# PERC-WV

# West Virginia People's Election Reform Coalition

Report on Campaign Contributions to Legislative Candidates During the 2004 Election Cycle

PERC-WV is a joint project of:

Mountain State Education and Research Foundation
Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition
West Virginia Citizen Action Group

### **Table of Contents**

Acknowledgements and Credits	2
About the People's Election Reform Coalition	3
Forward	4-5
Terminology	6
Overview and Methodology	7
Executive Summary	8-10
Reflections and Recommendations	11-14
Analysis of 2004 Legislative Races	15-24
Sources of Campaign Contributions to Legislative Candidates	16
Special Interest Contributions to Legislative Candidates	17
Distribution of Special Interest Contributions to	
Legislative Candidates	18
Special Interest Contributions to Legislative Candidates	
by Amount	19
Sources of Campaign Contributions to Legislators	20
Special Interest Contributions to Legislators	21
Special Interest Contributions to Senators	22
Special Interest Contributions to Delegates	23
Biggest and Most Frequent Contributors	24
Indexes to Legislative Candidates	25-62
Key to Candidate Indexes	26
Defining Special Interest Blocks	27
Index to Senate Candidates	28-32
Index to House Candidates	33-62

#### **Acknowledgements and Credits**

The compilation of the PERC-WV database and the preparation of this report would not have been possible without the generous support and contributions from our funders and individual organizations' in-kind support.

#### Funders and In-Kind Support:

The Piper Fund
The Proteus Fund
The Deer Creek Foundation
The National Institute on Money in State Politics

#### This report was produced by:

Mountain State Education and Research Foundation P. O. Box 5517 Charleston, WV 25361 www.mserf.org

> Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition P. O. Box 6753 Huntington, WV 25773 304-522-0246 www.ohvec.org

West Virginia Citizen Action Group 1500 Dixie Street Charleston, WV 25311 304-346-5891 www.wvcag.org

Julie Archer, Editor

#### **About The WV People's Election Reform Coalition**

The West Virginia People's Election Reform Coalition (PERC-WV) is a joint project of the Mountain State Education and Research Foundation (MSERF), the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition (OVEC) and the WV Citizen Action Group (WV-CAG).

By maintaining a database of special interest contributions to political campaigns, tracking significant bills in the legislature, and issuing reports on our research, PERC-WV educates the public on the significant influence that special interest money plays in West Virginia politics. PERC-WV underscores problems and proposes solutions based on its research.

People across the political spectrum agree that special interest money dominates West Virginia politics, affecting everyone's issues. By focusing attention on the source of this campaign cash, PERC-WV encourages changes that can help shift the balance of power from the special interests to the public interest.

#### **Foreword**

In a democracy, every person should have an equal right to participate in our political system—regardless of race, color, creed, gender or economic status. Yet, it is increasingly difficult for an ordinary citizen to effectively participate in our democracy, either to be elected to public office or to be heard above moneyed special interests that finance election campaigns.

During the 2004 election, candidates for the state legislature collectively raised over \$6 million for their campaigns. These contributions came from a variety of sources, but the majority, 63%, came from a relatively small number of special interest contributors<sup>1</sup> seeking to influence public policy. As the cost of political campaigns continues to rise<sup>2</sup>, the concerns of ordinary citizens are overshadowed by the financial clout of these special interest groups. The average West Virginian is left feeling disenfranchised and powerless to effect change in government.

A recent report in *the West Virginia Public Affairs Reporter* revealed some alarming statistics about West Virginians' opinions of state and local government. According to the report, "large percentages of West Virginians (38.2%) are still convinced that the state Legislature is controlled by special interest [lobbyists]. 57.2% of West Virginians believe the state is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, and that state government can only sometimes (58.6%) or almost never (13.2%) be trusted to do what is right." While the latest survey, conducted in 2005, shows that West Virginians' opinion of state government is improving compared with a similar 1992 survey, there is still room for improvement since only 8.4% of those surveyed thought voters had the most influence over lawmakers.<sup>3</sup>

One way to restore voters' faith in government is to fundamentally change the way we finance election campaigns. The concept of "Clean Elections," a comprehensive approach to campaign finance reform pioneered by Maine and Arizona, is designed to help level the playing field by giving people from many backgrounds a shot at getting elected without relying on special interest groups and lobbyists to help finance their campaigns. If we want a government that takes into account the needs of all its citizens, we have to end the influence of coal companies, pharmaceutical firms, the insurance industry and other special interest groups who foot the bill for getting candidates elected.

The WV Public Campaign Financing Act, under consideration by the West Virginia legislature since 2002, would establish a constitutional alternative to special interest driven campaigns by providing full public financing to qualified candidates who agree to limit their spending and reject contributions from private sources. This "clean money" option would

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> PERC-WV estimates that less than one half of one percent of all voting age West Virginians contributed to a legislative campaign in 2004.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Since 1996, when PERC-WV began monitoring campaign finance in West Virginia, the median contributions to a winning candidate for the state legislature have nearly doubled from \$12,795 to \$25,297 in 2004.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Thomas K. Bias, et al., "Citizen Evaluations of West Virginia Government: Stability and Change, 1992 to 2005," *the West Virginia Public Affairs Reporter*, Vol. 23, No 1, April 2006 <a href="http://www.polsci.wvu.edu/ipa/par/reporter23\_1.pdf">http://www.polsci.wvu.edu/ipa/par/reporter23\_1.pdf</a>>.

reduce candidate reliance on special interest money and enable those who lack personal wealth or access to wealthy contributors to run a competitive campaign – paving the way for ordinary citizens to have a greater voice in the political process, both as candidates and contributors.

At least six states have already adopted full public financing for some or all state offices, and several others are considering similar legislation. In Maine and Arizona, the nation's first Clean Election states, this reform is making a difference in legislative outcomes.

For example, Maine passed a progressive health care initiative that enables all but its wealthiest families to purchase prescription drugs on the Medicaid list for the Medicaid price, saving as much as 60% off market prices.

In Arizona, a bipartisan coalition of legislators enacted a state budget that guaranteed all-day kindergarten for more than 150 of the state's poorest schools, raised subsidies to community colleges and provided financial help to thousands of working families in need of childcare—provisions long opposed by top lawmakers.<sup>4</sup>

By eliminating the need for traditional fundraising, Clean Elections allows legislators to focus more time on issues and constituent service and is a sensible (and cost-effective<sup>5</sup>) approach to changing the status quo and moving toward a government that is more honest, open and accountable to the needs of all its citizens, not just a select few who can afford to make big contributions to candidates.

For more information on Clean Elections in West Virginia visit www.wvoter-owned.org or call Citizens for Clean Elections at 304-522-0246.

<www.publicampaign.org>. AAHH! is an occasional e-mail bulletin published by Public Campaign. This AAHH! was a compilation of AAHH! #8 and AAHH! #9, <a href="http://www.publicampaign.org/publications/aahh/index.htm">http://www.publicampaign.org/publications/aahh/index.htm</a>.

Clean Elections program in West Virginia would cost less than \$3 annually per state resident.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>AAHH! The Clean Money News Keeps Getting Better, a fact sheet published by Public Campaign,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Based on the number of candidates who ran for state Senate and House of Delegates in 2002 and candidate participation rates in Maine and Arizona, under the terms of the proposed "WV Public Campaign Financing Act," <a href="http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\_Text\_HTML/2006\_SESSIONS/RS/BILLS/sb124%20intr.htm">http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\_Text\_HTML/2006\_SESSIONS/RS/BILLS/sb124%20intr.htm</a>, PERC-WV estimates a

#### **Terminology**

For the purposes of this report the following definitions apply:

- "Business lobbyists" refers to lobbyists who have multiple clients with different business or "special interest" affiliations. Lobbyists who represent one "special interest group" exclusively are identified with that perspective "special interest group."
- "Identified special interest contributions" reflect the total donations received by candidates from special interest groups.
- "Other business" refers to members of the business community who do not fall under one of the other specific interest groups used by PERC. This interest group includes, but is not limited to: retailers, wholesalers and funeral home directors (and their various trade organizations).
- "Other lawyers" refers to lawyers who could not be identified as either a consumer (trial) lawyer or a corporate lawyer.
- A "political action committee" or "PAC" is any entity (a corporation, labor union, political party or other organization) that collects funds from its employees or members to redistribute in the form of campaign contributions. PACs are required by law to keep accounts and file regular financial statements with the Secretary of State and/or the Federal Election Commission (FEC).
- "Social issues" include all individual or organizational contributors affiliated with issues such as gun control and choice, among others.
- A "special interest block" is an assemblage of special interest groups that unite to advocate for, or oppose, specific legislation.
- A "**special interest group**" is a unique interest or business affiliation. PERC-WV uses 34 special interest groups to identify contributors.
- "Tort reform" is any effort by health care providers, the insurance industry and members of the business community to place limits on malpractice and product liability.
- "**Total contributions**" are the aggregate of all contributions a candidate(s) raises or receives from all sources during an election cycle.
- "Unidentified contributions" are campaign donations from contributors whose occupation or business interest is not known. Other sources of campaign income that are considered unidentified include interest income and refunds.

#### **Overview and Methodology**

This report provides West Virginians with a quantitative summary of campaign contributions made in the 2004 election cycle to legislative candidates, with special focus on legislators. The raw data compiled for this report were obtained from the candidates' own financial reports filed with the Secretary of State and provided to PERC-WV by the National Institute on Money in State Politics (www.followthemoney.org).

Unless otherwise noted, the percentages given are based on "identified special interest contributions," although in some instances percentages are based on "total contributions." PERC-WV uses 36 different categories to identify the origin of contributions. Although contributions carried over from previous campaigns or from political parties, other candidates, and candidates and their family members come from "identified" sources, they are not considered "special interest" contributions for purposes of this report.

By law, candidates must identify donors who give more than \$250 by name, address, occupation and employer. Donors who contribute \$250 or less can be identified by name only. However, many contributors who give over \$250 are often not identified and ascertaining their business interests is sometimes impossible.

Candidates list the occupation of their donors in a variety of ways. Some are very specific, listing not only the name of the employer, but also the industry represented. Others list very generic terms such as "businessman," "housewife" or "retired." Still others ignore the occupation requirement altogether. Such practices account for many of the "unidentified contributions."

PERC-WV researchers discovered a variety of reasons candidates use generic terms. Sometimes, candidates are simply careless or ignorant about either the donor's occupation or state election laws. However, the terms "housewife" or "businessman" often describe people motivated by or affiliated with major special interests. Over the past five election cycles, this has been noted with contributors affiliated with gambling and amusement interests, garbage and solid waste collectors, and the coal industry.

A variety of resources were employed in determining contributors' special interest relationships. PERC-WV databases for the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2002 election cycles were used as well as professional rosters, phone books and direct contacts with the candidates. Volunteers from around the state also helped identify contributors. These efforts identified 92% of all contributions to legislative candidates.

PERC-WV researchers also developed four "special interest blocks" to further depict a broader influence. It is important to note that these special interest categories are somewhat subjective. Because some special interests are members of more than one block, total percentages may exceed 100%.

#### **Executive Summary**

- In 2004, candidates for the West Virginia legislature raised over \$6 million for their campaigns. 63% of those contributions came from special interest groups, another 13% came from the candidates or their family members, 11% of funds were carried over from previous campaigns, and contributions from other candidates and political parties accounted for 4%. 9% of contributions were not attributable to one of the 36 categories PERC-WV uses to identify contributors.
- Our electoral system continues to be financed by a select few. PERC-WV
  estimates that less than one half of one percent of all voting age West Virginians
  contributed to a legislative campaign in 2004.
- Incumbents have a significant advantage in elections, especially when it comes to raising money. Incumbents received 72% of all special interest contributions to legislative candidates, 22% went to challengers and 6% to candidates for open seats<sup>6</sup>. Incumbents won 83% of all contested legislative seats. Out of 109 incumbents running, only 13 failed to get re-elected.
- 76% of special interest contributions went to candidates who won, while the
  distribution of special interest contributions to Democrat and Republican
  candidates was 70% and 30% respectively. The handful of third party and
  independent candidates who ran for the legislature raised little or no money and
  many were largely self-financed.
- 39% of all special interest contributions to legislative candidates were over \$750.
   Another 2% of contributions were in excess of \$500. Only 8% of special interest contributions to legislative candidates came in increments of \$100 or less.
- Candidates and their family members were the largest single source of campaign funding, contributing over \$800,000, or 13% of all identified contributions.
   However, for winning candidates, money carried from previous campaigns made up a bigger portion (14% or \$633,591) of overall funding than self and family members (8% or \$379,737).
- At nearly \$600,000, contributions from health care providers were the biggest source of special interest campaign funding for legislative candidates, whether they were elected or not. The majority (\$528,198) of health care dollars went to winning candidates, accounting for 18% of their identified special interest contributions.
- Individual contributors and PACs each accounted for roughly half of all special interest contributions to legislators in 2004, contributing \$1,446,514 and \$1,567,487 respectively. However, individual contributors played a more

8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Vacant seats in multi-member House districts where one or more incumbents were seeking re-election were not considered open seats.

- significant role in Senate races, while PACs accounted for the majority of contributions in House races. Senators received 61% of their contributions from individuals and 39% from PACS. Among Delegates, the ratio was reversed.
- Labor was the largest source of PAC contributions to legislative candidates, and the second largest source of special interest funding. Of the \$499,865 that labor contributed to legislative candidates, 99% came from PACs. Although labor is a powerful political force and an active contributor to political campaigns, in 2004, it was outspent by the business sector nearly six times.
- More than half of all special interest contributions to legislative candidates came from four special interest groups – health care, labor, coal and consumer (trial) lawyers.
- Nearly all of the top ten special interest groups contributing the most in 2004 health care, labor, coal, consumer (trial) lawyers, banking & finance, real estate & construction, education, gambling, oil & gas and insurance were involved in major legislative battles or had key issues before the legislature in either a regular or special session in 2005 or 2006. Some of these issues included medical malpractice reform and the creation of the physicians' mutual; the privatization of workers' compensation; changes in severance taxes; efforts to eliminate third party bad faith lawsuits, joint and several liability and other "tort reform" measures; and the bond initiative to wipe out the pension debt for teachers' and other state workers' retirement funds.
- Of the top ten individual contributors to legislative winners, four were trial lawyers, four were affiliated with gambling and two with the coal industry.
   Contributions from the four affiliated with gambling accounted for nearly 50% of all gambling contributions to legislators.
- House Speaker Bob Kiss (D-Raleigh) received the most contributions of all House candidates. Kiss raised \$188,097 and carried over an additional \$103,269 from previous campaigns. He returned over \$162,000 raised by an exploratory committee he formed to gauge support for running for a seat on the WV Supreme Court of Appeals.
- Senate President Earl Ray Tomblin (D-Logan) was the most successful fundraiser of all Senate candidates. Tomblin's contributions totaled \$353,515.
   Nearly half (\$176,251) was carried over from previous campaigns. Although Tomblin received the most contributions he did not make the top ten in expenditures.
- In most legislative races the candidate who raises and spends the most money wins. The only notable exception in 2004 was the race between former Senate Transportation Chairman Mike Ross (D-Randolph) and political newcomer Clark Barnes (R). Ross raised (\$247,731) and spent (\$241,649) more than three times as much as Barnes, who raised and spent \$73,221.

- Candidates who spent the most money in their district won 78% (85 out of 109) of all contested seats for the legislature. Overall, legislative candidates spent more than \$4.7 million in 2004. Senate candidates spent \$1,890,725, and House candidates spent \$2,909,090.
- Although the race between Ross and Barnes was the most expensive Senate race of 2004, contributions to Senate Minority Leader Vic Sprouse (R-Kanawha) and his Democratic opponent, former Supreme Court Justice Margaret Workman (D), exceeded \$400,000. Sprouse raised \$291,272 to Workman's \$143,133. Sprouse and Workman spent \$200,272 and \$141,420 respectively.
- Contributions and expenditures in House of Delegates races tend to be highest in multi-member districts. In the 5-person, 27<sup>th</sup> district, the 10 candidates on the ballot in the general election raised nearly half a million dollars collectively. That race included four of the top ten fundraisers among House candidates, including House Speaker Bob Kiss (D) (\$188,09), Delegates Sally Susman (D-Raleigh) (\$102,729) and Virginia Mahan (D-Summers) (\$56,928), and Robert Pulliam (R) (\$72,913), who lost the election. Susman (\$99,811), Pulliam (\$72,713), and Kiss (\$70,999) were among the top five House candidates who spent the most during the 2004 election. Candidates in Kanawha County's 30<sup>th</sup> district raised \$440,866 collectively. Delegate Mark Hunt (D) was the top fundraiser in that race (\$133,221), as well as the biggest spender among all House candidates (\$132,378).
- The most expensive single-member district race was in the 57<sup>th</sup> district between Delegate John Doyle (D-Jefferson) and his Republican opponent Bob Murto. Doyle raised \$35,315 to Murto's \$14,394. Doyle and Murto spent \$32,906 and \$13,274 respectively. The 58<sup>th</sup> district race was a close second, with Delegate Locke Wysong (D-Jefferson) and Suzanne Morgan (R) each raising around \$20,000, but Wysong outspending Morgan by \$3,908. Both districts are in the state's eastern panhandle.

#### **Reflections and Recommendations**

The deeper one looks into the money chase that has become our electoral process, the more one finds the need for reform. Nearly ten years have passed since PERC-WV began tracking and reporting on campaign finance. In each of our reports, we have made recommendations on how to best reduce the influence of money in West Virginia politics. While some areas of concern discussed in previous reports have improved, others still need to be addressed. Our recommendations for 2004 are to address the lingering concerns outlined below, and adopt Clean Elections in West Virginia.

**1996 Suggestion:** Increase funding for Secretary of State's office in order to more closely monitor campaign filings.

Action to date: Significantly improved. Although perhaps due more to political will to enforce the law than with increased funding, both monitoring of candidates' financial disclosure reports and enforcement of campaign finance laws have significantly improved under Secretary of State Betty Ireland. One of her first official acts was to report candidates and PACs to county prosecutors for failing to file their campaign finance reports. Although state code has long given the Secretary of State this authority, Ireland is the first in recent memory to actually do so. Since taking office Ireland also hired a full-time compliance officer to audit campaign reports, and convinced the legislature to require candidates to keep campaign finance records for six months. While the six-month record-keeping requirement fell short of the two years Ireland initially proposed, it closed a significant loophole in state law that effectively prevented election officials from auditing campaign expenses.

**Recommendation:** While significant improvements have been made since the 2004 election, adequately funding the Secretary of State's Division of Elections to ensure effective oversight and candidate compliance with campaign finance disclosure laws remains a critical need.

**1996 Suggestion:** Require electronic filing of reports by candidates who raise more than \$5,000.

Action to date: Improved. Thanks to former Secretary of State Ken Hechler, the Election Division posts candidates' financial reports on its website (www.wvsos.com/elections/cfreports). This has increased public access immensely. However, scanning and posting is a tedious and time-consuming task for Election Division staff that could be eliminated by electronic filing. Although former Secretary, now Governor, Joe Manchin put in place the first electronic filing system for candidates and Secretary Ireland continues to make improvements to that system, electronic filing of campaign disclosure reports remains voluntary.

**Recommendation:** Mandatory electronic filing by all candidates would streamline the filing and oversight of campaign finance reports, as well as make it easier for the public to know who is financing candidates' campaigns and how candidates are spending the money they raise. With all candidates filing electronically, a searchable on-line database of contributors to West Virginia political campaigns could be developed.

**1996 Suggestion:** Prohibit 'co-mingling' of campaign contributions between candidate committees.

Action to Date: Somewhat improved. Because of PERC-WV research and media coverage, the practice of candidates giving their campaign money to other candidates was closely scrutinized. It was discovered that there was already a law against this practice that had not been enforced. Legislators guickly "fixed" the problem of past noncompliance and now candidates may legally transfer monies from their campaign to another only after an election, when the law allows liquidation of such funds. Candidates now better understand the statutory limitations on campaign fund disbursement. **Recommendation:** More attention needs to be focused on this practice. A loophole still exists where a candidate may indefinitely hold funds in a prior campaign account even after opening a separate account for the next election. Such funds held over in a prior campaign account become "excess funds" which the candidate can then legally distribute to other candidates. The letter of the law is being followed but the intent is violated. House Speaker Bob Kiss has at least three open committees and several former candidates and office holders have open accounts that they use to make campaign donations. Candidates should be required to close out prior campaign accounts when they move into the next election cycle; or additional limitations should placed on the use of excess funds, to prevent candidates from using prior campaign accounts as a personal PAC.

**2000 Suggestion:** Require full disclosure of lobbying activities including compensation paid to lobbyists.

Action to Date: None. After elections, lobbyists begin the flow of money and perks to our lawmakers. How much money is spent by special interests to influence our laws? Lobbyists have to report direct contributions and 'entertainment' given to candidates, but full disclosure by their employers is not required. Under West Virginia's Ethics Act, revamped in 2005, lobbyists now report first-dollar spending on legislators and elected officials. The reformed Ethics Act also gave the state Ethics Commission, under fire for its inability to effectively police ethics violations by public officials and lobbyists, the power to launch its own investigations. Unfortunately, the revised Act failed to address the abuses that initially led calls to overhaul the Act in the first place, scandals involving former Senate Transportation Committee Chairman Mike Ross (D-Randolph) and former House Education Committee Chairman Jerry Mezzatesta (D-Hampshire).

In 2004, Ross voted to give \$750,000 to promote a professional tournament at the Pete Dye Golf and Sporting Club where he owns land. Ross invested nearly \$8 million dollars in the golf course and in exchange, the owner gave Ross and a business partner almost 150 acres at the resort, as well as an interest in some coal property outside the resort. Although Ross lost his 2004 re-election bid, the Ethics Commission ruled that Ross's dealings were not a conflict of interest. In the scandal, Mezzatesta was investigated for violating a 1999 Ethics Commission ruling that allowed him to accept the position of grant administrator for Hampshire County schools provided he did not solicit funds. A second ethics complaint was filed against Mezzatesta for "double-

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> According to the Center for Public Integrity, spending by registered lobbyists in West Virginia totaled \$311,519 in 2004 alone, and \$2,285,203 between 1996 and 2004. These figures DO NOT include lobbyist salaries/compensation. <a href="http://www.publicintegrity.org/docs/hiredguns/9yr">http://www.publicintegrity.org/docs/hiredguns/9yr</a> Spending Chart PDF WEB.pdf>.

dipping" by continuing to draw his salary from Hampshire County schools during legislative sessions. That complaint was dismissed on grounds that nothing in ethics law prohibits "double-dipping" of government salaries. An investigation revealed that Mezzatesta's wife owned a video lottery company that stood to benefit by legalization of gray machines. For the past ten years Mezzatesta led the charge to expand gambling in the state and was the most out-spoken proponent to legalize the gray machines.

Recommendation: West Virginia should adopt a law similar to Maryland's that requires full disclosure by employers. Full disclosure would provide a more accurate picture of what special interests are willing to pay to influence government decision-making. Additionally, legislators should be required to reveal all investment real estate they own, as well as disclose potential conflicts of interest by listing spouse occupations.

**2000 Suggestion:** Require candidates to file at least three reports during the year between election cycles if they raise more than \$5,000.

**Action to Date: None.** Reporting periods for candidates' financial reports during the election year have become shorter and more frequent because of the passage of several PERC-WV backed election bills. However, in the off years between elections, candidates are required to file only one report. This allows a candidate to do a year of fundraising that goes unreported until a few weeks before the primary election. While many candidates do little fundraising during the off year, some candidates raise a substantial amount of their contributions during this time.

**Recommendation:** Require candidates to file at least three reports during the year between election cycles if they raise more than \$5,000.

**2002 Suggestion:** In addition to comprehensive reforms like Clean Elections, West Virginia could consider placing additional limits on contributions to candidate committees. Spending limits could also be considered.

Action to Date: None. During every legislative session since 2003, Senator Truman Chafin has sponsored legislation to raise the limit on individual and PAC contributions to candidates from \$1,000 to \$4,000 per election. Fortunately, the Senate has either defeated or refused to take up this effort. Although several states allow unlimited contributions from individuals to candidates, many have limits similar to West Virginia, and at least a dozen states have even lower limits.8 While no state has mandatoryspending limits, Vermont passed a comprehensive reform initiative in 1997 that featured public financing and strict limits on contributions from political parties, PACs and individuals (perhaps the lowest in the nation), as well as imposed strict spending limits on privately financed candidates. The spending and contribution limits were challenged, but upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second District, which ruled that Vermont established two compelling governmental interests that justify its campaign spending limits: preventing the reality and appearance of corruption, and protecting the time of candidates and elected officials from the burdens of endless fundraising. On June 26, 2006, however, the U. S. Supreme Court overturned the Second District ruling. The high court said that Vermont's limits on how much a candidate could spend violated

13

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See <a href="http://www.fec.gov/pubrec/cfl/cfl00/cfl00chart2a.html">http://www.fec.gov/pubrec/cfl/cfl00/cfl00chart2a.html</a> for a summary of contribution and solicitation limits in the states.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> National Voting Rights Institute website, Campaign Spending Limits in the U.S. Supreme Court, <a href="http://www.nvri.org/campaignspending/index.html">http://www.nvri.org/campaignspending/index.html</a>>.

the landmark 1976 *Buckley v. Valeo* ruling, which equated such spending with free speech, and said that its limits on donations to a campaign were too stringent. <sup>10</sup> **Recommendation:** Given the Supreme Court's ruling upholding *Buckley v. Valeo*, imposing spending limits on candidates is not an option. However, we can establish a system that provides full public financing to candidates who are willing to reject private funding and *voluntarily* agree to spending limits in exchange for receiving public funds. Legislation creating a public financing system could also include lower contribution limits for non-participating or traditionally funded candidates. Both Maine and Arizona incorporated lower contribution limits into their Clean Election laws<sup>11</sup>. Such reforms would be complementary to the "527" legislation adopted by the legislature in 2005 requiring that 527 groups register with and disclose their contibutors to the Secretary of State's office. This reform was fueled by public outcy over the millions of dollars spent on negative political advertising, disguised as "issue advocacy", during the state's 2004 Supreme Court race<sup>12</sup>.

\_


<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Neil A. Lewis, "Justices Block Vermont Campaign Finance Law," the New York Times, June 26, 2006.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Marc Breslow, et al., "Revitalizing Democracy: Clean Election Reform Shows the Way Forward," a publication of the Money and Politics Implementation Project and Northeast Action, <a href="http://www.neaction.org/revitalizingdemocracy.pdf">http://www.neaction.org/revitalizingdemocracy.pdf</a>>.

West Virginia's contest earned national notoriety for its negativity, according to a report from the Justice at Stake Campaign and its partners, the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and the Institute for Money in State Politics (see Deborah Goldberg, et al., "The New Politics of Judicial Elections 2004: How Special Interest Pressure on Our Courts Has Reached a 'Tipping Point' – and How to Keep Our Courts Fair and Impartial," Justice at Stake, <a href="http://www.justiceatstake.org/files/NewPoliticsReport2004.pdf">http://www.justiceatstake.org/files/NewPoliticsReport2004.pdf</a>). Independent groups poured millions into the race. One group, And for the Sake of the Kids, was largely funded by Massey Energy CEO Don Blankenship. Blankenship donated \$2.4 million of the \$3.6 million And for the Sake of the Kids reported raising in its filings with the Internal Revenue Service.


# PERC-WV Analysis of 2004 Legislative Races

#### Sources of Campaign Contributions to Legislative Candidates in 2004



	Senate Candidates	House Candidates	All Legislative Candidates	% of Total Contributions
Total Identified Special Interest Contributions	\$1,661,791	\$2,300,395	\$3,962,186	63%
Carry Over from				
Previous Campaigns	\$268,929	\$420,283	\$689,212	11%
Other Candidates	\$81,939	\$110,216	\$192,155	3%
Political Party	\$16,380	\$36,829	\$53,209	1%
Self & Family	\$252,827	\$563,988	\$816,815	13%
Unidentified				
Contributions	\$225,924	\$307,806	\$533,730	9%
Total Contributions	\$2,507,790	\$3,739,517	\$6,247,307	

#### Special Interest Contributions to Legislative Candidates in 2004




Special Interest Group	Senate Candidates	House Candidates	Legislative Total	% of Identified Special Interest Contributions
Health Care	\$284,477	\$313,874	\$598,351	15%
Labor	\$115,580	\$384,285	\$499,865	13%
Coal	\$228,137	\$240,314	\$468,451	12%
Consumer Lawyers	\$133,413	\$323,001	\$456,414	12%
Banking & Finance	\$85,145	\$121,844	\$206,989	5%
Education	\$52,030	\$135,535	\$187,565	5%
Real Estate & Construction	\$87,180	\$86,000	\$173,180	4%
Oil & Gas	\$68,540	\$82,470	\$151,010	4%
Gambling	\$88,055	\$60,568	\$148,623	4%
All Other Business Interests <sup>13</sup>	\$496,805	\$522,379	\$1,019,184	25%
All Other Interests <sup>14</sup>	\$22,429	\$30,125	\$52,554	1%
Total Identified Special		•		
Interest Contributions	\$1,661,791	\$2,300,395	\$3,962,186	

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> All Other Business Interests includes the following special interest groups: Agriculture, Beverage, Business Lobbyists, Chemicals & Manufacturing, Communications & High Tech, Corporate Lawyers, Electric Power, Insurance, Other Business, Other Lawyers, Prescription Drugs, Railroad, Solid Waste, Timber, Tobacco, Tourism and Transportation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> All Other Interests includes: Environment, Public Employees, Religion and Social Issues.


# Distribution of Special Interest Contributions to Legislative Candidates in 2004



	Senate	House	
	<b>Candidates</b>	<b>Candidates</b>	Total
Incumbents (S15/H87) <sup>15</sup>	\$1,159,273	\$1,686,329	\$2,845,601
Challengers (S18/H103)	\$321,897	\$546,893	\$868,790
Candidates for Open Seats (S2/H6)	\$180,621	\$67,174	\$247,794
Winning Candidates	\$1,206,051	\$1,807,951	\$3,014,002
Losing Candidates	\$455,740	\$492,444	\$948,184
Democrats	\$1,025,274	\$1,757,959	\$2,783,233
Republicans	\$636,518	\$542,435	\$1,178,953


 $^{15}$  Indicates the number of Senate and House candidates respectively that fall into each category.

#### **Special Interest Contributions to Legislative Candidates by Amount**




Contribution Range	Senate Candidates	House Candidates	Total
\$751 to \$1,000	\$808,053	\$765,048	\$1,573,101
\$500 to \$750	\$32,403	\$48,765	\$81,168
\$251 to \$500	\$459,885	\$679,654	\$1,139,539
\$101 to \$250	\$258,075	\$597,058	\$855,133
\$100 or Less	\$103,375	\$209,870	\$313,245

#### Sources of Campaign Contributions to Legislators in 2004



	Senators	Delegates	Legislative Total	% of Total Contributions
Total Identified Special Interest Contributions	\$1,206,051	\$1,807,951	\$3,014,002	66%
Carry Over from Previous				
Campaigns	\$226,923	\$406,668	\$633,591	14%
Other Candidates	\$54,684	\$78,475	\$133,158	3%
Political Party	\$8,330	\$15,470	\$23,800	1%
Self & Family	\$86,950	\$292,787	\$379,737	8%
Unidentified				
Contributions	\$150,719	\$199,829	\$350,548	8%
Total Contributions	\$1,733,656	\$2,801,180	\$4,534,836	

#### **Special Interest Contributions to Legislators in 2004**



				Special Interest
Special Interest Group	Senators	Delegates	Legislative Total	Contributions
Healthcare	\$257,247	\$270,951	\$528,198	18%
Labor	\$60,295	\$280,310	\$340,605	11%
Coal	\$160,533	\$138,779	\$299,312	10%
Consumer Lawyers	\$37,269	\$248,955	\$286,224	9%
Banking & Finance	\$66,601	\$107,360	\$173,961	6%
Real Estate &Construction	\$79,150	\$68,595	\$147,745	5%
Education	\$32,970	\$98,193	\$131,163	4%
Gambling	\$72,980	\$56,518	\$129,498	4%
Oil & Gas	\$49,340	\$73,250	\$122,590	4%
All Other Business Interests <sup>16</sup>	\$372,643	\$444,401	\$817,044	28%
All Other Interests <sup>17</sup>	\$17,024	\$20,639	\$37,663	1%
Total Identified Special				
Interest Contributions	\$1,206,051	\$1,807,951	\$3,014,002	

% of Identified

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> All Other Business Interests includes the following special interest groups: Agriculture, Beverage, Business Lobbyists, Chemicals & Manufacturing, Communications & High Tech, Corporate Lawyers, Electric Power, Insurance, Other Business, Other Lawyers, Prescription Drugs, Railroad, Solid Waste, Timber, Tobacco, Tourism and Transportation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> All Other Interests includes: Environment, Public Employees, Religion and Social Issues.

#### **Special Interest Contributions to Senators in 2004**

Special Interest Group	Special Interest	Contributions from Individuals		PAC Contributions	% from PACs
Agriculture	\$4,725	\$725		\$4,000	85%
Banking & Finance	\$66,601	\$28,701	43%	\$37,900	57%
Beverage	\$39,150			\$25,950	66%
Business Lobbyists	\$27,845			\$500	2%
Chemicals & Manufacturing	\$29,675	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	40%	\$17,950	60%
Coal	\$160,533			\$30,650	19%
Communications & High Tech	\$7,650		100%	\$0	-
Consumer Lawyers	\$37,269	•	72%	\$10,500	28%
Corporate Lawyers	\$45,215	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	54%	\$21,000	46%
Education	\$32,970			\$24,950	76%
Electric Power	\$11,075			\$9,700	88%
Environment	\$600	• •	33%	\$400	67%
Gambling	\$72,980	\$64,080	88%	\$8,900	12%
Health Care	\$257,247			\$80,825	31%
Insurance	\$43,846			\$29,250	67%
Labor	\$60,295	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		\$59,225	98%
Oil & Gas	\$49,340	•		\$24,300	49%
Other Business	\$49,837			\$7,600	15%
Other Lawyers	\$13,280		100%	\$0	-
Prescription Drugs	\$30,145		26%	\$22,400	74%
Public Employees	\$10,109	•		\$0	-
Railroad	\$1,900	\$300	16%	\$1,600	84%
Real Estate & Construction	\$79,150	\$64,780	82%	\$14,370	18%
Religion	\$555	\$555	100%	\$0	-
Social Issues	\$5,760	\$1,860	32%	\$3,900	68%
Solid Waste	\$1,500	\$1,500	100%	\$0	-
Timber	\$10,950	\$6,050	55%	\$4,900	45%
Tobacco	\$24,800	\$8,900	36%	\$15,900	64%
Tourism	\$4,050	\$1,550	38%	\$2,500	62%
Transportation	\$26,999	\$17,449	65%	\$9,550	35%
Total Identified Special					
Interest Contributions	\$1,206,051	\$737,331	61%	\$468,720	39%

#### **Special Interest Contributions to Delegates in 2004**

Special Interest Group	Special Interest	Contributions from Individuals	% from	PAC Contributions	% from PACs
Agriculture	\$8,955	\$2,005	22%	\$6,950	78%
Banking & Finance	\$107,360	\$25,760	24%	\$81,600	76%
Beverage	\$50,407	\$9,365	19%	\$41,042	81%
Business Lobbyists	\$30,407 \$22,715	\$22,715	100%	\$0	-
Chemicals & Manufacturing	\$46,165	\$10,555	23%	\$35,611	77%
Coal	\$138,779	\$85,179	61%	\$53,600	39%
Communications & High Tech	\$4,985	\$4,985	100%	\$55,600 \$0	39 /0
Consumer Lawyers	\$248,955	\$190,205	76%	\$58,750	- 24%
•	. ,	\$25,925	53%	\$23,450	47%
Corporate Lawyers Education	\$49,375		53% 5%		47% 95%
	\$98,193	\$5,195		\$92,998	
Electric Power	\$15,825	\$550		\$15,275	97%
Environment	\$1,255	\$755	60%	\$500	40%
Gambling	\$56,518	\$44,318	78%	\$12,200	22%
Health Care	\$270,951	\$113,351	42%	\$157,600	58%
Insurance	\$51,425			\$43,650	85%
Labor	\$280,310	\$1,880	1%	\$278,430	99%
Oil & Gas	\$73,250	\$12,500	17%	\$60,750	83%
Other Business	\$30,552	\$22,477	74%	\$8,075	26%
Other Lawyers	\$52,312	\$52,312	100%	\$0	-
Prescription Drugs	\$37,037	\$4,050	11%	\$32,987	89%
Public Employees	\$5,643	\$5,643	100%	\$0	-
Railroad	\$3,625	\$975	27%	\$2,650	73%
Real Estate & Construction	\$68,595	\$33,995	50%	\$34,600	50%
Religion	\$160	\$160	100%	\$0	-
Social Issues	\$13,581	\$7,031	52%	\$6,550	48%
Solid Waste	\$3,470	\$3,470	100%	\$0	-
Timber	\$10,944	\$4,194	38%	\$6,750	62%
Tobacco	\$19,100	\$7,100	37%	\$12,000	63%
Tourism	\$2,750	\$350	13%	\$2,400	87%
Transportation	\$34,760	\$4,410	13%	\$30,350	87%
Total Identified Special					
Interest Contributions	\$1,807,951	\$709,183	39%	\$1,098,767	61%

#### **Individuals Contributing the Most to Legislators in 2004**

Contributor	<b>Total Contributions</b>	# of Contributions	Affiliation
Marvin Masters	\$47,000	50	Trial Lawyer
James & Linda Bordas	\$33,000	34	Trial Lawyer
William Bright	\$22,700	58	Coal
Edson Arneault	\$19,000	37	Gambling
Jeremy Jacobs	\$17,000	40	Gambling
Don Blankenship	\$14,500	17	Coal
Herbert & Suzanne Tyner	\$13,500	27	Gambling
C. Michael Bee	\$13,250	45	Trial Lawyer
Scott & Kathy Ann Blass	\$13,000	14	Trial Lawyer
Bernard Lee Hartman	\$12,750	25	Gambling

#### Political Action Committees Contributing the Most to Legislators in 2004

Political Action Committee	<b>Total Contributions</b>	Affiliation
WV Hospital Association PAC (HOSPAC)	\$74,350	Heath Care
WV LAW PAC	\$69,250	Consumer (Trial) Lawyers
WV Federation of Teachers (WV-AFT)	\$69,250	Education
WV Bankers Association PAC	\$57,900	Banking & Finance
WV Building & Construction Trades Council (BAC PAC)	\$55,250	Labor
WV Laborers District Council PAC	\$53,000	Labor
WV State Medical Association PAC (WESPAC)	\$42,350	Health Care
Coca-Cola Employees Good Gov't Committee	\$39,992	Beverage
WV Regional Council of Carpenters PAC	\$39,500	Labor
WV Auto & Truck Dealers Association PAC (CAR PAC)	\$37,100	Transportation
WV Education Association (WVEA) PAC	\$37,050	Education

#### Political Action Committees Contributing the Most Frequently to Legislators in 2004

Political Action Committee	# of Contributions	Affiliation
WV Hospital Association PAC (HOSPAC)	176	Health Care
WV Association of Community Bankers PAC	145	Banking & Finance
WV Bankers Association PAC	140	Banking & Finance
WV Auto & Truck Dealers Association PAC (CAR PAC)	130	Transportation
Chiropractors Independent Political Committee	116	Health Care
West Virginians for Coal PAC	114	Coal
Jackson & Kelly State Legislative PAC	114	Corporate Lawyers
WV Contractors Association PAC (HUBPAC)	112	Construction
WV LAW PAC	107	Consumer (Trial) Lawyers
WV Federation of Teachers	105	Education
WV Education Association (WVEA) PAC	100	Education
WV Chamber of Commerce PAC	100	WV Chamber of Commerce

# PERC-WV Indexes to Legislative Candidates

#### **Key to Legislative Candidate Indexes**

"Candidate Indexes" at the end of this report provide details on the sources individual legislative candidates relied upon to fund their 2004 campaigns. These tables include all general election candidates with separate tables for state Senate and House of Delegates candidates. Candidates are grouped by district for easy comparison. Italics indicate that race's incumbent. If none is identified, he or she either lost the primary election or the race was for an open seat. Each candidate's party is noted in parentheses. An asterisk indicates candidates defeated in the general election.

Total contributions raised and reported by each candidate are listed, followed by the amount and percentage from previous campaigns, other candidates, contributors associated with a candidate's political party, candidates and their family members, and "identified special interests." A percentage or dollar amount in bold indicates a candidate was in the top five for state Senate candidates, or top ten for House candidates, in that perspective category. Additional numbers may appear in bold if candidates are "tied" for a position.

The "Candidate Indexes" show the amount and percentage of "identified special interest contributions" came from selected "special interest groups." Although PERC-WV uses 30 special interest groups to identify contributors, only half of them are included in the "indexes." The majority of special interest groups chosen for inclusion were among the top ten contributing the most to legislative candidates during one or more of the last five election cycles (1996-2004). Other special interest groups were selected because they contributed significantly more to candidates in 2004 than during the previous election, while others were included simply for their relevance or close relationship to another special interest group(s).

Amounts and percentages are also given for the amount of a candidate's special interest contributions from individual contributors versus political action committees, or PACs. The portion of a candidate's contributions from small and large contributions is shown and broken into five categories. Although all are considered "special interest contributions," those of \$100 or less are more likely from "average" citizens, while those of more than \$500 tend to come from contributors representing special interest groups. Amounts and percentages from four "special interest blocks", defined on the following page, are also listed.

Candidates' reported expenditures and ending balances are listed. Figures cited in these categories are taken from candidate reports filed with the Secretary of State's office. PERC-WV did not audit expenditure reporting. A candidate's reported expenditures may exceed his or her total contributions, usually a case of loan repayments being deducted from contributions but still counted as expenditures. However, some discrepancies are the result of math errors affecting total contributions.

Finally, the number of votes each candidate received is noted and is used to calculate the amount of money raised and spent per vote.

#### **Defining Special Interest Blocks**

Special interest groups often unite to advocate for, or oppose, specific legislation. PERC-WV identified four "special interest blocks," described below, that are currently active on issues at the legislature. PERC-WV lists the amount and percentage of identified contributions each legislator received from these four blocks: "tort reform" advocates; special interests typically opposing increased environmental protection; special interests typically opposing increased taxes on alcohol, tobacco and gambling; and "progressive" special interests. Since some special interest groups are members of more than one block, total percentages may exceed 100%.

#### "Tort Reform" Advocates

A perennial legislative issue is some form of "tort reform." Advocates for tort reform include virtually all members of the **business community, health care providers and corporate lawyers** who are seeking to put a limit on liabilities of manufacturers and the medical profession. The tort reform percentage assigned to each legislator reflects the percentage of identified contributions from these donors.

### Special Interests Typically Opposed to Increased Environmental Protection ("Polluter" Block)

This block is comprised of regulated industries that typically oppose strengthening environmental regulation and enforcement. These groups include agriculture, chemical and manufacturing, coal, electric power, oil and gas, real estate and construction, solid waste, timber, transportation (automotive), and the corporate lawyers and lobbyists who represent these interests.

## Special Interests Typically Opposed to Increased Taxes on Alcohol, Tobacco and Gambling ("Anti-Sin Tax" Block)

Increased taxation of **alcohol**, **tobacco and gambling** is a common legislative issue. Each of these special interests opposes the general concept of "sin taxes" and often work with each other to defeat proposals for increased taxes and regulations. The "anti-sin tax" percentage assigned to each legislator is the percentage of identified contributions coming from the alcohol (beverage), tobacco and gambling interest groups.

#### "Progressive" Special Interest Groups

Organized labor, education organizations, trial (consumer) lawyers, environmentalists and social justice advocates often align themselves on the same issues. This block tends to support common political candidates as well.

#### Index to Senate Candidates<sup>18</sup>

				mount and Pe	om	Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest Contributions from			
D:	0	Total		Other	Political	0.16.0.5	Identified		D40
District		Contributions		Candidates	Party		Special Interests	Individuals	PACs
1	HUTCHINS, TAL (D)*	\$61,462		\$915 1%	\$100 < 1%	<b>\$17,400</b> 28%	\$37,430 61%	\$28,280 76%	\$9,150 24%
	MCKENZIE, ANDY (R)	\$91,979	· ·	\$0 -	<b>\$1,300</b> 1%	\$100 <1%	\$77,715 84%	\$49,615 64%	\$28,100 36%
2	KESSLER, JEFFREY V (D)	\$62,195		\$3,150 5%	\$200 < 1%	\$100 <1%	\$56,650 <b>91%</b>	\$16,300 29%	\$40,350 71%
3	SNYDER, RUSS (R)*	\$3,248			\$1,800 55%	\$333 10%	\$100 3%	\$100 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
3	BOLEY, DONNA J (R)	\$5,675	·	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$5,675 <b>100%</b>	\$600 11%	\$5,075 <b>89%</b>
4	FACEMYER, KAREN (R)	\$99,021	\$1,946 2%	\$1,950 2%	\$850 1%	\$1,265 1%	<b>\$82,865</b> 84%	\$42,965 52%	<b>\$39,900</b> 48%
	MULLINS, DAVID (D)*	\$39,958		\$1,250 3%	\$800 2%	\$2,338 6%	\$30,855 77%	\$7,405 24%	\$23,450 <b>76%</b>
5	HALL, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$12,624	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,300 10%	\$224 2%	\$10,000 79%	\$10,000 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
	PLYMALE, ROBERT H (BOB) (D)	\$81,445		\$3,175 4%	\$0 -	\$120 <1%	\$67,540 83%	\$42,290 63%	\$25,250 37%
6	FANNING, JOHN PAT (D)	\$22,790		\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$22,200 <b>97%</b>	\$3,600 16%	\$18,600 <b>84%</b>
	POTTER, JACOB T (JAKE) (R)*	\$616	•	\$0 -	\$0 - ************************************	\$616 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
7	MARCUM, BILLY (R)*	\$0	· ·	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	TOMBLIN, EARL RAY (D)	\$353,515	·		\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$163,728</b> 46%	\$101,328 62%	\$62,400 38%
8	SPROUSE, VIC (R)	\$291,272	. ,	<b>\$7,530</b> 3%	<b>\$1,930</b> 1%	\$3,853 1%	<b>\$232,539</b> 80%	<b>\$181,979</b> 78%	\$50,560 22%
	WORKMAN, MARGARET L*	\$143,133		\$5,225 4%	\$200 <1%	<b>\$32,150</b> 22%	\$75,035 52%	\$61,335 82%	\$13,700 18%
9	BAILEY JR, BILLY WAYNE (D)	\$90,353			\$100 < 1%	\$0 -	\$61,625 68%	\$29,475 48%	\$32,150 52%
	FINCHAM, JACK E (R)*	\$18,599		\$375 2%	\$850 5%	\$1,857 10%	\$12,450 67%	\$10,200 82%	\$2,250 18%
10	CALDWELL, ANITA SKEENS (D)*	\$66,800	\$0 -	\$8,000 12%	\$500 1%	\$0 -	\$56,675 85%	\$33,025 58%	\$23,650 42%
	CARUTH, DONALD T (R)	\$86,185		\$1,475 2%		\$650 1%	\$69,427 81%	\$44,827 65%	\$24,600 35%
11	JOHNSON, ROBERT C (BOB) (R)*	\$1,129	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$525 46%	\$525 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
	LOVE, SHIRLEY (D)	\$85,621	\$11,108 13%		\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$58,870 69%	\$33,845 57%	\$25,025 43%
10	SHARPE, BILL (D)	\$85,345		\$4,850 <b>6%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$66,145 78%	\$40,245 61%	\$25,900 39%
12	WEAVER, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$8,872	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$650 <b>7%</b>	\$176 2%	\$7,600 <b>86%</b>	\$7,600 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
40	WILLIAMS, JOHN M (M)*	\$29		\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
13	PREZIOSO JR, ROMAN W (D)	\$67,203	\$1,205 2%	\$3,250 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$58,613 <b>87%</b>	\$31,813 54%	\$26,800 46%
1.1	BARTLETT, JOHN R (RICK) (C)*	\$2,064	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,064 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
14	HUNTER, JON BLAIR (D)	\$73,005		\$5,525 8%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$56,880 78%	\$19,355 34%	<b>\$37,525</b> 66%
	SYPOLT, DAVID C (R)*	\$47,985			\$1,000 <b>2%</b>	\$3,200 7%	\$36,480 76%	\$21,180 58%	\$15,300 42%
15	BARNES, CLARK S (R)	\$73,221	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,700 <b>2</b> %	\$64,142 88%	\$5,400 7%	\$1,550 29%	\$3,850 <b>71%</b>
	ROSS, MIKE (D)*	\$247,731	\$39,814 16%	. ,	\$0 -	\$105,000 42%	<b>\$91,553</b> 37%	\$56,803 62%	\$34,750 38%
16	LANCE, R GREGORY (D)*	\$24,784	\$0 -	\$1,100 4%	\$0 -	\$519 2%	\$18,945 76%	\$10,545 56%	\$8,400 44%
	YODER, JOHN (R)	\$35,512		\$500 1%	\$850 <b>2%</b>	\$16,150 45%	\$17,650 50%	\$13,250 75%	\$4,400 25%
17	FOSTER, DAN (D)	\$129,320	·	\$5,192 4%	\$0 -	\$570 <1%	<b>\$102,529</b> 79%	\$84,294 82%	\$18,235 18%
	WEBB, RUSTY (R)*	\$95,100	\$1,181 1%	\$4,400 5%	\$850 1%	<u>\$0</u> -	\$78,091 82%	\$56,456 72%	\$21,635 <u>28%</u>

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (C)=Constitution, (M)=Mountain. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top five for category.

			to Senate		s (Continu				
			Amou	nt and Percent	of Identified S	pecial Interest	Contributions	from	
		Banking &		Consumer	Corporate	•			
District	Candidate	Finance	Coal	Lawyers	Lawyers	Education	Gambling	Health Care	Insurance
4	HUTCHINS, TAL (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$21,600 58%	\$700 2%	\$5,110 14%	\$0 -	\$475 1%	\$250 1%
1	MCKENZIE, ANDY (R)	\$1,925 2%	\$4,100 5%	\$0 -	\$1,800 2%	\$1,250 2%	\$9,750 13%	\$24,325 31%	\$1,740 2%
2	KESSLER, JEFFREY V (D)	\$4,550 <b>8%</b>	\$3,450 6%	\$3,750 7%	\$2,400 <b>4%</b>	\$2,400 4%	\$3,750 7%	\$11,075 20%	\$1,000 2%
	SNYDER, RUSS (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -
3	BOLEY, DONNA J (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,950 <b>34%</b>	\$0 -
4	FACEMYER, KAREN (R)	\$4,350 5%	\$5,000 6%	\$0 -	\$2,325 3%	\$1,970 2%	\$15,650 19%	\$8,050 10%	\$4,350 5%
4	MULLINS, DAVID (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 2%	\$2,500 <b>8%</b>	\$1,500 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
5	HALL, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$0 -	\$8,200 <b>82%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	PLYMALE, ROBERT H (BOB) (D)	\$2,700 4%	\$6,800 10%	\$3,450 5%	\$2,050 3%	\$4,800 7%	\$220 <1%	\$13,350 20%	\$2,100 3%
6	FANNING, JOHN PAT (D)	\$1,550 7%	\$800 4%	\$1,250 6%	\$1,500 <b>7%</b>	\$1,150 5%	\$450 2%	\$2,550 11%	\$1,550 <b>7%</b>
0	POTTER, JACOB T (JAKE) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
7	MARCUM, BILLY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
,	TOMBLIN, EARL RAY (D)	<b>\$7,200</b> 4%	<b>\$21,300</b> 13%	\$6,500 4%	<b>\$5,700</b> 3%	\$2,800 2%	<b>\$19,300</b> 12%	<b>\$23,912</b> 15%	\$8,850 5%
8	SPROUSE, VIC (R)	<b>\$10,500</b> 5%	<b>\$46,654</b> 20%	\$0 -	\$10,220 4%	\$1,000 < 1%	\$785 <1%	\$72,255 31%	<b>\$8,725</b> 4%
0	WORKMAN, MARGARET L*	\$450 1%	\$750 1%	\$34,100 45%	\$1,850 2%	<b>\$3,300</b> 4%	\$700 1%	\$230 <1%	\$200 <1%
9	BAILEY JR, BILLY WAYNE (D)	\$3,150 5%	\$2,350 4%	\$2,850 5%	\$1,950 3%	\$2,100 3%	\$6,050 10%	\$10,825 18%	\$850 1%
3	FINCHAM, JACK E (R)*	\$750 6%	\$8,500 <b>68%</b>	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,350 11%	\$0 -
10	CALDWELL, ANITA SKEENS (D)*	\$150 <1%	\$0 -	\$22,250 39%	\$525 1%	\$5,900 10%	\$8,100 14%	\$1,500 3%	\$300 1%
10	CARUTH, DONALD T (R)	\$4,671 7%	<b>\$22,750</b> 33%	\$50 <1%	\$1,250 2%	\$500 1%	\$200 <1%	\$11,150 16%	\$4,431 6%
11	JOHNSON, ROBERT C (BOB) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
11	LOVE, SHIRLEY (D)	\$3,500 6%	\$13,425 23%	\$3,800 6%	\$2,275 <b>4%</b>	\$1,500 3%	\$5,750 10%	\$9,375 16%	\$1,200 2%
	SHARPE, BILL (D)	\$6,000 <b>9%</b>	\$10,300 16%	\$3,100 5%	\$2,725 4%	\$1,500 2%	\$8,675 13%	\$6,250 9%	\$1,700 3%
12	WEAVER, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$0 -	\$6,100 <b>80%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WILLIAMS, JOHN M (M)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
13	PREZIOSO JR, ROMAN W (D)	\$4,900 <b>8%</b>	\$5,350 9%	\$350 1%	\$1,675 3%	\$1,650 3%	\$1,250 2%	\$18,225 31%	\$1,500 3%
	BARTLETT, JOHN R (RICK) (C)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
14	HUNTER, JON BLAIR (D)	\$1,805 3%	\$150 <1%	\$10,524 19%	\$450 1%	\$7,050 12%	\$500 1%	\$3,225 6%	\$0 -
	SYPOLT, DAVID C (R)*	\$1,000 3%	\$16,400 45%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 <1%	\$2,280 6%	\$1,000 3%
15	BARNES, CLARK S (R)	\$1,250 <b>23%</b>	\$250 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,500 <b>28%</b>	\$0 -	\$50 1%	\$0 -
10	ROSS, MIKE (D)*	\$7,774 8%	\$12,904 14%	\$2,800 3%	\$3,850 4%	\$1,000 1%	\$3,625 4%	\$8,925 10%	\$2,600 3%
16	LANCE, R GREGORY (D)*	\$300 2%	\$300 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,250 <b>7%</b>	\$2,500 <b>13%</b>	\$4,020 21%	\$900 <b>5%</b>
	YODER, JOHN (R)	\$1,500 8%	\$10,700 <b>61%</b>	\$1,000 6%	\$50 <1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$750 4%	\$0 -
17	FOSTER, DAN (D)	<b>\$7,050</b> 7%	\$7,154 7%	\$645 1%	\$8,845 9%	\$1,800 2%	\$650 1%	\$39,930 39%	\$5,850 6%
''	WEBB, RUSTY (R)*	\$8,120 10%	<b>\$14,450</b> 19%	\$14,894 19%	\$2,000 3%	\$1,000 1%	\$50 <1%	\$8,350 11%	\$2,250 3%

*Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (C)=Constitution, (M)=Mountain. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top five for category.

			Amoun	t and	Percent of	Identi	ified Special In	terest Contril	butions from		
			Oth	er				Prescription	Real Estate &		
District	Candidate	Labor	Busir	ess	Other Lav	yers	Oil & Gas	Drugs	Construction	Tobac	co
1	HUTCHINS, TAL (D)*	\$1,900 5%	\$450	1%	\$5,725	15%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$220 1%	\$0	-
'	MCKENZIE, ANDY (R)	\$6,550 8%	\$1,550	2%	\$800	1%	\$1,350 2%	\$2,150 <b>3%</b>	<b>\$5,450</b> 7%	\$6,200	8%
2	KESSLER, JEFFREY V (D)	<b>\$8,550</b> 15%	\$1,000	2%	\$1,000	2%	\$2,800 5%	\$1,800 <b>3%</b>	\$2,650 5%	\$1,000	2%
	SNYDER, RUSS (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
3	BOLEY, DONNA J (R)	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$600 <b>11%</b>	\$0 -	\$625 <b>11%</b>	\$0	) -
4	FACEMYER, KAREN (R)	\$0 -	\$4,850	6%	\$1,000	1%	\$4,300 5%	\$2,300 3%	\$6,720 8%	\$4,000	5%
	MULLINS, DAVID (D)*	\$23,835 77%	\$500	2%	\$1,270	4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
5	HALL, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$0 -	\$800	8%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
	PLYMALE, ROBERT H (BOB) (D)	\$5,100 8%	\$2,200	3%	\$1,650	2%	\$4,150 <b>6%</b>	\$0 -	\$8,050 12%	\$0	-
6	FANNING, JOHN PAT (D)	\$4,600 <b>21%</b>	\$300	1%	\$0	-	\$1,350 <b>6%</b>	\$500 2%	\$500 2%	\$1,200	5%
	POTTER, JACOB T (JAKE) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
7	MARCUM, BILLY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
,	TOMBLIN, EARL RAY (D)	\$0 -	\$9,230	6%	\$450	<1%	<b>\$4,350</b> 3%	\$7,700 5%	<b>\$10,300</b> 6%	\$3,000	2%
8	SPROUSE, VIC (R)	\$0 -	\$7,265	3%	\$1,450	1%	<b>\$7,315</b> 3%	<b>\$5,045</b> 2%	\$27,870 12%	\$0	-
	WORKMAN, MARGARET L*	<b>\$9,250</b> 12%	\$1,150	2%	\$15,850	21%	\$700 1%	\$0 -	\$75 <1%	\$0	-
9	BAILEY JR, BILLY WAYNE (D)	\$5,250 9%	\$3,950	6%	\$550	1%	\$2,550 4%	\$1,800 <b>3%</b>	\$50 <1%	\$8,250	13%
	FINCHAM, JACK E (R)*	\$0 -	\$500	4%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
10	CALDWELL, ANITA SKEENS (D)*	\$12,400 22%	\$200	<1%	\$3,900	7%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
10	CARUTH, DONALD T (R)	\$0 -	\$2,450	4%	\$1,050	2%	\$1,400 2%	\$2,000 <b>3%</b>	\$5,050 7%	\$0	-
11	JOHNSON, ROBERT C (BOB) (R)*	\$0 -	\$525	100%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
- ' '	LOVE, SHIRLEY (D)	\$3,850 7%	\$1,800	3%	\$375	1%	\$2,800 5%	\$0 -	\$1,275 2%	\$0	-
	SHARPE, BILL (D)	\$2,000 3%	\$2,650	4%	\$1,000	2%	\$6,025 9%	\$1,000 2%	\$3,300 5%	\$0	-
12	WEAVER, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$0 -	\$500	7%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
	WILLIAMS, JOHN M (M)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
13	PREZIOSO JR, ROMAN W (D)	\$0 -	\$5,228	9%	\$125	<1%	\$2,850 5%	\$3,500 6%	\$3,825 7%	\$0	) -
	BARTLETT, JOHN R (RICK) (C)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
14	HUNTER, JON BLAIR (D)	\$21,895 38%	\$1,356	2%	\$1,850	3%	\$250 <1%	\$1,200 2%	\$400 1%	\$1,000	2%
	SYPOLT, DAVID C (R)*	\$0 -	\$1,900	5%	\$0	-	\$900 2%	\$1,650 <b>5%</b>	\$50 <1%	\$300	1%
15	BARNES, CLARK S (R)	\$2,350 <b>44%</b>	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
10	ROSS, MIKE (D)*	\$400 <1%	\$2,475	3%	\$1,200	1%	\$16,400 18%	<b>\$2,250</b> 2%	\$4,500 5%	\$500	1%
16	LANCE, R GREGORY (D)*	\$4,000 <b>21%</b>	\$25	<1%	\$1,000	5%	\$750 4%	\$600 <b>3%</b>	\$2,100 <b>11%</b>	\$0	-
10	YODER, JOHN (R)	\$0 -	\$500	3%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	-
17	FOSTER, DAN (D)	\$150 <1%	\$5,508	5%	\$1,980	2%	\$7,250 7%	\$1,150 1%	\$3,085 3%	\$150	<1%
''	WEBB, RUSTY (R)*	\$3,500 4%	\$3,317	4%	\$3,300	4%	\$450 1%	\$2,025 <b>3%</b>	\$1,085 1%	\$700	1%

*Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (C)=Constitution, (M)=Mountain. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top five for category.

				ate Caridiu		Continue	-/				
		Amo	ount and	Percent of Ide	ntified S	Special Interes	t Contri	butions from	Contribu	utors Giving	
District	Candidate	\$100 or Lo	ess	\$101 to \$2	50	\$251 to \$5	00	\$501 to \$7	750	\$751 to \$1,0	000
1	HUTCHINS, TAL (D)*	\$3,630	10%	\$3,750	10%	\$6,750	18%	\$1,500	4%	\$21,800	58%
•	MCKENZIE, ANDY (R)	\$6,690	9%	\$13,575	17%	\$22,000	28%	\$1,450	2%	\$34,000	44%
2	KESSLER, JEFFREY V (D)	\$3,450	6%	\$10,800	19%	\$20,650	36%	\$3,750	7%	\$18,000	32%
2	SNYDER, RUSS (R)*	\$100	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
3	BOLEY, DONNA J (R)	\$200	4%	\$1,875	33%	\$2,600	46%	\$0	-	\$1,000	18%
4	FACEMYER, KAREN (R)	\$2,740	3%	\$14,475	17%	\$30,400	37%	\$2,250	3%	\$33,000	40%
4	MULLINS, DAVID (D)*	\$1,110	4%	\$4,020	13%	\$6,925	22%	\$0	-	\$18,800	61%
5	HALL, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$0	-	\$200	2%	\$800	8%	\$0	-	\$9,000	90%
3	PLYMALE, ROBERT H (BOB) (D)	\$3,590	5%	\$13,150	19%	\$25,800	38%	\$3,000	4%	\$22,000	33%
6	FANNING, JOHN PAT (D)	\$500	2%	\$3,700	17%	\$6,700	30%	\$1,300	6%	\$10,000	45%
O	POTTER, JACOB T (JAKE) (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
7	MARCUM, BILLY (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
,	TOMBLIN, EARL RAY (D)	\$2,685	2%	\$14,212	9%	\$34,480	21%	\$1,350	1%	\$111,000	68%
8	SPROUSE, VIC (R)	\$30,290	13%	\$38,600	17%	\$47,350	20%	\$4,000	2%	\$112,299	48%
	WORKMAN, MARGARET L*	\$3,285	4%	\$7,700	10%	\$15,700	21%	\$2,550	3%	\$45,800	61%
9	BAILEY JR, BILLY WAYNE (D)	\$2,675	4%	\$10,200	17%	\$22,000	36%	\$750	1%	\$26,000	42%
5	FINCHAM, JACK E (R)*	\$200	2%	\$250	2%	\$3,500	28%	\$1,500	12%	\$7,000	56%
10	CALDWELL, ANITA SKEENS (D)*	\$1,125	2%	\$5,650	10%	\$15,200	27%	\$0	-	\$34,700	61%
10	CARUTH, DONALD T (R)	\$2,250	3%	\$9,756	14%	\$19,000	27%	\$1,421	2%	\$37,000	53%
11	JOHNSON, ROBERT C (BOB) (R)*	\$25	5%	\$0	-	\$500	95%	\$0	-	\$0	-
11	LOVE, SHIRLEY (D)	\$4,895	8%	\$10,725	18%	\$20,500	35%	\$750	1%	\$22,000	37%
	SHARPE, BILL (D)	\$3,400	5%	\$10,945	17%	\$22,900	35%	\$0	-	\$28,900	44%
12	WEAVER, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$0	-	\$200	3%	\$1,400	18%	\$0	-	\$6,000	<b>79</b> %
	WILLIAMS, JOHN M (M)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$7,000 \$34,700 \$37,000 \$0 \$22,000	-
13	PREZIOSO JR, ROMAN W (D)	\$3,360	6%	\$12,675	22%	\$16,300	28%	\$1,350	2%	\$24,928	43%
	BARTLETT, JOHN R (RICK) (C)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
14	HUNTER, JON BLAIR (D)	\$3,275	6%	\$9,049	16%	\$16,950	30%	\$750	1%	\$26,856	47%
	SYPOLT, DAVID C (R)*	\$980	3%	\$2,450	7%	\$7,050	19%	\$0	-	\$26,000	71%
15	BARNES, CLARK S (R)	\$150	3%	\$750	14%	\$1,500	28%	\$0	-	\$3,000	56%
10	ROSS, MIKE (D)*	\$3,775	4%	\$15,750	17%	\$29,054	32%	\$2,974	3%	\$40,000	44%
16	LANCE, R GREGORY (D)*	\$2,045	11%	\$2,800	15%	\$6,100	32%	\$0	-	\$8,000	42%
10	YODER, JOHN (R)	\$150	1%	\$700	4%	\$4,800	27%	\$0		\$12,000	68%
17	FOSTER, DAN (D)	\$14,540	14%	\$33,523	33%	\$33,408	33%	\$1,059	1%	\$20,000	20%
17	WEBB, RUSTY (R)*	\$2,260	3%	\$6,594	8%	\$19,567	25%	\$700	1%	\$48,970	63%

*Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (C)=Constitution, (M)=Mountain. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top five for category.

	Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest											
		Amount an	d Percent of Ide Contributio	ns from .								
Distric	t Candidate	"Tort Reform" Advocates	Polluter Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	"Progressive" Interest Groups	Reported Expenditures	Reported Ending Balance	Votes Received	\$Raised \$ per Vote	Spent per Vote		
1	HUTCHINS, TAL (D)*	\$2,895 8%	\$1,020 3%	\$0 -	\$28,810 77%	\$56,593	\$4,424	19,249	\$3.19	\$2.94		
'	MCKENZIE, ANDY (R)	\$68,915 89%	\$17,600 23%	\$19,450 25%	\$7,800 10%	\$90,516	\$1,463	22,089	\$4.16	\$4.10		
2	KESSLER, JEFFREY V (D)	\$39,860 70%	\$15,100 27%	\$5,150 9%	\$14,705 26%	\$41,656	\$22,228	27,822	\$2.24	\$1.50		
	SNYDER, RUSS (R)*	\$100 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,248	\$0	13,455	\$0.24	\$0.24		
3	BOLEY, DONNA J (R)	\$5,675 <b>100%</b>	\$2,225 39%	\$1,250 -	\$0 -	\$4,427	\$1,298	37,788	\$0.15	\$0.12		
4	FACEMYER, KAREN (R)	<b>\$78,195</b> 94%	\$31,245 38%	\$21,650 26%	\$1,970 2%	\$100,116	\$3,128	29,321	\$3.38	\$3.41		
4	MULLINS, DAVID (D)*	\$3,450 11%	\$2,850 9%	\$0 -	\$25,935 84%	\$36,096	\$3,698	21,466	\$1.86	\$1.68		
5	HALL, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$10,000 <b>100</b> %	\$9,200 <b>92</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$12,500	\$0	15,006	\$0.84	\$0.83		
5	PLYMALE, ROBERT H (BOB) (D)	\$51,690 77%	\$28,000 41%	\$2,320 3%	\$13,350 20%	\$67,858	\$13,387	24,268	\$3.36	\$2.80		
6	FANNING, JOHN PAT (D)	\$15,200 68%	\$6,200 28%	\$2,550 11%	\$7,000 32%	\$7,106	\$16,023	22,232	\$1.03	\$0.32		
0	POTTER, JACOB T (JAKE) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$616	\$0	8,557	\$0.07	\$0.07		
7	MARCUM, BILLY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0	\$0	9,300	\$0.00	\$0.00		
	TOMBLIN, EARL RAY (D)	<b>\$149,593</b> 91%	<b>\$62,450</b> 38%	\$28,550 17%	\$9,300 6%	\$55,743	\$297,534	27,709	\$12.76	\$2.01		
8	SPROUSE, VIC (R)	<b>\$228,459</b> 98%	<b>\$112,184</b> 48%	\$10,485 5%	\$1,000 <1%	\$200,272	\$15,573	48,762	\$5.97	\$4.11		
	WORKMAN, MARGARET L*	\$9,480 13%	\$4,750 6%	\$700 1%	<b>\$46,805</b> 62%	\$141,420	\$4,716	37,709	\$3.80	\$3.75		
9	BAILEY JR, BILLY WAYNE (D)	\$49,925 81%	\$12,500 20%	\$16,400 27%	\$10,200 17%	\$74,780	\$15,661	20,430	\$4.42	\$3.66		
9	FINCHAM, JACK E (R)*	\$12,450 100%	\$9,850 <b>79%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$19,008	\$0	16,285	\$1.14	\$1.17		
10	CALDWELL, ANITA SKEENS (D)*	\$12,225 22%	\$1,175 2%	\$8,900 16%	\$40,550 72%	\$61,880	\$5,170	19,942	\$3.35	\$3.10		
10	CARUTH, DONALD T (R)	\$67,827 98%	<b>\$36,450</b> 53%	\$4,700 7%	\$550 1%	\$83,631	\$1,026	20,714	\$4.16	\$4.04		
11	JOHNSON, ROBERT C (BOB) (R)*	\$525 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$779	\$0	14,549	\$0.08	\$0.05		
11	LOVE, SHIRLEY (D)	\$46,870 80%	\$24,325 41%	\$6,450 11%	\$9,150 16%	\$57,045	\$28,941	26,659	\$3.21	\$2.14		
	SHARPE, BILL (D)	\$56,845 86%	\$27,170 41%	\$11,675 18%	\$6,600 10%	\$42,929	\$42,186	28,603	\$2.98	\$1.50		
12	WEAVER, STEPHEN L (R)*	\$7,600 <b>100%</b>	\$7,100 <b>93%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$8,350	\$0	13,207	\$0.67	\$0.63		
	WILLIAMS, JOHN M (M)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$29	\$0	2,048	\$0.01	\$0.01		
13	PREZIOSO JR, ROMAN W (D)	\$56,078 96%	\$18,775 32%	\$2,750 5%	\$2,025 3%	\$27,096	\$39,179	30,777	\$2.18	\$0.88		
	BARTLETT, JOHN R (RICK) (C)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,064	\$2,064	5	\$412.78	\$412.77		
14	HUNTER, JON BLAIR (D)	\$12,811 23%	\$3,275 6%	\$1,750 3%	\$39,839 70%	\$63,871	\$7,377	23,154	\$3.15	\$2.76		
	SYPOLT, DAVID C (R)*	\$36,280 99%	\$23,000 <b>63%</b>	\$4,900 13%	\$0 -	\$47,310	\$4,680	22,210	\$2.16	\$2.13		
15	BARNES, CLARK S (R)	\$1,550 29%	\$250 5%	\$0 -	\$3,850 <b>71%</b>	\$73,221	\$0	22,000	\$3.33	\$3.33		
15	ROSS, MIKE (D)*	<b>\$83,553</b> 91%	<b>\$51,804</b> 57%	\$7,125 8%	\$4,200 5%	\$241,649	\$6,082	21,669	\$11.43	\$11.15		
16	LANCE, R GREGORY (D)*	\$12,195 64%	\$3,650 19%	\$2,700 14%	\$5,250 28%	\$25,085	\$0	20,748	\$1.19	\$1.21		
10	YODER, JOHN (R)	\$16,550 94%	\$12,050 <b>68%</b>	\$1,000 6%	\$1,100 6%	\$39,382	\$141	28,480	\$1.25	\$1.38		
17	FOSTER, DAN (D)	<b>\$95,120</b> 93%	<b>\$34,383</b> 34%	\$800 1%	\$2,695 3%	\$111,165	\$7,811	46,994	\$2.75	\$2.37		
17	WEBB, RUSTY (R)*	\$55,347 71%	\$23,535 30%	\$7,000 9%	\$19,394 25%	\$93,285	\$153	37,704	\$2.52	\$2.47		

*Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (C)=Constitution, (M)=Mountain. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top five for category.

#### Index to House Candidates<sup>19</sup>

			Carry Over from Previous	mount and Pe	ercent of Total C	Contributions from	Identified Special	Identified Sp Contribut	d Percent of ecial Interest ions from
District		Contributions	Campaigns		Political Party		Interests	Individuals	PACs
	CHANEY, PAT (R)*	\$75	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$75 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
1	DELONG, JOE (D)	\$70,531	\$4,763 7%	\$390 1%	\$50 <1%	\$1,040 1%	<b>\$57,123</b> 81%		\$19,200 34%
	MADDEN, ROGER D (R)*	\$5,020	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$50 1%	\$3,925 78%	\$410 8%	\$410 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -
	SWARTZMILLER, RANDY (D)	\$47,318	\$2,015 4%	\$740 2%	\$0 -	\$900 2%	\$32,748 69%	·	
	ENNIS, TIM (D)	\$16,336	\$2,511 15%	\$300 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$13,200 81%	\$3,150 24%	
2	GRAY, JAMEY (R)*	\$3,650	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,000 82%	\$3,000 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -
	MCNINCH, ROBERT (LES) (R)*	\$496	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$496 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	YOST, JACK (D)	\$36,812	\$0 -	\$450 1%	\$50 <1%	\$10 <1%	\$33,288 90%		\$18,833 57%
	KLEMPA, ORPHY (D)*	\$56,940	\$0 -	\$1,220 2%	\$125 <1%	\$405 1%	<b>\$50,005</b> 88%		<b>\$34,300</b> 69%
3	TIGHE, JERRY A (D)*	\$3,123	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,123 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WAKIM, CHRISTOPHER (R)	\$16,704	\$454 3%	\$450 3%	\$350 2%	\$100 1%	\$14,525 87%	\$9,175 63%	\$5,350 37%
	WHITE, L GIL (R)	\$64,077	<b>\$15,983</b> 25%	\$500 1%	\$200 <1%	\$0 -	<b>\$38,089</b> 59%	·	
4	LUCEY, CODY J (R)*	\$5,733	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,236 22%	\$892 16%	\$732 82%	\$160 18%
	MORRIS, RONALD (R)*	\$6,315	\$0 -	\$600 10%	\$650 10%	\$2,625 42%	\$2,100 33%	\$1,550 74%	\$550 26%
-	TUCKER, KENNETH D (D)	\$19,396	\$6,574 <b>34%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$22 <1%	\$12,600 65%	· ·	\$10,600 84%
	VARNER, SCOTT G (D)	\$34,639	\$1,589 5%	<b>\$2,600</b> 8%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$30,075 87%		<b>\$24,975</b> 83%
5	AMOS JR, ED (R)*	\$1,465	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,325 90%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	PETHTEL, DAVE (D)	\$29,045	\$9,508 33%	\$2,200 8%	\$200 1%	\$0 -	\$16,700 57%	\$3,350 20%	\$13,350 80%
6	ROMINE, WM ROGER (R)	\$1,350	\$0 -	\$100 7%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,250 <b>93%</b>	\$0 -	\$1,250 <b>100</b> %
	JANES, PAUL D (D)*	\$675	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$675 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
7	LEGGETT, OTIS A (R)	\$5,732	\$116 2%	\$100 2%	\$0 -	\$166 3%	\$5,350 <b>93%</b>	\$0 -	\$5,350 <b>100%</b>
	SHULTZ, TRAVIS (I)*	\$1,478	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,478 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
8	ANDERSON JR, E W (BILL) (R)	\$18,965	\$11,317 60%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$6,900 36%	\$750 11%	\$6,150 89%
9	BORDER, LARRY (R)	\$12,344	\$455 4%	\$0 -	\$600 5%	\$0 -	\$10,487 85%	\$1,650 16%	\$8,837 84%
3	LEWIS, JEFF (D)*	\$14,275	\$0 -	\$50 <1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$13,100 <b>92%</b>	\$2,350 18%	\$10,750 82%
	AZINGER, TOM (R)	\$18,805	\$145 1%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$75 <1%	\$14,550 77%	\$5,000 34%	\$9,550 66%
	BEANE, J D (D)	\$49,578	<b>\$13,203</b> 27%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$34,875 70%	\$13,625 39%	<b>\$21,250</b> 61%
10	ELLEM, JOHN N (R)	\$22,934	\$0 -	\$225 1%	\$250 1%	\$487 2%	\$18,775 82%	\$6,475 34%	\$12,300 66%
10	GILLESPIE, FRED (R)*	\$43,586	\$0 -	\$1,000 2%	\$250 1%	<b>\$35,636</b> 82%	\$6,475 15%	\$1,075 17%	\$5,400 83%
	RADCLIFF, PATRICK N (D)*	\$11,351	\$0 -	\$25 <1%	\$0 -	\$1,125 10%	\$7,175 63%	\$2,275 32%	\$4,900 68%
	WILKINSON, SCOTT (D)*	\$250	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
11	ASHLEY, BOB (R)	\$5,432	\$2,182 <b>40%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,250 60%	\$450 14%	\$2,800 86%
12	CARMICHAEL, MITCH B (R)	\$7,359	\$734 10%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$6,450 88%	\$700 11%	\$5,750 89%
12	SIDERS, CORBON (R)*	\$1,006	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$506 50%	\$500 50%	\$0 -	\$500 <b>100%</b>

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

Index to House Candidates (continued)<sup>19</sup>

		inae	x to House C	andidates	(continuea)			1		
									d Percent of	
									ecial Interest	
			Carry Over	amount and Pe	ercent of Total C	ontributions from	Identified	Contributions from		
		Total	from Previous	Other			Special			
District	Candidate	Contributions	Campaigns	Candidates	Political Party	Self & Family	Interests	Individuals	PACs	
	MARTIN, DALE (D)	\$39,227	\$4,852 12%	\$2,200 6%	<b>\$1,300</b> 3%	\$0 -	\$30,075 77%	\$9,025 30%	<b>\$21,050</b> 70%	
40	MCLANE, JACK R (R)*	\$7,789	\$0 -	\$750 10%	\$650 8%	\$400 5%	\$4,525 58%	\$2,075 46%	\$2,450 54%	
13	PAXTON, BRADY R (D)	\$20,067	\$747 4%	\$100 <1%	\$500 2%	\$0 -	\$17,300 86%	\$600 3%	\$16,700 97%	
	WOOD, CHRISTOPHER TROY (R)*	\$4,386	\$0 -	\$750 <b>17%</b>	\$650 15%	\$463 11%	\$1,707 39%	\$1,707 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	
	HALL, MIKE (R)	\$10,450	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$600 6%	\$7,950 76%	\$1,100 14%	\$6,850 86%	
14	MCNEELY, TOM A (D)*	\$75	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$75 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	
14	SCHOEN, PATTI EAGLOSKI (R)	\$11,320	\$0 -	\$800 7%	\$0 -	\$2,100 19%	\$8,025 71%	\$4,575 57%	\$3,450 43%	
	SLUSS, STEPHEN C (STEVE) (D)*	\$4,626	\$0 -	\$800 <b>17%</b>	\$0 -	\$276 6%	\$3,005 65%	\$2,755 92%	\$250 8%	
	BARRY, DENNIS A (R)*	\$14,780	\$0 -	\$500 3%	\$25 <1%	\$650 4%	\$7,900 53%	\$7,650 97%	\$250 3%	
15	CRAIG, KEVIN J (D)	\$53,118	\$1,906 4%	<b>\$2,848</b> 5%	\$0 -	\$1,700 3%	<b>\$43,700</b> 82%	<b>\$26,600</b> 61%	\$17,100 39%	
	LEACH, MARGARETTE R (D)	\$36,441	\$20,485 56%	\$1,225 3%	\$100 <1%	\$455 1%	\$10,655 29%	\$3,255 31%	\$7,400 69%	
	MILLER, CAROL D (R)*	\$25,515	\$0 -	\$650 3%	\$280 1%	\$3,675 14%	\$15,770 62%	\$12,570 80%	\$3,200 20%	
	MORGAN, JIM (D)	\$20,660	\$0 -	\$1,693 8%	\$0 -	\$1,000 5%	\$13,451 65%	\$8,526 63%	\$4,925 37%	
	STEWART, PAULA L (R)*	\$1,151	\$0 -	\$100 9%	\$250 <b>22%</b>	\$421 37%	\$25 -	\$25 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	
	HOWARD, GREG (R)	\$22,969	\$0 -	\$1,100 5%	\$700 3%	\$546 2%	\$15,300 67%	\$6,600 43%	\$8,700 57%	
	HUBBARD, SUSAN (D)*	\$36,554	\$3,035 8%	<b>\$2,400</b> 7%	\$200 1%	\$25 <1%	\$29,100 80%	\$9,150 31%	\$19,950 69%	
16	NELSON, BOBBY (D)*	\$34,193	\$0 -	\$450 1%	\$200 1%	<b>\$13,478</b> 39%	\$15,210 44%	\$7,510 49%	\$7,700 51%	
	SABIN, MATT (R)*	\$100	\$0 -	\$100 <b>100</b> %	•	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	
	SOBONYA, KELLI (R)	\$25,297	\$46 <1%	\$2,050 8%	\$650 3%	\$0 -	\$17,130 68%	\$5,905 34%	\$11,225 66%	
	STEPHENS, DALE (D)	\$32,177	\$0 -	\$2,175 7%	\$0 -	\$3,453 11%	\$23,369 73%	\$7,490 32%	\$15,879 68%	
	PERDUE, DON C (D)	\$27,115	\$6,385 24%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$19,750 73%	. ,	\$17,750 90%	
17	RAMEY, LESLIE (LES) (R)*	\$2,200	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,000 45%	\$0 -	\$1,200 55%	\$1,000 83%	\$200 17%	
	STROUD, MATT (R)*	\$950	\$0 -	\$200 <b>21%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$550 58%	\$550 <b>100</b> %	•	
	THOMPSON, RICHARD (D)	\$26,181	\$1,371 5%	<b>\$2,350</b> 9%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$20,735 79%		\$16,050 77%	
18	BARKER, LARRY W (D)	\$6,371	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,568 72%	\$1,750 27%	\$0 -	\$1,750 <b>100%</b>	
	MILLER, WARREN K (R)*	\$2,275	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$75 3%	\$0 -	\$1,850 81%	\$600 32%	\$1,250 68%	
	BUTCHER, GREG (D)	\$20,606	\$2,764 13%	\$0 -	<b>\$1,000</b> 5%	\$0 -	\$16,843 82%	\$2,793 17%		
	COOK, JEFF (R)*	\$477	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$477 100%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	
	ELDRIDGE, JEFF (D)	\$12,126	\$165 1%	\$1,500 12%	\$0 -	\$2,467 20%	\$7,994 66%	\$2,794 35%	\$5,200 65%	
19	FERRELL, JOE C (D)	\$27,861	\$11,573 42%	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$14,088</b> 51%	\$2,200 8%	\$200 9%	\$2,000 91%	
	HRUTKAY, LIDELLA WILSON (D)	\$37,311	\$0 -	\$1,070 3%	\$100 <1%	<b>\$10,941</b> 29%		\$11,400 46%		
	LITZ, DAVE (R)*	\$7,591	\$0 -	\$250 3%	\$650 9%	\$4,651 61%	\$750 10%	\$150 20%	\$600 80%	
	MULLINS, JIM (R)*	\$17,636	\$0 -	\$976 6%	\$0 -	\$5,718 32%	\$9,050 51%	\$6,200 69%	\$2,850 31%	
	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM E (R)*	\$1,597	<u>\$0</u> -	\$150 <u>9%</u>	<u>\$0</u> -	\$797 <u>50%</u>	<u>\$0</u> -	\$0 -	<u>\$0</u> -	

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

Index to House Candidates (continued)<sup>19</sup>

			Ar Carry Over from	Amount and Percent of Total Contributions from						
		Total	Previous	Other			Identified			
District		Contributions	Campaigns				Special Interests		PACs	
20	KOMINAR, K STEVEN (D)	\$46,291	\$3,691 8%	<b>\$2,250</b> 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$38,050</b> 82%		<b>\$20,875</b> 55%	
	SHAFER, DIANE (R)*	\$500	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 <b>100</b> %		\$500 <b>100</b> %	
21	SAUNDERS, JAMES (R)*	\$1,513	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,000 66%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	
	WHITE, HARRY KEITH (D)	\$21,100	\$1,000 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$20,100 <b>95</b> %		\$18,300 91%	
	BLAYLOCK, BRANDON (R)*	\$9,342	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$650 7%	\$4,116 44%		\$2,650 93%	\$200 7%	
22	BROWNING, RICHARD (D)	\$35,360	\$0 -	\$2,100 6%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$31,049 88%		\$19,050 61%	
	SPEARS, SHAWN R (R)*	\$1,500	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$600 <b>40</b> %	\$850 57%		\$0 -	\$50 <b>100%</b>	
	STATON, W RICHARD (RICK) (D)	\$55,259	\$9,493 17%	\$5,000 9%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$36,935 67%			
23	LUSHBAUGH, MIKE (R)*	\$1,634	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,534 94%	•	\$0 -	\$0 -	
	MOORE, CLIF (D)	\$3,790	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,750 73%	\$900 33%		
24	FREDERICK, EUSTACE (D)	\$39,904	\$32,483 81%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$5,950 15%	\$350 6%	\$5,600 94%	
	QUESINBERRY, DOUGLAS C (R)*	\$629	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$415 <b>66%</b>	\$0 -	\$150 24%	\$100 67%		
	HALL, JONATHAN (R)*	\$8,725	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$1,250</b> 14%	\$6,420 74%		\$500 83%	\$100 17%	
25	LONG, MARSHALL C (D)	\$28,257	\$2,328 8%	\$1,000 4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$22,449 79%	\$12,599 56%		
	MAGANN, MICHAEL (D)*	\$26,607	\$0 -	\$1,000 4%	\$0 -	\$2,300 9%	\$21,900 82%	\$15,850 72%		
	PORTER, THOMAS (MIKE) (R)	\$12,693	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$350 3%	\$0 -	\$6,254 49%	\$6,254 <b>100</b> %		
26	CROSIER, GERALD L (D)	\$5,610	\$0 -	\$200 4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,675 83%	\$975 21%		
20	MILLER, DUANE (R)	\$5,110	\$0 -	\$800 <b>16%</b>	\$650 13%	\$1,598 31%	\$1,650 32%	\$1,650 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	
	CARPENTER, CHARLES (CHUCK) (R)*	\$10,832	\$0 -	\$1,275 12%	\$650 6%	\$3,774 35%	\$2,020 19%	\$1,770 88%	\$250 12%	
	HEDRICK, RON (R)*	\$10,900	\$0 -	\$500 5%	\$0 -	<b>\$9,900</b> 91%	\$250 2%	\$250 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	
	KISS, ROBERT S (D)	\$188,097	\$103,269 55%	<b>\$3,132</b> 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$71,789</b> 38%	<b>\$26,817</b> 37%	<b>\$44,973</b> 63%	
	MAHAN, VIRGINIA (D)	\$56,928	\$7,306 13%	<b>\$3,750</b> 7%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	<b>\$42,457</b> 75%	<b>\$22,507</b> 53%	\$19,950 47%	
27	PULLIAM, ROBERT (R)*	\$72,913	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$70,688</b> 97%	\$2,225 3%	\$525 24%	\$1,700 76%	
	STEVENS, PHILIP L (R)*	\$5,791	\$0 -	\$1,250 <b>22%</b>	\$650 11%	\$125 2%	\$2,600 45%	\$1,200 46%	\$1,400 54%	
	SUMNER, LINDA (R)	\$23,849	\$581 2%	\$1,700 7%	\$650 3%	\$0 -	\$18,100 76%	\$7,350 41%	\$10,750 59%	
	SUSMAN, SALLY (D)	\$102,729	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 <1%	<b>\$89,704</b> 87%	\$12,000 12%	\$300 3%	\$11,700 98%	
	THOMPSON, RON (D)	\$35,287	\$3,687 10%	\$600 2%	\$0 -	\$500 1%	\$25,775 73%	\$14,275 55%	\$11,500 45%	
	WOOTON, JOHN D (D)*	\$50,008	\$0 -	\$400 1%	\$0 -	<b>\$16,592</b> 33%	\$31,491 63%	<b>\$22,041</b> 70%	\$9,450 30%	
	CAMPBELL, THOMAS W (D)	\$15,192	\$0 -	\$1,850 12%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$13,150 87%		\$11,900 90%	
20	CANTERBURY, RAY (R)	\$5,375	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$275 5%	\$4,950 <b>92%</b>	\$1,250 25%	\$3,700 75%	
28	FRIEDMAN, CHARLIE (R)*	\$1,675	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$0 -	\$300 18%		\$315 <b>100</b> %	·	
	SCARLES, TOMMY D (D)*	\$4,875	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$75 2%	\$4,800 <b>98%</b>	\$0 -	\$4,800 <b>100%</b>	

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		mue	x to nouse	Candidate	s (continued	)			
				Amount and P		Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest Contributions from			
			Carry Over				Identified		
District	Condidata		from Previous	Other	Delitical Dante	Calf 9 Family	Special	la dividuale	DAC-
District		Contributions	Campaigns		Political Party	Self & Family	Interests	Individuals	PACs
	LILLY, BETTY (R)*	\$181	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$181 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	LOUISOS, TOM (D)	\$1,561	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,111 71%	\$450 29%	\$0 -	\$450 <b>100</b> %
29	PERRY, DAVID G (D)	\$21,570	\$0 -	\$1,625 8%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$18,000 83%		\$11,400 63%
	PINO, JOHN (D)	\$23,390	\$7,990 <b>34%</b>	\$1,000 4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$14,150 60%	\$1,700 12%	
	SCHALLEN, WANDALEEN KINCAID (R)*	\$1,865	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,865 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	TAYLOR, RICHARD P (R)*	\$1,092	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$142 13%	\$250 23%	\$0 -	\$250 <b>100</b> %
	AMORES, JON (D)	\$39,318	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 1%	\$0 -		\$11,325 30%	<b>\$26,650</b> 70%
	BROWN, BONNIE (D)	\$39,050	\$10,075 26%	\$1,250 3%	\$100 <1%	\$25 <1%	\$25,167 64%	\$9,867 39%	\$15,300 61%
	CALVERT, ANN (R)*	\$28,351	\$9 <1%	\$1,100 4%	\$650 2%	\$4,572 16%		\$10,800 54%	\$9,325 46%
	CARDEN, TODD (R)*	\$5,461	\$0 -	\$31 1%	\$0 -	\$4,080 75%	\$200 4%	\$0 -	\$200 <b>100%</b>
	HATFIELD, BARBARA (BOBBIE) (D)	\$39,882	\$2,922 7%	\$500 1%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -		<b>\$20,330</b> 59%	
	HUNT, MARK (D)	\$133,221	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$119,315</b> 90%	\$13,800 14%	\$3,200 23%	\$10,600 77%
30	MATHEWS, REBECCA A (R)*	\$250	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 <b>100%</b>	-\$50 -20%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
00	MOORE, AUSTIN C (R)*	\$290	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$190 66%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	PALUMBO, COREY (D)	\$31,488	\$1,341 4%	\$700 2%	\$0 -	\$2,275 7%	\$22,880 73%	\$13,030 57%	\$9,850 43%
	RAINES, PHIL (R)*	\$21,109	\$0 -	\$100 <1%	\$250 1%	\$8,284 39%	\$9,600 45%	\$8,850 92%	\$750 8%
	SIMS, BRADFORD L (R)*	\$36,447	\$0 -	\$825 2%	\$250 1%	<b>\$10,213</b> 28%	\$21,954 60%	\$15,604 71%	\$6,350 29%
	SPENCER, SHARON (D)	\$55,775	\$0 -	<b>\$2,400</b> 4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$51,040 92%	<b>\$38,190</b> 75%	\$12,850 25%
	SUMMERS, JERRY (R)*	\$15,670	\$0 -	\$225 1%	\$250 2%	\$3,000 19%	\$11,475 73%	\$10,325 90%	\$1,150 10%
	WELLS, DANNY (D)	\$25,902	\$383 1%	\$1,030 4%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$20,779 80%	\$15,549 75%	\$5,230 25%
31	MINIMAH, CHARLES (R)*	\$8,945	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$1,000</b> 11%	\$400 4%	\$6,900 77%	\$4,100 59%	\$2,800 41%
31	WEBSTER, CARRIE (D)	\$30,105	\$6,100 20%	\$725 2%	\$300 1%	\$40 <1%	\$21,455 71%	\$10,105 47%	\$11,350 53%
	ARMSTEAD, TIM (R)	\$18,678	\$827 4%	\$236 1%	\$275 1%	\$2,140 11%	\$14,615 78%	\$2,965 20%	\$11,650 80%
	CAIN SR, JON WILLIAM (D)*	\$25,057	\$0 -	\$950 4%	\$0 -	\$1,226 5%	\$18,866 75%	\$11,975 63%	\$6,891 37%
32	LANE, PATRICK 9R)	\$12,955	\$0 -	\$450 3%	<b>\$1,000</b> 8%	\$1,000 8%	\$9,350 72%	\$2,450 26%	\$6,900 74%
32	MORRISON, ROBERT (BOB) (D)*	\$251	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$251 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	ROBINSON, CURTIS (D)*	\$2,415	\$0 -	\$470 <b>19%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,815 75%	\$415 23%	\$1,400 77%
	WALTERS, RON (R)	\$31,689	\$3,349 11%	\$350 1%	\$25 <1%	\$0 -	\$23,090 73%	\$13,940 60%	\$9,150 40%
33	MCKOWN, CHARLES W (R)*	\$580	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$80 14%	\$500 86%	\$500 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -
33	STEMPLE, WILLIAM F (BILL) (D)	\$13,025	\$500 4%	\$250 2%	\$0 -	\$75 1%	\$11,700 90%	\$1,600 14%	\$10,100 86%
24	BOGGS, BRENT (D)	\$26,449	\$2,264 9%	\$300 1%	\$0 -	\$250 1%	\$21,040 80%	\$3,090 15%	\$17,950 85%
34	SHINGLER, BRADLEY N (R)*	\$0	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
35	ARGENTO, SAM (D)	\$9,975	\$0 -	\$250 3%	\$0 -	\$325 3%	\$9,400 <b>94%</b>	\$2,900 31%	\$6,500 69%
35	SALOMON, BILL (R)*	\$814	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$564 <b>69%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			X TO HOUSE ( A Carry Over from	mount and Pe	n Identified	Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest Contributions from			
		Total	Previous	Other			Special		
District		Contributions	Campaigns		Political Party	Self & Family	Interests	Individuals	PACs
36	TALBOTT, JOE (D)	\$7,341	\$1,316 18%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$75 1%	\$5,950 81%	\$1,150 19%	\$4,800 81%
	THOMPSON, JIM (R)*	\$398	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$98 25%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	GRIMES, MULVIE WILLIAM (R)*	\$1,263	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 8%	\$1,163 92%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
37	HADDIX, BRUCE (R)*	\$1,579	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$350 <b>22%</b>	\$974 62%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
01	HARTMAN, BILL (D)	\$8,781	\$2,876 33%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$5,685 65%	\$400 7%	\$5,285 93%
	PROUDFOOT, BILL (D)	\$14,047	\$5,862 <b>42%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$8,085 58%	\$1,450 18%	\$6,635 82%
	DEBARR, MIKE (J D) (W)*	\$155	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$155 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
38	LOVE, DERRICK W (R)*	\$5,409	\$0 -	\$50 1%	\$0 -	\$4,809 89%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	STALNAKER, DOUG (D)	\$10,134	\$919 9%	\$1,500 <b>15%</b>	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$7,360 73%	\$1,460 20%	\$5,900 80%
39	HAMILTON, BILL (R)	\$19,656	\$2,266 12%	\$350 2%	\$250 1%	\$0 -	\$13,400 68%	\$1,300 10%	\$12,100 90%
39	KHAN, TERESA D (D)*	\$7,959	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,110 39%	\$2,860 36%	\$2,360 83%	\$500 17%
40	POLING, MARY M (D)	\$15,547	\$299 2%	\$850 5%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$14,248 <b>92%</b>	\$200 1%	\$14,048 99%
40	WRIGHT, WILLIAM ROBERT (R)	\$4,915	\$0 -	\$250 5%	\$800 16%	\$1,350 27%	\$2,250 46%	\$1,450 64%	\$800 36%
	CANN, SAMUEL J (SAM) (D)	\$52,969	\$18,692 35%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$29,250 55%	\$15,700 54%	\$13,550 46%
	FRAGALE, RON (D)	\$30,350	\$3,695 12%	\$300 1%	\$0 -	\$2,500 8%	\$23,835 79%	\$6,435 27%	\$17,400 73%
	GRIFFITH, WILLIAM H (BILL) (R)*	\$24,470	\$0 -	\$740 3%	\$900 4%	\$9,180 38%	\$6,820 28%	\$5,320 78%	\$1,500 22%
41	IAQUINTA, RICHARD J (D)	\$17,983	\$1,517 8%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$16,416 91%	\$4,785 29%	\$11,631 71%
41	MILEY, TIM (D)	\$36,157	\$0 -	\$550 2%	\$0 -	\$4,036 11%	\$29,511 82%	\$15,536 53%	\$13,975 47%
	PROCTOR, LAMONT (MUTT) (R)*	\$1,485	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$450 <b>30%</b>	\$575 39%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SCUDERE, JAMES L (R)*	\$4,161	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 6%	\$3,911 94%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SHARP, BROOKS (C B) (R)*	\$1,400	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 18%	\$1,150 82%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
42	PARKER, DIANE C (D)*	\$27,699	\$0 -	\$500 2%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$25,575 <b>92%</b>	\$5,625 22%	\$19,950 78%
42	TANSILL, JEFFERY L (R)	\$5,595	\$0 -	\$750 <b>13%</b>	\$650 12%	\$550 10%	\$2,300 41%	\$1,600 70%	\$700 30%
	CAPUTO, MIKE (D)	\$50,551	<b>\$12,541</b> 25%	\$2,080 4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$32,270 64%	\$8,870 27%	<b>\$23,400</b> 73%
	LONGSTRETH, LINDA (D)	\$24,522	\$0 -	\$670 3%	\$100 <1%	\$10 <1%	\$22,015 90%	\$10,515 48%	\$11,500 52%
43	MANCHIN, TIMOTHY J (D)	\$41,426	\$0 -	\$545 1%	\$0 -	\$3,170 8%	\$35,961 87%	\$18,911 53%	\$17,050 47%
43	RICHARDS, BLAINE (R)*	\$0	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SMITH, THOMAS F (R)*	\$191	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$191 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WESTFALL, BRIAN (R)*	\$245	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$245 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	BEACH, ROBERT (BOB) (D)	\$13,136	\$954 7%	\$250 2%	\$0 -	\$2,757 21%	\$8,700 66%	\$1,400 16%	\$7,300 84%
44	FLEISCHAUER, BARBARA EVANS (D)*	\$66,453	\$9,126 14%	\$1,914 3%	\$100 <1%	\$100 <1%	<b>\$44,162</b> 66%	<b>\$26,862</b> 61%	\$17,300 39%
44	FRICH, CINDY (R)	\$35,916	\$0 -	\$725 2%	<b>\$1,000</b> 3%	\$8,001 22%	\$21,925 61%	\$8,275 38%	\$13,650 62%
	HOUSTON, NANCY J (D)	\$19,902	\$2,327 12%	\$350 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$16,275 <u>82%</u>	\$5,825 36%	\$10,450 64%

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			Carry Over from	mount and Pe	Identified	Amount and Perce Identified Special In Contributions fro			
District	Candidate	Total Contributions	Previous Campaigns	Other Candidates	Political Party	Solf & Family	Special Interests	Individuals	PACs
District	MANILLA, JIM (R)*	\$20,994	\$0 -	\$600 3%	\$650 3%	\$808 4%	\$15,663 75%	\$14,963 96%	\$700 4%
44	MARSHALL, CHARLENE (D)	\$43,005	\$1 <b>2,648</b> 29%	\$400 1%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$27,167 63%		\$19,250 71%
(con't)	PAULEY, W KENT (R)*	\$2,559	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 10%	\$0 -	\$250 <b>100%</b>
(5511.1)	RIFFLE, JEFF (R)*	\$961	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$300 31%	· ·	\$0 -
	BATSON, DAVID C (R)*	\$2,410	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,430 59%	\$750 31%	\$750 <b>100</b> %	
45	WILLIAMS, LARRY A (D)	\$16,774	\$7,136 <b>43%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$63 <1%	\$9,300 55%	*	\$5,850 63%
	SHAVER, STAN (D)*	\$9,410	\$1,445 15%	\$550 6%	\$0 -	\$1,415 15%	\$5,800 62%	\$150 3%	\$5,650 97%
46	STEVENS, DEBORAH (DEBBIE) (R)	\$8,928	\$0 -	\$841 9%	\$650 7%	\$1,113 12%	\$5,150 58%	\$5,150 <b>100</b> %	
	ESTES, SHIRLEY (R)*	\$0	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
47	MICHAEL, HAROLD (D)	\$62,118	\$10,718 17%	\$500 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	•	\$16,350 33%	•
	EVANS, ALLEN V (R)	\$4,143	\$657 16%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,900 70%	\$0 -	\$2,900 <b>100%</b>
48	RIGGLEMAN JR, DENVER LEE (D)*	\$0	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$O -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	GROVE, WALTER R (D)*	\$781	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$681 87%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
49	SCHADLER, ROBERT A (R)	\$4,096	\$0 -	\$100 2%	\$0 -	\$196 5%	\$3,600 88%	\$200 6%	\$3,400 94%
	MEZZATESTA, JERRY L (D)*	\$16,485	\$0 -	\$2,140 <b>13%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$11,785 71%	\$6,685 57%	\$5,100 43%
50	ROWAN, RUTH (R)	\$12,624	\$0 -	\$1,575 12%	<b>\$1,150</b> 9%	\$627 5%	\$8,750 69%	\$7,250 83%	\$1,500 17%
51	TRUMP IV, CHARLES S (R)	\$18,302	\$267 1%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$85 <1%	\$17,650 <b>96%</b>	\$1,800 10%	\$15,850 90%
52	BLAIR, CRAIG (R)	\$3,975	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$75 2%	\$3,650 <b>92%</b>	\$0 -	\$3,650 <b>100</b> %
52	FUNK, SCOTT (D)*	\$394	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
53	BURTON, JERRY L (D)*	\$6,941	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,884 70%	\$884 18%	\$4,000 82%
55	ROBERTS, VIC (R)	\$10,010	\$0 -	\$775 8%	\$650 6%	\$0 -	\$6,750 67%	\$3,500 52%	\$3,250 48%
54	DUKE, WALTER E (R)	\$6,847	\$47 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$6,800 <b>99%</b>	\$0 -	\$6,800 <b>100</b> %
55	OVERINGTON, JOHN (R)	\$7,538	\$401 5%	\$150 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,760 63%	\$2,060 43%	\$2,700 57%
56	TABB, BOB (D)	\$8,361	\$0 -	\$1,350 <b>16%</b>	\$400 5%	\$856 10%	\$5,280 63%	\$1,680 32%	\$3,600 68%
3	WHITACRE, JAMES (JIM) (R)*	\$7,840	\$0 -	\$750 10%	\$650 8%	\$2,190 28%	\$3,500 45%	\$3,500 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
57	DOYLE, JOHN (D)	\$35,315	\$98 <1%	\$2,175 6%	\$120 <1%	\$1,520 4%	\$19,639 56%	\$11,189 57%	\$8,450 43%
<u> </u>	MURTO, ROBERT (BOB) (R)*	\$14,394	\$0 -	\$1,600 11%	\$650 5%	\$2,550 18%	\$9,200 64%	\$9,200 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
58	MORGAN, SUZANNE (R)*	\$28,722	\$0 -	<b>\$2,750</b> 10%	\$650 2%	\$0 -	\$21,260 74%	\$15,410 72%	\$5,850 28%
50	WYSONG, LOCKE (D)	\$18,725	\$0 -	\$1,275 7%	\$750 4%	\$5,100 27%	\$6,405 34%	\$4,705 73%	\$1,700 27%

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				andidates (c	,				
			Amou	nt and Percent	of Identified S	Special Interest	Contributions	from	
		Banking &		Consumer	Corporate				_
District		Finance	Coal	Lawyers	Lawyers	Education	Gambling	Health Care	Insurance
	CHANEY, PAT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
1	DELONG, JOE (D)	\$1,550 3%	\$0 -	<b>\$12,523</b> 22%	<b>\$2,250</b> 4%	<b>\$4,250</b> 7%	\$800 1%	\$1,900 3%	\$550 1%
	MADDEN, ROGER D (R)*	\$100 <b>24%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$210 <b>51%</b>	\$0 -
	SWARTZMILLER, RANDY (D)	\$400 1%	\$2,000 6%	\$1,500 5%	\$725 2%	\$0 -	\$6,850 21%	<b>\$6,523</b> 20%	<b>\$1,750</b> 5%
	ENNIS, TIM (D)	\$650 5%	\$1,000 8%	\$3,000 23%	\$200 2%	\$500 4%	\$0 -	\$2,350 18%	\$500 4%
2	GRAY, JAMEY (R)*	\$0 -	\$3,000 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	MCNINCH, ROBERT (LES) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	YOST, JACK (D)	\$650 2%	\$0 -	\$12,200 37%	\$500 2%	\$1,850 6%	\$150 <1%	\$570 2%	\$0 -
	KLEMPA, ORPHY (D)*	\$260 1%	\$0 -	\$9,850 20%	\$600 1%	\$1,900 4%	\$1,600 3%	\$510 1%	\$10 <1%
3	TIGHE, JERRY A (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
3	WAKIM, CHRISTOPHER (R)	\$325 2%	\$350 2%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$500 3%	\$3,925 27%	\$375 3%
	WHITE, L GIL (R)	\$2,025 5%	\$1,400 4%	\$0 -	\$500 1%	\$150 <1%	\$3,500 9%	<b>\$11,050</b> 29%	<b>\$1,500</b> 4%
	LUCEY, CODY J (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$320 36%	\$0 -
4	MORRIS, RONALD (R)*	\$250 12%	\$1,550 <b>74%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$300 14%	\$0 -
	TUCKER, KENNETH D (D)	\$500 4%	\$0 -	\$3,000 24%	\$0 -	\$1,250 10%	\$0 -	\$900 7%	\$0 -
	VARNER, SCOTT G (D)	\$1,100 4%	\$2,450 8%	\$3,000 10%	\$600 2%	\$500 2%	\$2,000 7%	\$4,800 16%	\$250 1%
5	AMOS JR, ED (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
5	PETHTEL, DAVE (D)	\$1,350 8%	\$1,650 10%	\$500 3%	\$250 1%	\$250 1%	\$1,600 <b>10%</b>	\$2,550 15%	\$500 3%
6	ROMINE, WM ROGER (R)	\$100 8%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 20%	\$0 -
	JANES, PAUL D (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
7	LEGGETT, OTIS A (R)	\$750 14%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 5%	\$0 -	\$2,200 41%	\$250 5%
	SHULTZ, TRAVIS (I)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
8	ANDERSON JR, E W (BILL) (R)	\$550 8%	\$450 7%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$550 8%	\$50 1%	\$1,750 25%	\$250 4%
9	BORDER, LARRY (R)	\$600 6%	\$350 3%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,100 20%	\$700 7%
9	LEWIS, JEFF (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,150 9%	\$0 -	\$2,750 21%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	AZINGER, TOM (R)	\$1,850 13%	\$500 3%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,750 33%	\$850 6%
	BEANE, J D (D)	<b>\$2,725</b> 8%	\$1,750 5%	\$3,600 10%	\$1,150 3%	\$300 1%	\$500 1%	<b>\$11,100</b> 32%	\$1,150 3%
40	ELLEM, JOHN N (R)	\$900 5%	\$0 -	\$2,200 12%	\$100 1%	\$1,050 6%	\$0 -	\$3,700 20%	\$0 -
10	GILLESPIE, FRED (R)*	\$200 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$750 12%	\$0 -	\$3,525 <b>54%</b>	\$500 8%
	RADCLIFF, PATRICK N (D)*	\$0 -	\$200 3%	\$500 7%		\$1,050 15%	\$0 -	\$175 2%	\$0 -
	WILKINSON, SCOTT (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
11	ASHLEY, BOB (R)	\$200 6%	\$250 8%	\$0 -	\$200 6%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$750 23%	\$200 6%
	CARMICHAEL, MITCH B (R)	\$1,450 <b>22%</b>	\$300 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 8%	\$0 -	\$1,350 21%	\$250 4%
12	SIDERS, CORBON (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				,	<i>'</i>				
			Amount	and Percent of	-	ecial Interest	Contributions	from	
District	Candidate	Banking & Finance	Coal	Consumer Lawyers	Corporate Lawyers	Education	Gambling	Health Care	Insurance
District	MARTIN, DALE (D)	\$700 2%	\$0 -	\$6,425 21%	\$100 <1%	\$2,400 8%	\$1,900 6%	\$950 3%	\$0 -
	MCLANE, JACK R (R)*	\$250 6%	\$1,200 27%	\$0 -	\$50 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 6%	\$250 6%
13	PAXTON, BRADY R (D)	\$950 5%	\$0 -	\$750 4%	\$0 -	\$2,400 14%	\$600 3%	\$800 5%	\$0 -
	WOOD, CHRISTOPHER TROY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,071 <b>63%</b>	\$0 -
	HALL, MIKE (R)	\$200 3%	\$800 10%	\$250 3%	\$100 1%	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$1,750 22%	\$150 2%
	MCNEELY, TOM A (D)*	\$0 -	\$00 10%	\$230 3 <i>7</i> 6 \$0 -	\$100 178	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$1,730 22%	\$130 276
14	SCHOEN, PATTI EAGLOSKI (R)	\$300 4%	\$100 1%	\$1,650 21%	\$75 1%	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$1,750 22%	\$100 1%
	SLUSS, STEPHEN C (STEVE) (D)*	\$100 3%	\$0 -	\$250 8%	\$50 2%	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	BARRY, DENNIS A (R)*	\$0 -	\$5,000 <b>63%</b>	\$50 1%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,200 28%	\$0 -
	CRAIG, KEVIN J (D)	\$2,325 5%	\$10,600 24%	\$0 -	<b>\$2,600</b> 6%	\$1,000 2%	\$600 1%	\$4,950 11%	\$1, <b>850</b> 4%
	LEACH, MARGARETTE R (D)	\$650 6%	\$1,000 9%	\$500 5%	\$100 1%	\$1,930 18%	\$0 -	\$3,775 35%	\$50 <1%
15	MILLER, CAROL D (R)*	\$250 2%	<b>\$6,900</b> 44%	\$100 1%	\$400 3%	\$0 -	\$O -	\$2,250 14%	\$350 2%
	MORGAN, JIM (D)	\$3,800 28%	\$650 5%	\$1,151 9%	\$350 3%	\$300 2%	\$O -	\$3,850 29%	\$350 3%
	STEWART, PAULA L (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	HOWARD, GREG (R)	\$1,200 8%	\$850 6%	\$0 -	\$650 4%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$4,350 28%	\$1,200 8%
	HUBBARD, SUSAN (D)*	\$500 2%	\$0 -	\$6,150 21%	\$0 -	\$8,280 28%	\$0 -	\$275 1%	\$0 -
16	NELSON, BOBBY (D)*	\$550 4%	\$0 -	\$5,000 33%	\$0 -	<b>\$3,500</b> 23%	\$0 -	\$850 6%	\$0 -
16	SABIN, MATT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SOBONYA, KELLI (R)	\$1,600 9%	\$3,175 19%	\$50 <1%	\$150 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,150 18%	\$900 5%
	STEPHENS, DALE (D)	\$250 1%	\$0 -	\$5,825 25%	\$0 -	<b>\$4,500</b> 19%	\$0 -	\$475 2%	\$0 -
	PERDUE, DON C (D)	\$450 2%	\$0 -	\$2,500 13%	\$200 1%	\$2,400 12%	\$300 2%	\$3,200 16%	\$0 -
17	RAMEY, LESLIE (LES) (R)*	\$0 -	\$1,200 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
17	STROUD, MATT (R)*	\$0 -	\$500 <b>91%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	THOMPSON, RICHARD (D)	\$550 3%	\$0 -	\$4,825 -	\$25 <1%	\$2,400 12%	\$50 <1%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -
18	BARKER, LARRY W (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 14%	\$0 -	\$150 9%	\$0 -	\$850 <b>49%</b>	\$0 -
-10	MILLER, WARREN K (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,100 <b>59%</b>	\$0 -	\$50 3%	\$250 <b>14%</b>
	BUTCHER, GREG (D)	\$900 5%	\$0 -	\$1,250 7%	\$0 -	\$1,150 7%	\$2,343 14%	\$650 4%	\$0 -
	COOK, JEFF (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	ELDRIDGE, JEFF (D)	\$200 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$900 11%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
19	FERRELL, JOE C (D)	\$900 <b>41%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 23%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	HRUTKAY, LIDELLA WILSON (D)	\$1,400 6%	\$200 1%	\$10,400 42%	\$0 -	\$2,050 8%	\$250 1%	\$1,600 6%	\$250 1%
	LITZ, DAVE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 <b>67%</b>	\$0 -	\$150 20%	\$0 -
	MULLINS, JIM (R)*	\$0 -	\$6,500 <b>72%</b>	\$0 -	\$850 <b>9%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 6%	\$0 -
	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM E (R)*	\$0 -	<u>\$0</u> -	\$0 -	\$0 -	<u>\$0</u> -	<u>\$0</u> -	<u>\$0</u> -	\$0 -

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				manadioo (o					
			Amoun	t and Percent o	of Identified S	pecial Interest	Contribution	s from	
		Banking &		Consumer	Corporate				
District	Candidate	Finance	Coal	Lawyers	Lawyers	Education	Gambling	Health Care	Insurance
20	KOMINAR, K STEVEN (D)	<b>\$2,775</b> 7%	<b>\$16,200</b> 43%	\$2,500 7%	\$1,500 4%	\$0 -	\$1,550 4%	\$2,450 6%	<b>\$1,500</b> 4%
20	SHAFER, DIANE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -
21	SAUNDERS, JAMES (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WHITE, HARRY KEITH (D)	\$4,400 22%	\$1,750 9%	\$750 4%	\$950 5%	\$1,000 5%	\$750 4%	\$600 3%	\$2,950 15%
	BLAYLOCK, BRANDON (R)*	\$250 9%	\$1,000 35%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 18%	\$0 -
22	BROWNING, RICHARD (D)	<b>\$2,925</b> 9%	\$3,675 12%	\$2,750 9%	<b>\$1,550</b> 5%	\$2,300 7%	<b>\$2,050</b> 7%	\$3,900 13%	\$500 2%
	SPEARS, SHAWN R (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	STATON, W RICHARD (RICK) (D)	<b>\$4,400</b> 12%	\$3,925 11%	\$2,550 7%	<b>\$2,450</b> 7%	\$1,050 3%	<b>\$2,650</b> 7%	\$4,500 12%	\$900 2%
23	LUSHBAUGH, MIKE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
23	MOORE, CLIF (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$750 <b>27%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
24	FREDERICK, EUSTACE (D)	\$650 11%	\$1,300 22%	\$0 -	\$100 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,550 26%	\$500 8%
24	QUESINBERRY, DOUGLAS C (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	HALL, JONATHAN (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
25	LONG, MARSHALL C (D)	\$600 3%	\$700 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$16,899 75%	\$1,200 5%
25	MAGANN, MICHAEL (D)*	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$13,000 59%	\$0 -	\$2,150 10%	\$0 -	\$500 2%	\$0 -
	PORTER, THOMAS (MIKE) (R)	\$150 2%	\$3,554 57%	\$0 -	\$500 <b>8%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
26	CROSIER, GERALD L (D)	\$500 11%	\$1,000 21%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,025 22%	\$500 <b>11%</b>
20	MILLER, DUANE (R)	\$250 15%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 15%	\$150 9%
	CARPENTER, CHARLES (CHUCK) (R)*	\$500 <b>25%</b>	\$150 7%	\$0 -	\$100 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$770 38%	\$0 -
	HEDRICK, RON (R)*	\$250 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	KISS, ROBERT S (D)	<b>\$6,475</b> 9%	<b>\$9,350</b> 13%	\$0 -	\$6,025 8%	\$775 1%	<b>\$2,025</b> 3%	<b>\$19,268</b> 28%	<b>\$4,875</b> 7%
	MAHAN, VIRGINIA (D)	\$835 2%	\$1,150 3%	\$17,900 42%	\$500 1%	\$1,800 4%	\$250 1%	<b>\$8,032</b> 19%	\$0 -
27	PULLIAM, ROBERT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,225 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -
21	STEVENS, PHILIP L (R)*	\$250 10%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$450 <b>17%</b>	\$250 10%	\$0 -
	SUMNER, LINDA (R)	\$1,350 7%	\$4,350 24%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$300 2%	\$0 -	\$3,600 20%	\$650 4%
	SUSMAN, SALLY (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$750 6%	\$200 2%	\$1,800 15%	\$0 -	\$2,400 20%	\$0 -
	THOMPSON, RON (D)	\$4,950 19%	\$6,525 25%	\$0 -	\$300 1%	\$650 3%	\$1,000 4%	<b>\$7,025</b> 27%	\$850 3%
	WOOTON, JOHN D (D)*	\$1,150 4%	\$6,250 20%	\$8,450 27%	\$200 1%	\$1,400 4%	\$250 1%	\$3,941 13%	\$0 -
	CAMPBELL, THOMAS W (D)	\$1,850 14%	\$1,400 11%	\$750 6%	\$500 4%	\$1,550 12%	\$200 2%	\$2,100 16%	\$700 5%
28	CANTERBURY, RAY (R)	\$850 17%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$150 3%	\$100 2%	\$1,150 23%	\$200 4%
20	FRIEDMAN, CHARLIE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$15 5%	\$50 <b>16%</b>
	SCARLES, TOMMY D (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,250 <b>26%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			10 110430 00		<u> </u>				
			Amour	nt and Percent o	of Identified S	pecial Interest	Contributions	s from	
		Banking &		Consumer	Corporate				
District		Finance	Coal	Lawyers	Lawyers	Education	Gambling	Health Care	Insurance
	LILLY, BETTY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	LOUISOS, TOM (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 <b>56%</b>	\$0 -
29	PERRY, DAVID G (D)	\$2,475 14%	\$4,000 22%	\$750 4%	\$200 1%	\$2,400 13%	\$1,400 8%	\$2,100 12%	<b>\$1,500</b> 8%
	PINO, JOHN (D)	\$1,050 7%	\$2,250 16%	\$750 5%	\$200 1%	\$150 1%	\$0 -	\$2,050 14%	\$700 5%
	SCHALLEN, WANDALEEN KINCAID (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	TAYLOR, RICHARD P (R)*	\$0 -	\$250 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	AMORES, JON (D)	<b>\$5,075</b> 13%	\$3,050 8%	\$0 -	\$1,350 4%	\$0 -	<b>\$2,100</b> 6%	<b>\$10,250</b> 27%	\$1,350 4%
	BROWN, BONNIE (D)	\$950 4%	\$0 -	\$6,100 24%	\$821 3%	\$2,525 10%	\$250 1%	\$1,610 6%	\$450 2%
	CALVERT, ANN (R)*	\$1,300 6%	<b>\$6,900</b> 34%	\$0 -	\$475 2%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$2,885 14%	\$625 3%
	CARDEN, TODD (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	HATFIELD, BARBARA (BOBBIE) (D)	\$1,350 4%	\$0 -	\$15,050 44%	\$0 -	\$2,650 8%	\$0 -	\$1,380 4%	\$0 -
	HUNT, MARK (D)	\$0 -	\$750 5%	\$4,200 30%	\$0 -	\$1,250 9%	\$750 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -
30	MATHEWS, REBECCA A (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
30	MOORE, AUSTIN C (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	PALUMBO, COREY (D)	\$2,525 11%	\$2,850 12%	\$250 1%	\$2,955 13%	\$300 1%	\$0 -	<b>\$6,500</b> 28%	\$500 2%
	RAINES, PHIL (R)*	\$0 -	\$5,600 58%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,300 14%	\$1,200 <b>13%</b>
	SIMS, BRADFORD L (R)*	\$1,349 6%	<b>\$8,350</b> 38%	\$0 -	\$2,550 12%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,025 14%	<b>\$1,500</b> 7%
	SPENCER, SHARON (D)	\$1,150 2%	\$2,350 5%	\$28,310 55%	\$650 1%	\$600 1%	<b>\$2,500</b> 5%	\$2,200 4%	\$0 -
	SUMMERS, JERRY (R)*	\$0 -	\$7,700 67%	\$0 -	\$450 4%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$500 4%	\$0 -
	WELLS, DANNY (D)	\$550 3%	\$1,274 6%	\$6,950 33%	\$650 3%	\$350 2%	\$3,500 17%	\$2,025 10%	\$450 2%
31	MINIMAH, CHARLES (R)*	\$250 4%	\$3,550 51%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$50 1%	\$0 -	\$1,100 16%	\$1,250 <b>18%</b>
31	WEBSTER, CARRIE (D)	\$650 3%	\$0 -	\$7,512 35%	\$1,033 5%	\$2,320 11%	\$0 -	\$570 3%	\$0 -
	ARMSTEAD, TIM (R)	\$1,150 8%	\$2,050 14%	\$0 -	\$240 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,275 22%	\$1,150 8%
	CAIN SR, JON WILLIAM (D)*	\$2,100 11%	\$800 4%	\$5,225 28%	\$250 1%	\$500 3%	\$0 -	\$1,790 9%	\$0 -
32	LANE, PATRICK 9R)	\$0 -	\$800 9%	\$0 -	\$300 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$3,050 33%	\$500 5%
32	MORRISON, ROBERT (BOB) (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	ROBINSON, CURTIS (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$215 12%	\$0 -	\$500 <b>28%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WALTERS, RON (R)	\$1,150 5%	\$1,800 8%	\$8,400 <b>36%</b>	\$805 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,210 18%	\$1,400 6%
33	MCKOWN, CHARLES W (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
33	STEMPLE, WILLIAM F (BILL) (D)	\$350 3%	\$750 6%	\$750 6%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$750 6%	\$900 8%	\$250 2%
34	BOGGS, BRENT (D)	\$550 3%	\$0 -	\$1,250 6%	\$0 -	\$2,150 10%	\$0 -	\$1,650 8%	\$250 1%
J-	SHINGLER, BRADLEY N (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
35	ARGENTO, SAM (D)	\$400 4%	\$0 -	\$2,000 21%	\$0 -	\$1,050 11%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SALOMON, BILL (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	<u>\$0</u> -	\$0 <u></u> -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				andidates (C	,				
			Amoui	nt and Percent	of Identified S	pecial Interest	Contributions	from	
		Banking &		Consumer	Corporate				
District	Candidate	Finance	Coal	Lawyers	Lawyers	Education	Gambling	<b>Health Care</b>	Insurance
36	TALBOTT, JOE (D)	\$300 5%	\$250 4%	\$750 13%	\$100 2%	\$500 8%	\$850 <b>14%</b>	\$1,600 27%	\$250 4%
30	THOMPSON, JIM (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	GRIMES, MULVIE WILLIAM (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
37	HADDIX, BRUCE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
31	HARTMAN, BILL (D)	\$550 10%	\$550 10%	\$0 -	\$350 6%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,350 24%	\$800 <b>14%</b>
	PROUDFOOT, BILL (D)	\$350 4%	\$750 9%	\$0 -	\$600 7%	\$0 -	\$1,500 <b>19%</b>	\$1,400 17%	\$250 3%
	DEBARR, MIKE (J D) (W)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
38	LOVE, DERRICK W (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	STALNAKER, DOUG (D)	\$550 7%	\$300 4%	\$250 3%	\$100 1%	\$250 3%	\$750 <b>10%</b>	\$1,160 16%	\$750 10%
39	HAMILTON, BILL (R)	\$550 4%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$50 <1%	\$1,300 10%	\$0 -	\$1,050 8%	\$1,475 <b>11%</b>
- 55	KHAN, TERESA D (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,860 <b>65%</b>	\$0 -
40	POLING, MARY M (D)	\$300 2%	\$0 -	\$1,500 11%	\$0 -	\$4,148 29%	\$0 -	\$300 2%	\$0 -
	WRIGHT, WILLIAM ROBERT (R)	\$500 <b>22%</b>	\$1,000 44%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 9%	\$250 <b>11%</b>
	CANN, SAMUEL J (SAM) (D)	\$1,250 4%	\$1,750 6%	\$0 -	<b>\$1,600</b> 5%	\$0 -	\$500 2%	\$2,900 10%	\$0 -
	FRAGALE, RON (D)	\$650 3%	\$0 -	\$5,600 23%	\$300 1%	<b>\$3,450</b> 14%	\$500 2%	\$1,300 5%	\$250 1%
	GRIFFITH, WILLIAM H (BILL) (R)*	\$350 5%	\$2,000 29%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,150 17%	\$0 -
41	IAQUINTA, RICHARD J (D)	\$750 5%	\$250 2%	\$2,500 15%	\$0 -	\$2,600 16%	\$0 -	\$3,650 22%	\$0 -
	MILEY, TIM (D)	\$300 1%	\$100 <1%	\$12,786 43%	\$400 1%	\$2,600 9%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$0 -
	PROCTOR, LAMONT (MUTT) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SCUDERE, JAMES L (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SHARP, BROOKS (C B) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
42	PARKER, DIANE C (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$4,850 19%	\$100 <1%	\$1,900 7%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	TANSILL, JEFFERY L (R)	\$250 11%	\$1,000 43%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$350 15%	\$250 <b>11%</b>
	CAPUTO, MIKE (D)	\$800 2%	\$40 <1%	\$6,100 19%	\$50 <1%	<b>\$3,240</b> 10%	<b>\$2,500</b> 8%	\$500 2%	\$0 -
	LONGSTRETH, LINDA (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$9,450 <b>43%</b>	\$0 -	\$2,360 11%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
43	MANCHIN, TIMOTHY J (D)	\$750 2%	\$95 <1%	\$12,950 36%	\$270 1%	<b>\$2,800</b> 8%	\$250 1%	\$230 1%	\$0 -
.0	RICHARDS, BLAINE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SMITH, THOMAS F (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WESTFALL, BRIAN (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	BEACH, ROBERT (BOB) (D)	\$900 10%	\$1,400 16%	\$750 9%	\$400 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,100 24%	\$250 3%
44	FLEISCHAUER, BARBARA EVANS (D)*	\$1,150 3%	\$0 -	\$19,006 43%	\$500 1%	<b>\$4,340</b> 10%	\$250 1%	\$1,825 4%	\$0 -
''	FRICH, CINDY (R)	\$1,250 6%	\$4,700 21%	\$0 -	\$650 3%	\$350 2%	\$400 2%	\$5,000 23%	\$1,250 6%
	HOUSTON, NANCY J (D)	\$900 6%	\$950 6%	\$900 -	\$200 1%	\$2,050 13%	\$1,250 8%	\$4,225 26%	\$250 2%

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			Amour	t and Percent	of Identified S	pecial Interest	Contributions	from	
District	Candidate	Banking & Finance	Coal	Consumer Lawyers	Corporate Lawyers	Education	Gambling	Health Care	Insurance
	MANILLA, JIM (R)*	\$400 3%	<b>\$8,950</b> 57%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 3%	\$300 2%	\$1,300 8%	\$0 -
44	MARSHALL, CHARLENE (D)	\$0 -	\$1,416 5%	\$5,750 21%	\$100 <1%	<b>\$3,550</b> 13%	\$1,750 6%	\$800 3%	\$250 1%
(con't)	PAULEY, W KENT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	RIFFLE, JEFF (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
45	BATSON, DAVID C (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$300 <b>40%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -
45	WILLIAMS, LARRY A (D)	\$300 3%	\$500 5%	\$250 3%	\$100 1%	\$1,240 13%	\$750 8%	\$800 9%	\$250 3%
46	SHAVER, STAN (D)*	\$300 5%	\$200 3%	\$250 4%	\$0 -	\$1,450 25%	\$0 -	\$300 5%	\$150 3%
40	STEVENS, DEBORAH (DEBBIE) (R)	\$0 -	\$4,000 <b>78%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
47	ESTES, SHIRLEY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
47	MICHAEL, HAROLD (D)	<b>\$4,175</b> 8%	\$4,700 9%	\$0 -	\$5,675 11%	\$250 1%	\$1,550 3%	<b>\$13,200</b> 27%	<b>\$3,500</b> 7%
48	EVANS, ALLEN V (R)	\$200 7%	\$250 9%	\$0 -	\$200 7%	\$500 17%	\$0 -	\$1,100 38%	\$100 3%
40	RIGGLEMAN JR, DENVER LEE (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
49	GROVE, WALTER R (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
49	SCHADLER, ROBERT A (R)	\$550 15%	\$250 7%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,050 29%	\$0 -
50	MEZZATESTA, JERRY L (D)*	\$575 5%	\$4,585 39%	\$0 -	\$950 <b>8%</b>	\$550 5%	\$100 1%	\$250 2%	\$0 -
50	ROWAN, RUTH (R)	\$250 3%	\$4,000 46%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,250 <b>26%</b>	\$0 -	\$250 3%	\$0 -
51	TRUMP IV, CHARLES S (R)	\$550 3%	\$1,550 9%	\$0 -	\$500 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$5,250 30%	\$2,550 14%
52	BLAIR, CRAIG (R)	\$850 <b>23%</b>	\$100 3%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$850 23%	\$250 7%
52	FUNK, SCOTT (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
53	BURTON, JERRY L (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,422 <b>50%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
55	ROBERTS, VIC (R)	\$1,200 18%	\$2,000 30%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$825 12%	\$250 4%
54	DUKE, WALTER E (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,100 <b>31%</b>	\$0 -	\$600 9%	\$250 4%
55	OVERINGTON, JOHN (R)	\$550 12%	\$250 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$2,125 <b>45%</b>	\$0 -
56	TABB, BOB (D)	\$550 10%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$600 <b>11%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$700 13%	\$250 5%
50	WHITACRE, JAMES (JIM) (R)*	\$250 7%	\$1,000 29%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 14%	\$0 -
57	DOYLE, JOHN (D)	\$1,650 8%	\$1,000 5%	\$1,349 7%	\$1,900 10%	\$325 2%	\$150 1%	\$4,300 22%	\$250 1%
31	MURTO, ROBERT (BOB) (R)*	\$250 3%	\$6,700 73%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
58	MORGAN, SUZANNE (R)*	\$500 2%	<b>\$10,500</b> 49%	\$0 -	\$75 <1%	\$0 -	\$500 2%	\$3,350 16%	\$350 2%
50	WYSONG, LOCKE (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 8%	\$25 <1%	\$880 14%	\$0 -	\$550 9%	\$0 -

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amoun	t and Percent	of Identified \$	Special Interes	t Contributions	from
				Other	Prescription	Real Estate &	
District	Candidate	Labor	Oil & Gas	Business	Drugs	Construction	Tobacco
	CHANEY, PAT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
1	DELONG, JOE (D)	<b>\$10,700</b> 19%	\$400 1%	<b>\$2,550</b> 4%	\$700 1%	<b>\$2,350</b> 4%	\$0 -
	MADDEN, ROGER D (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SWARTZMILLER, RANDY (D)	\$2,050 6%	\$1,125 3%	\$800 2%	\$600 2%	<b>\$3,900</b> 12%	\$250 1%
	ENNIS, TIM (D)	\$750 6%	\$1,050 8%	\$200 2%	\$0 -	\$400 3%	\$250 2%
2	GRAY, JAMEY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	MCNINCH, ROBERT (LES) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	YOST, JACK (D)	<b>\$13,595</b> 41%	\$0 -	\$725 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	KLEMPA, ORPHY (D)*	\$30,550 61%	\$0 -	\$300 1%	\$0 -	\$1,175 2%	\$0 -
3	TIGHE, JERRY A (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
3	WAKIM, CHRISTOPHER (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$800 <b>6%</b>	\$500 3%	\$350 2%	\$4,300 30%
	WHITE, L GIL (R)	\$1,650 4%	\$1,100 3%	<b>\$2,022</b> 5%	\$750 2%	<b>\$2,300</b> 6%	\$3,650 10%
	LUCEY, CODY J (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$157 <b>18%</b>	\$0 -	\$100 11%	\$0 -
4	MORRIS, RONALD (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
4	TUCKER, KENNETH D (D)	\$6,800 <b>54%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -
	VARNER, SCOTT G (D)	\$3,850 13%	<b>\$2,100</b> 7%	\$75 <1%	\$250 1%	\$1,450 5%	\$1,000 3%
5	AMOS JR, ED (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
5	PETHTEL, DAVE (D)	\$1,250 7%	\$1,750 10%	\$150 1%	\$250 1%	\$950 6%	\$0 -
6	ROMINE, WM ROGER (R)	\$0 -	\$350 <b>28%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 16%	\$0 -
	JANES, PAUL D (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
7	LEGGETT, OTIS A (R)	\$0 -	\$600 11%	\$200 4%	\$0 -	\$300 6%	\$0 -
	SHULTZ, TRAVIS (I)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
8	ANDERSON JR, E W (BILL) (R)	\$0 -	\$800 12%	\$600 <b>9%</b>	\$0 -	\$400 6%	\$0 -
9	BORDER, LARRY (R)	\$0 -	\$1,200 11%	\$200 2%	\$837 8%	\$400 4%	\$200 2%
9	LEWIS, JEFF (D)*	\$8,150 <b>62%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 4%	\$0 -
	AZINGER, TOM (R)	\$0 -	\$1,250 9%	\$200 1%	\$250 2%	\$1,150 8%	\$250 2%
	BEANE, J D (D)	\$0 -	<b>\$2,050</b> 6%	\$300 1%	<b>\$1,500</b> 4%	<b>\$2,750</b> 8%	\$0 -
10	ELLEM, JOHN N (R)	\$6,800 36%	\$250 1%	\$700 4%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$450 2%
10	GILLESPIE, FRED (R)*	\$0 -	\$100 2%	\$250 4%	\$0 -	\$600 9%	\$0 -
	RADCLIFF, PATRICK N (D)*	\$3,350 47%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -
	WILKINSON, SCOTT (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
11	ASHLEY, BOB (R)	\$0 -	\$250 8%	\$200 <b>6%</b>	\$0 -	\$300 9%	\$250 <b>8%</b>
12	CARMICHAEL, MITCH B (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 3%	\$1,000 <b>16%</b>	\$200 3%	\$250 <b>4%</b>
12	SIDERS, CORBON (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amoun	•		nacial Interest	Contributions f	rom
District	Candidate	Labor	Oil & Gas	Other Business	=	Contributions f Real Estate & Construction	Tobacco
District	MARTIN, DALE (D)	\$14,700 49%	\$0 -	\$150 <1%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$200 1%
	MCLANE, JACK R (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,000 <b>22%</b>	\$0 -	\$200 1%
13	PAXTON, BRADY R (D)	\$9,100 <b>53%</b>	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$500 3%	\$400 2%	\$0 -
	• •	, ,				•	-
	WOOD, CHRISTOPHER TROY (R)*	\$0 - \$0 -	•	*	·	\$0 -	\$0 -
	HALL, MIKE (R)	·	\$850 11%	\$200 3%	\$1,350 17%	\$200 3% \$0 -	\$400 <b>5%</b>
14	MCNEELY, TOM A (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 - \$700 9%	\$0 -
	SCHOEN, PATTI EAGLOSKI (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 2%	\$0 -	•	\$0 -
	SLUSS, STEPHEN C (STEVE) (D)*	\$0 - \$0 -	<u>\$0 -</u> \$0 -	<u>\$0 -</u> \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	<b>\$2,340 78%</b> \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -
	BARRY, DENNIS A (R)*	\$0 - \$1,000 2%	\$0 - <b>\$2,250</b> 5%	**	**	**	ΨΟ
	CRAIG, KEVIN J (D) LEACH, MARGARETTE R (D)	\$1,000 2%	\$2,230 5% \$850 8%	<b>\$1,950</b> 4% \$125 1%	<b>\$1,350</b> 3% \$400 4%	<b>\$4,150</b> 9% \$25 <1%	<b>\$650</b> 1% \$0 -
15	MILLER, CAROL D (R)*	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$250 2%	\$500 3%	\$300 2%	\$0 - \$250 2%
	* *	\$0 - \$0 -	\$100 1%	\$250 2% \$275 2%	\$500 3% \$0 -	\$300 2% \$450 3%	\$250 2% \$0 -
	MORGAN, JIM (D) STEWART, PAULA L (R)*	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$275 2% \$25 <b>100%</b>		\$450 5% \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -
	HOWARD, GREG (R)	\$0 -	\$400 3%	\$25 <b>100</b> %	\$1,750 11%	\$850 6%	\$0 -
	HUBBARD, SUSAN (D)*	\$11,600 40%	\$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$1,730 1178	\$25 <1%	\$0 - \$0 -
	NELSON, BOBBY (D)*	\$3,950 26%	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$25 <1% \$25 <1%	\$0 - \$0 -
16	SABIN, MATT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SOBONYA, KELLI (R)	\$0 -	\$350 2%	\$200 1%	\$1, <b>750</b> 10%	\$1,400 8%	\$200 1%
	STEPHENS, DALE (D)	\$10,279 44%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$150 1%	\$0 -
	PERDUE, DON C (D)	\$8,700 44%	\$600 3%	\$0 -	\$1,000 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -
	RAMEY, LESLIE (LES) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$O -
17	STROUD, MATT (R)*	\$0 -	\$O -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	THOMPSON, RICHARD (D)	\$10,150 49%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 1%
4.0	BARKER, LARRY W (D)	\$500 29%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
18	MILLER, WARREN K (R)*	\$0 -	\$450 <b>24%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	BUTCHER, GREG (D)	\$8,700 52%	\$0 -	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$500 3%	\$450 <b>3%</b>
	COOK, JEFF (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	ELDRIDGE, JEFF (D)	\$4,100 51%	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$200 3%	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$0 -
10	FERRELL, JOE C (D)	\$200 9%	\$100 5%	\$100 5%	\$0 -	\$0 <b>-</b>	\$0 -
19	HRUTKAY, LIDELLA WILSON (D)	\$7,150 29%	\$0 -	\$225 1%	\$0 -	\$250 1%	\$0 -
	LITZ, DAVE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	MULLINS, JIM (R)*	\$0 -	\$200 2%	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$0 -	\$0 <b>-</b>	\$0 -
	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM E (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amou	nt and Percent	of Identified	Snecial Interes	t Contributions	irom
District	Candidate			Other	Prescription	Real Estate &	
District	KOMINAR, K STEVEN (D)	Labor \$0 -	Oil & Gas \$2,350 6%	Business	Drugs	Construction	Tobacco
20	• •	i '	-	\$525 1% \$0 -	\$500 1% \$0 -	\$1,000 3% \$0 -	<b>\$650</b> 2%
	SHAFER, DIANE (R)*	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 -
21	SAUNDERS, JAMES (R)*	T -	·	•	·	·	\$0 -
	WHITE, HARRY KEITH (D)	\$5,000 25% \$0 -	\$250 1%	\$100 <1% \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -	\$200 1% \$0 -	\$0 - \$0 -
	BLAYLOCK, BRANDON (R)*	Ψ°	\$900 <b>32%</b>		•	•	-
22	BROWNING, RICHARD (D)	\$1,900 6%	\$1,475 5%	\$850 3%	\$250 1%	\$1,250 4%	\$1,000 3%
	SPEARS, SHAWN R (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	STATON, W RICHARD (RICK) (D)	\$0 -	<b>\$3,025</b> 8%	\$950 3%	<b>\$1,100</b> 3%	<b>\$2,250</b> 6%	<b>\$500</b> 1%
23	LUSHBAUGH, MIKE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	MOORE, CLIF (D)	\$1,100 40%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
24	FREDERICK, EUSTACE (D)	\$0 -	\$100 2%	\$200 3%	\$0 -	\$200 3%	\$0 -
	QUESINBERRY, DOUGLAS C (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$100 <b>67%</b>	\$0 -
	HALL, JONATHAN (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 <b>83%</b>	\$0 -
25	LONG, MARSHALL C (D)	\$0 -	\$350 2%	\$0 -	\$1,000 4%	\$400 2%	\$0 -
	MAGANN, MICHAEL (D)*	\$1,700 8%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$250 1%	\$0 -
	PORTER, THOMAS (MIKE) (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,450 <b>23%</b>	\$0 -
26	CROSIER, GERALD L (D)	\$0 -	\$500 11%	\$200 4%	\$0 -	\$300 6%	\$0 -
	MILLER, DUANE (R)	\$0 -	\$1,000 <b>61%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	CARPENTER, CHARLES (CHUCK) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$150 7%	\$0 -
	HEDRICK, RON (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	KISS, ROBERT S (D)	\$125 <1%	<b>\$3,500</b> 5%	\$350 <1%	<b>\$1,250</b> 2%	\$700 1%	<b>\$500</b> 1%
	MAHAN, VIRGINIA (D)	\$4,450 10%	\$1,100 3%	\$200 <1%	\$200 <1%	\$650 2%	\$0 -
27	PULLIAM, ROBERT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
21	STEVENS, PHILIP L (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$150 6%	\$0 -
	SUMNER, LINDA (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$2,150 12%	\$1,225 7%	\$250 1%
	SUSMAN, SALLY (D)	\$6,250 52%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -
	THOMPSON, RON (D)	\$0 -	\$1,650 6%	\$200 1%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$0 -
	WOOTON, JOHN D (D)*	\$5,000 16%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,500 5%	\$0 -
	CAMPBELL, THOMAS W (D)	\$0 -	\$1,250 10%	\$0 -	\$250 2%	\$300 2%	\$0 -
20	CANTERBURY, RAY (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$0 -	\$950 <b>19%</b>	<b>\$</b> 0 -
28	FRIEDMAN, CHARLIE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -
	SCARLES, TOMMY D (D)*	\$3,550 <b>74%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -

\_\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amoun	t and Ba	roont o	of Identified	Special Inte	orost	Contribut	ione f	rom	
		Amoun	t and Per	rcent c	of Identified Other	-		Real Esta		rom	
District	Candidate	Labor	Oil & C	Gas	Business	•		Constru		Toba	cco
	LILLY, BETTY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -			\$0	-	\$0	-
	LOUISOS, TOM (D)	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$200	44%	\$0	
29	PERRY, DAVID G (D)	\$0 -	\$1,700	9%	\$200 19	6 \$0	-	\$400	2%	\$0	-
29	PINO, JOHN (D)	\$300 2%	\$2,050	14%	\$0 -	\$1,000	7%	\$1,000	7%	\$0	-
	SCHALLEN, WANDALEEN KINCAID (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	TAYLOR, RICHARD P (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	AMORES, JON (D)	\$0 -	\$3,100	8%	\$350 19	6 <b>\$1,800</b>	5%	\$3,250	9%	\$0	-
	BROWN, BONNIE (D)	\$7,400 29%	\$600	2%	\$150 19	6 \$0	-	\$230		\$0	-
	CALVERT, ANN (R)*	\$0 -	\$850	4%	\$350 29	6 \$1,025	5%	\$2,050	10%	\$0	-
	CARDEN, TODD (R)*	\$0 -	\$200	100%	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	HATFIELD, BARBARA (BOBBIE) (D)	\$9,000 26%	\$75	<1%	\$500 19	6 \$250	1%	\$755	2%	\$0	-
	HUNT, MARK (D)	\$6,700 49%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
30	MATHEWS, REBECCA A (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
30	MOORE, AUSTIN C (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	PALUMBO, COREY (D)	\$0 -	\$1,100	5%	<b>\$1,100</b> 59	6 \$1,000	4%	\$850	4%	\$100	<1%
	RAINES, PHIL (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$500 5%	6 \$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SIMS, BRADFORD L (R)*	\$0 -	\$1,050	5%	\$400 29	6 \$1,000	5%	\$1,125	5%	\$100	<1%
	SPENCER, SHARON (D)	\$0 -	\$1,200	2%	\$0 -	\$450	1%	\$950	2%	\$0	-
	SUMMERS, JERRY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$500 49	6 \$0	-	\$750	7%	\$0	-
	WELLS, DANNY (D)	\$0 -	\$200	1%	\$300 19	6 \$0	-	\$330	2%	\$200	1%
31	MINIMAH, CHARLES (R)*	\$0 -	\$100	1%	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
31	WEBSTER, CARRIE (D)	\$4,750 22%	\$1,150	5%	\$30 <19	% \$0	-	\$50	<1%	\$0	-
	ARMSTEAD, TIM (R)	\$0 -	\$2,050	14%	\$0 -	\$750	5%	\$400	3%	\$0	-
	CAIN SR, JON WILLIAM (D)*	\$4,200 22%	\$1,000	5%	\$100 19	6 \$0	-	\$900	5%	\$0	-
32	LANE, PATRICK 9R)	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$100 19	6 \$1,000	11%	\$1,000	11%	\$200	2%
32	MORRISON, ROBERT (BOB) (D)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	ROBINSON, CURTIS (D)*	\$900 50%	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	WALTERS, RON (R)	\$0 -	\$250	1%	\$300 19	6 \$500	2%	\$850	4%	\$250	1%
33	MCKOWN, CHARLES W (R)*	\$0 -	\$500	100%	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
33	STEMPLE, WILLIAM F (BILL) (D)	\$2,000 17%	\$1,950	17%	\$0 -	\$500	4%	\$550	5%	\$400	3%
34	BOGGS, BRENT (D)	\$12,890 61%	\$1,350	6%	\$100 <19	% \$0	-	\$200	1%	\$0	-
J-7	SHINGLER, BRADLEY N (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
35	ARGENTO, SAM (D)	\$5,000 <b>53%</b>	\$0	-	\$400 49	6 \$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
55	SALOMON, BILL (R)*	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amount	•		nacial Interest	Contributions f	rom
		Amoun	and Percent C	Other	-	Real Estate &	rom
District	Candidate	Labor	Oil & Gas	Business	Drugs	Construction	Tobacco
36	TALBOTT, JOE (D)	\$300 5%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$200 3%	\$0 -
30	THOMPSON, JIM (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	GRIMES, MULVIE WILLIAM (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
37	HADDIX, BRUCE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
31	HARTMAN, BILL (D)	\$0 -	\$850 15%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$235 4%	\$0 -
	PROUDFOOT, BILL (D)	\$0 -	\$850 11%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$435 5%	\$0 -
	DEBARR, MIKE (J D) (W)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
38	LOVE, DERRICK W (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	STALNAKER, DOUG (D)	\$0 -	\$1,650 <b>22%</b>	\$200 3%	\$0 -	\$200 3%	\$250 <b>3%</b>
39	HAMILTON, BILL (R)	\$7,500 <b>56%</b>	\$250 2%	\$25 <1%	\$0 -	\$200 1%	\$0 -
39	KHAN, TERESA D (D)*	\$0 -	\$700 <b>24%</b>	\$50 2%	\$0 -	\$50 2%	\$0 -
40	POLING, MARY M (D)	\$7,300 51%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
40	WRIGHT, WILLIAM ROBERT (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	CANN, SAMUEL J (SAM) (D)	\$500 2%	\$8,700 30%	<b>\$1,500</b> 5%	\$1,000 3%	<b>\$2,200</b> 8%	\$0 -
	FRAGALE, RON (D)	\$10,100 42%	\$100 <1%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	GRIFFITH, WILLIAM H (BILL) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$115 2%	\$1,000 <b>15%</b>	\$55 1%	\$0 -
41	IAQUINTA, RICHARD J (D)	\$4,981 30%	\$250 2%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
41	MILEY, TIM (D)	\$9,125 31%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	PROCTOR, LAMONT (MUTT) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SCUDERE, JAMES L (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SHARP, BROOKS (C B) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
42	PARKER, DIANE C (D)*	\$17,550 69%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
42	TANSILL, JEFFERY L (R)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	CAPUTO, MIKE (D)	<b>\$14,510</b> 45%	\$0 -	\$920 3%	\$1,000 3%	\$300 1%	<b>\$650</b> 2%
	LONGSTRETH, LINDA (D)	\$8,675 39%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$10 <1%	\$0 -
43	MANCHIN, TIMOTHY J (D)	<b>\$10,480</b> 29%	\$700 2%	<b>\$1,379</b> 4%	\$0 -	<b>\$3,150</b> 9%	\$0 -
43	RICHARDS, BLAINE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	SMITH, THOMAS F (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	WESTFALL, BRIAN (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -
	BEACH, ROBERT (BOB) (D)	\$0 -	\$450 5%	\$0 -	\$200 2%	\$1,350 16%	\$0 -
44	FLEISCHAUER, BARBARA EVANS (D)*	\$9,925 22%	\$20 <1%	\$652 1%	\$250 1%	\$10 <1%	\$0 -
44	FRICH, CINDY (R)	\$0 -	\$650 3%	\$850 4%	\$2,750 13%	\$750 3%	\$0 -
	HOUSTON, NANCY J (D)	\$0 -	\$1,800 11%	\$200 1%	\$1,050 6%	\$1,650 10%	\$0 -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amo	ount and P	ercent	of Identi	fied Sp	pecial Inte	erest	Contribu	tions f	rom	
District	Candidate	Labor	Oil &		Oth Busin	er		tion	Real Est Constru	ate &	Tobac	cco
	MANILLA, JIM (R)*	\$0 -	- \$55	) 4%	\$413	3%	\$0	-	\$2,200	14%	\$0	-
44	MARSHALL, CHARLENE (D)	<b>\$13,250</b> 49	9% \$	) -	\$101	<1%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
(con't)	PAULEY, W KENT (R)*	\$0 -	- \$10	<b>40%</b>	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$150	60%	\$0	-
	RIFFLE, JEFF (R)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$300	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
45	BATSON, DAVID C (R)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$250	33%	\$0	-	\$0	-
40	WILLIAMS, LARRY A (D)	\$0 -	- \$65	7%	\$0	-	\$500	5%	\$200	2%	\$0	-
46	SHAVER, STAN (D)*	\$1,900 33	3% \$30	5%	\$100	2%	\$0	-	\$400	7%	\$200	3%
40	STEVENS, DEBORAH (DEBBIE) (R)	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$900	17%	\$0	-
47	ESTES, SHIRLEY (R)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
47	MICHAEL, HAROLD (D)	\$1,000 29	% \$2,40	<b>)</b> 5%	\$1,100	2%	\$600	1%	\$1,700	3%	\$500	1%
48	EVANS, ALLEN V (R)	\$0 -	- \$10	3%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$200	7%	\$0	-
40	RIGGLEMAN JR, DENVER LEE (D)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
49	GROVE, WALTER R (D)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
49	SCHADLER, ROBERT A (R)	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$200	6%	\$0	-	\$200	6%	\$200	6%
50	MEZZATESTA, JERRY L (D)*	\$0 -	- \$50	) 4%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$400	3%
50	ROWAN, RUTH (R)	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
51	TRUMP IV, CHARLES S (R)	\$0 -	- \$50	0 3%	\$0	-	\$1,050	6%	\$1,500	8%	\$0	-
52	BLAIR, CRAIG (R)	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$200	5%	\$0	-	\$200	5%	\$0	-
52	FUNK, SCOTT (D)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
53	BURTON, JERRY L (D)*	\$1,650 34	1% \$	) -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
55	ROBERTS, VIC (R)	\$0 -	- \$10	0 1%	\$1,000	15%	\$0	-	\$100	1%	\$0	-
54	DUKE, WALTER E (R)	\$3,600 <b>53</b>	8% \$	0 -	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
55	OVERINGTON, JOHN (R)	\$0 -	- \$20	0 4%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$250	5%	\$0	-
56	TABB, BOB (D)	\$0 -	- \$20	3 4%	\$25	<1%	\$0	-	\$700	13%	\$0	-
30	WHITACRE, JAMES (JIM) (R)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$750	21%	\$0	-	\$1,000	29%	\$0	-
57	DOYLE, JOHN (D)	\$0 -	- \$25	0 1%	\$1,450	7%	\$0	-	\$1,500	8%	\$0	-
31	MURTO, ROBERT (BOB) (R)*	\$0 -	- \$	) -	\$1,250	14%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
58	MORGAN, SUZANNE (R)*	\$0 -	- \$50	2%	\$750	4%	\$0	-	\$900	4%	\$0	-
30	WYSONG, LOCKE (D)	\$100_29	% \$40	6%	\$50	1%	\$0	-	\$1,500	23%	\$0	-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> *Italics* = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				anuluales	,,,,,						
		Amount a	nd Per	cent of Iden	tified S	Special Inter	est Cor	ntributions fr	om C	ontributors	Giving
District	Candidate	\$100 or	Less	\$101 to \$	250	\$251 to \$	500	\$501 to \$7	750	\$751 to \$	1,000
	CHANEY, PAT (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
1	DELONG, JOE (D)	\$2,400	4%	\$6,650	12%	\$13,123	23%	\$2,850	5%	\$32,100	56%
	MADDEN, ROGER D (R)*	\$410	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SWARTZMILLER, RANDY (D)	\$3,550	11%	\$10,999	34%	\$5,500	17%	\$750	2%	\$11,949	36%
	ENNIS, TIM (D)	\$1,450	11%	\$5,500	42%	\$4,250	32%	\$0	-	\$2,000	15%
2	GRAY, JAMEY (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$3,000	100%
	MCNINCH, ROBERT (LES) (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	YOST, JACK (D)	\$2,950	9%	\$4,950	15%	\$9,088	27%	\$1,400	4%	\$14,900	45%
	KLEMPA, ORPHY (D)*	\$1,445	3%	\$4,310	9%	\$11,850	24%	\$1,400	3%	\$31,000	62%
3	TIGHE, JERRY A (D)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
3	WAKIM, CHRISTOPHER (R)	\$1,875	13%	\$2,850	20%	\$4,800	33%	\$0	-	\$5,000	34%
	WHITE, L GIL (R)	\$5,925	16%	\$13,022	34%	\$14,142	37%	\$0	-	\$5,000	13%
	LUCEY, CODY J (R)*	\$592	66%	\$0	-	\$300	34%	\$0	-	\$0	-
4	MORRIS, RONALD (R)*	\$50	2%	\$750	36%	\$300	14%	\$0	-	\$1,000	48%
4	TUCKER, KENNETH D (D)	\$550	4%	\$1,450	12%	\$3,800	30%	\$0	-	\$6,800	54%
	VARNER, SCOTT G (D)	\$975	3%	\$6,700	22%	\$15,800	53%	\$600	2%	\$6,000	20%
5	AMOS JR, ED (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
5	PETHTEL, DAVE (D)	\$2,050	12%	\$8,950	54%	\$5,700	34%	\$0	-	\$0	-
6	ROMINE, WM ROGER (R)	\$300	24%	\$950	76%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	JANES, PAUL D (D)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
7	LEGGETT, OTIS A (R)	\$1,550	29%	\$2,100	39%	\$1,700	32%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SHULTZ, TRAVIS (I)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
8	ANDERSON JR, E W (BILL) (R)	\$1,300	19%	\$3,150	46%	\$2,450	36%	\$0	-	\$0	-
9	BORDER, LARRY (R)	\$1,000	10%	\$4,787	46%	\$3,700	35%	\$0	-	\$1,000	10%
9	LEWIS, JEFF (D)*	\$850	6%	\$1,850	14%	\$3,300	25%	\$1,200	9%	\$5,900	45%
	AZINGER, TOM (R)	\$2,350	16%	\$6,100	42%	\$6,100	42%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	BEANE, J D (D)	\$3,875	11%	\$10,900	31%	\$13,100	38%	\$0	-	\$7,000	20%
10	ELLEM, JOHN N (R)	\$2,875	15%	\$4,800	26%	\$6,100	32%	\$0	-	\$5,000	27%
10	GILLESPIE, FRED (R)*	\$800	12%	\$1,875	29%	\$800	12%	\$0	-	\$3,000	46%
	RADCLIFF, PATRICK N (D)*	\$925	13%	\$2,850	40%	\$2,400	33%	\$0	-	\$1,000	14%
	WILKINSON, SCOTT (D)*	\$0	-	\$0		\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
11	ASHLEY, BOB (R)	\$1,050	32%	\$1,900	58%	\$300	9%	\$0	-	\$0	-
10	CARMICHAEL, MITCH B (R)	\$750	12%	\$3,550		\$2,150	33%	\$0		\$0	-
12	SIDERS, CORBON (R)*	\$0	-	\$0			100%	\$0	-	\$0	-

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

	mac		<u> </u>	maidates	(0011	tiriucu)					
		Amount a	nd Perc	ent of Identi	fied Sp	pecial Interes	st Cont	tributions f	rom Co	ntributors G	Siving
District	Candidate	\$100 or	l ess	\$101 to \$	250	\$251 to \$	500	\$501 to \$	750	\$751 to \$1	000
Diotriot	MARTIN, DALE (D)	\$2,625	9%	\$5,300		\$6,000		\$2,150		\$14,000	
	MCLANE, JACK R (R)*	\$175	4%	\$1,350		\$1,000		\$0	-	\$2,000	
13	PAXTON, BRADY R (D)	\$1,150	7%	\$3,950		\$4,800		\$1,400	8%	\$6,000	
	WOOD, CHRISTOPHER TROY (R)*	\$313	18%	\$158		\$600		\$636		\$0,000	
	HALL, MIKE (R)	\$800	10%	\$2,950		\$4,200		\$0	-	\$0	
	MCNEELY, TOM A (D)*	\$0	-	\$0		\$0	-	\$0 \$0	-	\$0 \$0	
14	SCHOEN, PATTI EAGLOSKI (R)	\$1,575	20%	\$2,550		\$900		\$0	_	\$3,000	
	SLUSS, STEPHEN C (STEVE) (D)*	\$365	12%	\$650		\$0	-	\$0	_	\$1,990	
	BARRY, DENNIS A (R)*	\$750	9%	\$650		\$1,500		\$0	-	\$5,000	
	CRAIG, KEVIN J (D)	\$4,550	10%	\$12,500		\$20,650		\$0	_	\$6,000	
	LEACH, MARGARETTE R (D)	\$2,055	19%	\$2,750		\$4,850		\$0	_	\$1,000	
15	MILLER, CAROL D (R)*	\$2,220	14%	\$3,400		\$3,150		\$0	_	\$7,000	
	MORGAN, JIM (D)	\$2,650	20%	\$3,050		\$2,100		\$651	5%	\$5,000	
	STEWART, PAULA L (R)*	\$25	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	
	HOWARD, GREG (R)	\$2,100	14%	\$4,900	32%	\$8,300	54%	\$0	-	\$0	
	HUBBARD, SUSAN (D)*	\$3,200	11%	\$4,500		\$6,400		\$0	_	\$15,000	
40	NELSON, BOBBY (D)*	\$1,060	7%	\$4,600		\$3,650		\$0	-	\$5,900	
16	SABIN, MATT (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SOBONYA, KELLI (R)	\$1,905	11%	\$4,525	26%	\$7,700	45%	\$0	-	\$3,000	18%
	STEPHENS, DALE (D)	\$1,490	6%	\$2,750	12%	\$8,400	36%	\$729	3%	\$10,000	43%
	PERDUE, DON C (D)	\$850	4%	\$2,750	14%	\$5,000	25%	\$2,150	11%	\$9,000	46%
17	RAMEY, LESLIE (LES) (R)*	\$0	-	\$200	17%	\$1,000	83%	\$0	-	\$0	-
17	STROUD, MATT (R)*	\$50	9%	\$0	-	\$500	91%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	THOMPSON, RICHARD (D)	\$910	4%	\$3,725	18%	\$2,700	13%	\$1,400	7%	\$12,000	58%
18	BARKER, LARRY W (D)	\$0	-	\$400	23%	\$1,350	77%	\$0	-	\$0	-
10	MILLER, WARREN K (R)*	\$250	14%	\$250	14%	\$350	19%	\$0	-	\$1,000	54%
	BUTCHER, GREG (D)	\$1,250	7%	\$4,000	24%	\$3,000	18%	\$0	-	\$8,593	51%
	COOK, JEFF (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	ELDRIDGE, JEFF (D)	\$300	4%	\$1,494	19%	\$1,500	19%	\$700	9%	\$4,000	50%
19	FERRELL, JOE C (D)	\$600	27%	\$1,100	50%	\$500	23%	\$0	-	\$0	-
19	HRUTKAY, LIDELLA WILSON (D)	\$675	3%	\$7,025	28%	\$4,450	18%	\$0	-	\$12,900	51%
	LITZ, DAVE (R)*	\$100	13%	\$150	20%	\$500	67%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	MULLINS, JIM (R)*	\$1,250	14%	\$3,500	39%	\$2,300	25%	\$0	-	\$2,000	22%
	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM E (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				anuluales	(0011						
		Amount a	nd Per	cent of Ident	ified S	pecial Interes	st Cont	ributions fr	om Co	ontributors G	Siving
District	Candidate	\$100 or	l ess	\$101 to \$	\$250	\$251 to \$	500	\$501 to \$	\$750	\$751 to \$1	1 000
	KOMINAR, K STEVEN (D)	\$1,125	3%	\$8,900	23%	\$15,025		\$0	-	\$13,000	
20	SHAFER, DIANE (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	-	100%	\$0	-	\$0	
04	SAUNDERS, JAMES (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	
21	WHITE, HARRY KEITH (D)	\$700	3%	\$4,950	25%	\$7,450	37%	\$0	-	\$7,000	35%
	BLAYLOCK, BRANDON (R)*	\$0	-	\$1,350	47%	\$500	18%	\$0	-	\$1,000	
22	BROWNING, RICHARD (D)	\$3,175	10%	\$12,800	41%	\$11,424	37%	\$650	2%	\$3,000	10%
22	SPEARS, SHAWN R (R)*	\$50	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	STATON, W RICHARD (RICK) (D)	\$3,785	10%	\$11,450	31%	\$11,900	32%	\$0	-	\$9,800	27%
23	LUSHBAUGH, MIKE (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
23	MOORE, CLIF (D)	\$200	7%	\$500	18%	\$1,300	47%	\$750	27%	\$0	-
24	FREDERICK, EUSTACE (D)	\$900	15%	\$2,800	47%	\$2,250	38%	\$0	-	\$0	-
24	QUESINBERRY, DOUGLAS C (R)*	\$150	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	HALL, JONATHAN (R)*	\$100	17%	\$0	-	\$500	83%	\$0	-	\$0	-
25	LONG, MARSHALL C (D)	\$1,500	7%	\$5,499	24%	\$4,700	21%	\$750	3%	\$10,000	45%
25	MAGANN, MICHAEL (D)*	\$800	4%	\$2,850	13%	\$4,700	21%	\$750	3%	\$12,800	58%
	PORTER, THOMAS (MIKE) (R)	\$450	7%	\$250	4%	\$4,000	64%	\$554	9%	\$1,000	16%
26	CROSIER, GERALD L (D)	\$625	13%	\$2,950	63%	\$1,100	24%	\$0	-	\$0	-
20	MILLER, DUANE (R)	\$0	-	\$650	39%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$1,000	61%
	CARPENTER, CHARLES (CHUCK) (R)*	\$220	11%	\$1,500	74%	\$300	15%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	HEDRICK, RON (R)*	\$0	-	\$250	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	KISS, ROBERT S (D)	\$4,987	7%	\$14,485	20%	\$30,183	42%	\$4,208	6%	\$17,927	25%
	MAHAN, VIRGINIA (D)	\$4,741	11%	\$13,050	31%	\$9,682	23%	\$0	-	\$14,984	35%
27	PULLIAM, ROBERT (R)*	\$0	-	\$450	20%	\$775	35%	\$0	-	\$1,000	45%
	STEVENS, PHILIP L (R)*	\$0	-	\$1,150	44%	\$450	17%	\$0	-	\$1,000	38%
	SUMNER, LINDA (R)	\$1,650	9%	\$6,200	34%	\$8,250	46%	\$0	-	\$2,000	11%
	SUSMAN, SALLY (D)	\$700	6%	\$2,900	24%	\$4,400	37%	\$0	-	\$4,000	33%
	THOMPSON, RON (D)	\$1,975	8%	\$9,650	37%	\$4,550	18%	\$700	3%	\$8,900	35%
	WOOTON, JOHN D (D)*	\$2,201	7%	\$4,600	15%	\$7,900	25%	\$0	-	\$16,790	53%
	CAMPBELL, THOMAS W (D)	\$1,050	8%	\$8,050	61%	\$3,050	23%	\$0	-	\$1,000	8%
28	CANTERBURY, RAY (R)	\$550	11%	\$3,200	65%	\$1,200	24%	\$0	-	\$0	-
20	FRIEDMAN, CHARLIE (R)*	\$65	21%	\$250	79%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SCARLES, TOMMY D (D)*	\$300	6%	\$500	10%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$4,000	83%

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				andidates							
		Amount a	nd Per	cent of Ident	ified Sp	ecial Intere	st Conti	ributions fr	om Co	ntributors G	Siving
District	Candidate	\$100 or	Less	\$101 to \$	250	\$251 to \$	500	\$501 to \$	750	\$751 to \$1	,000
	LILLY, BETTY (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	LOUISOS, TOM (D)	\$0	-	\$450	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
29	PERRY, DAVID G (D)	\$1,250	7%	\$6,100	34%	\$7,750	43%	\$0	-	\$2,900	16%
23	PINO, JOHN (D)	\$1,350	10%	\$5,000	35%	\$6,800	48%	\$0	-	\$1,000	7%
	SCHALLEN, WANDALEEN KINCAID (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	TAYLOR, RICHARD P (R)*	\$0	-	\$250	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	AMORES, JON (D)	\$1,600	4%	\$9,675	25%	\$15,150	40%	\$750	2%	\$10,800	28%
	BROWN, BONNIE (D)	\$5,417	22%	\$5,050	20%	\$6,950	28%	\$750	3%	\$7,000	28%
	CALVERT, ANN (R)*	\$2,725	14%	\$4,200	21%	\$8,200	41%	\$0	-	\$5,000	25%
	CARDEN, TODD (R)*	\$200	100%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	HATFIELD, BARBARA (BOBBIE) (D)	\$2,680	8%	\$4,600	13%	\$9,400	27%	\$750	2%	\$17,000	49%
	HUNT, MARK (D)	\$400	3%	\$2,300	17%	\$2,100	15%	\$0	-	\$9,000	65%
30	MATHEWS, REBECCA A (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
30	MOORE, AUSTIN C (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	PALUMBO, COREY (D)	\$4,855	21%	\$10,475	46%	\$7,550	33%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	RAINES, PHIL (R)*	\$650	7%	\$1,950	20%	\$1,000	10%	\$0	-	\$6,000	63%
	SIMS, BRADFORD L (R)*	\$4,430	20%	\$7,324	33%	\$4,200	19%	\$0	-	\$6,000	27%
	SPENCER, SHARON (D)	\$3,540	7%	\$13,750	27%	\$16,750	33%	\$0	-	\$17,000	
	SUMMERS, JERRY (R)*	\$675	6%	\$1,000	9%	\$1,800	16%	\$0	-	\$8,000	70%
	WELLS, DANNY (D)	\$2,880	14%	\$8,699	42%	\$5,500	26%	\$700	3%	\$3,000	14%
31	MINIMAH, CHARLES (R)*	\$350	5%	\$1,400	20%	\$1,150	17%	\$0	-	\$4,000	58%
31	WEBSTER, CARRIE (D)	\$4,335	20%	\$4,520	21%	\$4,600	21%	\$0	-	\$8,000	37%
	ARMSTEAD, TIM (R)	\$1,865	13%	\$7,050	48%	\$5,700	39%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	CAIN SR, JON WILLIAM (D)*	\$2,225	12%	\$4,650	25%	\$5,000	27%	\$0	-	\$6,991	37%
32	LANE, PATRICK 9R)	\$1,450	16%	\$2,300	25%	\$5,600	60%	\$0	-	\$0	-
32	MORRISON, ROBERT (BOB) (D)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	ROBINSON, CURTIS (D)*	\$815	45%	\$500	28%	\$500	28%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	WALTERS, RON (R)	\$2,840	12%	\$5,450	24%	\$4,300	19%	\$2,500	11%	\$8,000	35%
22	MCKOWN, CHARLES W (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-		100%	\$0	-	\$0	
33	STEMPLE, WILLIAM F (BILL) (D)	\$1,100	9%	\$5,150	44%	\$3,450	29%	\$0	-	\$2,000	17%
34	BOGGS, BRENT (D)	\$800	4%	\$4,190	20%	\$5,050	24%	\$0	-	\$11,000	52%
34	SHINGLER, BRADLEY N (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
25	ARGENTO, SAM (D)	\$350	4%	\$3,350	36%	\$2,300	24%	\$1,400	15%	\$2,000	21%
35	SALOMON, BILL (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

				cent of Identi		pecial Intere	st Con	tributions fr	om Co	ontributors (	Sivina
District	Candidate	\$100 or L		\$101 to \$2		\$251 to \$		\$501 to \$7		\$751 to \$1	
36	TALBOTT, JOE (D)	\$900	15%	\$3,600	61%	\$1,450	24%	\$0	-	\$0	-
30	THOMPSON, JIM (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	GRIMES, MULVIE WILLIAM (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
37	HADDIX, BRUCE (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
31	HARTMAN, BILL (D)	\$735	13%	\$3,550	62%	\$1,400	25%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	PROUDFOOT, BILL (D)	\$985	12%	\$3,200	40%	\$3,900	48%	\$0	-	\$0	-
	DEBARR, MIKE (J D) (W)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
38	LOVE, DERRICK W (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	STALNAKER, DOUG (D)	\$810	11%	\$4,800	65%	\$1,150	16%	\$600	8%	\$0	-
39	HAMILTON, BILL (R)	\$1,700	13%	\$4,350	32%	\$3,350	25%	\$0	-	\$4,000	30%
39	KHAN, TERESA D (D)*	\$351	12%	\$200	7%	\$1,400	49%	\$0	-	\$909	32%
40	POLING, MARY M (D)	\$1,250	9%	\$1,948	14%	\$3,300	23%	\$750	5%	\$7,000	49%
40	WRIGHT, WILLIAM ROBERT (R)	\$0	-	\$950	42%	\$300	13%	\$0	-	\$1,000	44%
	CANN, SAMUEL J (SAM) (D)	\$3,450	12%	\$10,800	37%	\$12,000	41%	\$0	-	\$3,000	10%
	FRAGALE, RON (D)	\$1,635	7%	\$4,100	17%	\$5,750	24%	\$1,450	6%	\$10,900	46%
	GRIFFITH, WILLIAM H (BILL) (R)*	\$570	8%	\$950	14%	\$1,300	19%	\$0	-	\$4,000	59%
41	IAQUINTA, RICHARD J (D)	\$485	3%	\$5,581	34%	\$4,450	27%	\$0	-	\$5,900	36%
41	MILEY, TIM (D)	\$1,736	6%	\$4,175	14%	\$4,950	17%	\$750	3%	\$17,900	61%
	PROCTOR, LAMONT (MUTT) (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SCUDERE, JAMES L (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SHARP, BROOKS (C B) (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
42	PARKER, DIANE C (D)*	\$800	3%	\$2,175	9%	\$5,200	20%	\$1,400	5%	\$16,000	63%
42	TANSILL, JEFFERY L (R)	\$100	4%	\$1,200	52%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$1,000	43%
	CAPUTO, MIKE (D)	\$2,070	6%	\$7,700	24%	\$5,800	18%	\$0	-	\$16,700	52%
	LONGSTRETH, LINDA (D)	\$1,015	5%	\$3,150	14%	\$6,450	29%	\$1,400	6%	\$10,000	45%
43	MANCHIN, TIMOTHY J (D)	\$2,661	7%	\$7,750	22%	\$6,500	18%	\$2,150	6%	\$16,900	47%
43	RICHARDS, BLAINE (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	SMITH, THOMAS F (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	WESTFALL, BRIAN (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	BEACH, ROBERT (BOB) (D)	\$1,350	16%	\$5,850	67%	\$1,500	17%	\$0	-	\$0	-
44	FLEISCHAUER, BARBARA EVANS (D)*	\$6,879	16%	\$9,833	22%	\$11,450	26%	\$0	-	\$16,000	36%
44	FRICH, CINDY (R)	\$3,075	14%	\$7,950	36%	\$6,200	28%	\$700	3%	\$4,000	18%
	HOUSTON, NANCY J (D)	\$1,975	12%	\$6,450	40%	\$4,950	30%	\$0	-	\$2,900	

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

					- (00						
		Amount ar	nd Perc	ent of Iden	tified	Special Intere	st Con	tributions f	rom C	ontributors (	Siving
District	Candidate	\$100 or L	ess	\$101 to \$	<b>250</b>	\$251 to \$	500	\$501 to \$	750	\$751 to \$1	,000
	MANILLA, JIM (R)*	\$1,100	7%	\$1,950	12%	\$3,813	24%	\$0	-	\$8,800	56%
44	MARSHALL, CHARLENE (D)	\$1,350	5%	\$3,051	11%	\$8,450	31%	\$0	-	\$14,316	53%
(con't)	PAULEY, W KENT (R)*	\$100	40%	\$150	60%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
	RIFFLE, JEFF (R)*	\$100	33%	\$200	67%	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
45	BATSON, DAVID C (R)*	\$0	-	\$450	60%	\$300	40%	\$0	-	\$0	-
45	WILLIAMS, LARRY A (D)	\$1,160	12%	\$3,690	40%	\$2,450	26%	\$0	-	\$2,000	22%
46	SHAVER, STAN (D)*	\$400	7%	\$3,000	52%	\$2,400	41%	\$0	-	\$0	-
40	STEVENS, DEBORAH (DEBBIE) (R)	\$0	-	\$750	15%	\$500	10%	\$0	-	\$3,900	76%
47	ESTES, SHIRLEY (R)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
47	MICHAEL, HAROLD (D)	\$2,700	5%	\$8,950	18%	\$19,300	39%	\$750	2%	\$18,000	36%
48	EVANS, ALLEN V (R)	\$550	19%	\$1,850	64%	\$500	17%	\$0	-	\$0	-
40	RIGGLEMAN JR, DENVER LEE (D)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
49	GROVE, WALTER R (D)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
49	SCHADLER, ROBERT A (R)	\$750	21%	\$2,500	69%	\$350	10%	\$0	-	\$0	-
50	MEZZATESTA, JERRY L (D)*	\$965	8%	\$1,970	17%	\$3,850	33%	\$0	-	\$5,000	42%
30	ROWAN, RUTH (R)	\$0	-	\$500	6%	\$500	6%	\$750	9%	\$7,000	80%
51	TRUMP IV, CHARLES S (R)	\$400	2%	\$5,250	30%	\$8,000	45%	\$0	-	\$4,000	23%
52	BLAIR, CRAIG (R)	\$550	15%	\$2,750	75%	\$350	10%	\$0	-	\$0	-
52	FUNK, SCOTT (D)*	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
53	BURTON, JERRY L (D)*	\$497	10%	\$1,050	22%	\$2,800	57%	\$537	11%	\$0	-
55	ROBERTS, VIC (R)	\$600	9%	\$2,200	33%	\$1,200	18%	\$750	11%	\$2,000	30%
54	DUKE, WALTER E (R)	\$250	4%	\$2,200	32%	\$3,350	49%	\$0	-	\$1,000	15%
55	OVERINGTON, JOHN (R)	\$860	18%	\$2,900	61%	\$1,000	21%	\$0	-	\$0	-
56	TABB, BOB (D)	\$830	16%	\$2,500	47%	\$1,350	26%	\$600	11%	\$0	-
50	WHITACRE, JAMES (JIM) (R)*	\$0		\$250	7%	\$500	14%	\$750	21%	\$2,000	57%
57	DOYLE, JOHN (D)	\$2,190	11%	\$6,449	33%	\$11,000	56%	\$0	-	\$0	-
<i>ا</i> ن	MURTO, ROBERT (BOB) (R)*	\$0	-	\$450	5%	\$1,000	11%	\$750	8%	\$7,000	<b>76</b> %
58	MORGAN, SUZANNE (R)*	\$1,260	6%	\$3,950	19%	\$4,600	22%	\$1,450	7%	\$10,000	47%
	WYSONG, LOCKE (D)	\$855	13%	\$1,200	19%	\$3,350	52%	\$0	-	\$1,000	16%

 $<sup>^{19}</sup>$  Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			House Ca	•	•					
		Amount an	d Percent of Id Contribution		ial Interest					
District	Candidate	"Tort Reform" Advocates	"Polluter" Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	"Progressive" Interest Groups	Votes Received	Reported Expenditures		\$Raised per Vote	\$Spent per Vote
	CHANEY, PAT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,348	\$0	\$0	\$0.02	\$0.00
1	DELONG, JOE (D)	\$17,500 31%	\$6,600 12%	\$2,600 5%	<b>\$27,473</b> 48%	9,735	\$38,432	\$35,784	\$7.25	\$3.95
'	MADDEN, ROGER D (R)*	\$410 <b>100</b> %	\$100 24%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,672	\$3,296	\$298	\$1.37	\$0.90
	SWARTZMILLER, RANDY (D)	<b>\$29,108</b> 89%	\$10,800 33%	\$7,950 24%	\$3,550 11%	9,626	\$25,235	\$18,986	\$4.92	\$2.62
	ENNIS, TIM (D)	\$8,750 66%	\$4,400 33%	\$600 5%	\$4,250 32%	8,994	\$8,928	\$7,408	\$1.82	\$0.99
2	GRAY, JAMEY (R)*	\$3,000 <b>100</b> %	\$3,000 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,229	\$3,650	\$0	\$0.86	\$0.86
	MCNINCH, ROBERT (LES) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,054	\$496	\$0	\$0.12	\$0.12
	YOST, JACK (D)	\$3,193 10%	\$848 3%	\$250 1%	<b>\$27,645</b> 83%	8,931	\$35,385	\$2,420	\$4.12	\$3.96
	KLEMPA, ORPHY (D)*	\$4,855 10%	\$2,075 4%	\$1,700 3%	<b>\$42,300</b> 85%	7,105	\$53,278	\$3,662	\$8.01	\$7.50
3	TIGHE, JERRY A (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,741	\$3,120	\$0	\$0.83	\$0.83
3	WAKIM, CHRISTOPHER (R)	\$13,475 93%	\$1,600 11%	\$5,900 41%	\$0 -	7,906	\$25,170	\$534	\$2.11	\$3.18
	WHITE, L GIL (R)	<b>\$34,339</b> 90%	\$8,400 22%	\$8,542 22%	\$1,800 5%	8,361	\$37,540	\$26,037	\$7.66	\$4.49
	LUCEY, CODY J (R)*	\$877 98%	\$370 41%	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,087	\$5,336	\$0	\$1.13	\$1.05
4	MORRIS, RONALD (R)*	\$2,100 <b>100</b> %	\$1,550 74%	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,022	\$6,315	\$0	\$1.26	\$1.26
4	TUCKER, KENNETH D (D)	\$1,550 12%	\$100 1%	\$0 -	\$11,050 <b>88%</b>	7,368	\$10,896	\$8,477	\$2.63	\$1.48
	VARNER, SCOTT G (D)	\$22,025 73%	\$11,150 37%	<b>\$4,150</b> 14%	\$7,350 24%	10,115	\$22,729	\$11,910	\$3.42	\$2.25
5	AMOS JR, ED (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,325	\$1,456	\$0	\$0.63	\$0.63
3	PETHTEL, DAVE (D)	\$14,600 87%	\$7,400 44%	\$2,100 13%	\$2,000 12%	4,779	\$17,461	\$11,583	\$6.08	\$3.65
6	ROMINE, WM ROGER (R)	\$1,250 <b>100</b> %	\$650 52%	\$250 <b>20%</b>	\$0 -	6,420	\$1,350	\$0	\$0.21	\$0.21
	JANES, PAUL D (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,238	\$606	\$69	\$0.30	\$0.27
7	LEGGETT, OTIS A (R)	\$5,100 95%	\$1,150 21%	\$250 5%	\$250 5%	4,644	\$7,432	\$0	\$1.23	\$1.60
	SHULTZ, TRAVIS (I)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	561	\$1,785	\$0	\$2.63	\$3.18
8	ANDERSON JR, E W (BILL) (R)	\$6,350 92%	\$2,750 40%	\$300 4%	\$550 8%	6,840	\$4,626	\$14,339	\$2.77	\$0.68
9	BORDER, LARRY (R)	\$10,487 <b>100</b> %	\$5,500 52%	\$450 4%	\$0 -	4,632	\$12,344	\$0	\$2.66	\$2.66
9	LEWIS, JEFF (D)*	\$1,050 8%	\$500 4%	\$0 -	\$12,050 <b>92%</b>	3,455	\$13,460	\$815	\$4.13	\$3.90
	AZINGER, TOM (R)	\$14,550 <b>100</b> %	\$6,250 43%	\$250 2%	\$0 -	12,723	\$13,428	\$3,695	\$1.48	\$1.06
	BEANE, J D (D)	<b>\$30,125</b> 86%	\$11,650 33%	\$1,550 4%	\$4,000 11%	13,829	\$28,560	\$21,018	\$3.59	\$2.07
10	ELLEM, JOHN N (R)	\$6,675 36%	\$775 4%	\$450 2%	\$10,050 54%	12,903	\$23,339	\$0	\$1.78	\$1.81
10	GILLESPIE, FRED (R)*	\$5,725 88%	\$1,250 19%	\$0 -	\$750 12%	11,502	\$43,236	\$0	\$3.79	\$3.76
	RADCLIFF, PATRICK N (D)*	\$1,475 21%	\$1,300 18%	\$0 -	\$4,950 69%	6,740	\$11,173	\$0	\$1.68	\$1.66
	WILKINSON, SCOTT (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,978	\$127	\$123	\$0.04	\$0.02
11	ASHLEY, BOB (R)	\$3,250 <b>100</b> %	\$1,600 49%	\$250 8%	\$0 -	5,575	\$2,657	\$1,381	\$0.97	\$0.48
12	CARMICHAEL, MITCH B (R)	\$5,950 92%	\$1,400 22%	\$250 4%	\$500 8%	5,944	\$3,263	\$3,441	\$1.24	\$0.55
12	SIDERS, CORBON (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$500 <b>100%</b>	2,858	\$986	\$0	\$0.35	\$0.34

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			continuea)							
		Amount an	d Percent of Ic Contributi							
District	Candidate	"Tort Reform" Advocates	"Polluter" Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	"Progressive" Interest Groups	Votes Received	Reported Expenditures	Reported Ending Balance		\$Spent per Vote
	MARTIN, DALE (D)	\$5,300 18%	\$1,150 4%	\$2,350 8%	\$23,525 78%	7,156	\$33,108	\$6,119	\$5.48	\$4.63
4.0	MCLANE, JACK R (R)*	\$4,525 <b>100%</b>	\$1,975 44%	\$200 4%	\$0 -	6,452	\$7,789	\$0	\$1.21	\$1.21
13	PAXTON, BRADY R (D)	\$5,050 29%	\$1,350 8%	\$950 5%	\$12,250 71%	8,635	\$17,238	\$0	\$2.32	\$2.00
	WOOD, CHRISTOPHER TROY (R)*	\$1,707 <b>100</b> %	\$636 37%	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,960	\$4,383	\$2	\$0.74	\$0.74
	HALL, MIKE (R)	\$7,700 97%	\$3,300 42%		\$250 3%	10,283	\$8,241	\$2,709	\$1.02	\$0.80
14	MCNEELY, TOM A (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,127	\$75	\$0	\$0.01	\$0.01
14	SCHOEN, PATTI EAGLOSKI (R)	\$5,275 66%	\$2,575 32%	\$300 4%	\$1,650 21%	8,262	\$9,266	\$3,677	\$1.37	\$1.12
	SLUSS, STEPHEN C (STEVE) (D)*	\$2,640 88%	\$2,540 85%	\$0 -	\$250 8%	5,417	\$2,674	\$0	\$0.85	\$0.49
	BARRY, DENNIS A (R)*	\$7,600 96%	\$5,400 68%	\$0 -	\$50 -	7,132	\$14,990	\$250	\$2.07	\$2.10
	CRAIG, KEVIN J (D)	<b>\$40,700</b> 93%	<b>\$26,225</b> 60%	\$2,000 5%	\$2,000 5%	11,108	\$38,126	\$11,747	\$4.78	\$3.43
15	LEACH, MARGARETTE R (D)	\$8,075 76%	\$3,025 28%	\$0 -	\$2,430 23%	9,280	\$13,549	\$13,167	\$3.93	\$1.46
13	MILLER, CAROL D (R)*	\$15,200 96%	\$11,350 72%	\$250 2%	\$100 1%	8,169	\$23,911	\$1,604	\$3.12	\$2.93
	MORGAN, JIM (D)	\$11,925 89%	\$3,600 27%	\$0 -	\$1,451 11%	9,781	\$17,968	\$2,692	\$2.11	\$1.84
	STEWART, PAULA L (R)*	\$25 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,510	\$930	\$121	\$0.21	\$0.17
	HOWARD, GREG (R)	\$15,050 98%	\$4,450 29%	\$2,050 13%	\$100 1%	11,728	\$22,966	\$3	\$1.96	\$1.96
	HUBBARD, SUSAN (D)*	\$1,040 4%	\$25 <1%		\$26,190 90%	9,973	\$34,367	\$2,146	\$3.67	\$3.45
16	NELSON, BOBBY (D)*	\$1,675 11%	\$275 2%	\$0 -	\$12,600 83%	8,701	\$32,130	\$2,063	\$3.93	\$3.69
	SABIN, MATT (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,131	\$100	\$0	\$0.02	\$0.02
	SOBONYA, KELLI (R)	\$16,880 99%	\$7,030 41%	\$2,200 13%	\$50 <1%	12,656	\$23,855	\$53	\$2.00	\$1.88
	STEPHENS, DALE (D)	\$1,375 6%	\$650 3%	\$200 1%	\$20,604 <b>88%</b>	10,213	\$30,899	\$199	\$3.15	\$3.03
	PERDUE, DON C (D)	\$6,100 31%	\$800 4%	\$600 3%	\$13,650 69%	8,494	\$16,237	\$7,554	\$3.19	\$1.91
17	RAMEY, LESLIE (LES) (R)*	\$1,200 <b>100</b> %	\$1,200 <b>100</b> %		\$0 -	4,330	\$2,200	\$0	\$0.51	\$0.51
	STROUD, MATT (R)*	\$500 91%	\$500 <b>91%</b>	-	\$0 -	3,430	\$950	\$0	\$0.28	\$0.28
	THOMPSON, RICHARD (D)	\$2,025 10%	\$375 2%	\$800 4%	\$17,375 84%	8,414	\$17,419	\$8,762	\$3.11	\$2.07
18	BARKER, LARRY W (D)	\$850 49%	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$900 51%	5,088	\$6,865	\$0	\$1.25	\$1.35
	MILLER, WARREN K (R)*	\$750 41%	\$450 24%		\$1,100 59%	2,058	\$1,622	\$47	\$1.11	\$0.79
	BUTCHER, GREG (D)	\$5,643 34%	\$1,100 7%	\$2,793 17%	\$11,100 66%	15,013	\$16,339	\$2,474	\$1.37	\$1.09
	COOK, JEFF (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,849	\$476	\$0	\$0.07	\$0.07
	ELDRIDGE, JEFF (D)	\$2,644 33%	\$2,244 28%	•	\$5,000 63%	14,274	\$12,234	\$258	\$0.85	\$0.86
19	FERRELL, JOE C (D)	\$1,500 68%	\$500 23%		\$700 32%	13,377	\$27,906	\$0	\$2.08	\$2.09
	HRUTKAY, LIDELLA WILSON (D)	\$4,450 18%	\$475 2%	\$500 2%	\$19,600 78%	12,659	\$47,922	\$0	\$2.95	\$3.79
1	LITZ, DAVE (R)*	\$250 33%	\$100 13%		\$500 67%	10,078	\$7,929	\$0	\$0.75	\$0.79
	MULLINS, JIM (R)*	\$8,650 96%	\$8,150 90%		\$0 -	10,641	\$18,051	\$667	\$1.66	\$1.70
	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM E (R)*	<u>\$0</u> -	<u>\$0</u> -	\$0 -	<u>\$0</u> -	7,041	\$1,597	\$0	\$0.23	\$0.23

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

			House Cal nd Percent of Id Contribution	entified Speci	•					
District	Candidate	"Tort Reform" Advocates	"Polluter" Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	"Progressive" Interest Groups	Votes Received	Reported Expenditures		\$Raised per Vote	
20	KOMINAR, K STEVEN (D)	<b>\$34,450</b> 91%	<b>\$23,550</b> 62%	\$2,950 8%	\$2,500 7%	4,999	\$31,651	\$14,640	\$9.26	\$6.33
20	SHAFER, DIANE (R)*	\$500 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,090	\$150	\$0	\$0.24	\$0.07
21	SAUNDERS, JAMES (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	983	\$1,513	\$0	\$1.54	\$1.54
21	WHITE, HARRY KEITH (D)	\$12,850 64%	\$3,750 19%	\$1,050 5%	\$6,750 34%	3,985	\$4,863	\$16,237	\$5.29	\$1.22
	BLAYLOCK, BRANDON (R)*	\$2,850 <b>100</b> %	\$2,100 74%	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,660	\$13,431	\$0	\$2.00	\$2.88
22	BROWNING, RICHARD (D)	\$23,275 75%	\$10,550 34%	<b>\$4,050</b> 13%	\$6,950 22%	6,580	\$28,809	\$7,651	\$5.37	\$4.38
22	SPEARS, SHAWN R (R)*	\$0 -	\$50 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,420	\$1,500	\$0	\$0.44	\$0.44
	STATON, W RICHARD (RICK) (D)	<b>\$32,700</b> 89%	<b>\$15,300</b> 41%	<b>\$5,250</b> 14%	\$3,600 10%	5,506	\$50,381	\$5,879	\$10.04	\$9.15
23	LUSHBAUGH, MIKE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	1,205	\$1,634	\$0	\$1.36	\$1.36
23	MOORE, CLIF (D)	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,850 67%	3,815	\$3,790	\$0	\$0.99	\$0.99
24	FREDERICK, EUSTACE (D)	\$5,950 <b>100%</b>	\$2,950 50%	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,173	\$10,183	\$29,721	\$9.56	\$2.44
24	QUESINBERRY, DOUGLAS C (R)*	\$100 67%	\$100 67%	\$0 -	\$50 33%	2,114	\$613	\$16	\$0.30	\$0.29
	HALL, JONATHAN (R)*	\$600 <b>100%</b>	\$500 83%	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,579	\$8,725	\$0	\$1.91	\$1.91
25	LONG, MARSHALL C (D)	\$22,199 99%	\$2,200 10%	\$0 -	\$0 -	7,553	\$25,196	\$7,960	\$3.74	\$3.34
23	MAGANN, MICHAEL (D)*	\$950 4%	\$350 2%	\$0 -	\$16,850 77%	6,172	\$26,607	\$0	\$4.31	\$4.31
	PORTER, THOMAS (MIKE) (R)	\$6,154 98%	\$6,004 <b>96%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,313	\$12,436	\$157	\$2.01	\$1.97
26	CROSIER, GERALD L (D)	\$4,675 <b>100%</b>	\$2,250 48%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,786	\$6,810	\$0	\$1.48	\$1.80
20	MILLER, DUANE (R)	\$1,650 <b>100</b> %	\$1,000 61%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,414	\$4,913	\$0	\$1.50	\$1.44
	CARPENTER, CHARLES (CHUCK) (R)*	\$2,020 <b>100%</b>	\$650 32%	\$0 -	\$0 -	12,127	\$13,078	\$453	\$0.89	\$1.08
	HEDRICK, RON (R)*	\$250 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	13,154	\$10,864	\$36	\$0.83	\$0.83
	KISS, ROBERT S (D)	<b>\$67,990</b> 95%	<b>\$26,798</b> 37%	<b>\$5,525</b> 8%	\$900 1%	16,817	\$70,999	\$38,987	\$11.18	\$4.22
	MAHAN, VIRGINIA (D)	\$15,967 38%	\$4,975 12%	\$1,300 3%	<b>\$24,450</b> 58%	13,834	\$42,889	\$5,038	\$4.12	\$3.10
27	PULLIAM, ROBERT (R)*	\$2,225 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	13,945	\$72,713	\$0	\$5.23	\$5.21
21	STEVENS, PHILIP L (R)*	\$2,600 <b>100%</b>	\$400 15%	\$450 17%	\$0 -	11,232	\$5,791	\$0	\$0.52	\$0.52
	SUMNER, LINDA (R)	\$17,800 98%	\$7,400 41%	\$2,250 12%	\$300 2%	17,375	\$17,103	\$6,212	\$1.37	\$0.98
	SUSMAN, SALLY (D)	\$3,200 27%	\$450 4%	\$150 1%	\$8,800 73%	17,266	\$99,811	\$2,881	\$5.95	\$5.78
	THOMPSON, RON (D)	\$25,050 97%	\$10,625 41%	\$1,250 5%	\$650 3%	16,363	\$23,778	\$9,499	\$2.16	\$1.45
	WOOTON, JOHN D (D)*	\$13,341 42%	\$7,950 25%	\$250 1%	\$14,900 47%	15,976	\$49,218	\$0	\$3.13	\$3.08
	CAMPBELL, THOMAS W (D)	\$10,750 82%	\$5,050 38%	\$700 5%	\$2,300 17%	8,332	\$8,309	\$6,883	\$1.82	\$1.00
28	CANTERBURY, RAY (R)	\$4,650 94%	\$2,250 45%	\$100 2%	\$150 3%	7,814	\$4,371	\$1,004	\$0.69	\$0.56
20	FRIEDMAN, CHARLIE (R)*	\$315 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,684	\$1,670	\$0	\$0.45	\$0.45
	SCARLES, TOMMY D (D)*	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	<u>\$0</u> -	\$4,800 <b>100%</b>	5,207	\$4,875	\$0	\$0.94	\$0.94

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest								
		Contributions from								
					"Progressive"			Reported		
District	Candidate	"Tort Reform"	"Polluter" Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	Interest	Votes	Reported Expenditures	Ending	\$Raised per Vote	\$Spent
DISTRICT	LILLY, BETTY (R)*	Advocates \$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	Groups \$0 -	5,369	\$181	\$0	\$0.03	\$0.03
	LOUISOS, TOM (D)	\$450 <b>100</b> %	\$200 44%	\$0 - \$0 -	\$0 -	11,149	\$1,111	\$0 \$0	\$0.03	\$0.03
	PERRY, DAVID G (D)	\$14.800 82%	\$6,975 39%	\$1,550 9%	\$3,150 18%	11,013	\$13,128	\$8,442	\$1.96	\$1.19
29	PINO, JOHN (D)	\$12,800 90%	\$7,800 55%	\$150 1%	\$1,200 8%	11,410	\$13,663	\$9,726	\$2.05	\$1.13 \$1.20
	SCHALLEN, WANDALEEN KINCAID (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,268	\$2,273	\$0	\$0.44	\$0.53
	TAYLOR, RICHARD P (R)*	\$250 <b>100</b> %	\$250 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,297	\$1,092	\$0	\$0.21	\$0.21
	AMORES, JON (D)	<b>\$37,775</b> 99%	\$16,050 42%	\$2,900 8%	\$0 -	28,373	\$12,287	\$27,032	\$1.39	\$0.43
	BROWN, BONNIE (D)	\$5,346 21%	\$1,786 7%	\$400 2%	\$16,190 64%	24,563	\$17,025	\$21,994	\$1.59	\$0.69
	CALVERT, ANN (R)*	\$19,460 97%	<b>\$12,025</b> 60%	\$950 5%	\$0 -	21,135	\$25,676	\$2,470	\$1.34	\$1.21
	CARDEN, TODD (R)*	\$200 <b>100</b> %	\$200 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	15,228	\$6,092	\$0	\$0.36	\$0.40
	HATFIELD, BARBARA (BOBBIE) (D)	\$4,510 13%	\$1,030 3%	\$0 -	<b>\$26,750</b> 78%	26,486	\$35,823	\$4,059	\$1.51	\$1.35
	HUNT, MARK (D)	\$1,650 12%	\$750 5%	\$900 7%	\$12,150 <b>88%</b>	26,394	\$132,378	\$940	\$5.05	\$5.02
30	MATHEWS, REBECCA A (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	18,872	\$1,557	\$0	\$0.01	\$0.08
30	MOORE, AUSTIN C (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	14,705	\$290	\$0	\$0.02	\$0.02
	PALUMBO, COREY (D)	\$21,780 95%	\$9,855 43%	\$300 1%	\$550 2%	30,039	\$27,431	\$4,057	\$1.05	\$0.91
	RAINES, PHIL (R)*	\$9,600 <b>100%</b>	\$6,600 69%	\$0 -	\$0 -	20,384	\$24,754	\$0	\$1.04	\$1.21
	SIMS, BRADFORD L (R)*	\$21,954 <b>100%</b>	<b>\$14,555</b> 66%	\$100 < 1%	\$0 -	15,592	\$37,447	\$0	\$2.34	\$2.40
	SPENCER, SHARON (D)	\$14,800 29%	\$7,050 14%	\$3,950 8%	<b>\$28,910</b> 57%	24,754	\$56,025	\$0	\$2.25	\$2.26
	SUMMERS, JERRY (R)*	\$11,300 98%	\$10,200 89%	\$100 1%	\$50 <1%	15,339	\$14,262	\$1,408	\$1.02	\$0.93
	WELLS, DANNY (D)	\$12,109 58%	\$4,334 21%	\$4,350 21%	\$7,300 35%	26,946	\$23,314	\$2,688	\$0.96	\$0.87
31	MINIMAH, CHARLES (R)*	\$6,850 99%	\$4,250 62%	\$0 -	\$50 1%	2,260	\$8,775	-\$629	\$3.96	\$3.88
	WEBSTER, CARRIE (D)	\$4,058 19%	\$2,383 11%	\$200 1%	\$14,822 69%	4,118	\$20,635	\$9,470	\$7.31	\$5.01
	ARMSTEAD, TIM (R)	\$14,615 <b>100%</b>	\$7,190 49%	\$1,050 7%	\$0 -	12,277	\$14,896	\$1,092	\$1.52	\$1.21
	CAIN SR, JON WILLIAM (D)*	\$7,191 38%	\$3,200 17%	\$0 -	\$9,925 53%	7,998	\$21,520	\$1,820	\$3.13	\$2.69
32	LANE, PATRICK 9R)	\$9,350 <b>100%</b>	\$2,750 29%	\$1,800 <b>19%</b>	\$0 -	10,384	\$11,939	\$1,011	\$1.25	\$1.15
	MORRISON, ROBERT (BOB) (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,472	\$251	\$0	\$0.04	\$0.04
	ROBINSON, CURTIS (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$1,615 <b>89%</b>	6,193	\$1,627	\$0	\$0.39	\$0.26
	WALTERS, RON (R)	\$13,790 60%	\$5,130 22%		\$8,400 36%	11,267	\$26,688	\$5,001	\$2.81	\$2.37
33	MCKOWN, CHARLES W (R)*	\$500 <b>100</b> %	\$500 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	1,886	\$580	\$0	\$0.31	\$0.31
	STEMPLE, WILLIAM F (BILL) (D)	\$8,400 72%	\$4,750 41%		\$2,750 24%	4,621	\$7,165	\$5,860	\$2.82	\$1.55
34	BOGGS, BRENT (D)	\$4,750 23%	\$2,050 10%	\$100 < 1%	\$16,290 77%	5,746	\$4,862	\$1,701	\$4.60	\$0.85
<u> </u>	SHINGLER, BRADLEY N (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	1,201	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
35	ARGENTO, SAM (D)	\$1,350 14%	\$500 5%	\$0 -	\$8,050 86%	4,546	\$5,560	\$4,415	\$2.19	\$1.22
	SALOMON, BILL (R)*	<u>\$0</u> -	<u>\$0</u> -	<u>\$0</u> -	<u>\$0</u> -	2,673	\$814 <u></u>	\$0	\$0.30	\$0.30

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest Contributions from								
District	Candidate	"Tort Reform" Advocates	"Polluter" Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	"Progressive" Interest Groups	Votes Received	Reported Expenditures		\$Raised per Vote	\$Spent per Vote
36	TALBOTT, JOE (D)	\$4,350 73%	\$1,050 18%	\$1,100 <b>18%</b>	\$1,600 27%	4,297	\$2,932	\$4,409	\$1.71	\$0.68
	THOMPSON, JIM (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	1,993	\$298	\$0	\$0.20	\$0.15
	GRIMES, MULVIE WILLIAM (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,474	\$1,263	\$0	\$0.28	\$0.28
37	HADDIX, BRUCE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	<b>\$</b> 0 -	\$0 -	5,778	\$1,629	\$0	\$0.27	\$0.28
07	HARTMAN, BILL (D)	\$5,685 <b>100%</b>	\$2,935 52%	\$0 -	\$0 -	7,732	\$4,362	\$4,418	\$1.14	\$0.56
	PROUDFOOT, BILL (D)	\$7,585 94%	\$3,835 47%	\$1,600 <b>20%</b>	\$0 -	8,564	\$14,047	\$0	\$1.64	\$1.64
	DEBARR, MIKE (J D) (W)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	27	\$155	\$0	\$5.74	\$5.74
38	LOVE, DERRICK W (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,192	\$5,371	\$0	\$2.47	\$2.45
	STALNAKER, DOUG (D)	\$6,810 93%	\$3,100 42%	\$1,000 14%	\$500 7%	5,108	\$7,635	\$2,501	\$1.98	\$1.49
39	HAMILTON, BILL (R)	\$4,600 34%	\$1,450 11%	\$0 -	\$8,800 66%	4,924	\$9,959	\$9,537	\$3.99	\$2.02
39	KHAN, TERESA D (D)*	\$2,860 <b>100%</b>	\$950 33%	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,655	\$7,959	\$0	\$3.00	\$3.00
40	POLING, MARY M (D)	\$1,100 8%	\$200 1%	\$250 2%	\$12,948 <b>91%</b>	4,743	\$15,951	\$1,096	\$3.28	\$3.36
40	WRIGHT, WILLIAM ROBERT (R)	\$2,250 <b>100%</b>	\$1,300 58%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,006	\$4,915	\$0	\$1.64	\$1.64
	CANN, SAMUEL J (SAM) (D)	<b>\$28,500</b> 97%	<b>\$17,800</b> 61%	<b>\$4,000</b> 14%	\$500 2%	17,372	\$36,129	\$12,190	\$3.05	\$2.08
	FRAGALE, RON (D)	\$3,600 15%	\$500 2%	\$750 3%	\$19,200 81%	16,543	\$27,750	\$3,599	\$1.83	\$1.68
	GRIFFITH, WILLIAM H (BILL) (R)*	\$4,770 70%	\$2,155 32%	\$0 -	\$0 -	14,102	\$24,438	\$0	\$1.74	\$1.73
41	IAQUINTA, RICHARD J (D)	\$6,200 38%	\$750 5%	\$1,000 6%	\$10,081 61%	17,378	\$15,890	\$2,093	\$1.03	\$0.91
41	MILEY, TIM (D)	\$1,350 5%	\$500 2%	\$300 1%	<b>\$24,511</b> 83%	14,244	\$40,542	\$3,529	\$2.54	\$2.85
	PROCTOR, LAMONT (MUTT) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,901	\$1,503	\$0	\$0.25	\$0.25
	SCUDERE, JAMES L (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	7,449	\$5,250	\$0	\$0.56	\$0.70
	SHARP, BROOKS (C B) (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	8,960	\$1,400	\$0	\$0.16	\$0.16
42	PARKER, DIANE C (D)*	\$150 1%	\$100 <1%	\$0 -	\$24,300 <b>95%</b>	3,459	\$27,699	\$0	\$8.01	\$8.01
42	TANSILL, JEFFERY L (R)	\$2,300 <b>100%</b>	\$1,450 63%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,951	\$6,195	\$0	\$1.42	\$1.57
	CAPUTO, MIKE (D)	\$7,740 24%	\$820 3%	\$3,650 11%	\$23,925 74%	16,244	\$30,396	\$20,155	\$3.11	\$1.87
	LONGSTRETH, LINDA (D)	\$10 <1%	\$10 <1%	\$0 -	\$20,485 <b>93%</b>	14,603	\$20,546	\$6,143	\$1.68	\$1.41
43	MANCHIN, TIMOTHY J (D)	\$7,954 22%	\$4,580 13%	\$1,015 3%	<b>\$26,230</b> 73%	14,717	\$34,082	\$6,958	\$2.81	\$2.32
	RICHARDS, BLAINE (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,974	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	SMITH, THOMAS F (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,404	\$191	\$0	\$0.04	\$0.04
	WESTFALL, BRIAN (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	8,189	\$174	\$71	\$0.03	\$0.02
	BEACH, ROBERT (BOB) (D)	\$7,950 91%	\$4,300 49%	\$0 -	\$750 9%	15,753	\$12,607	\$1,604	\$0.83	\$0.80
44	FLEISCHAUER, BARBARA EVANS (D)*	\$5,807 13%	\$1,280 3%	\$650 1%	<b>\$33,466</b> 76%	15,307	\$46,658	\$18,958	\$4.34	\$3.05
44	FRICH, CINDY (R)	\$21,400 98%	\$8,400 38%	\$1,900 9%	\$400 2%	15,610	\$34,425	\$1,417	\$2.30	\$2.21
	HOUSTON, NANCY J (D)	\$13,175 81%	\$5,250 <u>3</u> 2%	\$1,250 8%	\$2,950 18%	15,518	\$14,935	\$4,967	\$1.28	\$0.96

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.

		Amount and Percent of Identified Special Interest Contributions from			•					
District	Candidate	"Tort Reform" Advocates	"Polluter" Block	"Anti-Sin Tax" Block	"Progressive" Interest Groups	Votes Received	Reported Expenditures		\$Raised per Vote	
	MANILLA, JIM (R)*	\$14,913 95%	\$11,700 75%	\$600 4%	\$500 3%	12,225	\$19,633	\$0	\$1.72	\$1.61
44	MARSHALL, CHARLENE (D)	\$4,417 16%	\$1,516 6%	\$1,750 6%	\$22,600 83%	16,078	\$22,372	\$19,216	\$2.67	\$1.39
(con't)	PAULEY, W KENT (R)*	\$250 <b>100</b> %	\$250 <b>100%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	7,531	\$2,559	\$0	\$0.34	\$0.34
	RIFFLE, JEFF (R)*	\$300 <b>100</b> %	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	9,185	\$873	\$88	\$0.10	\$0.10
45	BATSON, DAVID C (R)*	\$550 73%	\$0 -	\$300 <b>40%</b>	\$0 -	2,538	\$2,410	\$0	\$0.95	\$0.95
45	WILLIAMS, LARRY A (D)	\$7,800 84%	\$3,350 36%	\$2,550 <b>27%</b>	\$1,490 16%	4,667	\$10,492	\$6,219	\$3.59	\$2.25
46	SHAVER, STAN (D)*	\$2,200 38%	\$1,150 20%	\$200 3%	\$3,600 62%	3,935	\$9,181	\$0	\$2.39	\$2.33
40	STEVENS, DEBORAH (DEBBIE) (R)	\$5,150 <b>100%</b>	\$4,900 <b>95%</b>	\$0 -	\$0 -	4,120	\$6,663	\$2,265	\$2.17	\$1.62
47	ESTES, SHIRLEY (R)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	1,790	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
47	MICHAEL, HAROLD (D)	<b>\$48,250</b> 97%	<b>\$21,375</b> 43%	<b>\$4,200</b> 8%	\$1,250 3%	5,754	\$13,527	\$26,310	\$10.80	\$2.35
48	EVANS, ALLEN V (R)	\$2,400 83%	\$950 33%	\$0 -	\$500 17%	5,611	\$4,143	\$0	\$0.74	\$0.74
40	RIGGLEMAN JR, DENVER LEE (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,105	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
49	GROVE, WALTER R (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	2,395	\$781	\$0	\$0.33	\$0.33
43	SCHADLER, ROBERT A (R)	\$3,600 <b>100%</b>	\$1,550 43%	\$200 6%	\$0 -	4,706	\$2,458	\$1,495	\$0.87	\$0.52
50	MEZZATESTA, JERRY L (D)*	\$9,735 83%	\$7,610 65%	\$1,250 11%	\$550 5%	3,201	\$16,485	\$0	\$5.15	\$5.15
30	ROWAN, RUTH (R)	\$6,500 74%	\$6,000 69%	\$0 -	\$2,250 26%	3,922	\$10,360	\$2,264	\$3.22	\$2.64
51	TRUMP IV, CHARLES S (R)	\$17,650 <b>100</b> %	\$6,250 35%	\$1,900 11%	\$0 -	5,763	\$718	\$17,574	\$3.18	\$0.12
52	BLAIR, CRAIG (R)	\$3,650 <b>100%</b>	\$1,450 40%	\$0 -	\$0 -	5,193	\$415	\$3,311	\$0.77	\$0.08
32	FUNK, SCOTT (D)*	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,110	\$394	\$0	\$0.13	\$0.13
53	BURTON, JERRY L (D)*	\$275 6%	\$275 6%	\$0 -	\$4,072 83%	3,311	\$5,512	\$1,164	\$2.10	\$1.66
33	ROBERTS, VIC (R)	\$6,750 <b>100%</b>	\$3,200 47%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,847	\$10,486	\$524	\$2.60	\$2.73
54	DUKE, WALTER E (R)	\$1,100 16%	\$200 3%	\$0 -	\$5,700 84%	5,316	\$1,183	\$5,665	\$1.29	\$0.22
55	OVERINGTON, JOHN (R)	\$4,600 97%	\$1,600 34%	\$0 -	\$0 -	6,249	\$142	\$7,163	\$1.21	\$0.02
56	TABB, BOB (D)	\$4,980 94%	\$2,800 53%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,760	\$5,515	\$2,596	\$2.22	\$1.47
	WHITACRE, JAMES (JIM) (R)*	\$3,500 <b>100</b> %	\$2,000 57%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,491	\$7,690	\$0	\$2.25	\$2.20
57	DOYLE, JOHN (D)	\$15,950 81%	\$5,600 29%	\$1,250 6%	\$1,749 9%	4,893	\$32,906	\$332	\$7.22	\$6.73
	MURTO, ROBERT (BOB) (R)*	\$9,200 <b>100</b> %	\$7,700 84%	\$0 -	\$0 -	3,565	\$13,274	\$1,626	\$4.04	\$3.72
58	MORGAN, SUZANNE (R)*	\$20,425 96%	<b>\$14,275</b> 67%	\$500 2%	\$0 -	3,633	\$18,126	\$10,804	\$7.91	\$4.99
	WYSONG, LOCKE (D)	\$2,875 45%	\$2,275 36%	\$0 -	\$1,480 23%	4,246	\$22,304	\$2,796	\$4.41	\$5.25

<sup>19</sup> Italics = incumbents. (D)=Democrat, (R)=Republican, (I)=Independent, (W)=Write-in. \* = candidates defeated in the general election. **Bold** = top ten for category.