### Campaign Finance Activity by Mayoral Candidates in Massachusetts

1999



Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Office of Campaign and Political Finance
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 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. 2, 1999. It is the second review of such activity by the Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF).

OCPF started issuing mayoral studies in 1998 due to the significant amount of campaign finance activity on the municipal level, especially in cities. In many cities, mayoral candidates run in areas that are larger in population that the average House or Senate district. Not surprisingly, some of those mayoral candidates report fundraising and spending that is greater than many legislative candidates.

This high level of activity was the chief reason OCPF has devoted significant attention to municipal campaign finance in recent years. 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 third consecutive election that has been followed by local reviews; in early 2000, OCPF representatives reviewed candidates' filings for 1999 in six cities: Fall River, Holyoke, Revere, Salem, Taunton and Weymouth.

OCPF is an independent state agency that administers Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 55, which provides for disclosure and regulation of campaign finance activity on the state, county and municipal levels. Mayoral candidates file disclosure reports with their local election officials (city clerks or election commissioners) with the exception of candidates in four cities noted below. 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 69 mayoral candidates in 38 cities for the 1999 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 the finalists listed here, however, include activity for all of 1999.

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 (which in 1999 fell on Oct. 25). All candidates and committees were required to file year-end reports on Jan. 20, 2000, disclosing activity through Dec. 31, 1999. The filing location and schedule are different for mayoral candidates in Boston, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester, who have their

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The figures do not include activity from any special elections for mayor in 1999. For example, totals for Somerville Mayor Dorothy Kelly Gay cover the fall election, in which she was unopposed, not the contested election earlier that year in which she was first elected to fill a vacant seat.

financial institutions file reports directly with OCPF once a month and then twice monthly in the last six months of an election year. These depository candidates were also required to file a year-end summary report with OCPF on Jan. 20. 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, regardless of how many offices he or she may seek or hold. Some mayoral candidates in this report also held 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 1999 -- Sen. Robert Hedlund of Weymouth and Rep. David Gately of Waltham – 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. 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.

May 2000

#### **FINDINGS**

Voters in 38 of the 44 cities in Massachusetts went to the polls to elect their chief executives in 1999. The mayoral race was not on the ballot in three others – Boston, Lawrence and Newton -- where the mayoral term is four years and the current incumbents' terms are up at the end of 2001. 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.<sup>2</sup> In addition to the 43 cities headed by mayors, another city, Chelsea, no longer elects a mayor.

Sixty-nine candidates for mayor were listed on municipal ballots in November. Of that number, 32 were incumbents seeking another term. Eight incumbents ran unopposed while the other 24 were opposed for re-election. Of the 38 mayoral races, 30 were contested (featuring at least two candidates in the November election): of that number, 24 featured a challenged incumbent and six featured a contest for an open seat.

Of the 24 opposed incumbents, 20 were returned to office and four were defeated (in Gardner, Holyoke, Newburyport and Revere). The mayors who took office in January 2000 were thus 28 returning incumbents and 10 newcomers: four who defeated incumbents and six who won open seats.

The candidates' campaign finance activity in brief:

- ?? The 69 mayoral candidates raised \$3,198,736 and spent \$3,284,268 in 1999, according to their reports. (Several candidates already had cash on hand at the start of 1999.)
- ?? The median level of fundraising by mayoral candidates was \$32,289, while the median of spending was \$23,388. (A median represents the exact midpoint of all of 69 totals: half were higher and half were lower.<sup>3</sup>) All but six of the candidates raised less than \$100,000; all but five spent less than that figure.
- ?? 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. For example, Boston Newton and Lawrence, cities where mayoral candidates reported substantial fundraising and spending in 1997, have four-year mayoral terms and are therefore not included in this report. That could be a chief reason for the fundraising and spending totals and the spending median in 1999 being lower than

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</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 69 candidates was \$47,598.

- in 1997. In 1997, the median level of fundraising by the 66 mayoral finalists was \$28,157, while the median of spending was \$27,127. That same year, candidates raised a total of \$3,708,975 and spent a total of \$3,835,055.
- ?? Incumbents and candidates in contested races showed substantially higher medians than non-incumbents and unopposed candidates, respectively, in 1999. Winning candidates also showed higher medians than those who lost. But the highest medians of any individual category were posted by candidates for open mayoral seats, whose fundraising and spending figures were more than twice the overall medians.
- ?? The candidate who spent the most money won in 23 of the 30 contested races, or 77 percent of the time.
- ?? Candidates spent more than \$100,000 in each of eleven cities, most of which featured hotly contested races. The contested race with the most spending was in Fall River, where the two candidates spent a total of \$459,705. That figure is \$30,736 more than the top race in 1997, in Newton. Rounding out the top five in spending for 1999 were Revere, Waltham, Weymouth and Taunton. The last three cities featured contests for open seats.
- ?? Mayor Edward Lambert of Fall River was both the top fundraiser and the top spender in 1999. Lambert, who won re-election in a contested race, reported raising \$247,644 and spending \$395,250. Lambert's opponent reported raising \$63,285 and spending \$64,455. (The top individual fundraiser and spender in 1997 was Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston, who raised \$568,527 and spent \$755,565. Menino did not run in 1999; his four-year term expires at the end of 2001.)
- ?? The average amount spent per vote by the 69 candidates was \$7.44, up 81 cents from 1997.

The findings in more detail:

#### Most Active Races

The race between the two finalists for mayor in Fall River saw the greatest level of activity in 1999, with \$459,705 spent by the two candidates. (Of that amount, \$395,250 was spent by the incumbent and winner, Edward Lambert.) The 10 most active races in terms of spending included four contests for open seats (Methuen, Taunton, Waltham and Weymouth) and two in which a challenger defeated an incumbent (Revere and Holyoke).

### Mayoral Races with the Highest Total Spending by Finalists 1999

	City	Total Spent
1)	Fall River	\$459,705
2)	Revere	\$350,171
3)	Waltham (O)	\$199,510
4)	Weymouth (O)	\$187,558
5)	Taunton (O)	\$140,258
6)	Salem	\$137,057
7)	Methuen (O)	\$132,224
8)	Holyoke	\$123,201
9)	Everett	\$115,708
10)	Brockton	\$115,671

O = Open seat.

#### **Top Fundraisers**

Lambert of Fall River also raised the most of any mayoral candidate in 1999, amassing \$247,644 for the year. That was \$56,212 more than the second-most active fundraiser, Michael Albano of Springfield. Both Lambert and Albano were incumbents who won reelection. Albano was unopposed. In all, the top ten in fundraising included six incumbents (two of whom were unopposed) and four non-incumbents. All on the list won their elections but two, one of whom was an incumbent.

Top Mayoral Campaign Fundraisers 1999

	Candidate	City	Amount	Won/Lost
1)	Edward M. Lambert Jr. (I)	Fall River	\$247,644	W
2)	Michael J. Albano (I) (U)	Springfield	\$191,432	W
3)	Thomas G. Ambrosino	Revere	\$150,659	W
4)	Robert J. Haas Jr. (I)	Revere	\$147,626	L
5)	Frederick J. Kalisz Jr. (I)	New Bedford	\$109,900	W
6)	Rosario Malone (O)	Waltham	\$107,995	L
7)	Sharon M. Pollard (O)	Methuen	\$ 94,832	W
8)	Stanley J. Usovicz Jr. (I)	Salem	\$ 89,214	W
9)	David M. Madden (O)	Weymouth	\$ 86,666	W
10)	Peter Torigian (I) (U)	Peabody	\$ 85,780	W

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

Six candidates reported raising less than \$1,000 (including one candidate who reported no funds raised); none of the six won the election. The winning candidate who raised the least was an unopposed incumbent: Dean Mazzarella of Leominster reported receipts of \$8,795.

#### **Top Spenders**

Mayor Lambert also topped the list in total spending, this time by more than two to one over the second-place finisher. Several of the top ten spenders also made the list of the top fundraisers above. The top ten spenders included five incumbents, one of whom was unopposed and one of whom lost. In all, seven of the top ten in spending won their elections.

Top Mayoral Campaign Spenders in 1999

	Candidate	City	Amount	Won/Lost
1)	Edward M. Lambert Jr. (I)	Fall River	\$395,250	W
2)	Robert J. Haas Jr. (I)	Revere	\$187,467	L
3)	Thomas G. Ambrosino	Revere	\$162,704	W
4)	Rosario Malone (O)	Waltham	\$131,987	L
5)	Robert L. Hedlund (O)	Weymouth	\$106,331	L
6)	Stanley J. Usovicz Jr. (I)	Salem	\$ 96,510	W
7)	Sharon M. Pollard (O)	Methuen	\$ 93,059	W
8)	John T. Yunits Jr. (I)	Brockton	\$ 92,341	W
9)	Frederick J. Kalisz Jr. (I)	New Bedford	\$ 89,624	W
10)	Peter Torigian (I) (U)	Peabody	\$ 89,490	W

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

One candidate reported no expenditures, and another five reported expenditures of less than \$1,000. The lowest spending winner was incumbent Dean Mazzarella of Leominster, who reported spending \$6,299. As noted above, Mazzarella was also the winner who reported raising the least amount of funds in 1999.

#### **Per-Vote Spending**

The average candidate spent \$7.44 per vote in 1999, which was 81 cents more than the average in 1997. Six of the top ten in terms of per-vote spending were non-incumbents. Four of the top ten lost, including one incumbent. Topping the list was Revere Mayor Robert Haas, who spent \$36.22 per vote (\$227,087) but lost his re-election bid. Haas also topped this list in 1997, when he spent \$28.65 per vote and was re-elected.

### Per-Vote Spending by Mayoral Candidates 1999

	Candidate	City	Amount	Won/Lost
1.	Robert J. Haas Jr. (I)	Revere	\$36.22	L
2.	Edward M. Lambert Jr. (I)	Fall River	\$33.50	W
3.	Rosario Malone (O)	Waltham	\$22.29	L
4.	Stanley J. Usovicz Jr. (I)	Salem	\$17.78	W
5.	Thomas G. Ambrosino	Revere	\$17.38	W
6.	Sharon M. Pollard (O)	Methuen	\$13.69	W
7.	Lisa L. Mead (O)	Newburyport	\$12.90	W
8.	Robert L. Hedlund * (O)	Weymouth	\$12.88	L
9.	Barry J. Amaral (O)	Taunton	\$12.51	L
10.	David Ragucci (I)	Everett	\$12.39	W

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

that

seat.

For the second straight election year, Chicopee Mayor Richard Kos got the biggest bargain for his money of all mayoral candidates in Massachusetts. Kos, who was unopposed for re-election, spent \$1.53 per vote (\$11,071). That was \$1.07 more than his figure in 1997, but once again the lowest of any winning candidate.

#### **Top Spenders**

Of the 30 contested races, the top spender won in 23 (all but Agawam, Gardner, Holyoke, Revere, Taunton, Waltham and Weymouth). Twenty of those 23 winning top spenders were incumbents. The three non-incumbents who outspent their opponents and won were in Methuen, Newburyport and Northampton. In Newburyport, the outspent candidate was the incumbent; in the two other cities the incumbent was not running for re-election.

The seven candidates who outspent their opponents but lost were in Agawam, Gardner, Holyoke, Revere, Taunton, Waltham and Weymouth. Three losing top spenders were incumbents: in Gardner, Holyoke and Revere.

#### Winners

Winning candidates raised and spent significantly more than those who did not gain election in November 1999. The 38 winners raised and spent more than twice the totals of their opponents. The medians also reflect the winners' advantage.

<sup>\*</sup> Hedlund was also a state senator in 1999. Some of his spending may reflect activity related to

#### Fundraising and Spending by Winning and Losing Mayoral Candidates 1999

	Raised (% of total)	Spent (% of total)
Winners (38)		
Total	\$2,343,628 (73.3%)	\$2,314,213 (70.5%)
Median	\$ 54,551	\$ 56,011
Losers (31)		
Total	\$ 855,108 (26.7%)	\$ 970,053 (29.5%)
Median	\$ 14,861	\$ 14,347

#### Opposed vs. Unopposed

Fundraising and spending by opposed candidates was significantly higher than in uncontested races. The 61 opposed candidates accounted for more than 85 percent of both fundraising and spending. The median amount raised by an opposed candidate was about 50 percent higher than the median raised by an unopposed candidate. The difference was more pronounced on the expenditure side, where the opposed candidate's median was more than twice that of an unopposed candidate (all the unopposed candidates were incumbents).

## Fundraising and Spending in Contested/Uncontested Mayoral Races 1999

	Raised (% of total)	<b>Spent (% of total)</b>
Opposed (61)		
Total	\$2,770,340 (86.6%)	\$2,996,873 (91.2%)
Median	\$ 33,675	\$ 33,511
Unopposed (8)		
Total	\$ 428,396 (13.4%)	\$ 287,394 (8.8%)
Median	\$ 22,374	\$ 15,749

#### Open seats

In the races for six open seats in 1999, the top spender won twice (Methuen and Northampton) and lost four times (Agawam, Taunton, Waltham and Weymouth). Campaign finance activity by candidates for open seats is usually greater than other types of races, and 1999 was no exception. The 12 finalists for open seats represented about 17 percent of all the mayoral candidates, but accounted for 22 percent of both fundraising and spending.<sup>4</sup> The medians for fundraising and spending by these candidates were \$69,345 and \$67,309, respectively, more than twice the overall median for fundraising and almost three times the overall spending median.

#### *Incumbency*

Incumbents outspent their opponents in all but one of the 24 contested races they were in. The exception was in Newburyport, where Mayor Mary Carrier was outspent by the challenger and ultimate winner, former Mayor Lisa Mead, by more than three to one. The three other defeated incumbents, in Gardner, Holyoke and Revere, spent more than their challengers. The 24 incumbents outraised and outspent non-incumbents in 1999 by more than two to one in both categories.

# Mayoral Campaign Fundraising and Spending by Incumbency 1999

	Raised (% of total)	Spent (% of total)
Incumbents (32)	Ф1 005 044 (50 60())	Ф1.060.622.(600/)
Totals	\$1,905,944 (59.6%)	\$1,968,623 (60%)
Median	\$ 50,131	\$ 49,272
Non-Incumbents (37)		
Totals	\$1,292,792 (0.4%)	\$1,315,644 (40%)
Median	\$ 20,423	\$ 20,423

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Totals for all candidates for open seats were even larger, because this study only covers those candidates who were on the November ballot. In Weymouth, for example, there were nine candidates in the preliminary election for the newly created mayor's seat. In Methuen, four candidates competed for the mayor's office.

### Campaign Finance Activity by Mayoral Finalists in the 1999 Mayoral Elections

City (	Candidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open		Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
Agawam										
Donald M.	Rheault				<b>~</b>	\$	23,674.90	\$ 23,388.37	3,725	\$ 6.28
Richard A.	. Cohen			<b>✓</b>	$\checkmark$	\$	10,931.63	\$ 10,066.09	4,340	\$ 2.32
	City totals					\$	34,606.53	\$ 33,454.46	8,065	\$ 4.15
Amesbury										
James N.	Thivierge					\$	6,517.28	\$ 6,517.28	1,214	\$ 5.37
Nicholas J	. Costello	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$	19,208.00	\$ 16,495.05	1,992	\$ 8.28
	City totals					\$	25,725.28	\$ 23,012.33	3,206	\$ 7.18
Attleboro										
Gerald	Keane					\$	20,423.17	\$ 20,423.17	2,337	\$ 8.74
Judith H.	Robbins	<b>✓</b>		✓		\$	46,789.96	\$ 48,943.03	4,553	\$ 10.75
	City totals					\$	67,213.13	\$ 69,366.20	6,890	\$ 10.07
Beverly										
Philip	Dunkelbarger					\$	43,136.00	\$ 42,784.74	4,462	\$ 9.59
William F.	Scanlon Jr.	<b>✓</b>		<b>~</b>		\$	53,472.43	\$ 69,894.51	6,558	\$ 10.66
	City totals					\$	96,608.43	\$ 112,679.25	11,020	\$ 10.22
		Inc	c = Incur	nhent	Unop = Un	oppose	d Win = Winne	er Open = Open seat		

City	C	'andidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
Broo	ekton									
	John T.	Yunits Jr.	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 85,647.20	\$ 92,340.76	8,444	\$ 10.94
	Martha A.	Crowell					\$ 25,388.86	\$ 23,330.73	4,665	\$ 5.00
		City totals					\$ 111,036.06	\$ 115,671.49	13,109	\$ 8.82
Chic	copee									
	Richard J.	Kos	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	<b>~</b>		\$ 14,861.00	\$ 11,071.21	7,251	\$ 1.53
		City totals					\$ 14,861.00	\$ 11,071.21	7,251	\$ 1.53
East	hampton									
	Jeannette (	G. Davis-Harris					\$ 2,037.00	\$ 2,035.70	1,398	\$ 1.46
	Michael A.	Tautznik	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 10,439.75	\$ 8,257.82	2,657	\$ 3.11
		City totals					\$ 12,476.75	\$ 10,293.52	4,055	\$ 2.54
Ever	rett									
	David	Ragucci	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 71,739.99	\$ 82,196.78	6,635	\$ 12.39
	John R.	McCarthy					\$ 33,675.29	\$ 33,510.74	3,811	\$ 8.79
		City totals					\$ 105,415.28	\$ 115,707.52	10,446	\$ 11.08
Fall	River									
	Edward M.	Lambert Jr.	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 247,643.62	\$ 395,250.10	11,800	\$ 33.50
	William F.	Whitty					\$ 63,285.00	\$ 64,455.10	8,578	\$ 7.51
		City totals					\$ 310,928.62	\$ 459,705.20	20,378	\$ 22.56

City	Candidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open		Receipts	Ex	penditures	Votes	Spen	t per Vote
Fitchburg												
John C.	Burke					\$	6,630.00	\$	6,581.08	2,895	\$	2.27
Mary H.	Whitney	<b>✓</b>		✓		\$	12,276.00	\$	11,055.19	3,983	\$	2.78
	City totals					\$	18,906.00	\$	17,636.27	6,878	\$	2.56
Gardner												
Charles J	Manca	<b>✓</b>				\$	9,266.32	\$	20,884.82	2,759	\$	7.57
Daniel J.	Kelley			<b>✓</b>		\$	18,731.10	\$	10,821.42	2,772	\$	3.90
	City totals					\$	27,997.42	\$	31,706.24	5,531	\$	5.73
Gloucester												
Bruce H.	Tobey	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$	33,859.72	\$	45,939.53	4,825	\$	9.52
Robin J.	Hubbard					\$	12,485.00	\$	13,042.80	3,478	\$	3.75
	City totals					\$	46,344.72	\$	58,982.33	8,303	\$	7.10
Haverhill												
James A.	Rurak	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$	46,262.50	\$	61,513.56	7,153	\$	8.60
Maureen	M. Corbett					\$	3,342.23	\$	2,890.26	4,229	\$	0.68
	City totals					\$	49,604.73	\$	64,403.82	11,382	\$	5.66
Holyoke												
Daniel J.	Szostkiewicz	✓				\$	58,199.54	\$	61,692.42	5,275	\$	11.70
Michael J	Sullivan			<b>~</b>		\$	74,566.01	\$	61,508.58	6,323	\$	9.73
	City totals					\$	132,765.55	\$	123,201.00	11,598	\$	10.62
		Inc	= Incum	bent	Unop = Un	oppose	d Win = Winne	er Ope	en = Open seat			

Office of Campaign and Political Finance

Page 3

City	Candidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open	Receipts	Ex	penditures	Votes	Spen	t per Vote
Leominster											
Dean J	Mazzarella	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	✓		\$ 8,795.00	\$	6,299.01	3,116	\$	2.02
	City totals					\$ 8,795.00	\$	6,299.01	3,116	\$	2.02
Lynn											
Joseph	J. Downey					\$ 2,885.00	\$	2,257.43	4,680	\$	0.48
Patrick	J. McManus	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 82,736.48	\$	82,924.71	10,033	\$	8.27
	City totals					\$ 85,621.48	\$	85,182.14	14,713	\$	5.79
Malden											
James	A. Dello Russo					\$ 524.30	\$	658.80	2,251	\$	0.29
Richard	I C. Howard	<b>✓</b>		✓		\$ 54,681.49	\$	57,005.09	6,472	\$	8.81
	City totals					\$ 55,205.79	\$	57,663.89	8,723	\$	6.61
Marlboroug	h										
William	J. Mauro Jr.	<b>✓</b>	$\checkmark$	<b>✓</b>		\$ 13,535.00	\$	13,519.29	2,933	\$	4.61
	City totals					\$ 13,535.00	\$	13,519.29	2,933	\$	4.61
Medford											
Michae	l J. McGlynn	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 64,011.49	\$	55,773.29	7,155	\$	7.80
Patrick	J. Fiorello					\$ 287.00	\$	287.00	2,441	\$	0.12
	City totals					\$ 64,298.49	\$	56,060.29	9,596	\$	5.84

City	C	andidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open	Receipt	ts Ex	xpenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
Melr	ose										
	Harry A.	Coule					\$ 0.0	00 \$	0.00	570	\$ 0.00
	Patrick C.	Guerriero	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 35,995.0	00 \$	16,886.93	3,508	\$ 4.81
		City totals					\$ 35,995.0	00 \$	16,886.93	4,078	\$ 4.14
Meth	huen										
	Larry F.	Giordano				<b>✓</b>	\$ 32,289.0	00 \$	39,164.77	4,676	\$ 8.38
	Sharon M.	Pollard			<b>✓</b>	<b>~</b>	\$ 94,832.0	08 \$	93,059.40	6,799	\$ 13.69
		City totals					\$ 127,121.0	08 \$	132,224.17	11,475	\$ 11.52
New	Bedford										
	Eddie L.	Johnson					\$ 351.0	00 \$	351.00	2,105	\$ 0.17
	Frederick J	. Kalisz Jr.	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 109,900.4	19 \$	89,623.61	15,120	\$ 5.93
		City totals					\$ 110,251.4	19 \$	89,974.61	17,225	\$ 5.22
New	buryport										
	Lisa L.	Mead			<b>✓</b>		\$ 54,420.4	18 \$	56,248.16	4,361	\$ 12.90
	Mary M.	Carrier	<b>✓</b>				\$ 17,150.0	00 \$	17,404.65	2,696	\$ 6.46
		City totals					\$ 71,570.4	48 \$	73,652.81	7,057	\$ 10.44
Nort	h Adams										
	John	Barrett III	<b>~</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 30,122.8	32 \$	21,500.79	2,911	\$ 7.39
	John A.	Gwozdz					\$ 12,392.4	19 \$	12,267.64	1,820	\$ 6.74
		City totals					\$ 42,515.3	31 \$	33,768.43	4,731	\$ 7.14
			Inc	= Incun	nbent	Unop = Un	opposed Win=	Winner Op	en = Open sea	t	

City	Candidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open		Receipts	Exp	penditures	Votes	Spen	t per Vote
Northampton												
Mary Cla	re Higgins			✓	<b>✓</b>	\$	25,831.13	\$	22,786.03	6,493	\$	3.51
Tony M.	Long				✓	\$	12,049.67	\$	12,049.67	2,947	\$	4.09
	City totals					\$	37,880.80	\$	34,835.70	9,440	\$	3.69
Peabody												
Peter	Torigian	$\checkmark$	<b>~</b>	<b>~</b>		\$	85,779.83	\$	89,489.85	8,365	\$	10.70
	City totals					\$	85,779.83	\$	89,489.85	8,365	\$	10.70
Pittsfield												
Gerald S	. Doyle Jr.	$\checkmark$	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$	29,888.00	\$	17,979.47	7,883	\$	2.28
	City totals					\$	29,888.00	\$	17,979.47	7,883	\$	2.28
Quincy												
James A.	Sheets	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$	68,800.00	\$	83,933.01	14,487	\$	5.79
Robert J.	Boussy					\$	425.00	\$	425.00	2,476	\$	0.17
	City totals					\$	69,225.00	\$	84,358.01	16,963	\$	4.97
Revere												
Robert J.	Haas Jr.	<b>✓</b>				\$ 1	47,625.99	\$ ^	187,467.12	5,176	\$	36.22
Thomas (	G. Ambrosino			<b>~</b>		\$ 1	50,659.50	\$ 1	162,704.10	9,360	\$	17.38
	City totals					\$ 2	98,285.49	\$ 3	350,171.22	14,536	\$	24.09

City C	Candidate	Inc	Unop	Win	Open	Receipts	Expenditures	Votes	Spent per Vote
Salem									
John J.	Donahue					\$ 38,845.73	\$ 40,547.20	4,801	\$ 8.45
Stanley J.	Usovicz Jr.	<b>✓</b>		✓		\$ 89,214.00	\$ 96,509.93	5,427	\$ 17.78
	City totals					\$ 128,059.73	\$ 137,057.13	10,228	\$ 13.40
Somerville									
Dorothy A.	Kelly Gay	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>~</b>		\$ 73,075.00	\$ 49,600.24	7,849	\$ 6.32
	City totals					\$ 73,075.00	\$ 49,600.24	7,849	\$ 6.32
Springfield									
Michael J.	Albano	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>		\$ 191,431.93	\$ 89,348.25	17,284	\$ 5.17
	City totals					\$ 191,431.93	\$ 89,348.25	17,284	\$ 5.17
Taunton									
Barry J.	Amaral				$\checkmark$	\$ 71,000.00	\$ 73,162.99	5,847	\$ 12.51
Thaddeus	M. Strojny			<b>✓</b>	$\checkmark$	\$ 85,598.00	\$ 67,094.97	6,990	\$ 9.60
	City totals					\$ 156,598.00	\$ 140,257.96	12,837	\$ 10.93
Waltham									
David F.	Gately			<b>✓</b>	$\checkmark$	\$ 67,690.00	\$ 67,523.71	6,386	\$ 10.57
Rosario	Malone				$\checkmark$	\$ 107,995.08	\$ 131,986.53	5,922	\$ 22.29
	City totals					\$ 175,685.08	\$ 199,510.24	12,308	\$ 16.21

City Candidate		Inc	nc Unop Win Open		Rec	eipts	Expenditures		Votes	Spent per Vote		
Westfield												
Richard K.	Sullivan Jr.	<b>✓</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>~</b>		\$ 11,0	30.00	\$	10,086.36	4,221	\$	2.39
	City totals					\$ 11,0	30.00	\$	10,086.36	4,221	\$	2.39
Weymouth												
David M.	Madden			<b>✓</b>	<b>~</b>	\$ 86,6	66.00	\$ 8	31,226.86	9,845	\$	8.25
Robert L.	Hedlund				<b>✓</b>	\$ 73,2	12.23	\$ 10	06,331.13	8,257	\$	12.88
	City totals					\$ 159,8	78.23	\$ 18	37,557.99	18,102	\$	10.36
Woburn												
Robert M.	Dever	<b>✓</b>		<b>✓</b>		\$ 20,9	16.30	\$ 2	20,936.78	5,008	\$	4.18
Thomas M.	Gouthro					\$ 11,7	86.30	\$	9,446.85	4,682	\$	2.02
	City totals					\$ 32,7	02.60	\$ :	30,383.63	9,690	\$	3.14
Worcester												
George A.	Fox III					\$ 2	73.32	\$	361.16	1,016	\$	0.36
Konstantina	Lukes					\$ 17,9	55.00	\$	14,347.30	6,518	\$	2.20
Raymond V	. Mariano	✓		✓		\$ 61,5	88.96	\$ 3	36,799.51	13,939	\$	2.64
	City totals					\$ 79,8	17.28	\$ :	51,507.97	21,473	\$	2.40
	<i>Totals</i> 69 Cand		dates		-	\$3,198,7	'35.59	\$3,28	4,266.43	382,938	\$	8.58
	Medians					\$32.3	89.00	\$2	3,388.37			