, but still say nothing of the expected costs.

Fortunately, we can look to the experience of other cities as a guide. Since 2000, the average Summer Games has cost hosts $19.2 billion, roughly seven times the annual budget of the city of Boston, or enough to pay off all of the outstanding debt of the MBTA and the Regional Transit Authorities, and still have enough left over to house every homeless family in the Commonwealth. When economists tally the final cost of each Summer Games, they find that, on average, they come in at three times the estimated costs of the initial bid submitted to the IOC. The incentive structures...
inherent to the Olympic bid process lead boosters to consistently overpromise and then under deliver — especially on their assurances of benefits to host communities. And the examples that boosters often cite as successful prove to be poor models for a Boston bid when examined closely:

**LOS ANGELES:** In the first bid following the 1976 Summer Games, which were financially ruinous for host city Montreal, the City of Angels was the sole international bidder. Free from the auction dynamics that characterize a typical Olympic process, Los Angeles was able to dictate its terms to a powerless and desperate IOC. This won’t be the case for the 2024 Games.

**BARCELONA:** When it won the 1992 Games, this gem on the Mediterranean was still shaking off its economic cobwebs after 35 years of fascist rule under Generalissimo Franco. The Olympics perhaps highlighted its reopening and regeneration as a city for tourism and pleasure, securing its place as one of the top tourist destinations in Europe. But there is little evidence that the Olympics provided Barcelona with a long-term economic boost — given its innate charm, the tourists likely would have come anyway, and studies have found that Madrid enjoyed a similar economic revival without hosting the Olympics. Boston’s hotels already exceed 90 percent capacity in the busy summer tourist season. We are not an undiscovered gem.

**ATLANTA:** Atlanta is tearing down its Olympic stadium less than 20 years after it was constructed, and has been severely criticized for its neglected promises to the African-American community, particularly on unfulfilled guarantees to create workforce housing in conjunction with the Games. It also offers perhaps the greatest evidence that hosting the Olympic Games does little for a city’s global reputation: 20 years later, does anyone consider Atlanta a global city?

**LONDON:** In February, Boston’s Olympic boosters trotted out the British Consul General to Boston, Susie Kitchens, to talk about the London Games at a State House hearing. She initially claimed the Games came in on budget, but eventually admitted that the Games actually cost three times the original projections, and that, in a stroke of Orwellian brilliance, the budget had to be “revised” to ensure that the Games could be claimed to be a financial success. Some of the overrun was incurred when the public had to bail out a private developer who had promised to build the Olympic Village without public subsidy — an assurance echoed by Boston’s boosters. London and Boston residents also heard the same tune about a new soccer stadium, but the costs of retrofitting the Olympic Stadium to
make a new home for the West Ham United soccer club in London cost as much as building a new stadium from the ground up — the vast majority of it at public expense. The reality of the London Games is that they dramatically under-delivered on promises to revive East London, while far exceeding projected costs.

And for each Games that boosters cite as a success, there are a two or three well-known calamities, including Montreal, which took 30 years to pay off its debt; Sochi, which cost more than $50 billion; and Athens, whose legacy is a wasteland of deserted Olympic facilities, and $11 billion of obligations that contributed to a debt crisis that left Greece (whose GDP is roughly equivalent to that of Massachusetts) teetering on the edge of default.

In cities around the world, when Olympic boosters are forced to put the bid to a public referendum, voters almost always shoot down the Games. Votes in Munich, Krakow, Stockholm, and Switzerland have all rejected Olympic proposals within the last two years. Massachusetts voters appear to share the sentiments of their European counterparts. According to a poll commissioned by the Boston Globe, when presented with both pro and con perspectives on hosting the Games, Massachusetts residents overwhelmingly voiced opposition, with 63 percent against and just 29 percent in favor.

What Massachusetts voters understand is that you don’t just account for a Boston Olympics by tallying the billions of required expenditures on unnecessary Olympic venues — you must also calculate the cost of having our civic agenda hijacked. Hosting the Olympics would prove to be an enormous distraction from more important priorities that our community values, whether it is creating a more welcoming business environment, improving our education system, tackling the Commonwealth’s housing shortage, or easing tortured commutes. Our Commonwealth didn’t become great — and won’t stay great — by focusing on hosting an extravagant three-week party for the international elite. Let’s say no to a costly, wasteful, unpopular Boston Olympics, and instead return our civic attention and conversations to far more important, far more challenging, and ultimately far more rewarding concerns.

Chris Dempsey, Liam Kerr, Kelley Gossett Phillips, and Conor Yunits are the cochairs of No Boston Olympics. Dempsey is a management consultant, Kerr is Massachusetts state director of Democrats for Education Reform, Gossett Phillips is an attorney, and Yunits is senior vice president at Liberty Square Group.
Boston’s grass roots

Jim Vrabel offers a rich history of community organizing in Boston told through the voices of the activists of the 1960s and 1970s who helped shape the city

**A People’s History of the New Boston**

By Jim Vrabel

Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press

288 pages

REVIEWED BY DON GILLIS

**History is Replete** with the stories of the mighty and powerful. Jim Vrabel’s latest book, *A People’s History of the New Boston*, tells another story. Vrabel, a former newspaper reporter and longtime community activist who has worked for Mayor Ray Flynn, the Boston School Committee, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority, is also a quintessential historian and sets out to give all those who have pushed at power from the outside their due.

More than 40 years ago, Stephan Thernstrom followed a similar impulse in *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis, 1880–1970*. “A study of the present that neglects the processes of change by which the present was created is necessarily superficial,” wrote Thernstrom.

Vrabel drills deep into the processes of change that help explain how Boston became the city it is today. He does so by drawing on more than a decade of personal interviews with some 100 past and current community activists to paint a portrait of the transition from the Old Boston to the New Boston. While the term “New Boston” has more recently come to describe the increasing racial and ethnic diversity of the city and its political leadership, it also refers to the efforts started in the late 1940s to remake the city through big development projects. Through the book’s 22 chapters, Vrabel lets readers hear directly the voices of people as they tried to salvage their neighborhoods from the architects of that New Boston. He gives voice to those activists who worked hard every day and were ignored at City Hall and the State House until they organized and fought back.

Interspersed with meticulously researched archival materials that document the actions of politicians, especially mayors and other government officials, most notably those at the Boston Redevelopment Authority, Vrabel clearly shows the neglect, abuse, and disdain demonstrated by many in the 1960s and 1970s toward the activists trying to protect and preserve their neighborhoods. In writing about the city’s leaders, he sets out to document “how willing they were to listen to the people of Boston and to share power with them.” His conclusion? Most of them weren’t interested.

Eighteen of the 22 chapters tell the story, in a case study methodology, of a particular community struggle against powerful forces. Vrabel skillfully includes profiles of the 18 neighborhoods of Boston while chronicling an issue, protest, or controversy in each one of them. He also suggests noteworthy works by other authors that more fully examine a controversy or community conflict he describes.

*A People’s History of the New Boston* is a must-read for a new generation of community activists, politicians, government officials, students of cities, and the media. The book recognizes the role neighborhood organizing can play in changing the course of history and suggests some of the reasons there may have been a decline in activism in Boston beginning in the 1980s.

Vrabel traces the rise in Boston of what sociolo-
gist Harvey Molotch calls the “growth machine,” which determines who gets what in a city. In Boston, the growth machine era coincided with the reigns of Mayors John Hynes, John Collins, and Kevin White. Much of the energy of the growth machine coalition, led by business elites, real estate developers, labor organizations, the local media, and supported by politicians, was devoted to development issues, including pursuit of urban renewal projects like the razing of the old West End. These have been among the most contentious battles in modern Boston history. The planning agency of the city, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, was the arm of government to implement the growth machine policies of urban renewal that triggered a militant response by the people in Boston’s neighborhoods.

Vrabel points to the limited, but still notable, successes that community activists had in slowing the bulldozers, if not always stopping them completely. This was the case in each story Vrabel details: the destruction of the West End and New York streets neighborhood of the South End; the expansion of Logan Airport in East Boston; Harvard University’s land grab in Mission Hill; and the real-estate-fueled destruction of Mattapan by the Boston Banks Urban Renewal Group. In each case, the growth machine won much of what it was seeking to accomplish, making millions of dollars in profits and destroying the social fabric of Boston’s neighborhoods in the process. The early losses taught other neighborhoods the consequences if they were not organized.

Neighborhood activism can be credited for sparing much of Charlestown and South Boston from the urban renewal bulldozers, and the neighborhoods of Roxbury, the South End, and Jamaica Plan ultimately won a reprieve by stopping the I-95 highway project, but not before thousands of homes were destroyed in the process. The book shows that the determinants of Boston’s development policies are largely political.

Boston’s public school segregation and desegregation get significant attention. Both the protest movement to improve the schools led by black parents and organiza-
tions, and the movement led by white politicians to stop busing as a school integration strategy are highlighted. Vrabel characterizes US District Court Judge W. Arthur Garrity’s 1974 order — that the city’s school committee had willfully engaged in discriminatory policies — as the right finding, but says it was unfortunately paired with the ill-conceived remedy of busing thousands of school kids across the city. It is a widely shared opinion that busing was an abject failure in Boston, and Vrabel captures the highly charged sentiments on all sides of the issue.

Vrabel also pays important attention to the history of organizing around preserving and building affordable housing in Boston. He provides a case study of the successful effort by a group of Puerto Rican activists in the South End to transform a vacant piece of land known as Parcel 19 into Villa Victoria, a neighborhood of affordable housing modeled on a village in Puerto Rico. He examines the history of public housing in Boston and efforts by thousands of poor tenants to live in safe and sanitary housing, and the important role played by tenant leader Doris Bunte, who went on to serve as administrator of the Boston Housing Authority. In analyzing the tenant movement in the city, and the battle over rent control, Vrabel again demonstrates that many of the victories were short-lived. The real estate interests captured the local politicians through hefty campaign contributions and gutted the hard-fought gains achieved through rent control in Boston, forcing many low-income residents from neighborhoods that were fast becoming gentrified.

While Vrabel’s book focuses mainly on the activism of the 1960s and 1970s, he does devote a later chapter to the 1983 mayoral election and the repudiation of Kevin White’s growth machine coalition in the selection of Mel King and Ray Flynn as the two mayoral finalists. Vrabel notes that the 1983 final election that Flynn won had the highest turnout — 70 percent — of any mayoral election since 1949, when James Michael Curley was ousted by John Hynes and the growth machine spearheaded by West End developer Jerome Rappaport.

Vrabel highlights Flynn’s redistributive and managed growth policies, including linkage, a tax on downtown commercial development to fund affordable housing and job training; the expansion of the Boston Residents Jobs Policy guaranteeing construction jobs for Boston residents, minorities and women; the granting of eminent domain powers to a Roxbury redevelopment nonprofit; and the largest production of affordable housing for a city its size, much of it built by community development
For half a century, the University of Massachusetts Boston has been actively engaged in the community and has helped to shape the Commonwealth’s future by making available a high-quality affordable education to the most diverse student population in New England. Boston’s only public university is and will always be a research university with a teaching soul.

– PRESIDENT ROBERT L. CARET
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