

# *Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance*

**Campaign Finance Activity by  
Candidates for the Massachusetts  
General Court**

**2016**



# INTRODUCTION

This study examines campaign finance activity undertaken by candidates for the Massachusetts Senate and House of Representatives (known collectively as The General Court) in calendar year 2016. The Office of Campaign and Political Finance has issued a report of this type after every state election since 1990.

The information contained in this legislative study is based on data compiled from campaign finance reports electronically filed by candidates and treasurers of political committees organized on behalf of candidates for the Massachusetts Senate and House. In 2016, a total of 337 candidates sought legislative office and filed disclosure reports with OCPF: 69 running for 40 Senate seats, and 268 seeking one of 160 House seats.

Legislative candidates and their committees are required to file three campaign finance reports disclosing election year financial activity. The reports are due with OCPF eight days prior to the state primary election; eight days prior to the November general election; and in January of the year immediately following. Reports were due from the candidates in this study on Aug. 31, 2016, Oct. 31, 2016, and Jan. 20, 2017.

Candidates and committee treasurers are required to disclose 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.

OCPF has taken steps to ensure that the information contained in this study is accurate as of the time of its compilation in 2017. This study takes into account many corrections, additions or deletions made by candidates as a result of any review conducted by OCPF or amendments filed by candidates or political committees.

The Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF) is an independent state agency that administers Massachusetts General Law Chapter 55, the campaign finance law. The law provides for disclosure and regulation of campaign finance activity on the state, county and municipal levels. The reports filed by state and county candidates and committees are available on the office's web site at [ocpf.us](http://ocpf.us).

This study was compiled and written based on information filed by candidates and committees. Those seeking further information on the study or any other facet of the Massachusetts campaign finance law may contact the Office of Campaign and Political Finance by calling (617) 979-8300. This study and other data are also available on the office's website.

October 2017

## OVERVIEW

Receipts for legislative candidates increased in 2016 compared to the previous state election in 2014, but expenditures decreased.

**Total fundraising** for the 337 legislative candidates in 2016 reached \$12.9 million (\$38,278 per candidate). The 2016 figure is \$714,064 more than in 2014 when 372 candidates ran (\$32,757 per candidate).

**Expenditure** totals in 2016 decreased to \$12.2 million (\$36,235 per candidate), down from \$12.4 million in 2014 (\$33,400 per candidate).

### AGGREGATE RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES 2004 – 2016

	<i>2004</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2016</i>
<b>Number of candidates</b>	390	339	311	433	346	372	337
<b>Receipts</b>	\$17,275,537	\$12,398,381	\$12,462,676	\$14,994,001	\$11,533,612	\$12,185,713	\$12,899,777
<b>Expenditures</b>	\$17,640,644	\$11,877,068	\$12,550,335	\$16,873,190	\$11,902,207	\$12,425,073	\$12,211,196

Of the 337 legislative candidates in 2016, 69 were seeking one of 40 Senate seats and 238 were running for the 160-seat House.

Of the 200 legislative races, 118, or 59 percent, were not contested in either the primary or general elections. There were 96 uncontested races in 2014.

The 337 legislative candidates comprised 187 incumbents, or 55 percent. There were 179 incumbents in 2014, making up 48 percent of the field.

One record was reached in 2016:

- House Speaker Robert DeLeo of Winthrop reported receipts of \$569,200, a record for House candidates. The record exceeds the previous high of \$465,281, set in 2014 by DeLeo.

The number of candidates in 2016 decreased to 338 from 372 in 2014. The lowest total ever recorded in OCPF studies, which have been compiled after each election since 1990, was 311 in 2008. The highest number of legislative candidates recorded in an OCPF study was 507 in 1990.

All but two incumbents were re-elected, both in the House. In 2014, four incumbents were unsuccessful.

Fifteen new legislators were elected in 2016 – 12 in the House and three in the Senate. In 2014, 20 new legislators were elected.

The findings for each of the two chambers of the Legislature are broken down in each of the two sections that follow this introduction.

#####

## SECTION I: THE SENATE

Average receipt totals increased compared to the 2014 election. Senate candidates on average raised \$67,364 in 2016, up from \$56,973 two years earlier.

Average expenditures increased to \$64,820 in 2016 from \$57,962 in 2014.

Twenty incumbents were unopposed in 2016, down from 21 unopposed incumbents in 2014. The highest number of unopposed incumbents was 27 in 2008.

Of 37 incumbents on the ballot, all were returned to office. Three new senators were elected to fill open seats.

### OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR SENATE CANDIDATES

	<i>2008</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2016</i>
<i>Number of candidates</i>	58	95	72	75	69
<i>Total on hand at start</i>	\$4,820,215	\$4,157,359	\$3,325,868	\$3,182,657	\$3,723,734
<i>Total receipts</i>	\$4,310,074	\$6,067,005	\$4,387,418	\$4,272,990	\$4,648,172
<i>Average receipts per candidate</i>	\$74,311	\$63,863	\$60,936	\$56,973	\$67,364
<i>Total expenditures</i>	\$4,343,233	\$7,322,783	\$4,561,438	\$4,347,182	\$4,472,623
<i>Average expenditures per candidate</i>	\$74,883	\$77,081	\$63,353	\$57,962	\$64,820
<i>Total on hand at end</i>	\$4,772,024	\$2,871,752	\$3,151,043	\$3,113,278	\$3,916,553

Expenditures do not include debts incurred that had not been paid at the end of 2016.

Total receipts do not include in-kind contributions, which are things of value other than money. Senate candidates reported receiving \$335,509 in in-kind contributions in 2016. Candidates receiving the five highest in-kind contribution totals in 2016 include Anthony Schiavi of Harwich (\$83,799); James Ehrhard of Sturbridge (\$70,245); James Crocker of Osterville (\$51,181); Susan Laplante of Lawrence (\$35,619); and James Harrington of Ludlow (\$26,814). All five are Republicans.

Overall totals in both receipts and expenditures increased in 2016. The 2016 fundraising total of \$4.65 million was a 9 percent increase from 2014. The expenditure total of \$4.47 million in 2016 was an increase of 3 percent from 2014.

A total of 69 candidates ran for the Senate in 2016, a decrease of six candidates from 2014. The Senate that was seated in January 2017 was made up of 34 Democrats and six Republicans (the same balance as two years earlier).

The findings in greater detail:

## **I. Success of Campaigns**

Winning candidates spent more money than their opponents. On average, Senate winners outspent unsuccessful candidates \$87,212 to \$33,935. The winners outspent unsuccessful candidates \$77,390 to \$35,759 in 2014.

The winning candidate who spent the least amount of money was Sen. Sonia Chang-Diaz of Boston, who reported \$9,351 in expenditures.

### **SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SUCCESS OF CAMPAIGNS 2016**

	<i>Successful (40)</i>	<i>Unsuccessful (29)</i>
<i>Total Receipts</i>	\$3,715,435	\$932,737
<i>Average Receipts</i>	\$92,885	\$32,163
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	\$3,488,504	\$984,119
<i>Average Expenditures</i>	\$87,212	\$33,935

## **II. Incumbency**

Senators seeking to return to office accounted for the majority of the total receipts and expenditures.

Averages for expenditures were up for incumbents compared to 2014. The 37 incumbent senators on the ballot spent \$73,818 on average in 2016, up from \$64,473 in 2014. The 32 non-incumbents in 2016 reported expenditures of \$54,416, up from \$51,951 in 2014.

### **SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY INCUMBENCY 2016**

	<i>Incumbents (37)</i>	<i>Non-Incumbents (32)</i>
<i>Total Receipts</i>	\$3,025,819	\$1,622,353
<i>Average Receipts</i>	\$81,778	\$50,698
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	\$2,731,290	\$1,741,333
<i>Average Expenditures</i>	\$73,818	\$54,416

Historically, some expenditures by incumbents are not necessarily related directly to their election campaigns (such as bumper stickers or advertisements), but were geared toward constituent or legislative expenses. The campaign finance law allows campaign funds to be used for expenditures such as maintaining a district office, charitable contributions and official or political travel.

### **III. Party Affiliation**

Democrats, who accounted for the majority of Senate candidates in 2016, had higher average receipt and expenditure totals than Republican candidates.

There were 44 Democrats on the ballot in 2016, accounting for 64 percent of all Senate candidates. There were 50 Democrats in 2014.

Democrats accounted for 82 percent of funds raised and 83 percent of expenditures in 2016. Two years earlier, Democrats accounted for 76 percent of funds raised and 75 percent of expenditures.

There were 18 Republicans on the ballot in 2016, four fewer than in 2014.

### **SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY PARTY AFFILIATION 2016**

	<i>Democrats (44)</i>	<i>Republicans (18)</i>	<i>Unenrolled or Other (7)</i>
<i>Total receipts</i>	\$3,848,844	\$792,136	\$7,191
<i>Average receipts</i>	\$87,473	\$44,007	\$1,027
<i>Total expenditures</i>	\$3,701,067	\$763,699	\$7,856
<i>Average expenditures</i>	\$84,115	\$42,427	\$1,122

### **IV. Contested and Uncontested Races**

The 49 opposed candidates reported higher receipts and expenditures, on average, than the 20 unopposed candidates.<sup>1</sup>

In the 20 contested Senate races, the candidate who spent the most money won in all the races.

---

<sup>1</sup> This study considered a race “contested” if there were two or more candidates for the seat, regardless of the outcome or the level of campaign finance activity.

The average amount spent by an opposed candidate in 2016 was \$73,816, up from \$60,289 in 2014.

**RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SENATE CANDIDATES  
OPPOSED AND UNOPPOSED  
2016**

	<i>Opposed (49)</i>	<i>Unopposed (20)</i>
<i>Total Receipts</i>	\$3,726,135	\$992,037
<i>Average receipts</i>	\$76,043	\$49,601
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	\$3,616,986	\$855,637
<i>Average Expenditures</i>	\$73,816	\$42,781

Of the 20 contested races in 2016, three were for seats being vacated by outgoing senators.

The **three open seats** in 2016:

<i>District</i>	<i>Previous Incumbent</i>	<i>Winner</i>
<i>Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin and Hampden</i>	Benjamin Downing, Pittsfield	Adam Gray Hinds, Pittsfield
<i>Norfolk, Bristol and Plymouth</i>	Brian Joyce, Milton	Walter Timilty, Milton
<i>Cape and Islands</i>	Dan Wolf, Harwich	Julian Andre Cyr, Truro

**V. Starting Balances**

Candidates for the Senate reported having a total of \$3,723,734 on hand at the start of 2016, up from \$3,182,657 on hand at the start of 2014.

Incumbents accounted for most of the money on hand at the start of 2016, \$3,450,308, or 92.6 percent. The total was \$2,946,641, or 92.5 percent, in 2014.

The average amount on hand in an incumbent's account at the start of 2016 was \$93,251, up from \$81,851 in 2014. The average starting balance by a non-incumbent in 2016 was \$8,544.

The starting balance figures have traditionally favored incumbents because many challengers are first-time candidates who begin their campaign with a zero balance and start their campaigns during the election year.



A total of 19 candidates, all non-incumbents, reported having no campaign funds on hand at the start of the year. Of the 19, one was elected (Adam Hinds of Pittsfield). The 150 Senate candidates who have started an election year with a zero balance since 2004 have had limited success – only six winners.

**STARTING AN ELECTION YEAR WITH A ZERO BALANCE**

Year	Candidates with zero starting balance	Winners
2016	19	1 (Adam Hinds)
2014	16	1 (Eric Lesser)
2012	16	1 (Kathleen O’Connor-Ives)
2010	32	1 (Daniel Wolf)
2008	12	0
2006	25	1 (Benjamin Downing)
2004	29	1 (Edward Augustus)

The Senate candidate with the highest starting balance was Mark Montigny of New Bedford, who reported a total of \$982,368. Montigny was also first in 2014 with \$1,057,160. Only two Senate candidates have reported election-year starting balances of more than \$1 million (Montigny and Senate President Thomas Birmingham, who started 2000 with \$1.1 million).

**SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST STARTING BALANCES: 2016**

	Candidate	District	Balance	Opposed	Elected
1.	Mark Montigny (D)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$982,368	No	Yes
2.	Bruce Tarr (R)	1 <sup>st</sup> Essex & Middlesex	\$270,770	No	Yes
3.	Stanley Rosenberg (D)	Hampshire, Franklin & Worcester	\$261,895	Yes	Yes
4.	Karen Spilka (D)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Middlesex & Norfolk	\$158,180	Yes	Yes
5.	Harriette Chandler (D)	1 <sup>st</sup> Worcester	\$155,366	No	Yes
6.	Sonia Chang-Diaz (D)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Suffolk	\$128,685	Yes	Yes
7.	Michael Moore (D)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Worcester	\$120,530	Yes	Yes
8.	Eric Phillip Lesser (D)	1 <sup>st</sup> Hampden & Hampshire	\$115,612	Yes	Yes
9.	Sal DiDomenico (D)	Middlesex & Suffolk	\$110,322	No	Yes
10.	Michael Barrett (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Middlesex	\$105,443	No	Yes

Note: All 10 are incumbents

Eleven of 69 Senate candidates reported starting balances of more than \$100,000, two more than in 2014.

The incumbents with the smallest starting balances in 2016 were Donald Humason of Westfield with \$4,639, Kathleen O'Connor Ives of Newburyport with \$8,436, and Richard Ross of Wrentham with \$9,006.

## **VI. Most Active Candidates and Races**

### **SENATE RACES WITH THE HIGHEST EXPENDITURES 2016**

	<i>District</i>	<i>Total spent</i>	<i>Number of candidates</i>	<i>Winner</i>
1.	Cape and Islands (O)	\$726,573	5	Julian Cyr
2.	Norfolk, Bristol and Plymouth (O)	\$497,796	3	Walter Timilty
3.	Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester	\$333,461	2	Stanley Rosenberg
4.	1 <sup>st</sup> Hampden and Hampshire	\$297,935	2	Eric Lesser
5.	Plymouth and Norfolk	\$255,706	4	Patrick Michael O'Connor
6.	1 <sup>st</sup> Suffolk and Middlesex *	\$255,600	2	Joseph Boncore
7.	2 <sup>nd</sup> Middlesex	\$242,579	2	Patricia Jehlen
8.	2 <sup>nd</sup> Essex and Middlesex	\$198,121	2	Barbara L'Italien
9.	Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin and Hampden (O)	\$166,546	4	Adam Hinds
10.	1 <sup>st</sup> Plymouth and Bristol	\$129,462	2	Marc Pacheco

O=Open seat

\*The winner, Joseph Boncore, also appeared in a special election in 2016.

The highest amount ever spent for a Senate race was \$809,637 in 2002, when three candidates were vying for an open seat in the Middlesex, Suffolk and Essex District. The winner was Jarrett Barrios of Cambridge.

The least expensive contested Senate race in 2016 was in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Suffolk District, where incumbent and winner Sonia Chang-Diaz of Boston reported \$9,351 in expenditures. A challenger, Roy Owens, reported no expenditures.

In 2014, the least expensive race was also the 2<sup>nd</sup> Suffolk District. Sonia Chang-Diaz reported \$2,226 in expenditures, and the challenger, David James Wyatt, reported \$3,125. A third candidate for the seat reported no expenditures.

### **TOP FUNDRAISERS.**

The top fundraiser in 2016 was Senate President Stanley Rosenberg of Amherst, who reported \$427,811 in receipts. He had one opponent, Donald Peltier, who reported \$1,000 in receipts.

The top fundraiser in 2014 was Eric Lesser of Longmeadow, who reported \$416,894 in receipts. He ran for the open 1<sup>st</sup> Hampden & Hampshire seat with six other candidates.

The highest amount ever raised by any Senate candidate in an election year was \$1.358 million in 2000 by Thomas Birmingham, who ran unopposed. Murray raised \$475,095 in 2012, the highest amount ever raised by an opposed Senate candidate in an election year.

### **SENATE CANDIDATES RAISING THE MOST MONEY IN 2016**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>City or Town</b>	<b>Receipts</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Winner</b>
1.	Stanley Rosenberg (I)	Amherst	\$427,811	Yes	Yes
2.	Walter Timilty	Milton	\$317,344	Yes	Yes
3.	Eric Lesser (I)	Longmeadow	\$275,234	Yes	Yes
4.	Julian Cyr	Truro	\$256,087	Yes	Yes
5.	*Joseph Boncore (I)	Winthrop	\$187,524	Yes	Yes
6.	Karen Spilka (I)	Ashland	\$170,670	Yes	Yes
7.	Patrick O'Connor (I)	Weymouth	\$147,276	Yes	Yes
8.	Patricia Jehlen (I)	Somerville	\$145,799	Yes	Yes
9.	Barbara L'Italien (I)	Andover	\$131,361	Yes	Yes
10.	Nora Harrington	Milton	\$127,636	Yes	No

I = Incumbent

Note: All are Democrats, except Patrick O'Connor, a Republican.

\*Boncore also appeared in a special election during calendar year 2016.

The winning candidate who raised the least in 2016 was opposed incumbent Richard Ross with \$11,555 in receipts. In 2014 the winning candidate who raised the least was unopposed incumbent Cynthia Creem, who reported \$736 in receipts.

### **TOP EXPENDITURE TOTALS**

Walter Timilty of Milton topped the expenditure list in 2016 with \$354,137. Timilty was an incumbent state representative who ran for the open Senate seat previously held by Brian Joyce of Milton.

In 2014, Eric Lesser of Longmeadow reported the most expenditures with \$405,573. Senate President Therese Murray of Plymouth topped the expenditure list in 2012 with \$513,164, the highest total ever recorded for a Senate candidate.

Expenditures were reported by all but four Senate candidates (Roy Owens, Terra Friedrichs, Adele Martino and Sarah Genova Pimentel). All four were unsuccessful.

The opposed candidate who spent the least and won was incumbent Sonia Chang Diaz of Boston, who reported \$9,351 in expenditures. In 2014, Chang Diaz also reported

the fewest expenditures, \$2,226. Richard Ross of Wrentham had the second lowest spending total for a winner, \$13,073.

## **SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST EXPENDITURE TOTALS IN 2016**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>City or Town</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Walter Timilty	Milton	\$354,137	Yes	Yes
2.	Stanley Rosenberg (I)	Amherst	\$332,894	Yes	Yes
3.	Julian Cyr	Truro	\$289,828	Yes	Yes
4.	Joseph Boncore (I)	Winthrop	\$255,600*	Yes	Yes
5.	Eric Lesser (I)	Longmeadow	\$239,668	Yes	Yes
6.	Barbara L'Italien (I)	Andover	\$173,562	Yes	Yes
7.	Patrick O'Connor (I)	Weymouth	\$168,323	Yes	Yes
8.	James Crocker	Osterville	\$165,604	Yes	No
9.	Patricia Jehlen (I)	Somerville	\$151,209	Yes	Yes
10.	Anthony Schiavi	Harwich	\$134,111	Yes	No

I = Incumbent

Note: All candidates are Democrats, except O'Connor, Crocker and Schiavi, who are Republicans.

Note: Boncore also appeared in a special election in 2016.

The record amount spent by all Senate candidates was \$7,620,649 in 2004. The 2016 total was \$4,472,623.

### **Out-of-Pocket Expenditures**

Candidates who make direct expenditures for campaign purposes using their personal funds have made “out-of-pocket” expenditures. Senate candidates in 2016 reported \$44,585 in out-of-pocket expenditures.

## **VII. Ending Balances**

Candidates for the Senate reported ending 2016 with \$3,916,553.<sup>2</sup> It was \$3,113,278 in 2014. The record high of \$4.9 million was posted in 2000.

The candidate with the greatest amount of money on hand at the end of 2016 was Mark Montigny of New Bedford with a total of \$948,957 (he also led in 2014 with \$1,020,336). The record of \$2.2 million was held by Senate President Thomas Birmingham in 2000.

---

<sup>2</sup> This ending balance may not correspond exactly with the aggregate starting balance, total receipts and total expenditures due to inconsistencies or errors in candidates' reports that are addressed during the OCPF audit process.

As was the case in every election year since 1998, the candidates with the ten highest ending balances in 2014 were all incumbents.

**SENATE CANDIDATES WITH  
THE HIGHEST ENDING BALANCES  
2016**

	<b>Candidate*</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Winner</b>
1.	Mark Montigny (D)	Senate, 2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$948,957	No	Yes
2.	Stanley Rosenberg (D)	Senate, Hampshire, Franklin & Worcester	\$356,812	Yes	Yes
3.	Bruce Tarr (R)	Senate, 1st Essex & Middlesex	\$311,792	No	Yes
4.	Karen Spilka (D)	Senate, 2nd Middlesex & Norfolk	\$234,579	Yes	Yes
5.	Harriette Chandler (D)	Senate, 1st Worcester	\$162,402	No	Yes
6.	Eric Lesser (D)	Senate, 1st Hampden & Hampshire	\$151,178	Yes	Yes
7.	Sonia Chang-Diaz (D)	Senate, 2nd Suffolk	\$146,694	Yes	Yes
8.	Ryan Fattman (R)	Senate, Worcester & Norfolk	\$128,053	No	Yes
9.	Michael Moore (D)	Senate, 2nd Worcester	\$127,812	Yes	Yes
10.	Michael Rodrigues (D)	Senate, 1st Bristol & Plymouth	\$118,984	No	Yes

\*All 10 are incumbents

Nine Senate candidates reported having no money (or negative balances) at the end of the election year, a decrease of one from 2014.

*A table of campaign finance activity by all Senate candidates is available on the OCPF website by clicking this link: [click here](#).*

## SECTION II: THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The number of state representative candidates decreased from 297 in 2014 to 268 in 2016, a drop of 29.

One record was broken in 2016 by House Speaker Robert DeLeo of Winthrop. DeLeo raised \$569,200 in 2016, breaking the previous record of \$465,281 that he set in 2014. DeLeo also broke the record in 2012 with \$462,596 in receipts.

The House record for expenditure is held by DeLeo – \$537,357 in 2014.

A total of 268 candidates sought election to the House in 2016 – 187 Democrats, 55 Republicans and 26 unenrolled or another party. The largest number of House candidates recorded in an OCPF study was 401 in 1990.

A total of 150 incumbents ran for re-election, up from 142 incumbents in 2014. Incumbents reported spending, on average, \$35,877 in 2016 compared to \$19,974 for non-incumbents.

The new House that took office in January 2017 was composed of 12 new representatives – William Crocker of Centerville, Michael Connolly of Cambridge, Juana Matias of Lawrence, Bud Williams of Springfield, Brian Murray of Milford, Chynah Tyler of Boston, William Driscoll of Milton, Jack Lewis of Ashland, Natalie Higgins of Leominster, Joan Meschino of Hull, Solomon Goldstein-Ruse of Amherst and Dylan Fernandes of Falmouth.

### OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES

	<b>2010</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2016</b>
<i>Number of candidates</i>	338	274	297	268
<i>Total cash on hand at start</i>	\$6,378,377	\$5,631,363	\$4,943,309	\$6,145,532
<i>Total receipts</i>	\$8,926,996	\$7,146,193	\$7,912,723	\$8,251,605
<i>Average receipts per candidate</i>	\$26,411	\$26,080	\$26,642	\$30,789
<i>Total expenditures</i>	\$9,550,407	\$7,340,769	\$8,077,891	\$7,738,573
<i>Average expenditures per candidate</i>	\$28,255	\$26,791	\$27,198	\$28,875
<i>Total on hand at end</i>	\$5,785,773	\$5,428,552	\$4,763,029	\$6,658,564

Expenditures do not include debts incurred that had not been paid.

Total receipts increased in 2016, from \$7.9 million in 2014 to \$8.3 million. Expenditures decreased, from \$8.1 million in 2014 to \$7.7 million in 2016.

The findings in greater detail:

## **I. Winners vs. Losers**

Winning candidates comprised 60 percent of the field and accounted for 76 percent of spending.

### **HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SUCCESS OF CAMPAIGNS 2016**

	<i>Successful (160)</i>	<i>Unsuccessful (108)</i>
<i>Total Receipts</i>	\$6,436,650	\$1,814,955
<i>Average Receipts</i>	\$40,229	\$16,805
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	\$5,915,523	\$1,823,050
<i>Average Expenditures</i>	\$36,972	\$16,880

The average expenditure totals for winning candidates, \$36,972, was a small increase from 2014's average of \$36,545.

#### **Average Election-Year Expenditures for Winning House Candidates**

2016	\$36,972
2014	\$36,545
2012	\$33,583
2010	\$39,621
2008	\$40,233
2006	\$35,038

As of Dec. 31, 2016, the average ending balance for the 160 winners was \$40,848. The average ending balance for unsuccessful candidates was \$1,002.

Nine candidates were outspent in 2016 but still won their races. The total was 17 in 2014.

#### **Winning candidates who were outspent by at least one other candidate**

Kate Campanale of Cherry Valley  
Michael Connolly of Cambridge  
Susan Gifford of Wareham  
David Vieira of Falmouth  
Steven Howitt of Seekonk  
Danielle Gregoire of Marlborough  
Josh Cutler of Duxbury  
William Driscoll of Milton  
Donald Wong of Saugus

## **II. Incumbents vs. Challengers**

The 150 incumbents seeking re-election made up 72 percent of receipts and 70 percent of expenditures in 2016. In 2014, 142 incumbents made up 62 percent of receipts and 63 percent of expenditures. In 2012, 153 incumbents made up 67 percent of receipts and 69 percent of expenditures.

Incumbents, on average, reported expenditures of \$35,877 in 2016, a slight decrease from 2014 (\$35,985). It was \$33,275 in 2012. For non-incumbents, the expenditure average was \$19,974.

### **HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY INCUMBENCY 2016**

	<i>Incumbents (150)</i>	<i>Non-Incumbents (118)</i>
<i>Total Receipts</i>	\$5,934,945	\$2,316,660
<i>Average Receipts</i>	\$39,566	\$19,632
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	\$5,381,641	\$2,356,932
<i>Average Expenditures</i>	\$35,877	\$19,974

On average, incumbents started the 2016 election year with \$39,629, compared to \$1,704 for non-incumbents.

The 2016 election saw two incumbent representative lose their bids for re-election, both in the primary contest (Timothy Toomey of Cambridge and Marcos Devers of Lawrence). Three incumbent representatives lose their bids for re-election in 2014.

Historically, many expenditures made by incumbents, both unopposed and opposed, are not necessarily related *directly* to their campaigns (such as bumper stickers or advertisements), but were geared toward constituent or legislative expenses. The campaign finance law allows campaign funds to be used for expenditures such as maintaining a district office, charitable contributions and official or political travel.

## **III. Party Affiliation**

Democrats were the dominant party in terms of receipts and expenditures in 2016. The 187 Democrats represented 70 percent of the candidates and 78 percent of all expenditures. In 2014, Democrats represented 62 percent of those running for House seats and accounted for 76 percent of the total expenditures.

The 55 Republicans running in 2016 (88 in 2014) made up 20 percent of the candidate roster and 20 percent of the total expenditures.



Average expenditures for Democrats in 2016 decreased to \$32,189 from the 2014 average of \$33,221. Republicans spent \$28,421 on average, \$8,254 more than in 2014.

## RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY PARTY AFFILIATION 2016

	<i>Democrats (187)</i>	<i>Republicans (55)</i>	<i>Unenrolled or minor party (26)</i>
<b><i>Total Receipts</i></b>	\$6,574,537	\$1,506,514	\$170,553
<b><i>Average Receipts</i></b>	\$35,157	\$27,391	\$6,559
<b><i>Total Expenditures</i></b>	\$6,019,493	\$1,563,191	\$155,888
<b><i>Average Expenditures</i></b>	\$32,189	\$28,421	\$5,995

On average, Democrats started the 2016 election year with a balance of \$27,379. Republicans started with \$18,615, on average.

No unenrolled or minor party candidate won his or her election.

### **IV. Contested and Uncontested Races**

There were 98 House races in 2016 that featured unopposed candidates, up from 75 in 2014. The 102 unopposed races in 2008 was the highest number recorded since OCPF began studying legislative campaign finance activity in 1990.

The remaining 62 races in 2016 were contested, featuring two or more candidates.<sup>1</sup>

## RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY HOUSE CANDIDATES OPPOSED AND UNOPPOSED 2016

	<i>Opposed (170)</i>	<i>Unopposed (98)</i>
<b><i>Total Receipts</i></b>	\$4,488,829	\$3,762,777
<b><i>Average receipts</i></b>	\$26,404	\$38,395
<b><i>Total Expenditures</i></b>	\$4,580,092	\$3,158,481
<b><i>Average Expenditures</i></b>	\$26,941	\$32,229

<sup>1</sup> This study considered a race contested if there were two or more candidates for the seat, regardless of the outcome or the level of campaign finance activity.

Total receipts do not include in-kind contributions, which are things of value other than money. House candidates reported a total of \$653,852 in in-kind receipts in 2016, down from \$802,882 in 2014.

Candidates who reported the highest in-kind receipt totals in 2016 were: William Crocker of Centerville (\$38,847); Shaunna O’Connell of Taunton (\$32,487); Steven Howitt of Seekonk (\$29,206); Kate Campanale of Cherry Valley (\$28,545); and John Rogers of Norwood (\$27,332). All are Republicans except Rogers, a Democrat. All five won their races.

***CONTESTED SEATS***

Candidates who were opposed in 2016 outspent unopposed candidates as a group.

In the 62 contested House races in 2016, the candidate who spent the most money won 53 times, a success rate of 85 percent. In 2014, there were 85 contested House races and the candidate who spent the most money won 66 times, a success rate of 77 percent.

In 2016, 10 house seats were open (no incumbent). In 2014, 17 House seats were open.

***\*OPEN SEATS IN 2016***

<b><i>District</i></b>	<b><i>Previous incumbent</i></b>	<b><i>Winner</i></b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Plymouth	Garrett Bradley, Hingham	Joan Meschino
10 <sup>th</sup> Worcester	John Fernandes, Milford	Brian Murray
7 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	Gloria Fox, Roxbury	Chynah Tyler
Barnstable, Dukes & Nantucket	Tim Madden, Nantucket	Dylan Fernandes
2 <sup>nd</sup> Barnstable	Brian Mannal, Barnstable	William Crocker
4 <sup>th</sup> Worcester	Dennis Rosa, Leominster	Natalie Higgins
7 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	Tom Sannicandro, Ashland	Jack Lewis
3 <sup>rd</sup> Hampshire	Ellen Story, Amherst	Solomon Goldstein-Rose
11 <sup>th</sup> Hampden	Benjamin Swan, Springfield	Bud Williams
7 <sup>th</sup> Norfolk	**Walter Timilty, Milton	William Driscoll

\*An open seat is when there’s no incumbent

\*\*Moved to the Senate

The most expensive race for an open seat was in the 7<sup>th</sup> Norfolk District, where seven candidates reported \$203,596 in expenditures, an average of \$29,085 per candidate. The winner, William Driscoll, reported \$19,712 in expenditures. In 2014, the 33<sup>rd</sup> Middlesex District race was the most expensive, where three candidates spent an average of \$58,665. In 2012, the 24<sup>th</sup> Middlesex District was the most expensive race – \$216,677, an average of \$43,335 for each of the five candidates.

## V. Starting Balances

Candidates for state representative had a total of \$6,145,532 on hand at the start of 2016. The \$6,703,525 on hand in 2008 is the highest amount ever recorded for House candidates in an OCPF study.

A head start in fundraising is often accompanied by success at the polls – of the total amount on hand at the start of 2016, 98 percent was held by eventual winners.

*Starting Balances: Total amount of money held by eventual winners at the start of an election year:*

2016:	98 percent held by winners
2014:	94 percent held by winners
2012:	95 percent held by winners
2010:	94 percent held by winners

The largest starting balance in 2016 belonged to incumbent Brian Dempsey of Haverhill, with \$419,648. The largest starting balances in 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014 belonged to incumbent Thomas Petrolati of Ludlow.

### **HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH HIGHEST STARTING BALANCES 2016**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Brian Dempsey	3 <sup>rd</sup> Essex	\$419,648	No	Yes
2.	Thomas Petrolati	7 <sup>th</sup> Hampden	\$390,902	No	Yes
3.	Ronald Mariano	3 <sup>rd</sup> Norfolk	\$360,565	No	Yes
4.	Robert DeLeo	19 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$262,937	No	Yes
5.	Angelo Puppolo	12 <sup>th</sup> Hampden	\$196,921	No	Yes
6.	Aaron Michlewitz	3 <sup>rd</sup> Suffolk	\$182,781	No	Yes
7.	Bradley Jones	20 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	\$165,320	No	Yes
8.	James Cantwell	4 <sup>th</sup> Plymouth	\$126,156	Yes	Yes
9.	Patricia Haddad	5 <sup>th</sup> Bristol	\$114,422	No	Yes
10.	Thomas Golden	16 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	\$104,578	No	Yes

Note: All 10 are incumbents

Note: All are Democrats, except Bradley Jones, a Republican

The average starting balance for all 268 House candidates in 2016 was \$22,931.

A total of 74 candidates started the year with no money on hand. Seven of those candidates won their races. A total of 82 candidates started the year with no money on hand in 2014, and seven won their races. In 2012, 76 candidates started the year with no money on hand. Ten of those candidates won their races.

## **VI. Most Active Candidates and Races**

While 62 of the 160 seats in the House were contested in the 2016 election, each election varied in factors such as the level of competition and campaign finance activity.

Seventeen races featured total expenditures that exceeded \$100,000, four fewer than in 2014.

The most expensive House race was in the 19<sup>th</sup> Suffolk District, where House Speaker Robert DeLeo spent a total of \$461,926. There was no challenger.

### **HOUSE RACES WITH THE HIGHEST EXPENDITURE TOTALS 2016**

	<b>District</b>	<b>Total spent</b>	<b>Number of candidates</b>	<b>Winner</b>
1.	19 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$461,926	1	Robert DeLeo (I)
2.	7 <sup>th</sup> Norfolk (O)	\$203,596	7	William Driscoll
3.	9 <sup>th</sup> Essex	\$201,715	3	Donald Wong (I)
4.	31 <sup>st</sup> Middlesex	\$180,863	2	Michael Day (I)
5.	26 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	\$164,502	2	Michael Connolly*
6.	Barnstable, Dukes & Nantucket (O)	\$151,156	7	Dylan Fernandes
7.	3 <sup>rd</sup> Bristol	\$150,039	2	Shaunna O'Connell (I)
8.	5 <sup>th</sup> Plymouth	\$141,804	3	David DeCoste (I)
9.	3 <sup>rd</sup> Plymouth (O)	\$140,022	5	Joan Meschino
10.	4 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$138,856	1	Nicholas Collins (I)

O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. \*Defeated an incumbent

In 2016, the least expensive contested election was in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Hampden District, where two candidates reported expenditures of \$7,451 (incumbent Brian Ashe of Longmeadow was the winner). In 2014, the least expensive contested election was in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Essex District, a race where two candidates reported expenditures of \$10,790.

## TOP FUNDRAISERS AND SPENDERS

House Speaker Robert DeLeo of Winthrop topped the fundraising list, raising \$569,200 in 2016, the highest amount raised by a House candidate in an OCPF study. DeLeo held the previous record of \$465,281, which he recorded in 2014.

Nine House candidates reported no receipts. Of those nine, incumbent Jonathan Hecht of Watertown won.

## HOUSE CANDIDATES RAISING THE MOST MONEY IN 2016

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Robert DeLeo (I)	19 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$569,200	No	Yes
2.	Brian Dempsey (I)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Essex	\$237,137	No	Yes
3.	Aaron Michlewitz (I)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Suffolk	\$197,330	No	Yes
4.	Nicholas Collins (I)	4 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$181,986	No	Yes
5.	Jay Livingstone (I)	8 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$141,005	No	Yes
6.	Joan Meschino	3 <sup>rd</sup> Plymouth	\$132,112*	Yes	Yes
7.	Michael Day (I)	31 <sup>st</sup> Middlesex	\$118,974	Yes	Yes
8.	Adrian Madaro (I)	1 <sup>st</sup> Suffolk	\$101,825	No	Yes
9.	Ronald Mariano (I)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Norfolk	\$93,900	No	Yes
10.	James Cantwell (I)	4 <sup>th</sup> Plymouth	\$91,262	Yes	Yes

I = Incumbent.

Note: All 10 are Democrats

\* The total represents the entire calendar year, which included a special election.

## HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST EXPENDITURE TOTALS IN 2016

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Robert Deleo (I) (D)	19 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$461,926	No	Yes
2.	Jay Livingstone (I) (D)	8 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$219,696	No	Yes
3.	Joan Meschino (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Plymouth	*\$148,171	Yes	Yes
4.	Nicholas Collins (I) (D)	4 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$138,856	No	Yes
5.	Brian Dempsey (I) (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Essex	\$128,617	No	Yes
6.	Aaron Michlewitz (I) (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Suffolk	\$119,003	No	Yes
7.	Shaunna O'Connell (I) (R)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Bristol	\$107,907	Yes	Yes
8.	Michael Day (I) (D)	31 <sup>st</sup> Middlesex	\$98,894	Yes	Yes
9.	William Crocker (R)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Barnstable	\$96,990	Yes	Yes
10.	Timothy Toomey (I) (D)	26 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	\$86,964	Yes	No

I = Incumbent

D=Democrat R=Republican

\*The total represents the entire calendar year, which included a special election.

DeLeo reported spending the most in 2014: \$537,357, the highest amount recorded by a House candidate in an OCPF study. The previous record of \$526,808 was set in 2012 by DeLeo.

Eleven candidates reported no expenditures in 2016, and one was successful – incumbent Jonathan Hecht of Watertown. He ran unopposed.

### Out-of-Pocket Expenditures

Candidates who make direct expenditures for campaign purposes using their personal funds have made “out-of-pocket” expenditures. House candidates in 2016 reported \$214,484 in out-of-pocket expenditures.

## **VII. Ending Balances**

Candidates for the House in 2016 reported a total ending balance of \$6,643,984, an increase from 2014’s total of \$4,762,976.

Incumbent Brian Dempsey of Haverhill posted the highest ending balance in 2016, \$528,168. Incumbent Thomas Petrolati of Ludlow posted the highest ending balance in 2014, \$411,014.

A total of 30 candidates reported no money on hand or negative account balances at the end of 2016. The figure was 47 in 2014. Of those, there were no incumbents and no winners.

## HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST ENDING BALANCES (2016)

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Brian Dempsey (I) (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Essex	\$528,168	No	Yes
2.	Thomas Petrolati (I) (D)	7 <sup>th</sup> Hampden	\$400,435	No	Yes
3.	Robert DeLeo (I) (D)	19 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	\$370,210	No	Yes
4.	Ronald Mariano (I) (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Norfolk	\$369,645	No	Yes
5.	Aaron Michlewitz (I) (D)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Suffolk	\$261,277	No	Yes
6.	Angelo Puppolo (I) (D)	12 <sup>th</sup> Hampden	\$201,264	No	Yes
7.	James Cantwell (I) (D)	4 <sup>th</sup> Plymouth	\$180,855	Yes	Yes
8.	Bradley Jones (I) (R)	20 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	\$171,637	No	Yes
9.	Paul Schmid (I) (D)	8 <sup>th</sup> Bristol	\$120,562	No	Yes
10.	Tackey Chan (I) (D)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Norfolk	\$115,864	No	Yes

I = Incumbent D = Democrat R = Republican

*A table of campaign finance activity by all House candidates is available by [clicking here](#).*