### OFFICE OF CAMPAIGN and POLITICAL FINANCE

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

### Campaign Finance Activity by Mayoral Candidates in Massachusetts

2001

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

### INTRODUCTION

This study examines campaign finance activity by candidates for Mayor in municipal elections throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on Nov. 6, 2001. It is the third review of mayoral activity by the Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF).

OCPF started issuing mayoral studies after the 1997 city elections due to the significant amount of campaign finance activity on the municipal level, especially in cities. Many mayoral candidates report fundraising and spending that is greater than many legislative candidates.

This high level of activity was the chief reason OCPF devotes significant attention to municipal campaign finance. After each mayoral election year, OCPF requests documents from each city concerning campaign finance activity by its candidates. This information is used in the compilation of this study and to determine the cities that will be visited or reviewed by OCPF staff. This is the fourth consecutive election that has been followed by local reviews; in early 2002, OCPF representatives reviewed candidates' filings for 2001 in five cities: Lawrence, Peabody, Pittsfield, Quincy and Salem.

OCPF is an independent state agency that administers Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 55, which provides for disclosure and regulation of campaign finance activity by candidates for state, county and municipal office. Mayoral candidates file disclosure reports with their local election officials (city clerks or election commissioners) with the exception of candidates in the cities of Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester, where information concerning mayoral candidates is filed directly with OCPF. OCPF responds to questions from local candidates and committees and also reviews any complaints received regarding campaign finance activity on the municipal level.

The information contained in this report is based on data compiled from campaign finance reports filed by 76 mayoral candidates in 38 cities for the 2001 election. It is limited to those who were on the ballot in the November elections in the cities; those who were eliminated in the preliminary election, as well as write-in candidates, are not included. The totals for most of the finalists listed here include activity for all of 2001. Activity for some first-time candidates, however, started only after the commencement of their campaigns later in 2001.

Most mayoral candidates and their committees are required to file reports directly with their local election officials up to three times during an election year. If a preliminary election is held in the city, the first report is due eight days before that election. The second report is due eight days before the general election (in 2001, that due date was Oct. 29). All candidates and committees were required to file year-end reports on Jan. 22, 2002, disclosing activity through Dec. 31, 2001. The filing location and schedule are different for mayoral candidates in the five cities noted above. Their financial institutions file reports directly with OCPF once a month and then twice monthly in the last six months

of an election year. These candidates were also required to file a year-end summary report with OCPF on Jan. 22. All candidates are required to disclose on their reports their account balances at the beginning of each reporting period; receipts and expenditures for the reporting period; in-kind contributions for the reporting period and all liabilities.

The campaign finance law allows candidates and committees to make expenditures for "the enhancement of the political future of the candidate," as long as an expenditure is not primarily for the personal use of a candidate or any other person. Some of the expenditures that are included in the totals contained in this report, especially those made by incumbents, may not have been directly related to campaigning. For example, candidates may use campaign funds for purposes such as constituent or legislative services, charitable contributions, transportation and other activity that is for an identifiable political or official purpose. A mayor who is unopposed for re-election, for example, may report significant expenses related to his or her incumbency.

The campaign finance law allows a candidate to have only one political committee while running for state or local office, regardless of how many offices he or she may seek or hold. Some mayoral candidates in this report also held another local or state office, such as city councilor or state representative, and figures from their committees may also include activity related to that office. Two mayoral candidates held state office in 2001 -- Sen. Edward J. Clancy Jr. of Lynn and Rep. Paul E. Caron of Springfield -- and several others were city councilors or aldermen.

OCPF has taken steps to ensure that the information contained in this report is accurate as of the time of its compilation. Nevertheless, the original information used for this report may not necessarily reflect all amendments filed after early 2002. In addition, the information provided by candidates and committees may have contained some mathematical errors and balance inconsistencies.

This report was compiled and written by Denis Kennedy, OCPF's Director of Public Information, based on information gathered from local election officials. OCPF would like to thank those officials for their cooperation in preparing this report. Those wishing further information on this report or any other facet of the Massachusetts campaign finance law may contact the Office of Campaign and Political Finance, McCormack Building, One Ashburton Place, Room 411, Boston, MA 02108, or call (617) 727-8352 or (800) 462-OCPF. The office's e-mail address is ocpf@cpf.state.ma.us.

July 2002

### **FINDINGS**

Voters in 38 of the 45 cities in Massachusetts went to the polls to elect their chief executives in 2001. Of those 38 mayoral races, 34 were contested (featuring at least two candidates) in the November election: of that number, 25 featured a challenged incumbent and nine featured a contest for an open seat. One candidate ran unopposed for a tenth open seat, in Lynn.

A total of 76 candidates for mayor were listed on municipal ballots in November 2001. Of those 76 candidates, 28 were incumbents seeking re-election. Three of those incumbents ran unopposed while the other 25 were opposed for re-election. Of those opposed incumbents, 21 were re-elected and four were defeated (in Beverly, Fitchburg, Newburyport and Quincy).

The mayors who took office in January 2002 were thus 24 returning incumbents and 14 newcomers: four who defeated incumbents and ten who won open seats.

The candidates' campaign finance activity in brief:

- o The 76 mayoral candidates raised \$4,546,947 and spent \$5,852,880 in 2001, according to their reports. (The larger expenditure figure is due to the fact that several candidates already had cash on hand at the start of 2001.) Those figures are about \$1.3 million and \$2.6 million more, respectively, than those in 1999. That year also saw 38 races for mayor, but only 69 candidates -- seven fewer than in 2001.
- o The median level of fundraising by mayoral candidates was \$32,644, while the median of spending was \$33,040. (A median represents the exact midpoint of all of 76 totals: half were higher and half were lower.<sup>2</sup>) The fundraising median was almost exactly comparable to the 1999 median of \$32,289, but the latest spending median is substantially higher than the \$23,388 posted in 1999.
- o Eleven mayoral candidates raised more than \$100,000 in 2001; 12 spent more than that figure. Two years before, the number of candidates who raised more than \$100,000 was six; the number spending more than that amount was five.

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The mayoral race was not on the ballot in four other cities – Malden, Waltham, West Springfield and Weymouth -- where the mayoral term is four years and the current incumbents' terms are up at the end of 2003. The mayors of two other cities, Cambridge and Lowell, are elected as city councilors and chosen by their fellow members to serve as mayor. Because those candidates never appear on the ballot for mayor, they are not included here. In contrast, the mayor of Worcester is a city councilor but is also elected by voters separately as mayor. That race is included in this report. In addition to the 44 cities headed by mayors, one other city, Chelsea, no longer elects a mayor.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In this case, a median is a more accurate figure than an average because a handful of candidates with significant activity would skew the average of a base of this size. The average spending figure for the 76 candidates was \$77.012.

- O Comparisons to other years are difficult, due to the turnover of candidates and the fact that not all cities hold mayoral elections every two years. The inclusion of Boston, which is by far the largest city in the Commonwealth, when it holds its mayoral election every four years has meant a marked increase in total fundraising and spending figures in those years. Totals for 1999, when there was no mayoral contest in Boston, were \$3,198,736 and \$3,284,268, respectively receipts of about \$1.3 million less and spending of about \$2.6 million less than 2001. As noted previously, the medians for 1999 were \$32,289 in receipts and \$23,388 in spending. The receipts median was virtually unchanged from 1999 while the spending median was almost \$10,000 higher than that year. (See Table I for totals for mayoral candidates over the last three elections.)
- o Incumbents and winning candidates showed substantially higher medians than non-incumbents and unsuccessful candidates, respectively, in 2001. Contests for open mayoral seats are traditionally competitive; candidates for open seats posted medians that were higher than the overall medians, though not as high as those for incumbents. That is a change from 1999, when candidates for open seats posted the highest medians of any class of candidate.
- o The candidate who spent the most money won in 27 of the 34 contested races, or 79 percent of the time.
- o Candidates spent more than \$100,000 in each of 13 cities, most of which featured hotly contested races. The contested race with the most spending was in Boston, where the two finalists spent a total of \$1,711,082. That figure is a substantial increase from 1999, when the top race in Fall River saw spending of \$459,705. Rounding out the top five in spending for 2001 were Springfield, Quincy, New Bedford and Everett.
- o Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston was both the top fundraiser and the top spender in 2001. Menino, who won re-election in a contested race, reported raising \$880,714 and spending \$1,603,925. The top fundraiser and spender in 1999 was Mayor Edward Lambert of fall River, who raised \$247,644 and spent \$395,250. Menino, who did not run in 1999, topped both categories the last time he ran, in 1997. That year, Menino, who was unopposed, raised \$568,527 and spent \$755,565.
- o The average amount spent per vote by the 76 candidates was \$11.70, an increase of almost 37 percent from the 1999 average of \$8.57. (The average spent per vote in 1997 was \$8.77.)

The findings in more detail:

### **Most Active Races**

The mayoral races in the largest cities in the Commonwealth accounted for the greatest level of activity in 2001. Boston once again reported the highest spending, as it did the last time the mayor's race was on the ballot in 1997. The two finalists, incumbent Thomas M. Menino and Peggy Davis-Mullen, reported spending a total of \$1,711,082. Menino, who was re-elected, accounted for spending of \$1,603,925, or 94 percent of the total.

The ten most active races in terms of spending included two contests for open seats (in Lawrence and Melrose) and one in which a challenger defeated an incumbent (Quincy). The other seven races featured incumbents who were re-elected and also accounted for the majority of the spending. Thirteen cities saw combined spending by finalists of more than \$100,000, an increase of two over 1999.

## Mayoral Races with the Highest Total Spending by Finalists 2001

	City	Total Spent
1)	Boston	\$1,711,082
2)	Springfield	\$ 893,436
3)	Quincy	\$ 389,583
4)	New Bedford	\$ 223,656
5)	Everett	\$ 217,660
6)	Fall River	\$ 207,224
7)	Lawrence (O)	\$ 158,350
8)	Somerville	\$ 145,394
9)	Melrose (O)	\$ 144,172
10)	Salem	\$ 143,467

O = Open seat.

### **Top Fundraisers**

Mayor Menino of Boston raised the most of any mayoral candidate in 2001, amassing \$880,714. That was more than triple the amount raised by the second most active fundraiser, Edward M. Lambert Jr. of Fall River. Lambert was the top fundraiser in 1999 with a total of \$247,644. Both Menino and Lambert were opposed incumbents who won re-election. In all, the top ten fundraisers included six incumbents, five of whom were re-elected, and four non-incumbents. All but two won the election: one incumbent and one challenger.

Top Mayoral Campaign Fundraisers 2001

	Last Name	City	Receipts	Won/Lost
1)	Thomas M. Menino (I)	Boston	\$880,714	W
2)	Edward M. Lambert Jr. (I)	Fall River	\$264,774	W
3)	James A. Sheets (I)	Quincy	\$240,381	L
4)	Michael J. Albano (I)	Springfield	\$208,356	W
5)	Paul E. Caron *	Springfield	\$177,379	L
6)	William J. Phelan	Quincy	\$156,576	W
7)	Frederick M. Kalisz Jr. (I)	New Bedford	\$142,465	W
8)	Edward J. Clancy Jr.* (U)	Lynn (O)	\$131,280	W
9)	Michael J. Sullivan	Lawrence (O)	\$123,951	W
10)	David Ragucci (I)	Everett	\$105,157	W

<sup>(</sup>I) = Incumbent (U) = Unopposed (O) = Open seat

Three candidates reported raising no funds at all; none of the three won election. The winning candidate who raised the least was an unopposed incumbent: Mayor Mary Clare Higgins of Northampton reported receipts of \$1,082.

### **Top Spenders**

Boston Mayor Menino also topped the list in total spending, with a figure of \$1,603,925, which was more than twice the total of the second-highest spender. Menino was also the top spender the last time he ran in 1997, with expenditures of \$755,565. Unlike 1997, however, Menino was opposed for re-election in 2001.

In second place in total spending was Mayor Michael J. Albano of Springfield with \$670,229. The top spender in 1999, Edward Lambert of Fall River, finished sixth in 2001. Several of the top ten spenders also made the fundraising list above. The ten on the 2001

<sup>\*</sup> Caron and Clancy were also state legislators in 2001. Some of their fundraising may reflect activity related to those seats.

spending list were seven incumbents and three non-incumbents. Eight of the top ten won their elections: six incumbents and two non-incumbents (one of whom was elected to an open seat).

Top Mayoral Campaign Spenders in 2001

	Last Name	City	Expenditures	Won/Lost
1)	Thomas M. Menino (I)	Boston	\$1,603,925	W
2)	Michael J. Albano (I)	Springfield	\$ 670,229	W
3)	James A. Sheets (I)	Quincy	\$ 243,057	L
4)	Paul E. Caron *	Springfield	\$ 223,208	L
5)	Frederick M. Kalisz Jr. (I)	New Bedford	\$ 206,909	W
6)	Edward M. Lambert Jr. (I)	Fall River	\$ 206,042	W
7)	William J. Phelan	Quincy	\$ 146,525	W
8)	Dorothy Kelly Gay (I)	Somerville	\$ 140,114	W
9)	David Ragucci (I)	Everett	\$ 131,092	W
10)	Michael J. Sullivan	Lawrence (O)	\$ 123,920	W

<sup>(</sup>I) = Incumbent (U) = Unopposed (O) = Open seat

Three candidates, all unsuccessful at the polls, reported no expenditures. The lowest spending winner was incumbent Michael Tautznik of Easthampton, who reported spending \$2,256.

### **Per-Vote Spending**

The average candidate spent \$11.70 per vote received in 2001, an increase of almost 37 percent over 1999. The 1999 figure of \$8.57 was in turn a slight decrease from the \$8.77 posted two years before.

Topping the per vote spending list in 2001 was Mayor Michael Albano of Springfield, who spent \$35.24 per vote in a successful re-election effort. That amount was slightly less than the \$36.22 per vote recorded by then-Mayor Robert Hass of Revere in 1999.

The top ten in terms of per-vote spending includes six incumbents, five of whom were reelected, and four non-incumbents. Six candidates won their races, one for an open seat.

<sup>\*</sup> Caron was also a state representative in 2001. Some of his spending may reflect activity related to that seat. The above figures, however, include only the period of his mayoral candidacy, starting in August 2001.

## Per-Vote Spending by Mayoral Candidates 2001

				Won/Lost
1.	Michael J. Albano (I)	Springfield	\$35.24	W
2.	Linda M. Benezra	Melrose (O)	\$24.69	L
3.	David Ragucci (I)	Everett	\$24.24	W
4.	Thomas M. Menino (I)	Boston	\$23.58	W
5.	Paul T. O'Neill	Melrose (O)	\$21.98	L
6.	Dorothy Kelly Gay (I)	Somerville	\$20.86	W
7.	James A. Sheets (I)	Quincy	\$19.70	L
8.	Michael J. Sullivan	Lawrence (O)	\$18.51	W
9.	John Hanlon	Everett	\$17.57	L
10.	Edward M. Lambert Jr. (I)	Fall River	\$17.33	W

<sup>(</sup>I) = Incumbent (U) = Unopposed (O) = Open seat

The mayoral candidate who got the biggest bargain for his money in 2001 was Timothy Murray of Worcester. Murray, who won election to an open seat, spent the least per vote of any opposed candidate, with a figure of \$1.38. One successful candidate spent less per vote: Mayor Michael Tautznik of Easthampton spent \$1.12, but he was unopposed for reelection.

### **Top Spenders' Success**

The top spending candidates won 27 of the 34 contested races in 2001, for a 79 percent success rate. Twenty-three of those 27 winning top spenders were incumbents. The four non-incumbents who outspent their opponents and won were in Fitchburg, Peabody, Woburn and Worcester. In Fitchburg, the outspent candidate was the incumbent, while in the other three cities the incumbent was not seeking re-election.

The seven candidates who outspent their opponents and lost were in Amesbury, Beverly, Gardner, Melrose, Newburyport, Pittsfield and Quincy. Three of those losing top spenders were incumbents: in Beverly, Newburyport and Quincy.

### **Winners**

Winning candidates raised and spent significantly more than those candidates who lost in November 2001. As in 1999, the 38 winners raised and spent more than twice the totals of their 38 unsuccessful opponents and also posted higher medians for both categories.

# Fundraising and Spending by Winning and Losing Mayoral Candidates 2001

	Raised (% of total)	Spent (% of total)
Winners (38)	<del></del>	
Total	\$3,256,808 (72%)	\$4,491,265 (77%)
Median	\$ 53,638	\$ 47,805
Losers (38)		
Total	\$1,290,139 (28%)	\$1,361,615 (23%)
Median	\$ 18,580	\$ 18,719

### Opposed vs. Unopposed

Fundraising and spending by opposed candidates was significantly higher than in uncontested races. The 72 opposed candidates accounted for more than 90 percent of both fundraising and spending. The medians for the unopposed candidates were significantly higher than those for opposed candidates, due largely to the small sample of unopposed candidates.

## Fundraising and Spending in Contested/Uncontested Mayoral Races 2001

	Raised (% of total)	<b>Spent</b> (% of total)
Opposed (72)		
Total	\$4,311,747 (95%)	\$5,630,250 (96%)
Median	\$ 32,644	\$ 33,040
Unopposed (4)		
Total	\$ 235,200 (5%)	\$ 222,630 (4%)
Median	\$ 50,657	\$ 55,646

#### Open seats

The 22 finalists for the ten open seats represented accounted for 23 percent of the fundraising (\$1.6 million) and 16 percent of the spending (\$963,617) in 2001. The medians for fundraising and spending by those candidates were \$45,444 and \$39,440, respectively. As in 1999, both those medians are higher than the overall medians for all candidates. (The medians for open seats in 1999, however, both exceeded \$65,000.)

Of the nine contested races for open mayoral seats in 2001, the candidate who spent the most money won six times (in Gloucester, Haverhill, Lawrence, Peabody, Woburn and Worcester) and lost three times (in Amesbury, Melrose and Pittsfield). The election to a tenth open seat, in Lynn, featured only one candidate. The top fundraiser among candidates for an open seat was Edward Clancy of Lynn, who raised \$131,280 (as noted earlier in this study, Clancy was also a state senator in 2001). Heading the list in expenditures was Michael Sullivan of Lawrence, who spent \$123,920 in a successful run for mayor.

### **Incumbency**

In 23 of the 25 races that featured an opposed incumbent, the sitting mayor was the top spender in the election. Incumbents were outspent in Fitchburg and Gardner. Fitchburg Mayor Mary Whitney was defeated, while Gardner Mayor Daniel J. Kelley was re-elected. The three other losing incumbents – William Scanlan of Beverly, Lisa Mead of Newburyport and James Sheets of Quincy – each outspent their opponents in their unsuccessful tries for re-election.

As a whole, the 28 incumbents (including three who were unopposed) outspent non-incumbents more than two to one.

## Mayoral Campaign Fundraising and Spending by Incumbency 2001

	Raised (% of total)	Spent (% of total)
Incumbents (28)		
Totals	\$2,709,675(60%)	\$4,078,513 (70%)
Median	\$ 47,030	\$ 49,437
Non-Incumbents (48)		
Totals	\$1,837,272 (40%)	\$1,774,367 (30%)
Median	\$ 27,072	\$ 24,684

Mayors seeking re-election also had more cash on hand at the start of the campaign. Incumbents reported starting 2001 with \$2.45 million, or about 93 percent of the total for all candidates. The incumbents' share has traditionally been high because many mayoral challengers have little or no funds at the start of their campaigns. For example, 31 candidates reported starting their 2001 campaigns with no money. None were incumbents, although seven were elected mayor in November 2001.

Incumbents also reported the lion's share of funds on hand at year's end. The \$1.1 million they reported was 80 percent of the \$1.35 million held by all mayoral candidates at that time.

A table of candidates and their individual campaign finance totals follows in Table II.

Table I
Aggregate Campaign Finance Activity by Mayoral Candidates
1997-2001

Year	1997	1999	2001
Number of candidates*	66	69	76
Total Raised	\$3,708,975	\$3,198,736	\$4,546,947
Median Raised	\$ 28,157	\$ 32,289	\$ 32,644
Total Spent	\$3,835,055	\$3,284,268	\$5,852,880
Median Spent	\$ 27,127	\$ 23,388	\$ 33,040
Total votes cast	437,078	382,938	500,373
Average spent per vote	\$ 8.77	\$ 8.57	\$ 11.70

<sup>\*</sup>Figures do not include candidates eliminated in a preliminary election

Table II
Campaign Finance Activity by Mayoral Candidates
2001

City	Candidate	1	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
<u>Agawam</u>								
Richard A	A. Cohen	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$18,993.99	\$22,103.10	4,769	\$4.63
Bob E.	Rossi				\$4,931.00	\$4,671.46	2,712	\$1.72
	City total				\$23,924.99	\$26,774.56	7,481	\$3.58
<u>Amesbur</u>	¥							
Joseph E	. Faro			$\checkmark$	\$15,164.57	\$14,929.14	2,149	\$6.95
David	Hildt		<b>✓</b>	✓	\$7,042.38	\$6,408.90	2,167	\$2.96
	City total				\$22,206.95	\$21,338.04	4,316	\$4.94
Attleboro								
Judith	Robbins	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$32,913.74	\$36,386.87	3,779	\$9.63
Linda A.	Tetreault				\$9,734.12	\$10,272.54	2,912	\$3.53
	City total				\$42,647.86	\$46,659.41	6,691	\$6.97

City	Candidate	I	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
<u>Beverly</u>								
Thomas	Crean		<b>✓</b>		\$14,430.34	\$14,269.02	5,573	\$2.56
William	Scanlan	<b>✓</b>			\$35,571.00	\$49,226.16	5,328	\$9.24
	City total				\$50,001.34	\$63,495.18	10,901	\$5.82
<u>Boston</u>								
Margaret	Davis Mullen				\$100,392.23	\$107,156.99	21,393	\$5.01
Thomas N	M. Menino	✓	✓		\$880,713.63	\$1,603,924.76	68,011	\$23.58
	City total				\$981,105.86	\$1,711,081.75	89,404	\$19.14
<u>Brockton</u>								
Arnold	Greenblatt				\$1,127.10	\$1,127.10	1,708	\$0.66
John T.	Yunits Jr.	✓	<b>✓</b>		\$51,131.42	\$53,869.34	8,158	\$6.60
	City total				\$52,258.52	\$54,996.44	9,866	\$5.57
<b>Chicopee</b>								
Richard J	. Kos	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$29,798.00	\$34,652.65	8,696	\$3.98
Robert J.	Zygarowski				\$27,898.93	\$28,670.24	4,513	\$6.35
	City total				\$57,696.93	\$63,322.89	13,209	\$4.79
Easthamp	<u>iton</u>							
Michael A	A. Tautznik	✓	✓		\$2,606.08	\$2,255.93	2,014	\$1.12
	City total				\$2,606.08	\$2,255.93	2,014	\$1.12

City	Candidate	1	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
<u>Everett</u>								
John	Hanlon				\$87,106.42	\$86,568.12	4,927	\$17.57
David	Ragucci	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$105,157.00	\$131,091.58	5,408	\$24.24
	City total				\$192,263.42	\$217,659.70	10,335	\$21.06
Fall River	•							
Edward I	M. Lambert Jr.	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$264,773.64	\$206,041.98	11,889	\$17.33
Paul R.	Viveros				\$1,182.46	\$1,182.46	4,253	\$0.28
	City total				\$265,956.10	\$207,224.44	16,142	\$12.84
<u>Fitchburg</u>	[							
Dan H.	Mylott		<b>✓</b>		\$31,971.00	\$24,388.66	4,382	\$5.57
Mary H.	Whitney	<b>~</b>			\$10,484.00	\$10,698.59	3,288	\$3.25
	City total				\$42,455.00	\$35,087.25	7,670	\$4.57
<u>Gardner</u>								
Daniel J.	Kelley	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$7,389.00	\$12,705.66	3,221	\$3.94
Charles	J. Manca				\$20,692.47	\$20,692.47	2,984	\$6.93
	City total				\$28,081.47	\$33,398.13	6,205	\$5.38
Gloucest	<u>er</u>							
John P.	Bell		<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	\$58,651.61	\$43,095.82	5,655	\$7.62
Harriett S	S. Webster			✓	\$28,145.02	\$28,252.85	3,492	\$8.09
	City total				\$86,796.63	\$71,348.67	9,147	\$7.80

City	Candidate	1	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
<u>Haverhill</u>								
Maureen I	M. Corbett			<b>✓</b>	\$24,142.43	\$23,850.06	4,441	\$5.37
John	Guerin Jr.		<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	\$52,408.86	\$50,023.18	7,030	\$7.12
	City total				\$76,551.29	\$73,873.24	11,471	\$6.44
<u>Holyoke</u>								
Michael J.	Sullivan	<b>✓</b>	✓		\$26,321.50	\$26,860.45	6,174	\$4.35
	City total				\$26,321.50	\$26,860.45	6,174	\$4.35
<u>Lawrence</u>								
Isabel	Melendez			✓	\$35,019.00	\$34,430.19	5,739	\$6.00
Michael J.	Sullivan		✓	✓	\$123,951.00	\$123,920.00	6,696	\$18.51
	City total				\$158,970.00	\$158,350.19	12,435	\$12.73
<u>Leominste</u>	<u>er</u>							
Dean J.	Mazzarella	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$15,436.99	\$25,499.38	5,692	\$4.48
Mark A.	Woodward				\$15,939.75	\$14,404.19	3,355	\$4.29
	City total				\$31,376.74	\$39,903.57	9,047	\$4.41
<u>Lynn</u>								
Edward J	Clancy Jr.		<b>✓</b>	✓	\$131,279.99	\$109,081.93	11,008	\$9.91
	City total				\$131,279.99	\$109,081.93	11,008	\$9.91

City	Candidate	1	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
<u>Marlborou</u>	ıgh							
Ron	Bucchino				\$1,790.24	\$1,750.34	1,469	\$1.19
William	Mauro	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$11,475.00	\$27,700.33	4,536	\$6.11
	City total				\$13,265.24	\$29,450.67	6,005	\$4.90
<u>Medford</u>								
Jay B.	Griffin				\$4,175.98	\$3,710.67	3,805	\$0.98
Michael J	. McGlynn	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$74,942.33	\$63,999.99	7,708	\$8.30
	City total				\$79,118.31	\$67,710.66	11,513	\$5.88
<u>Melrose</u>								
Linda M.	Benezra			✓	\$47,915.25	\$46,617.12	1,888	\$24.69
Richard E	. Connolly			✓	\$36,013.00	\$35,784.21	2,482	\$14.42
Harry A.	Coule			✓	\$0.00	\$0.00	42	\$0.00
Robert J.	Dolan		<b>✓</b>	$\checkmark$	\$35,615.00	\$34,422.09	2,492	\$13.81
Paul T.	O'Neill			✓	\$26,244.47	\$27,348.63	1,244	\$21.98
	City total				\$145,787.72	\$144,172.05	8,148	\$17.69
<u>Methuen</u>								
Wiiliam J	. Patenaude				\$1,317.44	\$1,317.44	3,828	\$0.34
Sharon M	l. Pollard	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$55,240.00	\$46,945.78	4,829	\$9.72
	City total				\$56,557.44	\$48,263.22	8,657	\$5.58

City	Candidate	I	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
New Bedi	ford							
Brian K.	Gomes				\$16,466.76	\$16,746.42	6,342	\$2.64
Frederick	M Kalisz Jr.	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$142,464.66	\$206,909.47	13,179	\$15.70
	City total				\$158,931.42	\$223,655.89	19,521	\$11.46
<u>Newbury</u>	<u>oort</u>							
Alan P.	Lavender		<b>✓</b>		\$13,410.35	\$13,950.90	3,377	\$4.13
Lisa L.	Mead	$\checkmark$			\$42,929.13	\$49,646.93	2,988	\$16.62
	City total				\$56,339.48	\$63,597.83	6,365	\$9.99
<u>Newton</u>								
David B.	Cohen	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$87,948.36	\$89,977.35	12,641	\$7.12
Anthony	Lupo				\$0.00	\$0.00	2,159	\$0.00
	City total				\$87,948.36	\$89,977.35	14,800	\$6.08
North Ada	ams							
Paul	Babeu				\$31,657.29	\$31,657.29	2,126	\$14.89
John	Barrett III	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$35,845.01	\$38,866.81	3,483	\$11.16
	City total				\$67,502.30	\$70,524.10	5,609	\$12.57
<u>Northamp</u>	oton_							
Mary Cla	re Higgins	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$1,081.95	\$4,693.95	3,310	\$1.42
Roy C.	Martin				\$0.00	\$0.00	510	\$0.00
	City total				\$1,081.95	\$4,693.95	3,820	\$1.23

City	Candidate	1	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
<u>Peabody</u>								
Michael	Bonfanti		<b>✓</b>	✓	\$76,737.56	\$72,675.79	10,280	\$7.07
David	McGeney			✓	\$57,455.45	\$55,031.38	7,082	\$7.77
	City total				\$134,193.01	\$127,707.17	17,362	\$7.36
<u>Pittsfield</u>								
Sara	Hathaway		✓	<b>✓</b>	\$62,130.27	\$48,665.03	8,218	\$5.92
James M	. Ruberto			✓	\$82,890.85	\$82,830.50	7,200	\$11.50
	City total				\$145,021.12	\$131,495.53	15,418	\$8.53
<u>Quincy</u>								
William J	l. Phelan		<b>✓</b>		\$156,576.37	\$146,525.26	12,355	\$11.86
James A	Sheets	✓			\$240,381.00	\$243,057.50	12,338	\$19.70
	City total				\$396,957.37	\$389,582.76	24,693	\$15.78
<u>Revere</u>								
Thomas	G. Ambrosino	✓	✓		\$74,992.63	\$84,431.57	7,994	\$10.56
	City total				\$74,992.63	\$84,431.57	7,994	\$10.56
<u>Salem</u>								
John	Donahue				\$44,775.00	\$45,969.25	5,580	\$8.24
Stanley	Usovicz	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$83,768.00	\$97,497.54	5,743	\$16.98
	City total				\$128,543.00	\$143,466.79	11,323	\$12.67

City	Candidate	I	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
Somerville								
William R.	Baro				\$5,280.00	\$5,280.00	3,775	\$1.40
Dorothy Ke	Dorothy Kell Gay ✓ ✓ □		\$81,719.00	\$140,114.17	6,716	\$20.86		
	City total				\$86,999.00	\$145,394.17	10,491	\$13.86
Springfield								
Michael J.	Albano	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$208,355.70	\$670,228.84	19,021	\$35.24
Paul E.	Caron				\$177,379.39	\$223,207.54	14,742	\$15.14
	City total				\$385,735.09	\$893,436.38	33,763	\$26.46
<u>Taunton</u>								
Walter C.	Bevis Jr.				\$1,325.27	\$1,314.60	1,005	\$1.31
Thaddeus	Strojny	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$54,867.76	\$68,873.87	6,026	\$11.43
Robert W.	Studley				\$2,500.71	\$2,500.71	3,047	\$0.82
	City total				\$58,693.74	\$72,689.18	10,078	\$7.21
<u>Westfield</u>								
Stephen J.	Sartori				\$3,481.00	\$3,416.49	2,572	\$1.33
Richard K.	Sullivan Jr.	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$32,374.00	\$30,252.33	5,344	\$5.66
	City total				\$35,855.00	\$33,668.82	7,916	\$4.25

City	Candidate	I	W	0	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
Woburn								
John M.	Cashell			<b>✓</b>	\$45,730.00	\$45,395.29	4,663	\$9.74
John C.	Curran		<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	\$45,157.70	\$52,976.28	6,495	\$8.16
	City total				\$90,887.70	\$98,371.57	11,158	\$8.82
Worceste	<u>r</u>							
William S	6. Coleman III			<b>✓</b>	\$2,900.00	\$2,900.00	4,100	\$0.71
Timothy	P. Murray		<b>✓</b>	✓	\$67,136.19	\$24,978.58	18,123	\$1.38
	City total				\$70,036.19	\$27,878.58	22,223	\$1.25
GR	AND TOTALS				\$4,546,946.74	\$5,852,880.01	500,373	\$11.70
	MEDIANS				\$32,644	\$33,040		