

New York City Campaign Finance Board

40 Rector Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10006 tel. 212.306.7100 fax 212.306.7143 www.nyccfb.info info@nyccfb.info

Public Dollars for the Public Good The New York City Campaign Finance Board 2005 Post Election Report

Welcome to the New York City Campaign Finance Board (CFB) 2005 Post Election Report Appendices on Compact Disc. The Portable Document Format (.PDF) files on this CD are readable by any computer with Adobe's free Acrobat Reader software installed.

The .PDF files linked below contain disclosure information in a tabular format that may be viewed, searched, and/or printed at your convenience. Click on the link below for detailed explanations of the data contained in each appendix.

NYC CFB PER 2005 Appendices – Notes

Click on any of the following links to open the corresponding appendix file in an *Acrobat Reader* window. When you are finished viewing, searching, or printing the file, click on the "Return to Main Menu" link at the top of each page to return to this list.

Appendix A – Candidates in the 2005 Elections

Appendix A-1 – Campaign Finance Program Participants in the 2005 Elections

Appendix B – Totals for Candidates Appearing on the Primary Election Ballot

Appendix C – Totals for Candidates Appearing on the General Election Ballot

Appendix D – Contributions and Other Receipts

Appendix E – Contributions by Type of Contributor

Appendix F – Loans

Appendix G – Total Expenditures by Expenditure Limit Period

Appendix H – Candidate Payments Summary (Participants Only)

Appendix I – Candidates' Financial Summary

Appendix J – Interim Report of the New York City Campaign Finance Board on

"Doing Business" Contributions

New York City Campaign Finance Board

40 Rector Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10006 tel. 212.306.7100 fax 212.306.7143 www.nyccfb.info info@nyccfb.info

Click here to return to main menu

Public Dollars for the Public Good The New York City Campaign Finance Board 2005 Post Election Report

Notes to Appendices and Data

All appendices cover candidates for the 2005 citywide elections only. Data in both the Report and appendices are cumulative for all committees for a given campaign. All data for candidates in the Report and in all appendices are from the New York City Campaign Finance Board's Campaign Finance Information System ("CFIS"), as of March 31, 2006. Prior to that date, the CFB made efforts to have campaigns provide missing submissions and correct apparent reporting errors that were not corrected during the election cycle. Notwithstanding those efforts, CFIS is subject to change as a result of ongoing audits, additional amendments to filings received from campaigns, and possible post-election public funds payments. Figures are based on information as it is reported to the CFB by the campaigns and may not reflect conclusions about the data reached during the audit and enforcement process. Current data, as well as the CFB's searchable database, can be viewed on the CFB's website at www.nyccfb.info. Clicking on the previous link or clicking on the CFB logo at the top of each appendix page will access the CFB web site.

Appendix A: Candidates in the 2005 Elections

Appendix A is a list of all the candidates in the 2005 election. The appendix shows the candidate's name, classification status with the Campaign Finance Program i.e. participant or non-participant, and the office sought. Candidates are sorted alphabetically by office. A plus (+) sign indicates the candidate was an incumbent in the office sought.

Appendix A-1: Campaign Finance Program Participants in the 2005 Elections

Appendix A-1 is an alphabetical list of participants by office sought for the 2005 election. An asterisk (*) indicates that the participant was on the ballot in either the primary or general elections. A plus (+) sign indicates the candidate was an incumbent in the office sought. An exclamation point (!) signifies the candidate terminated their candidacy during the election or was deemed terminated by the CFB.

Appendix B: Totals for Candidates Appearing on the Primary Election Ballot

Appendix B includes data through September 19, 2005 for all candidates appearing on the primary election ballot. The report does not necessarily reflect expenditures attributable only to the primary election because of adjustments made during the audit process. The appendix shows the candidate's name, classification status within the Campaign Finance Program i.e. participant or non-participant, net contributions, net expenditures, public funds payments for the primary to participants, and votes received in the primary election. Candidates are grouped by the party whose nomination they sought in the primary. Candidates participating in more than one primary appear accordingly, although contribution, expenditure, and public funds data are cumulative for all primary activity. Incumbents are noted with an asterisk (*). Candidates who qualified to receive public funds at the first tier bonus matching rate are noted with a pound (#) sign. Candidates who qualified to receive public funds at the second tier bonus matching rate are noted with an at (@) sign. A plus (+) sign indicates that the campaign filed its disclosure statements for the primary period as a small campaign, certifying minimal activity. N/A denotes no filing from the candidate or that the column does not apply. Specific information about the data is indicated by "Notes," listed at the end of the appendix.

Net contributions includes itemized and unitemized monetary contributions, in-kind contributions, transfers received from a party or constituted committee ("Type 1"), outstanding advances, and forgiven loans, less refunds through September 19, 2005. Net contributions does not include any surplus funds from previous elections; transfers from non-covered committees which are reported as lump sum amounts ("Type 2"); any loans that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding after the last election, taken out after the election, or paid back by a third party; or any bills that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding for more than 90 days, paid back by a third party, or forgiven.

Net expenditures includes itemized and unitemized expenditure payments, in-kind contributions, and transfers to a party or constituted committee, less expenditure refunds.

CFB payments consists of public funds disbursed for the primary election, less returned funds. Appendix H shows a breakdown of primary and general election payments.

Appendix C: Totals for Candidates Appearing on the General Election Ballot

Appendix C includes data for all candidates appearing on the general election ballot. It includes all data through January 11, 2006, which is the last day of the 2005 election cycle. It shows the candidate's name, party line(s), classification status within the Campaign Finance Program i.e. participant or non-participant, cumulative net contributions, cumulative net expenditures, cumulative public funds payments to participants, and votes received in the general election. The financial transactions are cumulative over the entire election cycle for a candidate regardless of whether or not the candidate participated in a primary. Incumbents are noted with an asterisk (*). Candidates

who qualified to receive public funds at the first tier bonus matching rate are noted with a pound (#) sign. Candidates who qualified to receive public funds at the second tier bonus matching rate are noted with an at (@) sign. A plus (+) sign indicates the campaign filed all its disclosure statements as a small campaign, certifying minimal activity. N/A denotes no filing from the candidate or that the column does not apply. Specific information about the data is indicated by "Notes," which are listed at the end of the appendix.

Net contributions includes itemized and unitemized monetary contributions, in-kind contributions, transfers received from a party or constituted committee ("Type 1"), outstanding advances, and loans forgiven, less refunds for the entire election cycle. Net contributions does not include any surplus funds from previous elections; transfers from non-covered committees which are reported as lump sum amounts ("Type 2"); any loans that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding after the last election, taken out after the election, or paid back by a third party; or any bills that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding for more than 90 days, paid back by a third party, or forgiven.

Net expenditures includes itemized and unitemized expenditure payments, in-kind contributions, and transfers to a party or constituted committee, less expenditure refunds.

CFB payments consists of public funds disbursed for the primary and general elections. Appendix H shows a breakdown of primary and general election payments.

Appendix D: Contributions and Other Receipts

Appendix D gives a detailed breakdown of candidates' contributions and other receipts and totals by office. It shows the candidate's name, classification status within the Campaign Finance Program i.e. participant or non-participant, itemized contributions, unitemized contributions, refunds, net contributions, miscellaneous receipts, funds from prior elections, and totals.

Itemized contributions includes itemized monetary and in-kind contributions, transfers received from a party or constituted committee, outstanding advances, and forgiven loans.

Unitemized contributions includes contributions of \$99 or less for which campaigns are not required to report detailed information.

Refunds represents contributions refunded by the campaign.

Net contributions is the sum of itemized and unitemized contributions, less refunds.

Other receipts shows total income derived from sources other than contributions or loans, such as interest and proceeds from sales or leases, but does not include public funds payments.

Funds from prior elections shows each campaign's reported opening balance on its first disclosure statement filed for the 2005 election cycle, but does not reflect monies transferred from past elections.

Total represents the sum of total net contributions, other receipts, and funds from past elections.

Appendix E: Contributions by Type of Contributor

Appendix E shows the candidate's name, classification status within the Campaign Finance Program i.e. participant or non-participant, itemized monetary, in-kind contributions, outstanding advances, and forgiven loans, less refunds by type of contributor as reported by campaigns. Contributor types are *individuals*, including the candidate and the candidate's family; *corporations*, whose contributions Program participants were prohibited from accepting after December 31, 1998 and non-participants prohibited from accepting after December 15, 2004; *employee organizations*, including unions and guilds; *political committees*, including party committees, political action committees, candidate committees, and the pacs of unions and corporations; *partnerships\llc's*; *other organizations*, denoting entities that campaigns did not assign to one of the preceding categories. The data as reported may not reflect audit findings of misreporting by campaigns.

This appendix does not include surplus funds from previous elections; transfers from non-covered committees; loans that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding after the last election or paid back by a third party; or bills that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding for more than 90 days, paid back by a third party or forgiven.

Appendix F: Loans

Appendix F reports total loans made and the number of lenders to a candidates' campaign. Advances to a campaign are reported separately from loans and are not accounted for in this appendix.

Classification represents the candidate's participation status within the Campaign Finance Program (i.e. participant or non-participant).

Number of lenders identifies the number of individuals or other entities that made loans to the campaign.

Total loans represents the total dollar amount of loans received.

Aggregate amount outstanding is the total loans, less any principal and interest repayments and loans forgiven by the lender. Negative aggregate outstanding amounts can result from the extent to which accrual of interest causes loan repayments to exceed

the original loan amounts.

Appendix G: Total Expenditures by Expenditure Limit Period

Appendix G reports expenditures as reported by the campaigns totaled by expenditure limit periods. Expenditures are broken up into *non-exempt* and *exempt* subtotals and grouped by expenditure periods. *Exempt* expenditures are those expenditures not included when calculating spending limit compliance and are subject to review during the audit process. Expenditure periods include all expenditures incurred *prior to the election year* (< 2005), *election year to the primary* (1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005), *post primary to the general election* (9/14/2005 - 11/8/2005), and *post general election to the end of the election cycle reporting period* (11/9/2005 – 1/11/2006). Expenditures containing dates outside of this range are reported in the *prior to election year total*. Outstanding bills as of the last disclosure statement submitted are included in the period in which that statement covers.

Appendix H: Candidate Payments Summary (Participants Only)

Appendix H lists public funds disbursed to participating candidates in the primary and general elections, and totals by candidate, office, and election type. It does not include funds returned to the CFB. Amounts may reflect withholdings from public funds in lieu of penalty payments made by a campaign.

Appendix I: Candidates' Financial Summary

Appendix I summarizes contributions, expenditures, public funds payments, and other campaign activity.

Classification represents the candidate's participation status within the Campaign Finance Program (i.e. participant or non-participant).

Net contributions include itemized and unitemized monetary contributions, in-kind contributions, transfers received from a party or constituted committee ("Type 1"), outstanding advances, and forgiven loans, less refunds. Net contributions do not include any surplus funds from previous elections; transfers from non-covered committees which are reported as lump sum amounts ("Type 2"); any loans that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding after the last election, taken out after the election, or paid back by a third party; or any bills that are deemed contributions because they are outstanding for more than 90 days, paid back by a third party or forgiven.

Number of contributors is the number of distinct individuals and other entities that have made itemized contributions to the campaign.

Miscellaneous receipts is the total income derived from sources other than contributions, loans, or public funds payments, such as interest and proceeds from sales or leases. It also

Click here to return to main menu

includes any transfer from a committee solely supporting the same candidate that is not taking part in this election.

Public funds payments lists funds disbursed to candidates for the primary and general elections.

Public funds returned is the total amount of public funds returned, not including penalty payments.

Loans received is the total dollar amount of loans received.

Loans paid includes all payments of loan principal and interest and any loans forgiven.

Net expenditures (except outstanding) is the total itemized and unitemized expenditure payments, in-kind contributions, transfers to a party or constituted committee, and advances, less expenditure refunds.

Outstanding bills consists of the outstanding bills reported on the last disclosure statement filed.

Appendix J: Interim Report of the New York City Campaign Finance Board on "Doing Business" Contributions

Appendix J is a report prepared at the request of the Board by the students of the NYU Wagner Graduate School of Public Service's Capstone Program. The research paper, published June 19, 2006, presents both a quantitative and qualitative analysis of contributions from those "doing business" with New York City.

Candidate	Classification	Office Sought
Bloomberg, Michael R +	Non-Participant	Mayor
Blum, Seth A	Non-Participant	Mayor
Brodeur, Christopher X	Non-Participant	Mayor
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	Mayor
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	Mayor
Gronowicz, Anthony	Non-Participant	Mayor
Koppel, Martin G	Non-Participant	Mayor
McMillan, Jimmy	Non-Participant	Mayor
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	Mayor
Ognibene, Thomas V	Participant	Mayor
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	Mayor
Silk, Audrey	Non-Participant	Mayor
Weiner, Anthony D	Participant	Mayor
Brown, Michael E	Non-Participant	Public Advocate
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon L	Participant	Public Advocate
Goetz, Bernard H	Non-Participant	Public Advocate
Golub, Jay	Participant	Public Advocate
Gotbaum, Betsy F +	Participant	Public Advocate
Lesczynski, James L	Non-Participant	Public Advocate
Rasiej, Andrew C	Participant	Public Advocate
Siegel, Norman H	Participant	Public Advocate
Fein, Daniel B	Non-Participant	Comptroller
Moore, Ron	Non-Participant	Comptroller
Thompson, Jr., William C +	Participant	Comptroller
Brawley, Kevin	Non-Participant	Bronx Boro President
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo +	Participant	Bronx Boro President
Alatsas, Theodore	Non-Participant	Brooklyn Boro President
Markowitz, Marty +	Participant	Brooklyn Boro President
Mattera, Gloria	Participant	Brooklyn Boro President
Popkin, Gary S	Non-Participant	Brooklyn Boro President
Dobrian, Joseph	Non-Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Ellner, Brian V	Participant	Manhattan Boro President

Candidate	Classification	Office Sought
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Fields, Jessie	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Hawkins, Arrin T	Non-Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Michels, Stanley E	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Moskowitz, Eva S	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Perkins, Bill	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Popik, Barry A	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Stringer, Scott M	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Wright, Keith	Participant	Manhattan Boro President
Marshall, Helen M +	Participant	Queens Boro President
Sica, Philip T	Participant	Queens Boro President
Luisi, John	Participant	Staten Island Boro President
Molinaro, James P +	Participant	Staten Island Boro President
Gerson, Alan J +	Participant	City Council District 01
Beys, Michael P	Participant	City Council District 02
Bloch, Darren S	Participant	City Council District 02
Brightharp, Joan J	Participant	City Council District 02
Carlino, John	Participant	City Council District 02
Flanagan, Claudia	Participant	City Council District 02
Kavanagh, Brian P	Participant	City Council District 02
Martinez, Mildred R	Non-Participant	City Council District 02
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	City Council District 02
Papajohn, Christopher J	Participant	City Council District 02
Tsabar, Gur J	Participant	City Council District 02
Quinn, Christine C +	Participant	City Council District 03
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	City Council District 04
Garodnick, Daniel R	Participant	City Council District 04
Karako, Jak J	Participant	City Council District 04
Lester, Jack L	Participant	City Council District 04
Murphy, Patrick	Participant	City Council District 04

Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant Participant Participant	City Council District 05 City Council District 05
Quart, Dan Spitz, George N Zinberg, Joel M Brewer, Gale A + Yablon, Joshua Bernace, Victor A Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	•	City Council District 05
Spitz, George N Zinberg, Joel M Brewer, Gale A + Yablon, Joshua Bernace, Victor A Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	
Zinberg, Joel M Brewer, Gale A + Yablon, Joshua Bernace, Victor A Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	•	City Council District 05
Brewer, Gale A + Yablon, Joshua Bernace, Victor A Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 05
Yablon, Joshua Bernace, Victor A Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 05
Bernace, Victor A Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 06
Cox, Allen Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 06
Jackson, Robert + Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 07
Petelka, Michael Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Non-Participant	City Council District 07
Denis, Nelson A Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 07
Johnson, Joyce S Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Non-Participant	City Council District 07
Luciano, Felipe Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 08
Marcial, Edwin	Participant	City Council District 08
	Participant	City Council District 08
8.4 . I. S. C	Participant	City Council District 08
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	Participant	City Council District 08
Ruiz, John	Participant	City Council District 08
Allen, William A	Non-Participant	City Council District 09
Bloodsaw, Daryl G	Participant	City Council District 09
Brown Jr, Will	Participant	City Council District 09
Carroll, Rodney L	Participant	City Council District 09
Cornelius, Yasmin H	Participant	City Council District 09
Dickens, Inez	Participant	City Council District 09
Doty, Cynthia L	Participant	City Council District 09
Henderson, Woody	Participant	City Council District 09
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	City Council District 09
Montague, Virginia M	Participant	City Council District 09
Martinez, Miguel +	Non-Participant	City Council District 10
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	City Council District 10
Bradian, Steve M	Non-Participant	City Council District 11
Hoffnung, Aaron M	Participant	City Council District 11
Koppell, Oliver +		2, 200

Candidate	Classification	Office Sought
Rubin, George E	Non-Participant	City Council District 12
Seabrook, Larry B +	Participant	City Council District 12
Betancourt Jr, Ismael	Participant	City Council District 13
Foglia, Philip F	Participant	City Council District 13
Kaufman, Stephen B	Participant	City Council District 13
McManus, Joseph A	Participant	City Council District 13
Sementilli, Egidio J	Participant	City Council District 13
Vacca, James	Participant	City Council District 13
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin	Non-Participant	City Council District 14
Baez, Maria +	Participant	City Council District 14
Rosario, Antonio	Participant	City Council District 14
Rivera, Joel +	Participant	City Council District 15
Stern, Steven M	Non-Participant	City Council District 15
Campbell, Lisa Marie	Non-Participant	City Council District 16
Foster, Helen Diane +	Participant	City Council District 16
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen +	Participant	City Council District 17
Mohamed, Ali	Non-Participant	City Council District 17
Feliciano, Fabian A	Non-Participant	City Council District 18
Palma, Annabel +	Participant	City Council District 18
Avella, Tony +	Participant	City Council District 19
Boudouvas, Peter T	Participant	City Council District 19
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	Non-Participant	City Council District 20
Liu, John C +	Participant	City Council District 20
Jimenez, Luis	Non-Participant	City Council District 21
Monserrate, Hiram +	Participant	City Council District 21
Tapper, Marlene J	Participant	City Council District 21
Kann, Gerald F	Participant	City Council District 22
Ruks, Thomas	Non-Participant	City Council District 22
Vallone, Jr., Peter F +	Participant	City Council District 22
Weprin, David I +	Participant	City Council District 23
Gennaro, James F +	Participant	City Council District 24
Lobo, Renee	Participant	City Council District 24

Candidate	Classification	Office Sought
Nath, Dilip	Participant	City Council District 24
Flores, Rodolfo	Non-Participant	City Council District 25
Pu-Folkes, Bryan R	Participant	City Council District 25
Rahman, Masud M	Participant	City Council District 25
Sears, Helen +	Participant	City Council District 25
Gioia, Eric N +	Participant	City Council District 26
Hanks, Nancy	Non-Participant	City Council District 26
Sklar, Robyn L	Participant	City Council District 26
Comrie, Leroy G +	Non-Participant	City Council District 27
Baldeo, Albert J	Participant	City Council District 28
Bilal, Charles A	Participant	City Council District 28
Hunter, Jereline	Non-Participant	City Council District 28
Jennings, Jr., Allan W +	Non-Participant	City Council District 28
Mahadeo, Robby	Participant	City Council District 28
Narine, Dhanpaul	Participant	City Council District 28
White, Jr., Thomas	Participant	City Council District 28
Katz, Melinda R +	Non-Participant	City Council District 29
Nocerino, Joseph R	Participant	City Council District 29
Gallagher, Dennis P +	Participant	City Council District 30
Hooks, Jr., David R	Participant	City Council District 31
Sanders, Jr., James J +	Non-Participant	City Council District 31
Addabbo, Joseph P +	Participant	City Council District 32
Hooks, Erik L	Participant	City Council District 33
Yassky, David +	Participant	City Council District 33
Farmer, Bryan	Non-Participant	City Council District 34
Reyna, Diana +	Participant	City Council District 34
Rivera, George	Participant	City Council District 34
Trainer, Richard	Non-Participant	City Council District 34
Billups, Charles B	Participant	City Council District 35
Blackwell, Eric S	Participant	City Council District 35
Herbert, Anthony L	Participant	City Council District 35
James, Letitia +	Participant	City Council District 35

Candidate	Classification	Office Sought
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	City Council District 36
Vann, Albert +	Participant	City Council District 36
Dilan, Erik Martin +	Participant	City Council District 37
Gonzalez, Miguel M	Non-Participant	City Council District 37
Galarza, David	Participant	City Council District 38
Gonzalez, Sara M +	Participant	City Council District 38
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	City Council District 38
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	Participant	City Council District 38
de Blasio, Bill +	Participant	City Council District 39
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	Participant	City Council District 39
Clarke, Yvette D +	Participant	City Council District 40
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	City Council District 40
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka T	Non-Participant	City Council District 41
Antoine, Royston	Participant	City Council District 41
Boyland, Sr., William F	Non-Participant	City Council District 41
Britton, A. Brinmore	Non-Participant	City Council District 41
Duggan, Essie M	Participant	City Council District 41
Junior, Pamela M	Participant	City Council District 41
Kinard, Stanley	Participant	City Council District 41
King, Danny	Participant	City Council District 41
Mealy, Darlene	Participant	City Council District 41
Miller, David R	Participant	City Council District 41
Muhammad, Naquan A	Participant	City Council District 41
Samad, Maryam A	Participant	City Council District 41
Barron, Charles +	Participant	City Council District 42
Whitehead, John C	Participant	City Council District 42
Gentile, Vincent J +	Participant	City Council District 43
Russo, Pasqualino	Participant	City Council District 43
Felder, Simcha +	Non-Participant	City Council District 44
Grupico, Salvatore A	Non-Participant	City Council District 45
King, Erlene J	Participant	City Council District 45
Stewart, Kendall B +	Participant	City Council District 45

Click here to return to main menu

Candidate	Classification	Office Sought
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	City Council District 45
Fidler, Lewis A +	Participant	City Council District 46
Grandoit, Tamara	Participant	City Council District 46
Madden, Mary E	Non-Participant	City Council District 46
Weir, Elias J	Participant	City Council District 46
Gallo, Russell C	Participant	City Council District 47
Recchia, Domenic M +	Participant	City Council District 47
Gutnik, Oleg	Non-Participant	City Council District 48
Nelson, Michael C +	Participant	City Council District 48
Roth, Michael	Participant	City Council District 48
Hall, Jody	Participant	City Council District 49
McMahon, Michael E +	Participant	City Council District 49
Ceder, David	Participant	City Council District 50
Oddo, James S +	Participant	City Council District 50
Lanza, Andrew J +	Participant	City Council District 51
Schlanger, Craig	Participant	City Council District 51

Total: 208

Total for Participants: 155

Total for Non-Participants: 53

Click here to return to main menu

APPENDIX A-1 CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS IN THE 2005 ELECTIONS

Mayor	Boro President	City Council
Adames, Jose!	Wright, Keith *	Denis, Nelson *
Chino, Theo !	City Council	Dickens, Inez *
Ferrer, Fernando *	Addabbo, Joseph * +	Dilan, Erik Martin * +
Fields, C. Virginia *	Akbar, Celestina!	Doty, Cynthia *
Miller, A. Gifford *	Almodovar, Harry!	Duggan, Essie *
Ognibene, Thomas *	Antoine, Royston *	Emmanuel, Ernest!
Sloan, Sam !	Arangio, Jennifer!	Estrada Rukaj, Irene!
Weiner, Anthony *	Arroyo, Maria del Carmen * +	Fidler, Lewis * +
Public Advocate	Avella, Tony * +	Flanagan, Claudia *
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon *	Baez, Maria * +	Foglia, Philip *
Golub, Jay *	Baldeo, Albert *	Foster, Helen Diane *
Gotbaum, Betsy * +	Bari, Asef!	Galarza, David *
Maio, Danniel!	Barron, Charles * +	Gallagher, Dennis * +
Rasiej, Andrew *	Bernace, Victor *	Gallo, Russell *
Ruano-Melendez, Eric!	Betancourt Jr, Ismael *	Garodnick, Daniel *
Siegel, Norman *	Beys, Michael *	Gennaro, James * +
Comptroller	Bilal, Charles *	Gentile, Vincent * +
Sutliff, Jessica!	Billups, Charles *	Gerson, Alan * +
Thompson, Jr., William * +	Blackwell, Eric *	Gibbs, Edward!
Boro President	Bloch, Darren *	Gioia, Eric * +
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo * +	Bloodsaw, Daryl *	Gonzalez, Sara * +
Ellner, Brian *	Booker, Derek!	Goodwin, Gwen!
Espaillat, Adriano *	Boudouvas, Peter *	Grandoit, Tamara *
Fields, Jessie *	Brewer, Gale * +	Hall, Jody *
Lopez, Margarita *	Brightharp, Joan *	Henderson, Woody *
Luisi, John *	Brodsky, Meryl *	Herbert, Anthony *
Manzano, Carlos *	Brown Jr, Will *	Hoffnung, Aaron *
Markowitz, Marty * +	Burton, Arthur!	Hooks, Erik *
Marshall, Helen * +	Carlino, John *	Hooks, Jr., David *
Mattera, Gloria *	Carroll, Rodney *	Hughes, Michael!
Michels, Stanley *	Cavaco, Manuel!	Jackson, Robert * +
Molinaro, James * +	Ceder, David *	James, Letitia * +
Moskowitz, Eva *	Cesnik, Eric *	Johnson, Joyce *
Perkins, Bill *	Clarke, Yvette * +	Jones, Stephen!
Popik, Barry *	Cornelius, Yasmin *	Junior, Pamela *
Sica, Philip *	Davis, Melvin!	Kann, Gerald *
Stringer, Scott *	de Blasio, Bill * +	Karako, Jak *

^{*} Indicates participant was on ballot

⁺ Incumbent

Click here to return to main menu

APPENDIX A-1 CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS IN THE 2005 ELECTIONS

City Council City Council Kaufman, Stephen Peterson, Daniel! Kavanagh, Brian Powell IV, Adam! Kinard, Stanley * Price, Edward! King, Danny Pu-Folkes, Bryan * King, Erlene * Quart, Dan * Koppell, Oliver * Quinn, Christine * + Lanza, Andrew Rahman, Masud Recchia, Domenic * + Lappin, Jessica Lester, Jack Reyna, Diana * + Liu, John * + Rivera, George * Lobo, Renee Rivera, Joel * + Lopez, Michael! Rivera, William! Luciano, Felipe 3 Rodriguez, Edward * Mahadeo, Robby * Rosario, Antonio Roth, Michael * Marcial, Edwin * Mark-Viverito, Melissa * Ruiz, John * Martinez, Israel! Russo, Pasqualino * Martinez, Juan! Samad, Maryam Santiago, Gladys! McClean, Lawrence! McMahon, Michael * + Schlanger, Craig McManus, Joseph Seabrook, Larry * + Sears, Helen * + McNally, Zenobia * Mealy, Darlene Sementilli, Egidio * Mendez, Rosie * Sklar, Robyn * Miller, David * Spitz, George * Monserrate, Hiram * + Stewart, Kendall * + Montague, Virginia Taitt, Samuel * Muhammad, Naquan * Tapper, Marlene * Murphy, Patrick * Tsabar, Gur ' Narine, Dhanpaul * Vacca, James * Nath, Dilip * Vallone, Jr., Peter * + Vann, Albert * + Nelson, Michael * + Nocerino, Joseph Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana * Oddo, James * + Velazquez Bennett, Yvette * Ortiz, Omar! Watts, Gwendolyn!

Weir, Elias *

Weprin, David * +

City Council

White, Jr., Thomas *
Whitehead, John *
Yablon, Joshua *
Yassky, David * +
Young, Joseph!
Zinberg, Joel *
Undeclared

Swietnicki, Edward!

Palma, Annabel * +

Papajohn, Christopher *

^{*} Indicates participant was on ballot

⁺ Incumbent

Mayor Party: Democratic

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Brodeur, Christopher	Non-Participant	+	+	-	16,561	1,2
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	\$4,245,122	\$5,802,790	\$1,685,000	192,262	
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	\$1,754,873	\$2,953,074	\$1,459,636	75,826	
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	\$5,200,732	\$6,567,684	\$2,462,951	49,515	
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	+	+	-	5,584	1,2
Weiner, Anthony	Participant	\$2,804,423	\$4,609,534	\$1,710,376	138,917	
Total		\$14,005,150	\$19,933,082	\$7,317,963	478,665	

Public Advocate Party: Democratic

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Brown, Michael	Non-Participant	N/A	N/A	-	35,488	1
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon	Participant	\$2,167	\$1,227	-	9,679	
Golub, Jay	Participant	\$15,150	\$60,458	-	18,016	
Gotbaum, Betsy *	Participant	\$1,574,250	\$2,612,931	\$1,126,440	192,727	
Rasiej, Andrew	Participant	\$337,949	\$938,423	\$774,704	19,466	
Siegel, Norman	Participant	\$350,970	\$961,376	\$662,760	120,819	
Total		\$2,280,486	\$4,574,415	\$2,563,904	396,195	

Borough President Party: Democratic Borough: Manhattan

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
			<u> </u>			140163
Ellner, Brian	Participant	\$511,899	\$1,144,682	\$708,950	17,791	
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	\$550,193	\$1,013,171	\$498,338	13,999	
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	\$497,232	\$887,222	\$453,745	20,126	

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

 $^{@\ \} Indicates\ a\ high\ spending\ non-participant\ triggered\ the\ second\ tier\ bonus\ matching$

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

Borough President Party: Democratic Borough: Manhattan

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	\$365,327	\$900,610	\$544,152	5,282	
Michels, Stanley	Participant	\$180,927	\$434,851	\$296,716	5,684	
Moskowitz, Eva	Participant	\$945,878	\$1,526,886	\$625,788	26,348	
Perkins, Bill	Participant	\$379,728	\$775,822	\$418,334	16,690	
Stringer, Scott	Participant	\$910,429	\$1,678,960	\$708,950	40,226	
Wright, Keith	Participant	\$307,996	\$452,465	\$173,090	8,078	
Total		\$4,649,609	\$8,814,669	\$4,428,063	154,224	

City Council Party: Democratic District: 02

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Beys, Michael	Participant	\$81,621	\$152,605	\$82,500	945	
Bloch, Darren	Participant	\$77,996	\$163,534	\$82,500	2,212	
Brightharp, Joan	Participant	\$8,939	\$35,594	\$23,848	632	
Kavanagh, Brian	Participant	\$112,869	\$192,170	\$82,500	2,721	
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	\$105,682	\$163,842	\$82,500	5,250	
Papajohn, Christopher	Participant	\$18,048	\$24,367	-	323	
Tsabar, Gur	Participant	\$77,207	\$137,939	\$82,500	2,411	
Total		\$482.362	\$870.051	\$436.348	14.494	

City Council Party: Democratic District: 04

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	\$63,232	\$74,966	\$55,776	2,015	
Garodnick, Daniel	Participant	\$180,140	\$197,834	\$82,500	7,270	

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

 $^{@\} Indicates\ a\ high\ spending\ non-participant\ triggered\ the\ second\ tier\ bonus\ matching$

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council	Party: Democratic	I	District: 04			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Karako, Jak	Participant	\$41,103	\$99,561	\$82,500	1,131	
Total		\$284,475	\$372,361	\$220,776	10,416	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 05			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Cesnik, Eric	Participant	\$45,501	\$91,552	\$46,248	1,577	
Lappin, Jessica	Participant	\$137,411	\$183,081	\$82,500	7,286	
Quart, Dan	Participant	\$125,638	\$203,754	\$82,500	3,404	
Spitz, George	Participant	\$25,132	\$24,857	-	795	
Total		\$333,682	\$503,244	\$211,248	13,062	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 07			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Bernace, Victor	Participant	\$14,340	\$61,836	\$48,900	2,545	_
Jackson, Robert *	Participant	\$62,317	\$59,121	\$41,484	7,886	
Total		\$76,657	\$120,957	\$90,384	10,431	
City Council	Party: Democratic	I	District: 08			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Denis, Nelson	Participant	\$65,056	\$134,380	\$70,500	2,444	
Johnson, Joyce	Participant	\$65,343	\$154,926	\$82,500	2,857	
Luciano, Felipe	Participant	\$75,623	\$112,265	\$81,280	3,748	1

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

 $^{@\} Indicates\ a\ high\ spending\ non-participant\ triggered\ the\ second\ tier\ bonus\ matching$

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

14,890

Notes

APPENDIX B TOTALS FOR CANDIDATES APPEARING ON THE PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT

City Council Party: Democratic District: 08 Net **CFB** Net Candidate **Contributions** Classification **Expenditures Payments Vote Count**

Marcial, Edwin Participant \$12,600 \$10,992 387 Mark-Viverito, Melissa Participant \$85,651 \$160,407 \$82,500 3,831 Ruiz, John Participant \$26,695 \$105,257 \$76,556 1.623 Total \$330,968 \$678,227 \$393,336

City Council Party: Democratic District: 09

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Allen, William	Non-Participant	N/A	N/A	- uyee	788	1
Carroll, Rodney	Participant	\$40,069	\$93,863	\$72,420	1,389	
Cornelius, Yasmin	Participant	\$90,112	\$148,783	\$82,500	3,351	
Dickens, Inez	Participant	\$151,001	\$179,194	\$82,500	4,608	
Doty, Cynthia	Participant	\$24,551	\$79,124	\$65,044	2,803	
Henderson, Woody	Participant	\$7,335	\$5,989	-	509	
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	N/A	N/A	-	662	1
Montague, Virginia	Participant	\$41,148	\$37,254	\$82,500	2,049	
Total		\$354,216	\$544,207	\$384,964	16,159	

City Council Party: Democratic District: 10

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Martinez, Miguel *	Non-Participant	\$182,507	\$139,717	-	6,895	
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	+	+	-	1,581	2
Total		\$182,507	\$139,717	-	8,476	

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

[@] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council Party: Democratic District: 11 **CFB** Net Net Candidate Classification **Contributions Expenditures Vote Count Notes Payments** Hoffnung, Aaron Participant \$69,824 \$123,876 \$82,500 2.670 Koppell, Oliver * Participant \$83,536 \$155,521 \$82,500 8.457 Total \$153,360 \$279,397 \$165,000 11,127 City Council Party: Democratic District: 13 Net Net **CFB** Candidate Classification **Vote Count** Contributions **Expenditures Payments Notes** Betancourt Jr, Ismael Participant \$30,166 \$114,321 \$79,160 861 Kaufman, Stephen Participant \$129,141 \$192,121 \$63,528 2,443 McManus, Joseph \$95,938 \$100,914 \$82,500 **Participant** 1,913 Sementilli, Egidio \$9,360 \$7,927 **Participant** 464 1 Vacca, James Participant \$142,239 \$165,224 \$82,500 3,559 Total \$406,844 \$580,507 \$307,688 9,240 **City Council Party: Democratic** District: 21 **CFB** Net Net Candidate Classification Contributions **Expenditures Payments Vote Count Notes** Jimenez, Luis Non-Participant N/A N/A 730 Monserrate, Hiram * Participant \$175,239 \$221,421 \$82,500 3,401 Tapper, Marlene Participant \$25,890 \$126,472 \$82,500 1,085

\$201,129

\$347,893

\$165,000

Total

5,216

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

[@] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council Party: Democratic District: 24 **CFB** Net Net Candidate Classification **Contributions Expenditures Vote Count Notes Payments** Gennaro, James * Participant \$203,151 \$239,641 \$82,500 5.897 Lobo, Renee Participant \$57,890 \$99,384 \$81,984 1.208 Nath, Dilip Participant \$24,867 \$97,923 \$78,276 736 \$285,908 Total \$436,948 \$242,760 7,841 District: 25 City Council **Party: Democratic CFB** Net Net Candidate Classification Contributions **Expenditures Payments Vote Count Notes** Flores, Rodolfo Non-Participant \$12,905 \$11,397 886 1 Pu-Folkes, Bryan \$82,214 \$163,490 \$82,500 **Participant** 1,712 Sears. Helen * \$129,825 \$163,823 \$82,500 **Participant** 4,225 Total \$224,944 \$338,710 \$165,000 6,823 **City Council** Party: Democratic District: 28 Net **CFB** Net Candidate Classification Contributions **Expenditures Payments Vote Count Notes** Baldeo, Albert \$103,555 \$178,971 \$82,500 Participant 1,032 Jennings, Jr., Allan * Non-Participant \$32,610 \$32,191 2,148

\$17,475

\$19,862

\$90,013

\$263,515

\$115,987

\$26,503

\$173,544

\$527,196

\$82,500

\$165,000

Total

Mahadeo, Robby

Narine, Dhanpaul

White, Jr., Thomas

Participant

Participant

Participant

369

426

2,877

6,852

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

@ Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 29			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Katz, Melinda *	Non-Participant	\$633,629	\$331,304	-	5,757	
Nocerino, Joseph @	Participant	\$18,635	\$89,137	\$75,042	1,269	
Total		\$652,264	\$420,441	\$75,042	7,026	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 31			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Hooks, Jr., David #	Participant	\$38,819	\$58,692	\$54,350	3,223	
Sanders, Jr., James *	Non-Participant	\$159,087	\$147,783	-	5,025	
Total		\$197,906	\$206,475	\$54,350	8,248	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 34			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Reyna, Diana *	Participant	\$90,334	\$112,681	\$70,620	6,578	
Rivera, George	Participant	\$20,125	\$80,324	\$75,875	1,747	
Total		\$110,459	\$193,005	\$146,495	8,325	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 35			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Blackwell, Eric	Participant	\$14,754	-	-	1,539	
James, Letitia *	Participant	\$44,876	\$67,446	\$72,844	8,667	
Total		\$59,630	\$67,446	\$72,844	10,206	

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

 $^{@\} Indicates\ a\ high\ spending\ non-participant\ triggered\ the\ second\ tier\ bonus\ matching$

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council	Party: Democratic	Ι	District: 36			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	+	+	-	2,285	1,2
Vann, Albert *	Participant	\$17,680	\$26,196	-	4,794	
Total		\$17,680	\$26,196	-	7,079	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ι	District: 38			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Galarza, David	Participant	\$22,764	\$60,493	\$42,760	1,154	
Gonzalez, Sara *	Participant	\$65,456	\$90,834	\$59,000	2,273	
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	\$61,640	\$148,072	\$82,500	1,722	
Total		\$149,860	\$299,399	\$184,260	5,149	
City Council	Party: Democratic	Ι	District: 40			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Clarke, Yvette *	Participant	\$84,566	\$133,531	\$81,784	5,256	
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	\$20,348	\$73,492	\$45,444	1,510	
Total		\$104,914	\$207,023	\$127,228	6,766	
City Council	Party: Democratic	Ι	District: 41			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka	Non-Participant	\$35,082	\$22,970	-	309	
Antoine, Royston #	Participant	\$21,865	\$60,863	\$59,900	573	
Boyland, Sr., William	Non-Participant	\$60,520	\$61,182	-	1,806	

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

 $^{@\} Indicates\ a\ high\ spending\ non-participant\ triggered\ the\ second\ tier\ bonus\ matching\\$

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council	Party: Democratic	Ι	District: 41			
Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Duggan, Essie #	Participant	\$7,150	\$4,313	1 ayınıcınıs	276	1
Junior, Pamela #	Participant	\$32,726	\$25,345	-	294	'
Kinard, Stanley #	Participant	\$18,680	\$23,343 \$74,143	\$58,700	489	
King, Danny #	Participant	\$29,377	\$74,143 \$55,191	\$39,623	469 868	
Mealy, Darlene #	Participant	\$82,851	\$130,919	\$100,000	4,480	
Miller, David #	Participant	ψ02,031	ψ150,919 +	φ100,000 -	335	1,2
Samad, Maryam #	Participant	\$5,765	\$2,466	-	149	1,2
Total		\$294,016	\$437,392	\$258,223	9,579	
City Council	Party: Democratic	ı	District: 42			
		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Barron, Charles *	Participant	\$65,234	\$140,036	\$82,500	7,385	
Whitehead, John	Participant	\$11,540	\$14,450	-	1,422	1
Total		\$76,774	\$154,486	\$82,500	8,807	
City Council	Party: Democratic	I	District: 45			
Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Stewart, Kendall *	Participant	\$84,818	\$155,301	\$82,500	4,657	
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	\$44,305	\$107,818	\$82,500	3,829	
Total		\$129,123	\$263,119	\$165,000	8,486	

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

@ Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

City Council Party: Democratic District: 46 Net **CFB** Net Candidate **Contributions Expenditures** Classification **Payments Vote Count Notes** Fidler, Lewis * Participant \$42,493 \$111,847 \$82,500 6,484 Grandoit, Tamara Participant \$22,248 \$95,902 \$73,972 1,246 Weir, Elias Participant \$3,065 \$2,065 532 1 Total \$67,806 \$209,814 \$156,472 8,262 Total \$26,376,244 \$18,579,848 \$41,546,377

^{*} Incumbent

[#] Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching

@ Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching

⁺ Indicates a small campaign

New York City Campaign Finance Board

40 Rector Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10006 tel. 212.306.7100 fax 212.306.7143 www.nyccfb.info info@nyccfb.info

Click here to return to main menu

Notes for Appendix B

The notes below correspond to numbers under the column heading "Notes" (far right) in Appendix B of the NYC Campaign Finance Board's 2005 PER.

- 1. Candidate did not file all required statements with the NYC Campaign Finance Board.
- 2. Candidate certified minimal activity with the NYC Campaign Finance Board.

Mayor			Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification		ions E	xpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Bloomberg, Michael *	I,L,R	Non-Participant	\$84,155,8	868	\$84,587,319	-	753,089	
Blum, Seth	EDUCAT	Non-Participant		+	+	-	1,176	2
Ferrer, Fernando @	D	Participant	\$5,287,8	875	\$9,165,301	\$3,897,336	503,219	3
Gronowicz, Anthony	GP	Non-Participant		+	+	-	8,297	2
Koppel, Martin	S	Non-Participant		+	+	-	2,256	2
McMillan, Jimmy	RENT	Non-Participant		+	+	-	4,111	2
Ognibene, Thomas @	С	Participant	\$78,2	284	\$78,469	-	14,630	4
Silk, Audrey	LIB	Non-Participant	\$2	240	\$1,179	-	2,888	
Total			\$89,522,2	267	\$93,832,268	\$3,897,336	1,289,666	
Public Advocate			Not		Nice	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Net Contribut	ions Ex	Net xpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Goetz, Bernard	REBUIL	Non-Participant		+	+	-	17,257	2
Golub, Jay	С	Participant	\$55, ²	120	\$67,584	-	48,082	3
Gotbaum, Betsy *	D	Participant	\$1,611,9	975	\$2,758,397	\$1,170,700	745,035	3
Lesczynski, James	LIB	Non-Participant		+	+	-	17,139	2
Total			\$1,667,0	095	\$2,825,981	\$1,170,700	827,513	
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spending non-partic	inant triggered the first tier bo	nus matching		onservative emocratic	L LIB	Liberal Libertarian	R S	Republican Socialist
@ Indicates a high spending non-partic+ Indicates a small campaign	cipant triggered the second tie	=	EDUCAT Ed GP Gr	ucation een	REBUIL REFORM	Rebuild Reform	SMALL WARVET	Small Class Size War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from the candidate	ate or amount not applicable		I Inc	dependence	e RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

Comptroller			Mar			OFD		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Net Contribution		Net enditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Fein, Daniel	S	Non-Participant	+	о Ехр	+	-	2,009	2
Moore, Ron	LIB	Non-Participant	+		+	_	4,186	1,2
Ryan, Herbert	C	Non-Participant	N/A		N/A	_	7,888	1,2
Thompson, Jr., William *	D,WF	Participant	\$3,844,371	\$	2,380,985	-	211,793	!
Total			\$3,844,371	\$	2,380,985	-	225,876	
Borough President	Borough: Brooklyn		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contribution	s Expe	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Alatsas, Theodore	C,R	Non-Participant	N/A		N/A	-	32,444	1
Markowitz, Marty *	D,WF	Participant	\$1,652,261	\$	1,098,757	-	222,591	
Mattera, Gloria	GP	Participant	\$61,573		\$262,201	\$199,156	18,944	
Popkin, Gary	LIB,REFORM	Non-Participant	+		+	-	1,991	2
Total			\$1,713,834	\$	1,360,958	\$199,156	275,970	
Borough President	Borough: Manhattan		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contribution	s Expe	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Dobrian, Joseph	LIB	Non-Participant	N/A		N/A	-	2,678	1
Fields, Jessie	I	Participant	\$47,525		\$188,559	\$141,189	11,282	4
Hawkins, Arrin	S	Non-Participant	+		+	-	1,967	2
@ Indicates a high spending no+ Indicates a small campaign	n-participant triggered the first tier bonus n-participant triggered the second tier b candidate or amount not applicable	=	C Consen D Democr EDUCAT Educati GP Green I Indeper	atic on	L LIB REBUIL REFORM RENT	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn High	R S SMALL WARVET WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family

Borough President	Borough: Manhattan		Ne	t		Net	CFB				
Candidate	Party	Classification				enditures	Payments	V	ote Count	I	Notes
Popik, Barry	L,R	Participant	\$^	10,025		\$8,214	-		41,698		4
Stringer, Scott	D	Participant	\$1,00	06,911	\$	1,721,090	\$708,950		200,152		3
Total			\$1,06	64,461	\$1	1,917,863	\$850,139		257,777		
Borough President	Borough: Queens		Ne	t	ı	Net	CFB				
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expe	enditures	Payments	V	ote Count	I	Notes
Marshall, Helen *	D,WF	Participant	\$25	54,582		\$125,381	-		179,992		•
Sica, Philip	C,R	Participant	\$^	14,000		\$12,283	-		60,607		
Total			\$26	68,582		\$137,664	-		240,599		
Borough President	Borough: Staten Island										
J	J		Ne	t	I	Net	CFB				
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expe	enditures	Payments	٧	ote Count		Notes
Luisi, John	D,I,WF	Participant	\$4	49,375		\$157,611	\$107,736		34,023		
Molinaro, James *	C,R	Participant	\$47	79,357	\$	1,003,329	\$596,660		48,432		
Total			\$52	28,732	\$1	1,160,940	\$704,396		82,455		
Borough President	Borough: Bronx		Ne			Net	CFB				
Candidate	Party	Classification				enditures	Payments	V	ote Count	ı	Notes
Brawley, Kevin	C,R	Non-Participant		+		+	-		20,626		2
* Incumbent			С	Conservat	tive	L	Liberal		R	Republican	
# Indicates a high spending no	n-participant triggered the first tier bonus	matching	D	Democrati	ic	LIB	Libertarian		S	Socialist	
	on-participant triggered the second tier bo	-	EDUCAT	Education	1	REBUIL	Rebuild		SMALL	Small Class Size	е
+ Indicates a small campaign		-	GP	Green		REFORM	Reform		WARVET	War Veterans	
N/A Indicates no filing from the	candidate or amount not applicable		I	Independe	ence	RENT	Rent Is Too Damn	High	WF	Working Family	

Borough President	Borough: Bronx		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contributions		Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo *	D,WF	Participant	\$1,079,529	\$1,021,668	-	138,133	
Total			\$1,079,529	\$1,021,668	-	158,759	
City Council	District: 01		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Gerson, Alan *	D,WF	Participant	\$137,651	\$121,870	-	16,608	
Total			\$137,651	\$121,870	-	16,608	
City Council	District: 02		Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Carlino, John	I,R	Participant	\$9,410	\$8,297	-	4,805	4
Flanagan, Claudia	LIB	Participant	\$475	-	-	685	1,4
Mendez, Rosie	D,WF	Participant	\$108,545	\$229,426	\$123,750	21,341	3
Total			\$118,430	\$237,723	\$123,750	26,831	

* Incumbent	С	Conservative	L	Liberal	R	Republican
# Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching	D	Democratic	LIB	Libertarian	S	Socialist
@ Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching	EDUCAT	Education	REBUIL	Rebuild	SMALL	Small Class Size
+ Indicates a small campaign	GP	Green	REFORM	Reform	WARVET	War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from the candidate or amount not applicable	I	Independence	RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

City Council	District: 03	3								
				Ne		Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Quinn, Christine *		D,WF	Participant	\$27	74,528	\$190,472	-	25,515		
Total				\$27	74,528	\$190,472	-	25,515		_
City Council	District: 04	ı		Ne		Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	_		Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Garodnick, Daniel		D,WF	Participant	\$19	96,399	\$344,891	\$165,000	23,804		3
Karako, Jak		LIB	Participant	\$4	40,728	\$130,212	\$100,888	370		3
Murphy, Patrick		I,L,R	Participant	\$25	52,831	\$326,419	\$82,500	13,153		4
Total				\$48	89,958	\$801,522	\$348,388	37,327		_
City Council	District: 05	5								
				Net		Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Lappin, Jessica		D,WF	Participant	\$18	89,483	\$349,980	\$165,000	23,178		3
Zinberg, Joel		I,L,R	Participant	\$10	01,553	\$183,578	\$82,500	12,494		4
Total				\$29	91,036	\$533,558	\$247,500	35,672		_
City Council	District: 06	5		Ne		No	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	_		Net Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Brewer, Gale *		D,WF	Participant	\$11	11,118	\$112,426	<u>-</u>	31,092		_
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spendin @ Indicates a high spendi			=	C D EDUCAT GP	Conservation Democration Education Green		Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform	R S SMALL WARVET	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans	

City Council	District: 06	6		Net	ŀ	Net		CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib		_		Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Yablon, Joshua		R	Participant	\$1	6,570	\$5	52,047	\$36,592	6,852	
Total				\$12	27,688	\$16	64,473	\$36,592	37,944	
City Council	District: 07	7								
				Net		Net		CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expend	litures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Cox, Allen		I	Non-Participant		+		+	-	532	1,2
Jackson, Robert *		D,WF	Participant	\$8	33,065	\$10	09,051	\$57,124	18,173	3
Petelka, Michael		R	Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	2,049	1
Total				\$8	3,955	\$10	9,940	\$57,124	20,754	
City Council	District: 08	3								
•				Net	t	Net	t	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expend	litures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Mark-Viverito, Melissa		D,WF	Participant	\$8	88,327	\$17	73,640	\$82,500	18,425	3
Total				\$8	88,327	\$17	73,640	\$82,500	18,425	
City Council	District: 09)								
				Net	t	Net	t	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expend	litures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Bloodsaw, Daryl		1	Participant	\$2	22,797	\$!	59,465	\$37,700	1,773	4
Brown Jr, Will		R	Participant	\$1	0,580	9	\$9,900	-	2,207	4
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spending @ Indicates a high spending + Indicates a small campaig N/A Indicates no filing from	g non-participant trigge n	red the second tie	=	D	Conservation Education Green Independe	ic	L Lib Rebuil Reform Rent	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn High	R S SMALL WARVET WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family



City Council	District: 09)		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification		ons	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Dickens, Inez		D	Participant	\$183,4	56	\$261,658	\$82,500	21,222	3
Henderson, Woody		WARVET	Participant	\$8,0	80	\$29,272	\$21,580	913	3
Total				\$224,9	13	\$360,295	\$141,780	26,115	
City Council	District: 10)		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributi	ons	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Martinez, Miguel *		D,WF	Non-Participant	\$183,8	17	\$148,015	-	13,375	3
Total				\$183,8	17	\$148,015	-	13,375	
City Council	District: 11	l							
Candidate		Donte	Classification	Net Contributi	one	Net Expenditures	CFB Poyments	Vote Count	Notes
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributi	ons	Expenditures	Payments	vote Count	Notes
Bradian, Steve		C,R	Non-Participant		+	+	-	4,573	1,2
Koppell, Oliver *		D	Participant	\$102,1	86	\$201,783	\$103,125	19,598	3
Total				\$102,1	86	\$201,783	\$103,125	24,171	
City Council	District: 12	2		Net		Nat	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification		ons	Net Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Rubin, George		C,R	Non-Participant		+	+	-	2,895	1,2
* Incumbent					nservat	<u> </u>	Liberal	R	Republican
# Indicates a high spending @ Indicates a high spendin + Indicates a small campai	ng non-participant trigge gn	red the second tie	=	EDUCAT Edu GP Gre		REBUIL REFORM	Libertarian Rebuild Reform	S SMALL WARVET	Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from	the candidate or amou	nt not applicable		I Ind	epende	ence RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

City Council	District: 12	}							
·				Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	ons E	xpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
Seabrook, Larry *		D	Participant	\$42,7	7	\$121,615	\$71,000	19,729	
Total				\$42,7	17	\$121,615	\$71,000	22,624	
City Council	District: 13	3		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification		ons E	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
Foglia, Philip		C,I,R	Participant	\$79,80)2	\$137,475	\$82,500	9,116	
Vacca, James		D	Participant	\$177,62	29	\$324,167	\$165,000	16,484	
Total				\$257,43	31	\$461,642	\$247,500	25,600	
City Council	District: 14	ļ		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	ons E	xpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin		С	Non-Participant	N/	Ά	N/A	-	209	
Baez, Maria *		D	Participant	\$90,1	0	\$88,893	-	12,072	
Rosario, Antonio		1	Participant	\$13,00)5	\$43,934	\$30,860	463	
Total				\$103,11	15	\$132,827	\$30,860	12,744	
City Council	District: 15	i		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification		ons E	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
Rivera, Joel *		D	Participant	\$102,83	36	\$90,091	-	13,184	
•				C Con) I	Liberal	R	Republican

City Council	District: 15			Net			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification				enditures	Payments	Vote Count	No	otes
Stern, Steven		C,R	Non-Participant		+		+	-	1,303		2
Total				\$102	2,836		\$90,091	-	14,487		
City Council	District: 16			Net			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribu	utions	Ехре	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	No	otes
Campbell, Lisa Marie		С	Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	211		1
Foster, Helen Diane *		D,R,WF	Participant	\$92	2,902		\$62,969	\$20,625	15,344		
Total				\$92	2,902		\$62,969	\$20,625	15,555		
City Council	District: 17			Net			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribu	utions	Ехре	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	No	otes
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen *		D,I	Participant	\$28	8,660		\$26,713	-	16,088		
Mohamed, Ali		С	Non-Participant		+		+	-	273		2
Total				\$28	8,660		\$26,713	-	16,361		_
City Council	District: 18			Net			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribu	utions	Expe	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	No	otes
Feliciano, Fabian		R	Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	1,978		1
Lefebvre, Albert		С	Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	168		5
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spending nor @ Indicates a high spending no + Indicates a small campaign N/A Indicates no filing from the	n-participant trigger	ed the second tie	=	D I EDUCAT I GP	Conservat Democrati Education Green Independe	ic	L LIB REBUIL REFORM RENT	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn Hig	R S SMALL WARVET h WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family	

City Council	District: 18			Nat	Mad	CED		
				Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Palma, Annabel *	ι),WF	Participant	\$92,703	\$67,803	-	17,491	
Total				\$92,703	\$67,803	-	19,637	
City Council	District: 19							
				Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Avella, Tony *	[)	Participant	\$133,307	\$190,269	\$75,120	17,819	
Boudouvas, Peter	(C,I,R	Participant	\$34,473	\$116,115	\$81,960	10,712	
Total				\$167,780	\$306,384	\$157,080	28,531	
City Council	District: 20							
				Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate	I	Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	(Non-Participant	+	+	-	1,716	1,2
Liu, John *	Ι),I,WF	Participant	\$230,384	\$110,420	-	10,610	
Total				\$230,384	\$110,420	-	12,326	

* Incumbent	С	Conservative	L	Liberal	R	Republican
# Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching	D	Democratic	LIB	Libertarian	S	Socialist
@ Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching	EDUCAT	Education	REBUIL	Rebuild	SMALL	Small Class Size
+ Indicates a small campaign	GP	Green	REFORM	Reform	WARVET	War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from the candidate or amount not applicable	I	Independence	RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

City Council	District: 21			Net		N	et	CFB			
Candidate	Pa	ırty	Classification	Contrib				Payments	Vote Count	N	lotes
Monserrate, Hiram *	D,V	VF	Participant	\$18	5,352	\$	267,243	\$82,500	8,298		3
Total				\$18	5,352	\$	267,243	\$82,500	8,298		
City Council	District: 22			Net		N	et	CFB			
Candidate	Pa	irty	Classification	Contrib	utions	Exper	nditures	Payments	Vote Count	N	lotes
Kann, Gerald	GP		Participant	\$	5,490		\$2,353	-	1,327		
Ruks, Thomas	LIB		Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	358		1
Vallone, Jr., Peter *	C,D),R	Participant	\$18	6,110	\$	206,470	-	14,518		
Total				\$19	1,600	\$:	208,823	-	16,203		
City Council	District: 23			Net		N	et	CFB			
Candidate	Pa	irty	Classification	Contrib				Payments	Vote Count	N	lotes
Weprin, David *	D,V	VF	Participant	\$50	7,316	\$	227,201	-	18,016		
Total				\$50	7,316	\$	227,201	-	18,016		
City Council	District: 24			Net		N	et	CFB			
Candidate	Pa	irty	Classification	Contrib	utions			Payments	Vote Count	N	lotes
Gennaro, James *	D,V	VF	Participant	\$21	4,792	\$	336,418	\$127,204	16,311		3
Lobo, Renee	I		Participant	\$6	3,040	\$	153,265	\$91,164	1,570		3
@ Indicates a high spending+ Indicates a small campaig	non-participant triggered the g non-participant triggered th gn the candidate or amount not	e second tier bon	_	D EDUCAT GP	Conservati Democration Education Green Independe	С	L LIB REBUIL REFORM RENT	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn High	R S SMALL WARVET WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family	

City Council	District: 24			Ne	\	Ne	\	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification		outions			Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Lynch, Stephen		R	Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	2,836	5
Total				\$2	77,832	\$4	89,683	\$218,368	20,717	
City Council	District: 25									
				Ne		_ Ne		CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	outions	Expen	ditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Flores, Rodolfo		1	Non-Participant	\$	13,005	\$	511,672	-	545	3
Rahman, Masud		R	Participant	\$	15,977	\$	346,917	\$31,084	2,671	4
Sears, Helen *		D,WF	Participant	\$1	39,885	\$2	269,713	\$103,332	12,836	3
Total				\$1	68,867	\$3	28,302	\$134,416	16,052	
City Council	District: 26									
-				Ne	et	Ne	et	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	outions	Expen	ditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Gioia, Eric *		D	Participant	\$5	54,936	\$3	313,686	-	12,990	
Hanks, Nancy		1	Non-Participant		+		+	-	556	1,2
Sklar, Robyn		GP	Participant	\$	10,399	\$	343,458	\$33,172	2,032	
Total				\$5	65,335	\$3	57,144	\$33,172	15,578	
* Incumbent				С	Conservat		L	Liberal	R	Republican
# Indicates a high spendir @ Indicates a high spendi + Indicates a small campa	ing non-participant trigger			D EDUCAT GP	Democrati Education Green		LIB REBUIL REFORM	Libertarian Rebuild Reform	S SMALL WARVET	Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from	m the candidate or amoun	t not applicable		I	Independe	ence	RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

City Council	District: 27			Net	Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Comrie, Leroy *		D,I,R,WF	Non-Participant	\$211,624	\$193,629	-	19,931	
Total				\$211,624	\$193,629	-	19,931	
City Council	District: 28			Net	Net	СГВ		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Bilal, Charles		I	Participant	\$26,195	\$20,979	-	2,095	4
Hunter, Jereline		R	Non-Participant	+	+	-	1,523	2
White, Jr., Thomas		D	Participant	\$120,822	\$215,159	\$82,500	10,478	3
Total				\$147,017	\$236,138	\$82,500	14,096	
City Council	District: 29			Net	Net	СҒВ		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contributions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Katz, Melinda *		D,WF	Non-Participant	\$723,320	\$407,841	-	15,338	3
Total				\$723,320	\$407,841	-	15,338	

* Incumbent	С	Conservative	L	Liberal	R	Republican
# Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the first tier bonus matching	D	Democratic	LIB	Libertarian	S	Socialist
@ Indicates a high spending non-participant triggered the second tier bonus matching	EDUCAT	Education	REBUIL	Rebuild	SMALL	Small Class Size
+ Indicates a small campaign	GP	Green	REFORM	Reform	WARVET	War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from the candidate or amount not applicable	1	Independence	RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

City Council	District: 30)							
•				Ne	et	Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contri	butions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Gallagher, Dennis *		C,R	Participant	\$1	22,806	\$1,241,582	-	12,187	
Total				\$1	22,806	\$1,241,582	-	12,187	
City Council	District: 31			NI.	.4	Not	OFD		
0 1114			O 1 10 11	Ne		Net	CFB		N 1 4
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contri	butions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Sanders, Jr., James *		D,WF	Non-Participant	\$1	62,462	\$161,825	-	14,911	3
Total				\$1	62,462	\$161,825	-	14,911	
City Council	District: 32	2					055		
				Ne		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contri	butions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Addabbo, Joseph *		D,WF	Participant	9	647,430	\$27,028	-	13,400	
Total				\$	647,430	\$27,028	-	13,400	
City Council	District: 33	}							
,	2.00			Ne	et	Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contri	butions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Hooks, Erik		C,R	Participant		+	+	-	2,686	2
Yassky, David *		D,WF	Participant	\$5	67,483	\$210,975	-	20,899	
Total				\$5	67,483	\$210,975	-	23,585	
* Incumbent				С	Conserva	tive L	Liberal	R	Republican
# Indicates a high spending	non-participant trigger	ed the first tier b	oonus matching	D	Democrat		Libertarian	S	Socialist
@ Indicates a high spending			•	EDUCAT	Education	REBUIL	Rebuild	SMALL	Small Class Size
+ Indicates a small campaign	n			GP	Green	REFORM	Reform	WARVET	War Veterans
N/A Indicates no filing from t	he candidate or amour	nt not applicable		I	Independe	ence RENT	Rent Is Too Damn High	WF	Working Family

City Council	District: 34			Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification			Expenditures		Vote Count	Notes
Farmer, Bryan		1	Non-Participant		+	+	-	197	1,2
Reyna, Diana *		D,WF	Participant	\$9	6,227	\$159,007	\$87,920	12,795	3
Trainer, Richard		C,R	Non-Participant		N/A	N/A	-	1,388	1
Total				\$9	6,227	\$159,007	\$87,920	14,380	
City Council	District: 35	;		Nat		NI-4	OFD		
On add to		5 .	Olasaitiantian	Net		Net	CFB	Vata Caust	Nata
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Billups, Charles		I	Participant	\$1	6,139	\$59,760	\$44,124	979	4
Herbert, Anthony		C,R	Participant	\$	8,730	-	-	1,490	4
James, Letitia *		D,WF	Participant	\$6	5,026	\$152,296	\$88,604	18,722	3
Total				\$8	9,895	\$212,056	\$132,728	21,191	
City Council	District: 36	i		N 1 4			050		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Net Contrib		Net Expenditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Vann, Albert *		D	Participant		3,280	\$30,107	-	12,460	3
Total				\$2	3,280	\$30,107	-	12,460	
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spendir @ Indicates a high spendir + Indicates a small campa	ing non-participant trigge	ed the second t	ier bonus matching	D EDUCAT GP	Conservation Education Green Independe	ic LIB REBUIL REFORM	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn High	R S SMALL WARVET WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family

City Council	District: 37									
-				Ne			let	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	outions	Expe	nditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
Dilan, Erik Martin *		D,I	Participant	\$	37,165		\$25,808	-	8,217	
Gonzalez, Miguel		C,R	Non-Participant		\$624		\$624	-	1,482	•
Total				\$:	37,789		\$26,432	-	9,699	
City Council	District: 38						_			
				Ne			let	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	outions	Expe	nditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
Gonzalez, Sara *		D,WF	Participant	\$	72,776		\$128,988	\$59,500	7,720	3
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana		C,I,R	Participant	;	\$7,635		\$25,718	\$22,780	512	4
Total				\$6	80,411	;	154,706	\$82,280	8,232	
City Council	District: 39									
				Ne			let	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	outions	Expe	nditures	Payments	Vote Count	Note
de Blasio, Bill *		D,WF	Participant	\$20	05,458		\$233,984	-	17,554	
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette		C,R	Participant	;	\$1,800		\$750	-	3,481	
Total				\$20	07,258	;	\$234,734	-	21,035	
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spending non-	participant triggere	ed the first tier bon	us matching	C D	Conserva Democrat		L LIB	Liberal Libertarian	R S	Republican Socialist
@ Indicates a high spending non + Indicates a small campaign				EDUCAT GP	Education Green	1	REBUIL REFORM	Rebuild Reform	SMALL WARVET	Small Class Size War Veterans

City Council	District: 40)									
				Ne			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expe	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	<u> </u>	lotes
Clarke, Yvette *		D,WF	Participant	\$8	89,166		\$156,965	\$81,784	11,965		3
Total				\$8	89,166		\$156,965	\$81,784	11,965		
City Council	District: 41	l		Ne			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification				enditures	Payments	Vote Count		lotes
Britton, A. Brinmore		R	Non-Participant		N/A		N/A	-	899		1
Mealy, Darlene		D,WF	Participant	\$17	13,968		\$206,857	\$120,625	11,664		3
Muhammad, Naquan		1	Participant	\$	11,270		\$5,880	-	377		1,4
Total				\$12	25,238		\$212,737	\$120,625	12,940		
City Council	District: 42	2									
				Ne			Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contrib	utions	Expe	enditures	Payments	Vote Count	<u> </u>	lotes
Barron, Charles *		D,WF	Participant	\$6	65,854		\$189,611	\$141,077	15,103		3
Whitehead, John		C,R	Participant	\$^	11,540		\$15,450	-	1,894		1,3
Total				\$7	77,394		\$205,061	\$141,077	16,997		
City Council	District: 43	3						055			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Ne ^e Contrib			Net enditures	CFB Payments	Vote Count	. N	lotes
Gentile, Vincent *		D,SMALL,WF	Participant		25,935		\$195,256	\$82,500	13,989		
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spending @ Indicates a high spending + Indicates a small campaig	g non-participant trigge	red the second tier b	=	C D EDUCAT GP	Conservati Democrati Education Green Independe	ic	L LIB REBUIL REFORM RENT	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn High	R S SMALL WARVET WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family	

City Council	District: 43	3								
				Net		Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	is Ex	penditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Russo, Pasqualino		C,I,R	Participant	\$118,446		\$161,836	\$82,100	1,696		
Total				\$244,381		\$357,092	\$164,600	15,685		_
City Council	District: 44	ı		Nat		Not	CED			
0 "1 (01 '6' 4'	Net	_	Net	CFB	W 4 0 4		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	is Ex	penditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Felder, Simcha *		C,D,R	Non-Participant	\$287,862		\$105,779	-	15,439		
Total				\$287,862		\$105,779	-	15,439		_
City Council	District: 45	5		Net		Not	CED			
0 11 1			01 '6' 4'		_	Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	is Ex	penditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Grupico, Salvatore		C,I,R	Non-Participant	N/A		N/A	-	1,972		1
King, Erlene		RENT	Participant	\$23,519		\$88,768	\$54,378	1,100		4
Stewart, Kendall *		D	Participant	\$87,818		\$170,408	\$82,500	12,604		3
Total				\$111,337		\$259,176	\$136,878	15,676		_
City Council	District: 46	;								
				Net		Net	CFB			
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	is Ex	penditures	Payments	Vote Count	Not	es
Fidler, Lewis *		D	Participant	\$43,013		\$144,778	\$94,592	13,688		3
Madden, Mary		C,R	Non-Participant	N/A		N/A	-	5,462		1
* Incumbent # Indicates a high spendir @ Indicates a high spendi + Indicates a small campa N/A Indicates no filing froi	ng non-participant trigge	red the second t	er bonus matching	D Demoi EDUCAT Educa GP Green		L LIB REBUIL REFORM RENT	Liberal Libertarian Rebuild Reform Rent Is Too Damn High	R S SMALL WARVET WF	Republican Socialist Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family	

City Council	District: 46	5							
				Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	ns Ex	kpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Weir, Elias		1	Participant	\$3,13	5	\$2,065	-	314	1,3
Total				\$46,14	8	\$146,843	\$94,592	19,464	
City Council	District: 47	•		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification		ns Ex	kpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Gallo, Russell		C,I,R	Participant	\$6,98	5	\$31,812	\$24,860	4,752	
Recchia, Domenic *		D,WF	Participant	\$140,53	0	\$183,948	\$82,500	10,740	
Total				\$147,51	5	\$215,760	\$107,360	15,492	
City Council	District: 48	3		Net		Net	CFB		
Candidate		Party	Classification	Contribution	ns Ex	kpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Gutnik, Oleg		C,R	Non-Participant	N/	4	N/A	-	4,202	1
Nelson, Michael *		D	Participant	\$97,65	4	\$189,717	\$82,500	13,500	
Roth, Michael		1	Participant	\$12,27	0	\$22,040	\$20,392	477	
Total				\$109,92	4	\$211,757	\$102,892	18,179	
City Council	District: 49)		Net		Net	CFB		
		Party	Classification		ns Ex	kpenditures	Payments	Vote Count	Notes
Candidate									
Hall, Jody	_	R	Participant	\$42,76	1	\$100,945	\$71,540	7,333	

CFB Payments \$82,500	Vote Count	
\$82.500	roto oount	Notes
ψ02,300	17,761	
\$154,040	25,094	
CFB	V-1- 0	Nata
Payments	Vote Count	Notes
\$25,324	5,701	
\$82,500	20,169	
\$107,824	25,870	
CFB		
Payments	Vote Count	Notes
\$82,500	21,890	
\$20,248	5,143	
\$102,748	27,033	
\$10,657,855	4,324,360	
Liberal Libertarian	R S	Republican Socialist
Rebuild Reform	SMALL WARVET	Small Class Size War Veterans Working Family
	Libertarian Rebuild Reform	Libertarian S Rebuild SMALL

New York City Campaign Finance Board

40 Rector Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10006 tel. 212.306.7100 fax 212.306.7143 www.nyccfb.info info@nyccfb.info

Click here to return to main menu

Notes for Appendix C

The notes below correspond to numbers under the column heading "Notes" (far right) in Appendix C of the NYC Campaign Finance Board's 2005 PER.

- 1. Candidate did not file all required statements with the NYC Campaign Finance Board
- 2. Candidate certified minimal activity with the NYC Campaign Finance Board.
- 3. Candidate was opposed in a primary.
- 4. Candidate was unopposed in the primary but eligible for the primary spending limit due to another party having a primary for that same office.
- 5. Candidate submitted a verification of termination for their candidacy but still appeared on the ballot.

Candidate Classification		Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
Mayor								
Bloomberg, Michael	Non-Participant	\$84,155,868	-	-	\$84,155,868	\$452,326	-	\$84,608,194
Blum, Seth	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brodeur, Christopher	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	\$5,391,066	-	\$103,191	\$5,287,875	\$46,966	-	\$5,334,841
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	\$1,832,170	-	\$76,150	\$1,756,020	\$112	-	\$1,756,132
Gronowicz, Anthony	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koppel, Martin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMillan, Jimmy	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	\$5,334,751	-	\$152,990	\$5,181,761	\$68,052	-	\$5,249,813
Ognibene, Thomas	Participant	\$78,809	-	\$525	\$78,284	\$14	-	\$78,298
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Silk, Audrey	Non-Participant	\$240	-	-	\$240	-	\$939	\$1,179
Weiner, Anthony	Participant	\$2,880,047	-	\$70,174	\$2,809,873	\$2,675	-	\$2,812,548
Total:		\$99,672,951	-	\$403,030	\$99,269,921	\$570,145	\$939	\$99,841,005
Total for Participants:		\$15,516,843	-	\$403,030	\$15,113,813	\$117,819	-	\$15,231,632
Total for Non-Participa	nts:	\$84,156,108	-	-	\$84,156,108	\$452,326	\$939	\$84,609,373
Public Advocate								
Brown, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon	Participant	\$2,167	-	-	\$2,167	\$1,070	-	\$3,237
Goetz, Bernard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Golub, Jay	Participant	\$55,220	-	\$100	\$55,120	-	-	\$55,120
Gotbaum, Betsy	Participant	\$1,634,248	\$1	\$22,274	\$1,611,975	\$4,736	-	\$1,616,711
Lesczynski, James	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rasiej, Andrew	Participant	\$341,702	-	\$4,280	\$337,422	-	-	\$337,422

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
Public Advocate								
Siegel, Norman	Participant	\$366,373	-	\$6,819	\$359,554	-	-	\$359,554
Total:		\$2,399,710	\$1	\$33,473	\$2,366,238	\$5,806	-	\$2,372,044
Total for Participants:		\$2,399,710	\$1	\$33,473	\$2,366,238	\$5,806	-	\$2,372,044
Total for Non-Participa	nts:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comptroller								
Fein, Daniel	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moore, Ron	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thompson, Jr., William	Participant	\$3,951,321	-	\$106,950	\$3,844,371	\$479	-	\$3,844,850
Total:		\$3,951,321	-	\$106,950	\$3,844,371	\$479	-	\$3,844,850
Total for Participants:		\$3,951,321	-	\$106,950	\$3,844,371	\$479	-	\$3,844,850
Total for Non-Participa	nts:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Borough President								
Alatsas, Theodore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brawley, Kevin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo	Participant	\$1,129,329	-	\$49,800	\$1,079,529	\$6,643	-	\$1,086,172
Dobrian, Joseph	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ellner, Brian	Participant	\$511,744	\$389	\$425	\$511,708	-	-	\$511,708
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	\$589,318	-	\$18,475	\$570,843	\$2,500	-	\$573,343
Fields, Jessie	Participant	\$47,580	\$20	\$75	\$47,525	-	-	\$47,525
Hawkins, Arrin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	\$507,026	-	\$9,131	\$497,895	-	-	\$497,895
Luisi, John	Participant	\$49,975	-	\$600	\$49,375	-	-	\$49,375
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	\$412,202	-	\$16,994	\$395,208	\$78	-	\$395,286
Markowitz, Marty	Participant	\$1,679,111	-	\$26,850	\$1,652,261	-	-	\$1,652,261
Marshall, Helen	Participant	\$258,592	-	\$4,010	\$254,582	-	-	\$254,582
Mattera, Gloria	Participant	\$61,743	-	\$170	\$61,573	\$25	-	\$61,598

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
Borough President								
Michels, Stanley	Participant	\$181,527	-	\$600	\$180,927	-	-	\$180,927
Molinaro, James	Participant	\$482,512	-	\$3,155	\$479,357	-	-	\$479,357
Moskowitz, Eva	Participant	\$944,488	-	\$2,750	\$941,738	\$86	-	\$941,824
Perkins, Bill	Participant	\$384,233	-	\$3,130	\$381,103	\$3,466	-	\$384,569
Popik, Barry	Participant	\$10,025	-	-	\$10,025	-	\$3,000	\$13,025
Popkin, Gary	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sica, Philip	Participant	\$14,050	-	\$50	\$14,000	-	-	\$14,000
Stringer, Scott	Participant	\$1,023,401	-	\$16,490	\$1,006,911	\$34,878	-	\$1,041,789
Wright, Keith	Participant	\$320,666	-	\$7,675	\$312,991	\$493	-	\$313,484
Total:		\$8,607,522	\$409	\$160,380	\$8,447,551	\$48,169	\$3,000	\$8,498,720
Total for Participants:		\$8,607,522	\$409	\$160,380	\$8,447,551	\$48,169	\$3,000	\$8,498,720
Total for Non-Participa	nts:	-	-	-	· -	-	-	-
City Council								
Addabbo, Joseph	Participant	\$47,575	-	\$145	\$47,430	-	-	\$47,430
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allen, William	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka	Non-Participant	\$35,082	-	-	\$35,082	-	-	\$35,082
Antoine, Royston	Participant	\$22,725	-	\$860	\$21,865	-	-	\$21,865
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen	Participant	\$28,660	-	-	\$28,660	\$3,585	-	\$32,245
Avella, Tony	Participant	\$138,382	-	\$5,075	\$133,307	-	-	\$133,307
Baez, Maria	Participant	\$92,135	-	\$2,025	\$90,110	\$55	-	\$90,165
Baldeo, Albert	Participant	\$104,255	-	\$400	\$103,855	-	-	\$103,855
Barron, Charles	Participant	\$66,684	-	\$830	\$65,854	=	-	\$65,854
Bernace, Victor	Participant	\$14,590	-	\$250	\$14,340	=	-	\$14,340
Betancourt Jr, Ismael	Participant	\$31,485	-	\$100	\$31,385	=	-	\$31,385
Beys, Michael	Participant	\$81,621	-	-	\$81,621	-	-	\$81,621
Bilal, Charles	Participant	\$26,195	-	-	\$26,195	-	-	
Billups, Charles	Participant	\$16,164	-	\$25	\$16,139	-	-	\$16,139

Data as of March 31, 2006

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
City Council								
Blackwell, Eric	Participant	\$14,754	-	-	\$14,754	\$911	-	\$15,665
Bloch, Darren	Participant	\$78,536	-	\$40	\$78,496	\$6,229	-	\$84,725
Bloodsaw, Daryl	Participant	\$23,347	-	\$550	\$22,797	-	-	\$22,797
Boudouvas, Peter	Participant	\$36,101	-	\$1,628	\$34,473	\$30	-	\$34,503
Boyland, Sr., William	Non-Participant	\$63,050	-	-	\$63,050	-	-	\$63,050
Bradian, Steve	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brewer, Gale	Participant	\$111,118	-	-	\$111,118	-	\$6,324	\$117,442
Brightharp, Joan	Participant	\$9,024	-	\$60	\$8,964	\$3,000	-	\$11,964
Britton, A. Brinmore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	\$63,832	-	\$600	\$63,232	-	-	\$63,232
Brown Jr, Will	Participant	\$10,580	-	-	\$10,580	-	-	\$10,580
Campbell, Lisa Marie	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carlino, John	Participant	\$9,410	-	-	\$9,410	-	-	\$9,410
Carroll, Rodney	Participant	\$40,569	-	\$500	\$40,069	-	-	\$40,069
Ceder, David	Participant	\$10,073	-	\$10	\$10,063	-	-	\$10,063
Cesnik, Eric	Participant	\$45,422	-	\$70	\$45,352	-	-	\$45,352
Clarke, Yvette	Participant	\$90,666	-	\$1,500	\$89,166	-	-	\$89,166
Comrie, Leroy	Non-Participant	\$212,639	-	\$1,015	\$211,624	-	-	\$211,624
Cornelius, Yasmin	Participant	\$94,907	-	\$4,795	\$90,112	-	-	\$90,112
Cox, Allen	Non-Participant	\$820	\$70	-	\$890	-	-	\$890
de Blasio, Bill	Participant	\$206,968	-	\$1,510	\$205,458	\$60	-	\$205,518
Denis, Nelson	Participant	\$67,087	-	\$2,360	\$64,727	\$2,732	-	\$67,459
Dickens, Inez	Participant	\$185,121	-	\$1,665	\$183,456	\$106	-	\$183,562
Dilan, Erik Martin	Participant	\$38,415	-	\$1,250	\$37,165	-	-	\$37,165
Doty, Cynthia	Participant	\$24,551	-	-	\$24,551	=	-	\$24,551
Duggan, Essie	Participant	\$7,150	-	-	\$7,150	=	-	\$7,150
Farmer, Bryan	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	=
Felder, Simcha	Non-Participant	\$348,362	-	\$60,500	\$287,862	-	-	\$287,862
Feliciano, Fabian	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
City Council								
Fidler, Lewis	Participant	\$43,288	-	\$275	\$43,013	\$5,965	-	\$48,978
Flanagan, Claudia	Participant	\$475	-	-	\$475	-	-	\$475
Flores, Rodolfo	Non-Participant	\$13,705	-	\$700	\$13,005	-	(966)	\$12,039
Foglia, Philip	Participant	\$79,802	-	-	\$79,802	-	-	\$79,802
Foster, Helen Diane	Participant	\$93,592	-	\$690	\$92,902	\$10	-	\$92,912
Galarza, David	Participant	\$26,721	-	\$1,500	\$25,221	-	-	\$25,221
Gallagher, Dennis	Participant	\$123,526	-	\$720	\$122,806	-	-	\$122,806
Gallo, Russell	Participant	\$6,985	-	-	\$6,985	-	\$83	\$7,068
Garodnick, Daniel	Participant	\$196,649	-	\$250	\$196,399	-	-	\$196,399
Gennaro, James	Participant	\$218,742	-	\$3,950	\$214,792	\$395	-	\$215,187
Gentile, Vincent	Participant	\$132,980	-	\$7,045	\$125,935	-	-	\$125,935
Gerson, Alan	Participant	\$138,301	-	\$650	\$137,651	-	-	\$137,651
Gioia, Eric	Participant	\$560,786	-	\$5,850	\$554,936	\$205	-	\$555,141
Gonzalez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$624	-	-	\$624	-	-	\$624
Gonzalez, Sara	Participant	\$73,046	-	\$270	\$72,776	-	-	\$72,776
Grandoit, Tamara	Participant	\$22,248	-	-	\$22,248	\$8,000	-	\$30,248
Grupico, Salvatore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	. <u>-</u>	-	-	-
Gutnik, Oleg	Non-Participant	-	-	-	. <u>-</u>	-	-	-
Hall, Jody	Participant	\$43,761	-	\$1,000	\$42,761	-	\$10	\$42,771
Hanks, Nancy	Non-Participant	-	-	-	. <u>-</u>	-	-	-
Henderson, Woody	Participant	\$8,105	-	\$25	\$8,080	-	-	\$8,080
Herbert, Anthony	Participant	\$8,730	-	-	\$8,730	-	-	\$8,730
Hoffnung, Aaron	Participant	\$75,164	-	-	\$75,164	\$15	-	\$75,179
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	-	-	-	. <u>-</u>	-	-	-
Hooks, Erik	Participant	-	-	-	. <u>-</u>	-	-	-
Hooks, Jr., David	Participant	\$39,038	-	\$2,100	\$36,938	\$21	-	\$36,959
Hunter, Jereline	Non-Participant	-	-	-		-	-	-
Jackson, Robert	Participant	\$83,365	-	\$300	\$83,065	\$2,750	-	\$85,815
James, Letitia	Participant	\$65,116	\$300	\$390	\$65,026	-	-	\$65,026

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
City Council								
Jennings, Jr., Allan	Non-Participant	\$32,835	-	\$225	\$32,610	_	-	\$32,610
Jimenez, Luis	Non-Participant	-	-		-	-	-	, , , , <u>-</u>
Johnson, Joyce	Participant	\$68,543	-	\$925	\$67,618	\$139	-	\$67,757
Junior, Pamela	Participant	\$33,116	-	\$140		-	-	\$32,976
Kann, Gerald	Participant	\$5,490	-	-	\$5,490	-	-	\$5,490
Karako, Jak	Participant	\$43,203	-	\$2,475		-	-	\$40,728
Katz, Melinda	Non-Participant	\$756,045	-	\$32,725		-	-	\$723,320
Kaufman, Stephen	Participant	\$131,491	-	\$2,350	\$129,141	-	-	\$129,141
Kavanagh, Brian	Participant	\$115,714	-	\$1,210		-	-	\$114,504
Kinard, Stanley	Participant	\$19,480	-	\$1,010	\$18,470	-	-	\$18,470
King, Danny	Participant	\$29,972	-	\$595	\$29,377	-	\$129	\$29,506
King, Erlene	Participant	\$24,339	-	\$820	\$23,519	-	-	\$23,519
Koppell, Oliver	Participant	\$102,311	\$100	\$225	\$102,186	\$34	-	\$102,220
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lanza, Andrew	Participant	\$58,540	-	\$225	\$58,315	\$210	-	\$58,525
Lappin, Jessica	Participant	\$190,133	-	\$650	\$189,483	\$428	-	\$189,911
Lester, Jack	Participant	\$81,677	-	\$3,189	\$78,488	-	-	\$78,488
Liu, John	Participant	\$236,279	-	\$5,895	\$230,384	-	-	\$230,384
Lobo, Renee	Participant	\$63,190	-	\$150	\$63,040	-	-	\$63,040
Luciano, Felipe	Participant	\$76,123	-	\$500	\$75,623	-	-	\$75,623
Madden, Mary	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahadeo, Robby	Participant	\$24,975	-	-	\$24,975	-	-	\$24,975
Marcial, Edwin	Participant	\$12,700	-	\$100	\$12,600	-	-	\$12,600
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	Participant	\$89,547	-	\$1,220	\$88,327	\$4,316	-	\$92,643
Martinez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$189,817	-	\$6,000	\$183,817	-	\$21,250	\$205,067
Martinez, Mildred	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMahon, Michael	Participant	\$139,688	-	\$865	\$138,823	\$141	-	\$138,964
McManus, Joseph	Participant	pant \$104,205 - \$3,850 \$100,355 -		-	\$100,355			
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	\$23,885	\$83	-	\$23,968	-	-	\$23,968

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
City Council								
Mealy, Darlene	Participant	\$115,968	-	\$2,000	\$113,968	-	-	\$113,968
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	\$108,517	\$128	\$100	\$108,545	-	-	\$108,545
Miller, David	Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mohamed, Ali	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monserrate, Hiram	Participant	\$187,101	-	\$1,749	\$185,352	-	-	\$185,352
Montague, Virginia	Participant	\$41,148	-	-	\$41,148	\$2,000	-	\$43,148
Muhammad, Naquan	Participant	\$11,290	-	\$20	\$11,270	-	-	\$11,270
Murphy, Patrick	Participant	\$253,981	-	\$1,150	\$252,831	-	-	\$252,831
Narine, Dhanpaul	Participant	\$19,862	-	-	\$19,862	-	-	\$19,862
Nath, Dilip	Participant	\$24,867	-	-	\$24,867	-	-	\$24,867
Nelson, Michael	Participant	\$99,103	\$1	\$1,450	\$97,654	-	-	\$97,654
Nocerino, Joseph	Participant	\$18,736	-	-	\$18,736	-	-	\$18,736
Oddo, James	Participant	\$75,000	-	-	\$75,000	-	-	\$75,000
Palma, Annabel	Participant	\$92,703	-	-	\$92,703	-	-	\$92,703
Papajohn, Christopher	Participant	\$21,483	-	-	\$21,483	-	-	\$21,483
Petelka, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	=
Pu-Folkes, Bryan	Participant	\$89,200	-	\$740	\$88,460	-	-	\$88,460
Quart, Dan	Participant	\$141,754	-	\$17,455	\$124,299	-	-	\$124,299
Quinn, Christine	Participant	\$288,728	-	\$14,200	\$274,528	\$1,903	-	\$276,431
Rahman, Masud	Participant	\$16,177	-	\$200	\$15,977	\$20	-	\$15,997
Recchia, Domenic	Participant	\$143,830	-	\$3,300	\$140,530	-	-	\$140,530
Reyna, Diana	Participant	\$96,967	-	\$740	\$96,227	-	-	\$96,227
Rivera, George	Participant	\$20,125	-	-	\$20,125	-	-	\$20,125
Rivera, Joel	Participant	\$111,336	-	\$8,500	\$102,836	-	-	\$102,836
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	\$63,740	-	\$100	\$63,640	\$1,490	-	\$65,130
Rosario, Antonio	Participant	\$13,275	-	\$270	\$13,005	-	-	\$13,005
Roth, Michael	Participant	\$12,395	-	\$125	\$12,270	-	-	\$12,270
Rubin, George	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	=	-	=
Ruiz, John	Participant	\$27,335	-	\$640	\$26,695	=	-	\$26,695

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
City Council								
Ruks, Thomas	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	· -	-
Russo, Pasqualino	Participant	\$118,666	-	\$220	\$118,446	-	-	\$118,446
Samad, Maryam	Participant	\$5,765	-	-	\$5,765	-	-	\$5,765
Sanders, Jr., James	Non-Participant	\$180,112	-	\$17,650	\$162,462	-	-	\$162,462
Schlanger, Craig	Participant	\$6,792	-	-	\$6,792	-	-	\$6,792
Seabrook, Larry	Participant	\$44,422	\$1,500	\$3,205	\$42,717	-	-	\$42,717
Sears, Helen	Participant	\$145,585	-	\$5,700	\$139,885	-	-	\$139,885
Sementilli, Egidio	Participant	\$9,360	-	-	\$9,360	-	-	\$9,360
Sklar, Robyn	Participant	\$10,399	-	-	\$10,399	-	-	\$10,399
Spitz, George	Participant	\$27,192	-	-	\$27,192	-	\$250	\$27,442
Stern, Steven	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stewart, Kendall	Participant	\$88,018	-	\$200	\$87,818	-	-	\$87,818
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	\$45,257	-	\$1,050	\$44,207	\$3,000	-	\$47,207
Tapper, Marlene	Participant	\$35,033	-	-	\$35,033	-	-	\$35,033
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trainer, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	· -	-
Tsabar, Gur	Participant	\$79,763	-	\$157	\$79,606	-	· -	\$79,606
Vacca, James	Participant	\$178,804	-	\$1,175	\$177,629	-	· -	\$177,629
Vallone, Jr., Peter	Participant	\$195,460	-	\$9,350	\$186,110	\$1,048	-	\$187,158
Vann, Albert	Participant	\$23,480	-	\$200	\$23,280	\$6,500	-	\$29,780
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	· -	-
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	Participant	\$7,845	-	\$210	\$7,635	-	· -	\$7,635
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	Participant	\$1,890	-	\$90	\$1,800	-	· -	\$1,800
Weir, Elias	Participant	\$3,135	-	-	\$3,135	-	· -	\$3,135
Weprin, David	Participant	\$523,566	-	\$16,250	\$507,316	-	. <u>-</u>	\$507,316
White, Jr., Thomas	Participant	\$122,438	\$5	\$1,621	\$120,822	\$3,000	-	\$123,822
Whitehead, John	Participant	\$11,540	-	-	\$11,540	-	. <u>-</u>	\$11,540
Yablon, Joshua	Participant	\$16,570	-	-	\$16,570	\$146	-	\$16,716
Yassky, David	Participant	\$681,808	-	\$114,325	\$567,483	-	· -	\$567,483

Candidate	Classification	Itemized Contributions	Unitemized Contributions	Refunds	Net Contributions	Other Receipts	Funds From Prior Elections	Total
City Council								
Zinberg, Joel	Participant	\$101,603	-	\$50	\$101,553	-	-	\$101,553
Total:		\$11,965,226	\$2,187	\$403,014	\$11,564,399	\$58,444	\$27,080	\$11,649,923
Total for Participan	ts:	\$10,132,135	\$2,117	\$284,199	\$9,850,053	\$58,444	\$6,796	\$9,915,293
Total for Non-Partic	cipants:	\$1,833,091	\$70	\$118,815	\$1,714,346	-	\$20,284	\$1,734,630
Total:		\$126,596,730	\$2,597	\$1,106,847	\$125,492,480	\$683,043	\$31,019	\$126,206,542
Total for Participan	ts:	\$40,607,531	\$2,527	\$988,032	\$39,622,026	\$230,717	\$9,796	\$39,862,539
Total for Non-Partic	cipants:	\$85,989,199	\$70	\$118,815	\$85,870,454	\$452,326	\$21,223	\$86,344,003

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiza	-	Politica Committ		Partners LLC'	•	Othe Organiza		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
Mayor														_
Bloomberg, Michael	Non-Participant	\$84,155,868	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$84,155,868
Blum, Seth	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Brodeur, Christopher	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	\$4,518,211	85%	-	0%	\$55,005	1%	\$251,291	5%	\$462,368	9%	\$1,000	0%	\$5,287,875
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	\$1,491,999	85%	-	0%	\$27,950	2%	\$69,141	4%	\$120,742	7%	\$46,188	3%	\$1,756,020
Gronowicz, Anthony	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Koppel, Martin	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
McMillan, Jimmy	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	\$4,346,084	84%	-	0%	\$85,500	2%	\$372,385	7%	\$342,892	7%	\$34,900	1%	\$5,181,761
Ognibene, Thomas	Participant	\$70,474	90%	-	0%	-	0%	\$6,275	8%	-	0%	\$1,535	2%	\$78,284
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Silk, Audrey	Non-Participant	\$240	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$240
Weiner, Anthony	Participant	\$2,540,209	90%	-	0%	\$27,650	1%	\$130,690	5%	\$107,890	4%	\$3,434	0%	\$2,809,873
Total		\$97,123,085	98%	-	0%	\$196,105	0%	\$829,782	1%	\$1,033,892	1%	\$87,057	0%	\$99,269,921
Total for Participants:		\$12,966,977	86%	-	0%	\$196,105	1%	\$829,782	5%	\$1,033,892	7%	\$87,057	1%	\$15,113,813
Total for Non-Participants:		\$84,156,108	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$84,156,108
Public Advocate														
Brown, Michael	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon	Participant	\$2,167	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,167
Goetz, Bernard	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Golub, Jay	Participant	\$54,470	99%	-	0%	-	0%	\$650	1%	-	0%	-	0%	\$55,120

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiza	•	Politica Committ		Partners LLC	•	Othe Organiza		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
Public Advocate														_
Gotbaum, Betsy	Participant	\$1,438,899	89%	-	0%	\$7,450	0%	\$71,550	4%	\$61,875	4%	\$32,200	2%	\$1,611,974
Lesczynski, James	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Rasiej, Andrew	Participant	\$336,172	100%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,000	0%	\$250	0%	-	0%	\$337,422
Siegel, Norman	Participant	\$342,088	95%	-	0%	\$2,625	1%	\$8,750	2%	\$966	0%	\$5,125	1%	\$359,554
Total		\$2,173,796	92%	-	0%	\$10,075	0%	\$81,950	3%	\$63,091	3%	\$37,325	2%	\$2,366,237
Total for Participants:		\$2,173,796	92%	-	0%	\$10,075	0%	\$81,950	3%	\$63,091	3%	\$37,325	2%	\$2,366,237
Total for Non-Participants:		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
Comptroller														
Fein, Daniel	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Moore, Ron	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Thompson, Jr., William	Participant	\$3,113,414	81%	-	0%	\$18,150	0%	\$170,374	4%	\$404,407	11%	\$138,026	4%	\$3,844,371
Total		\$3,113,414	81%	-	0%	\$18,150	0%	\$170,374	4%	\$404,407	11%	\$138,026	4%	\$3,844,371
Total for Participants:		\$3,113,414	81%	-	0%	\$18,150	0%	\$170,374	4%	\$404,407	11%	\$138,026	4%	\$3,844,371
Total for Non-Participants:		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
Boro President														
Alatsas, Theodore	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Brawley, Kevin	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo	Participant	\$821,494	76%	-	0%	-	0%	\$78,435	7%	\$167,400	16%	\$12,200	1%	\$1,079,529
Dobrian, Joseph	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Ellner, Brian	Participant	\$506,160	99%	-	0%	-	0%	\$4,749	1%	\$160	0%	\$250	0%	\$511,319

Data as of March 31, 2006

		Individ	uals	Corporat	ions	Emplo Organiza	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Othe Organiza		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
Boro President														
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	\$454,018	80%	-	0%	\$1,500	0%	\$70,250	12%	\$45,075	8%	-	0%	\$570,843
Fields, Jessie	Participant	\$47,505	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$47,505
Hawkins, Arrin	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	\$466,088	94%	(25)	-0%	\$5,350	1%	\$17,427	4%	\$9,055	2%	-	0%	\$497,895
Luisi, John	Participant	\$43,565	88%	-	0%	\$1,250	3%	\$1,000	2%	\$3,000	6%	\$560	1%	\$49,375
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	\$363,418	92%	-	0%	\$6,775	2%	\$9,175	2%	\$14,815	4%	\$1,025	0%	\$395,208
Markowitz, Marty	Participant	\$1,500,533	91%	-	0%	\$6,650	0%	\$75,203	5%	\$69,875	4%	-	0%	\$1,652,261
Marshall, Helen	Participant	\$195,412	77%	-	0%	\$4,050	2%	\$17,580	7%	\$27,960	11%	\$9,580	4%	\$254,582
Mattera, Gloria	Participant	\$61,573	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$61,573
Michels, Stanley	Participant	\$171,677	95%	-	0%	\$200	0%	\$7,200	4%	\$1,850	1%	-	0%	\$180,927
Molinaro, James	Participant	\$451,807	94%	-	0%	-	0%	\$12,550	3%	\$14,800	3%	\$200	0%	\$479,357
Moskowitz, Eva	Participant	\$895,938	95%	-	0%	-	0%	\$17,050	2%	\$22,900	2%	\$5,850	1%	\$941,738
Perkins, Bill	Participant	\$295,328	77%	-	0%	\$12,500	3%	\$19,000	5%	\$40,400	11%	\$13,875	4%	\$381,103
Popik, Barry	Participant	\$8,215	82%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,810	18%	\$10,025
Popkin, Gary	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Sica, Philip	Participant	\$14,000	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$14,000
Stringer, Scott	Participant	\$872,026	87%	-	0%	\$7,815	1%	\$67,330	7%	\$53,465	5%	\$6,275	1%	\$1,006,911
Wright, Keith	Participant	\$254,921	81%	-	0%	-	0%	\$22,750	7%	\$22,720	7%	\$12,600	4%	\$312,991
Total		\$7,423,678	88%	(25)	-0%	\$46,090	1%	\$419,699	5%	\$493,475	6%	\$64,225	1%	\$8,447,142
Total for Participants:		\$7,423,678	88%	(25)	-0%	\$46,090	1%	\$419,699	5%	\$493,475	6%	\$64,225	1%	\$8,447,142
Total for Non-Participants	s:	-		-		-		-		-		-		-

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiza	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Other Organizat		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Addabbo, Joseph	Participant	\$21,830	46%	-	0%	\$6,200	13%	\$16,575	35%	\$1,235	3%	\$1,590	3%	\$47,430
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Allen, William	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka	Non-Participant	\$34,507	98%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$575	2%	-	0%	\$35,082
Antoine, Royston	Participant	\$21,865	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$21,865
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen	Participant	\$17,185	60%	-	0%	-	0%	\$9,600	33%	\$1,600	6%	\$275	1%	\$28,660
Avella, Tony	Participant	\$51,450	39%	-	0%	\$8,407	6%	\$38,350	29%	\$35,100	26%	-	0%	\$133,307
Baez, Maria	Participant	\$67,910	75%	-	0%	-	0%	\$17,950	20%	\$4,250	5%	-	0%	\$90,110
Baldeo, Albert	Participant	\$103,855	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$103,855
Barron, Charles	Participant	\$59,248	90%	-	0%	-	0%	\$5,900	9%	\$250	0%	\$456	1%	\$65,854
Bernace, Victor	Participant	\$14,340	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$14,340
Betancourt Jr, Ismael	Participant	\$30,260	96%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,125	4%	-	0%	-	0%	\$31,385
Beys, Michael	Participant	\$79,461	97%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,150	1%	\$1,010	1%	\$81,621
Bilal, Charles	Participant	\$25,945	99%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$250	1%	\$26,195
Billups, Charles	Participant	\$14,539	90%	-	0%	\$100	1%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,500	9%	\$16,139
Blackwell, Eric	Participant	\$12,004	81%	-	0%	\$2,750	19%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$14,754
Bloch, Darren	Participant	\$74,321	95%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,950	4%	\$275	0%	\$950	1%	\$78,496
Bloodsaw, Daryl	Participant	\$22,797	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$22,797
Boudouvas, Peter	Participant	\$34,473	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$34,473
Boyland, Sr., William	Non-Participant	\$46,045	73%	\$380	1%	-	0%	\$7,950	13%	\$7,625	12%	\$1,050	2%	\$63,050
Bradian, Steve	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Brewer, Gale	Participant	\$93,725	84%	-	0%	\$6,175	6%	\$9,950	9%	\$1,268	1%	-	0%	\$111,118

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiz	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Othe Organizat		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Brightharp, Joan	Participant	\$8,864	99%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$100	1%	-	0%	\$8,964
Britton, A. Brinmore	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	\$63,232	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$63,232
Brown Jr, Will	Participant	\$7,830	74%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,750	26%	-	0%	-	0%	\$10,580
Campbell, Lisa Marie	Non-Participant	-		-		-		=	0%	=		=	0%	-
Carlino, John	Participant	\$9,410	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$9,410
Carroll, Rodney	Participant	\$25,119	63%	-	0%	\$8,700	22%	\$6,250	16%	-	0%	-	0%	\$40,069
Ceder, David	Participant	\$8,913	89%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,150	11%	=	0%	=	0%	\$10,063
Cesnik, Eric	Participant	\$45,352	100%	-	0%	-	0%	=	0%	=	0%	=	0%	\$45,352
Clarke, Yvette	Participant	\$49,445	55%	-	0%	-	0%	\$33,721	38%	\$2,100	2%	\$3,900	4%	\$89,166
Comrie, Leroy	Non-Participant	\$133,979	63%	-	0%	\$6,350	3%	\$45,950	22%	\$16,800	8%	\$8,545	4%	\$211,624
Cornelius, Yasmin	Participant	\$82,092	91%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,500	2%	\$6,340	7%	\$180	0%	\$90,112
Cox, Allen	Non-Participant	\$820	100%	-	0%	-	0%	=	0%	=	0%	=	0%	\$820
de Blasio, Bill	Participant	\$157,958	77%	\$1,000	0%	\$9,000	4%	\$26,250	13%	\$11,000	5%	\$250	0%	\$205,458
Denis, Nelson	Participant	\$42,719	66%	-	0%	-	0%	\$7,396	11%	\$13,862	21%	\$750	1%	\$64,727
Dickens, Inez	Participant	\$141,206	77%	-	0%	\$750	0%	\$32,000	17%	\$8,625	5%	\$875	0%	\$183,456
Dilan, Erik Martin	Participant	\$15,040	40%	-	0%	\$7,750	21%	\$9,475	25%	\$4,900	13%	=	0%	\$37,165
Doty, Cynthia	Participant	\$24,551	100%	-	0%	-	0%	=	0%	=	0%	=	0%	\$24,551
Duggan, Essie	Participant	\$7,150	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$7,150
Farmer, Bryan	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Felder, Simcha	Non-Participant	\$265,112	92%	-	0%	-	0%	\$400	0%	\$13,500	5%	\$8,850	3%	\$287,862
Feliciano, Fabian	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiz	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Other Organizat		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Fidler, Lewis	Participant	\$33,663	78%	-	0%	-	0%	\$7,600	18%	\$200	0%	\$1,550	4%	\$43,013
Flanagan, Claudia	Participant	\$475	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$475
Flores, Rodolfo	Non-Participant	\$12,955	100%	\$50	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$13,005
Foglia, Philip	Participant	\$74,290	93%	-	0%	-	0%	\$87	0%	\$3,400	4%	\$2,025	3%	\$79,802
Foster, Helen Diane	Participant	\$57,352	62%	-	0%	-	0%	\$30,050	32%	\$4,000	4%	\$1,500	2%	\$92,902
Galarza, David	Participant	\$20,802	82%	=	0%	\$320	1%	\$4,099	16%	-	0%	=	0%	\$25,221
Gallagher, Dennis	Participant	\$89,621	73%	=	0%	\$1,260	1%	\$23,075	19%	\$6,950	6%	\$1,900	2%	\$122,806
Gallo, Russell	Participant	\$6,985	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$6,985
Garodnick, Daniel	Participant	\$179,470	91%	-	0%	-	0%	\$15,804	8%	\$1,125	1%	-	0%	\$196,399
Gennaro, James	Participant	\$104,582	49%	-	0%	\$7,591	4%	\$59,350	28%	\$40,019	19%	\$3,250	2%	\$214,792
Gentile, Vincent	Participant	\$63,595	50%	-	0%	\$13,845	11%	\$44,300	35%	\$1,480	1%	\$2,715	2%	\$125,935
Gerson, Alan	Participant	\$118,051	86%	\$50	0%	\$1,450	1%	\$16,700	12%	\$1,050	1%	\$350	0%	\$137,651
Gioia, Eric	Participant	\$370,536	67%	-	0%	\$19,475	4%	\$97,050	17%	\$58,250	10%	\$9,625	2%	\$554,936
Gonzalez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$624	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$624
Gonzalez, Sara	Participant	\$40,005	55%	-	0%	\$100	0%	\$26,171	36%	\$4,750	7%	\$1,750	2%	\$72,776
Grandoit, Tamara	Participant	\$21,948	99%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$300	1%	\$22,248
Grupico, Salvatore	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Gutnik, Oleg	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Hall, Jody	Participant	\$42,261	99%	-	0%	-	0%	\$250	1%	\$250	1%	-	0%	\$42,761
Hanks, Nancy	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Henderson, Woody	Participant	\$7,330	91%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$750	9%	-	0%	\$8,080
Herbert, Anthony	Participant	\$8,730	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$8,730

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiza	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Othe Organizat		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Hoffnung, Aaron	Participant	\$67,543	90%	-	0%	\$250	0%	\$7,000	9%	\$100	0%	\$271	0%	\$75,164
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Hooks, Erik	Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Hooks, Jr., David	Participant	\$29,317	79%	-	0%	-	0%	\$6,850	19%	\$500	1%	\$271	1%	\$36,938
Hunter, Jereline	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Jackson, Robert	Participant	\$39,009	47%	=	0%	\$30,306	36%	\$12,450	15%	\$1,250	2%	\$50	0%	\$83,065
James, Letitia	Participant	\$47,026	73%	=	0%	\$750	1%	\$14,400	22%	\$200	0%	\$2,350	4%	\$64,726
Jennings, Jr., Allan	Non-Participant	\$28,810	88%	=	0%	-	0%	\$1,650	5%	-	0%	\$2,150	7%	\$32,610
Jimenez, Luis	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Johnson, Joyce	Participant	\$63,868	94%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,500	4%	\$250	0%	\$67,618
Junior, Pamela	Participant	\$31,726	96%	=	0%	-	0%	\$1,250	4%	-	0%	-	0%	\$32,976
Kann, Gerald	Participant	\$5,290	96%	=	0%	-	0%	=	0%	-	0%	\$200	4%	\$5,490
Karako, Jak	Participant	\$40,728	100%	=	0%	-	0%	=	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$40,728
Katz, Melinda	Non-Participant	\$502,729	70%	\$500	0%	\$4,650	1%	\$77,041	11%	\$116,000	16%	\$22,400	3%	\$723,320
Kaufman, Stephen	Participant	\$105,776	82%	=	0%	\$5,500	4%	\$10,565	8%	\$5,200	4%	\$2,100	2%	\$129,141
Kavanagh, Brian	Participant	\$107,599	94%	-	0%	\$1,588	1%	\$1,400	1%	\$2,267	2%	\$1,650	1%	\$114,504
Kinard, Stanley	Participant	\$18,470	100%	=	0%	-	0%	=	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$18,470
King, Danny	Participant	\$26,602	91%	-	0%	\$2,475	8%	-	0%	-	0%	\$300	1%	\$29,377
King, Erlene	Participant	\$22,519	96%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,000	4%	-	0%	\$23,519
Koppell, Oliver	Participant	\$74,761	73%	-	0%	\$1,250	1%	\$24,175	24%	\$350	0%	\$1,550	2%	\$102,086
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Lanza, Andrew	Participant	\$53,670	92%	-	0%	-	0%	\$3,520	6%	\$860	1%	\$265	0%	\$58,315

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiza	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Other Organizat		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Lappin, Jessica	Participant	\$140,986	74%	-	0%	\$2,425	1%	\$41,372	22%	\$4,200	2%	\$500	0%	\$189,483
Lester, Jack	Participant	\$75,363	96%	\$25	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$250	0%	\$1,675	2%	\$175	0%	\$78,488
Liu, John	Participant	\$228,034	99%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,350	1%	-	0%	-	0%	\$230,384
Lobo, Renee	Participant	\$62,790	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$250	0%	-	0%	\$63,040
Luciano, Felipe	Participant	\$59,873	79%	-	0%	\$250	0%	\$4,250	6%	\$10,000	13%	\$1,250	2%	\$75,623
Madden, Mary	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Mahadeo, Robby	Participant	\$24,975	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$24,975
Marcial, Edwin	Participant	\$10,100	80%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,500	20%	-	0%	-	0%	\$12,600
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	Participant	\$59,695	68%	-	0%	\$2,913	3%	\$22,219	25%	\$3,500	4%	-	0%	\$88,327
Martinez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$117,015	64%	-	0%	-	0%	\$26,806	15%	\$35,246	19%	\$4,750	3%	\$183,817
Martinez, Mildred	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
McMahon, Michael	Participant	\$78,723	57%	-	0%	\$13,175	9%	\$33,475	24%	\$7,775	6%	\$5,675	4%	\$138,823
McManus, Joseph	Participant	\$52,763	53%	\$4	0%	\$3,800	4%	\$41,538	41%	\$2,250	2%	-	0%	\$100,355
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	\$23,885	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$23,885
Mealy, Darlene	Participant	\$63,309	56%	-	0%	\$1,200	1%	\$47,404	42%	\$850	1%	\$1,205	1%	\$113,968
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	\$75,611	70%	-	0%	\$15,596	14%	\$12,935	12%	\$4,225	4%	\$50	0%	\$108,417
Miller, David	Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Mohamed, Ali	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Monserrate, Hiram	Participant	\$131,815	71%	-	0%	\$15,292	8%	\$27,700	15%	\$5,450	3%	\$5,095	3%	\$185,352
Montague, Virginia	Participant	\$33,530	81%	-	0%	-	0%	\$7,068	17%	-	0%	\$550	1%	\$41,148
Muhammad, Naquan	Participant	\$11,270	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$11,270
Murphy, Patrick	Participant	\$241,731	96%	-	0%	-	0%	\$8,600	3%	\$2,500	1%	-	0%	\$252,831

		Individu	uals	Corporat	ions	Emplo _y Organiza	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Othei Organizat		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														_
Narine, Dhanpaul	Participant	\$19,862	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$19,862
Nath, Dilip	Participant	\$24,527	99%	-	0%	-	0%	\$340	1%	-	0%	-	0%	\$24,867
Nelson, Michael	Participant	\$81,253	83%	-	0%	\$350	0%	\$15,550	16%	-	0%	\$500	1%	\$97,653
Nocerino, Joseph	Participant	\$18,686	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$50	0%	\$18,736
Oddo, James	Participant	\$49,625	66%	-	0%	\$2,825	4%	\$21,500	29%	\$200	0%	\$850	1%	\$75,000
Palma, Annabel	Participant	\$48,788	53%	\$12,915	14%	\$3,750	4%	\$26,100	28%	\$1,150	1%	-	0%	\$92,703
Papajohn, Christopher	Participant	\$20,073	93%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,410	7%	-	0%	\$21,483
Petelka, Michael	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Pu-Folkes, Bryan	Participant	\$78,410	89%	-	0%	-	0%	\$250	0%	\$9,350	11%	\$450	1%	\$88,460
Quart, Dan	Participant	\$115,349	93%	-	0%	\$50	0%	\$2,750	2%	\$4,100	3%	\$2,050	2%	\$124,299
Quinn, Christine	Participant	\$207,828	76%	-	0%	\$5,350	2%	\$42,350	15%	\$18,500	7%	\$500	0%	\$274,528
Rahman, Masud	Participant	\$15,936	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$41	0%	\$15,977
Recchia, Domenic	Participant	\$107,780	77%	-	0%	\$4,500	3%	\$22,400	16%	\$3,750	3%	\$2,100	1%	\$140,530
Reyna, Diana	Participant	\$53,027	55%	-	0%	\$850	1%	\$32,750	34%	\$9,100	9%	\$500	1%	\$96,227
Rivera, George	Participant	\$20,125	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$20,125
Rivera, Joel	Participant	\$66,811	65%	-	0%	\$7,175	7%	\$19,975	19%	\$8,525	8%	\$350	0%	\$102,836
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	\$61,390	96%	\$1,000	2%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,250	2%	-	0%	\$63,640
Rosario, Antonio	Participant	\$13,005	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$13,005
Roth, Michael	Participant	\$12,270	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$12,270
Rubin, George	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Ruiz, John	Participant	\$24,495	92%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,200	8%	-	0%	-	0%	\$26,695
Ruks, Thomas	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-

		Individ	uals	Corporati	ons	Emplo Organiza	•	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Othe Organiza		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classification	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Russo, Pasqualino	Participant	\$108,184	91%	-	0%	-	0%	\$3,750	3%	\$6,512	5%	-	0%	\$118,446
Samad, Maryam	Participant	\$5,615	97%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$150	3%	\$5,765
Sanders, Jr., James	Non-Participant	\$92,345	57%	\$6,125	4%	\$1,250	1%	\$37,600	23%	\$22,600	14%	\$2,542	2%	\$162,462
Schlanger, Craig	Participant	\$5,292	78%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,150	17%	\$250	4%	\$100	1%	\$6,792
Seabrook, Larry	Participant	\$23,312	57%	-	0%	\$1,500	4%	\$12,825	31%	\$3,500	8%	\$80	0%	\$41,217
Sears, Helen	Participant	\$72,293	52%	-	0%	\$3,225	2%	\$29,775	21%	\$6,000	4%	\$28,592	20%	\$139,885
Sementilli, Egidio	Participant	\$9,350	100%	-	0%	=	0%	=	0%	-	0%	\$10	0%	\$9,360
Sklar, Robyn	Participant	\$10,399	100%	-	0%	=	0%	=	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$10,399
Spitz, George	Participant	\$24,092	89%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,600	10%	\$500	2%	-	0%	\$27,192
Stern, Steven	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Stewart, Kendall	Participant	\$48,695	55%	-	0%	\$1,350	2%	\$13,900	16%	\$700	1%	\$23,173	26%	\$87,818
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	\$43,957	99%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$250	1%	\$44,207
Tapper, Marlene	Participant	\$33,108	95%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,925	5%	-	0%	-	0%	\$35,033
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Trainer, Richard	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Tsabar, Gur	Participant	\$73,467	92%	\$40	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$326	0%	\$5,773	7%	\$79,606
Vacca, James	Participant	\$122,151	69%	-	0%	\$2,643	1%	\$31,685	18%	\$20,900	12%	\$250	0%	\$177,629
Vallone, Jr., Peter	Participant	\$146,785	79%	-	0%	\$4,600	2%	\$23,950	13%	\$7,875	4%	\$2,900	2%	\$186,110
Vann, Albert	Participant	\$17,230	74%	-	0%	-	0%	\$4,550	20%	\$600	3%	\$900	4%	\$23,280
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	-		-		-		-	0%	-		-	0%	-
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	Participant	\$7,335	96%	-	0%	-	0%	\$300	4%	-	0%	-	0%	\$7,635
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	Participant	\$1,300	72%	-	0%	-	0%	\$500	28%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,800

		Individ	uals	Corporat	ions	Emplo Organiza	-	Politic Commit		Partners LLC	•	Othe Organiza		Total Itemized Contributions
Candidate	Classificatio	n Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$	%	Total \$
City Council														
Weir, Elias	Participant	\$3,135	100%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$3,135
Weprin, David	Participant	\$338,741	67%	\$1,100	0%	\$1,750	0%	\$60,525	12%	\$51,200	10%	\$54,000	11%	\$507,316
White, Jr., Thomas	Participant	\$75,717	63%	-	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$29,950	25%	\$8,650	7%	\$5,500	5%	\$120,817
Whitehead, John	Participant	\$10,290	89%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	\$1,250	11%	\$11,540
Yablon, Joshua	Participant	\$13,920	84%	-	0%	-	0%	\$2,500	15%	\$150	1%	-	0%	\$16,570
Yassky, David	Participant	\$478,183	84%	\$4,050	1%	\$9,250	2%	\$34,950	6%	\$35,550	6%	\$5,500	1%	\$567,483
Zinberg, Joel	Participant	\$94,103	93%	-	0%	-	0%	\$5,350	5%	\$2,100	2%	-	0%	\$101,553
Total		\$8,822,977	76%	\$27,239	0%	\$254,061	2%	\$1,525,446	13%	\$685,675	6%	\$246,814	2%	\$11,562,212
Total for Participants:		\$7,588,036	77%	\$20,184	0%	\$241,811	2%	\$1,328,049	13%	\$473,329	5%	\$196,527	2%	\$9,847,936
Total for Non-Participants:		\$1,234,941	72%	\$7,055	0%	\$12,250	1%	\$197,397	12%	\$212,346	12%	\$50,287	3%	\$1,714,276
Total		\$118,656,950	95%	\$27,214	2%	\$524,481	0%	\$3,027,251	2%	\$2,680,540	2%	\$573,447	0%	\$125,489,883
Total for Participants:		\$33,265,901	84%	\$20,159	0%	\$512,231	1%	\$2,829,854	13%	\$2,468,194	6%	\$523,160	1%	\$39,619,499
Total for Non-Participants	:	\$85,391,049	99%	\$7,055	0%	\$12,250	0%	\$197,397	0%	\$212,346	0%	\$50,287	0%	\$85,870,384

		Number of	Total	Aggregate Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans (Outstanding
Mayor				
Bloomberg, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Blum, Seth	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Brodeur, Christopher	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	1	\$900,000	\$0
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	-	-	-
Gronowicz, Anthony	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Koppel, Martin	Non-Participant	-	-	-
McMillan, Jimmy	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	-	-	-
Ognibene, Thomas	Participant	1	\$1,000	\$0
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Silk, Audrey	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Weiner, Anthony	Participant	-	-	-
Total		2	\$901,000	\$0
Total for Pa	articipants:	2	\$901,000	\$0
Total for No	on-Participants:	-	-	-
Public Advocate				
Brown, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon	Participant	-	-	-
Goetz, Bernard	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Golub, Jay	Participant	1	\$51,150	\$13,000
Gotbaum, Betsy	Participant	-	-	-
Lesczynski, James	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Rasiej, Andrew	Participant	1	\$525,000	\$0
Siegel, Norman	Participant	-	-	-
Total		2	\$576,150	\$13,000
Total for Pa	rticipants:	2	\$576,150	\$13,000
Total for No	on-Participants:	-	-	-
Comptroller				
Fein, Daniel	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Moore, Ron	Non-Participant	-	-	-

				Aggregate
		Number of	Total	Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans	Outstanding
Comptroller				
Thompson, Jr., William	Participant	-	=	-
Total		-	-	-
Total for F	Participants:	-	-	-
Total for I	Non-Participants:	-	-	
Boro President	•			
Alatsas, Theodore	Non-Participant	_	_	-
Brawley, Kevin	Non-Participant	_	-	_
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo	Participant	_	-	-
Dobrian, Joseph	Non-Participant	_	-	-
Ellner, Brian	Participant	_	_	-
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	_	-	-
Fields, Jessie	Participant	-	-	<u>-</u>
Hawkins, Arrin	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	1	\$7,500	\$0
Luisi, John	Participant	-	-	-
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	1	\$140,000	\$0
Markowitz, Marty	Participant	-	-	-
Marshall, Helen	Participant	-	-	-
Mattera, Gloria	Participant	3	\$45,000	\$0
Michels, Stanley	Participant	1	\$50,000	\$0
Molinaro, James	Participant	-	-	-
Moskowitz, Eva	Participant	-	-	-
Perkins, Bill	Participant	-	-	-
Popik, Barry	Participant	-	-	-
Popkin, Gary	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Sica, Philip	Participant	-	-	-
Stringer, Scott	Participant	-	-	-
Wright, Keith	Participant	-	-	-
Total		6	\$242,500	\$0
	Participants:	6	\$242,500	\$0
	Non-Participants:	-	-	-
City Council Addabbo, Joseph	Participant	_	_	_
Addabbo, Joseph	Participant	-	-	-

		Number of	Total	Aggregate Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans C	Outstanding
City Council				
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Allen, William	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Antoine, Royston	Participant	1	\$11,900	\$0
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen	Participant	-	-	-
Avella, Tony	Participant	-	-	-
Baez, Maria	Participant	-	-	-
Baldeo, Albert	Participant	2	\$72,000	\$0
Barron, Charles	Participant	1	\$1,500	\$0
Bernace, Victor	Participant	-	-	-
Betancourt Jr, Ismael	Participant	2	\$10,150	\$4,500
Beys, Michael	Participant	1	\$40,000	\$0
Bilal, Charles	Participant	-	-	-
Billups, Charles	Participant	-	-	-
Blackwell, Eric	Participant	-	-	-
Bloch, Darren	Participant	-	-	-
Bloodsaw, Daryl	Participant	1	\$45,147	(\$2,647)
Boudouvas, Peter	Participant	1	\$5,000	\$0
Boyland, Sr., William	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Bradian, Steve	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Brewer, Gale	Participant	1	\$13,400	\$0
Brightharp, Joan	Participant	1	\$5,700	\$200
Britton, A. Brinmore	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	-	-	-
Brown Jr, Will	Participant	-	-	-
Campbell, Lisa Marie	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Carlino, John	Participant	-	-	-
Carroll, Rodney	Participant	-	-	-
Ceder, David	Participant	-	-	-
Cesnik, Eric	Participant	1	\$5,000	\$3,178
Clarke, Yvette	Participant	1	\$5,000	\$0
Comrie, Leroy	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Cornelius, Yasmin	Participant	3	\$6,708	\$0
Cox, Allen	Non-Participant	-	-	-

		Number of	Total	Aggregate Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans (Outstanding
City Council				
de Blasio, Bill	Participant	-	-	-
Denis, Nelson	Participant	-	-	-
Dickens, Inez	Participant	-	-	-
Dilan, Erik Martin	Participant	-	-	-
Doty, Cynthia	Participant	1	\$18,000	\$0
Duggan, Essie	Participant	1	\$3,000	\$3,000
Farmer, Bryan	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Felder, Simcha	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Feliciano, Fabian	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Fidler, Lewis	Participant	-	-	-
Flanagan, Claudia	Participant	-	-	-
Flores, Rodolfo	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Foglia, Philip	Participant	-	-	-
Foster, Helen Diane	Participant	-	-	-
Galarza, David	Participant	-	-	-
Gallagher, Dennis	Participant	-	-	-
Gallo, Russell	Participant	-	-	-
Garodnick, Daniel	Participant	-	-	-
Gennaro, James	Participant	-	-	-
Gentile, Vincent	Participant	-	-	-
Gerson, Alan	Participant	-	-	-
Gioia, Eric	Participant	-	-	-
Gonzalez, Miguel	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Gonzalez, Sara	Participant	-	-	-
Grandoit, Tamara	Participant	-	-	-
Grupico, Salvatore	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Gutnik, Oleg	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Hall, Jody	Participant	-	-	-
Hanks, Nancy	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Henderson, Woody	Participant	-	-	-
Herbert, Anthony	Participant	-	-	-
Hoffnung, Aaron	Participant	1	\$9,500	\$0
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Hooks, Erik	Participant	-	-	-

Click here to return to main menu

APPENDIX F LOANS

		Number of	Total	Aggregate Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans Ou	ıtstanding
City Council				
Hooks, Jr., David	Participant	-	-	-
Hunter, Jereline	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Jackson, Robert	Participant	-	-	-
James, Letitia	Participant	-	-	-
Jennings, Jr., Allan	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Jimenez, Luis	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Johnson, Joyce	Participant	-	-	-
Junior, Pamela	Participant	-	-	-
Kann, Gerald	Participant	-	-	-
Karako, Jak	Participant	1	\$11,000	\$0
Katz, Melinda	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Kaufman, Stephen	Participant	2	\$77,500	\$0
Kavanagh, Brian	Participant	-	-	-
Kinard, Stanley	Participant	1	\$20,000	\$0
King, Danny	Participant	-	-	-
King, Erlene	Participant	-	-	-
Koppell, Oliver	Participant	-	-	-
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Lanza, Andrew	Participant	-	-	-
Lappin, Jessica	Participant	-	-	-
Lester, Jack	Participant	1	\$67,000	\$0
Liu, John	Participant	-	-	-
Lobo, Renee	Participant	-	-	-
Luciano, Felipe	Participant	-	-	-
Madden, Mary	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Mahadeo, Robby	Participant	1	\$115,000	\$115,000
Marcial, Edwin	Participant	-	-	-
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	Participant	-	-	-
Martinez, Miguel	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Martinez, Mildred	Non-Participant	-	-	-
McMahon, Michael	Participant	-	-	-
McManus, Joseph	Participant	1	\$20,000	\$0
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	1	\$10,000	\$0
Mealy, Darlene	Participant	-	-	-

Click here to return to main menu

APPENDIX F LOANS

		Number of	Total	Aggregate Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans	Outstanding
City Council				
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	-	-	-
Miller, David	Participant	-	-	-
Mohamed, Ali	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Monserrate, Hiram	Participant	-	-	-
Montague, Virginia	Participant	3	\$12,000	\$0
Muhammad, Naquan	Participant	-	-	-
Murphy, Patrick	Participant	1	\$25,000	\$2,000
Narine, Dhanpaul	Participant	2	\$5,000	\$5,000
Nath, Dilip	Participant	-	-	-
Nelson, Michael	Participant	-	-	-
Nocerino, Joseph	Participant	1	\$100	\$0
Oddo, James	Participant	-	-	-
Palma, Annabel	Participant	-	-	-
Papajohn, Christopher	Participant	2	\$7,360	\$7,242
Petelka, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Pu-Folkes, Bryan	Participant	-	-	-
Quart, Dan	Participant	-	-	-
Quinn, Christine	Participant	-	-	-
Rahman, Masud	Participant	4	\$6,400	\$3,900
Recchia, Domenic	Participant	-	-	-
Reyna, Diana	Participant	-	-	-
Rivera, George	Participant	-	-	-
Rivera, Joel	Participant	-	-	-
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	3	\$37,000	\$5,000
Rosario, Antonio	Participant	1	\$6,000	\$0
Roth, Michael	Participant	-	-	-
Rubin, George	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Ruiz, John	Participant	1	\$2,500	\$2,500
Ruks, Thomas	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Russo, Pasqualino	Participant	-	-	-
Samad, Maryam	Participant	-	-	-
Sanders, Jr., James	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Schlanger, Craig	Participant	-	-	-
Seabrook, Larry	Participant	-	-	-

Click here to return to main menu

APPENDIX F LOANS

		Number of	Total	Aggregate Amount
Candidate	Classification	Lenders	Loans	Outstanding
City Council				
Sears, Helen	Participant	-	-	-
Sementilli, Egidio	Participant	-	-	-
Sklar, Robyn	Participant	-	-	-
Spitz, George	Participant	1	\$9,000	\$0
Stern, Steven	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Stewart, Kendall	Participant	-	-	-
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	-	-	-
Tapper, Marlene	Participant	1	\$36,500	\$10,250
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Trainer, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-
Tsabar, Gur	Participant	1	\$550	\$0
Vacca, James	Participant	-	-	-
Vallone, Jr., Peter	Participant	-	-	-
Vann, Albert	Participant	-	-	-
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	=	-	-
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	Participant	-	-	-
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	Participant	-	-	(\$1,000)
Weir, Elias	Participant	-	-	-
Weprin, David	Participant	-	-	-
White, Jr., Thomas	Participant	1	\$7,000	\$7,000
Whitehead, John	Participant	-	-	-
Yablon, Joshua	Participant	-	-	-
Yassky, David	Participant	-	-	-
Zinberg, Joel	Participant	-	-	-
Total		49	\$726,915	\$165,123
Total for Par	ticipants:	49	\$726,915	\$165,123
Total for Nor	n-Participants:	-	-	-
Total		59	\$2,446,565	\$178,123
Total for Par	ticipants:	59	\$2,446,565	\$178,123
Total for Nor	n-Participants:	-	-	-

		< 2005		1/1/2005	1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005		11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
Mayor										
Bloomberg, Michael	Non-Participant	\$2,123,451	-	\$37,849,981	-	\$30,576,315	-	\$14,037,572	-	\$84,587,319
Blum, Seth	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brodeur, Christopher	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	\$281,225	\$93,285	\$5,021,794	\$228,322	\$3,491,786	\$15,369	\$503,372	\$24,076	\$9,659,229
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	\$577,073	-	\$2,335,287	\$30,825	\$136,950	\$2,900	\$17,384	\$10,500	\$3,110,919
Gronowicz, Anthony	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koppel, Martin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMillan, Jimmy	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	\$661,452	\$272,379	\$4,407,309	\$1,227,823	\$213,609	\$95,284	\$72,373	\$30,652	\$6,980,881
Ognibene, Thomas	Participant	\$106	-	\$73,872	\$620	\$12,285	-	\$1,176	-	\$88,059
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Silk, Audrey	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	\$1,155	-	\$24	-	\$1,179
Weiner, Anthony	Participant	\$122,485	-	\$4,307,966	\$83,396	\$275,561	-	\$19,127	-	\$4,808,535
Total		\$3,765,792	\$365,664	\$53,996,209	\$1,570,986	\$34,707,661	\$113,553	\$14,651,028	\$65,228	\$109,236,121
Total for Participants:		\$1,642,341	\$365,664	\$16,146,228	\$1,570,986	\$4,130,191	\$113,553	\$613,432	\$65,228	\$24,647,623
Total for Non-Participants	:	\$2,123,451	-	\$37,849,981	-	\$30,577,470	-	\$14,037,596	-	\$84,588,498
Public Advocate										
Brown, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon	Participant	\$148	-	\$1,449	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,597
Goetz, Bernard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Golub, Jay	Participant	\$2,552	-	\$62,942	-	\$922	-	\$1,168	-	\$67,584

		< 2005		1/1/2005 -	1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005		11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
Public Advocate										
Gotbaum, Betsy	Participant	\$287,900	\$30,567	\$2,215,509	\$67,498	\$102,993	-	\$53,930	-	\$2,758,397
Lesczynski, James	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rasiej, Andrew	Participant	\$27	-	\$1,002,935	-	\$102,991	-	\$18,316	-	\$1,124,269
Siegel, Norman	Participant	\$63,906	-	\$853,784	-	\$115,528	-	\$50,386	-	\$1,083,604
Total		\$354,533	\$30,567	\$4,136,619	\$67,498	\$322,434	-	\$123,800	-	\$5,035,451
Total for Participants:		\$354,533	\$30,567	\$4,136,619	\$67,498	\$322,434	-	\$123,800	-	\$5,035,451
Total for Non-Participants	3:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comptroller										
Fein, Daniel	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moore, Ron	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thompson, Jr., William	Participant	\$633,921	\$273,410	\$460,626	\$84,062	\$876,001	\$13,700	\$28,653	\$11,560	\$2,381,933
Total		\$633,921	\$273,410	\$460,626	\$84,062	\$876,001	\$13,700	\$28,653	\$11,560	\$2,381,933
Total for Participants:		\$633,921	\$273,410	\$460,626	\$84,062	\$876,001	\$13,700	\$28,653	\$11,560	\$2,381,933
Total for Non-Participants	5:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boro President										
Alatsas, Theodore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brawley, Kevin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo	Participant	\$205,154	\$18,813	\$351,300	\$8,695	\$331,692	\$5,000	\$103,734	-	\$1,024,388
Dobrian, Joseph	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ellner, Brian	Participant	\$67,271	\$13,982	\$988,346	\$50,244	\$60,075	\$2,610	\$3,595	\$1,823	\$1,187,946
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	\$58,000	\$17,000	\$976,204	\$48,451	\$14,351	-	\$20,010	-	\$1,134,016

		< 20	005	05 1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005			11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
Boro President										
Fields, Jessie	Participant	-	-	\$91,414	\$6,103	\$86,695	-	\$4,347	-	\$188,559
Hawkins, Arrin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	\$10,897	-	\$842,404	\$21,920	\$16,025	\$1,097	\$1,516	\$870	\$894,729
Luisi, John	Participant	-	-	\$52,917	\$1,409	\$105,940	-	\$2,345	-	\$162,611
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	\$153,024	\$14,399	\$834,600	\$21,134	\$19,418	\$3,640	\$1,909	\$1,800	\$1,049,924
Markowitz, Marty	Participant	\$161,098	\$34,151	\$150,201	\$61,867	\$625,964	\$4,281	\$51,737	\$9,458	\$1,098,757
Marshall, Helen	Participant	\$28,801	\$7,728	\$15,309	\$8,989	\$62,303	\$4,756	\$85	\$3,200	\$131,171
Mattera, Gloria	Participant	\$167	-	\$12,079	-	\$237,491	\$4,775	\$2,821	\$7,941	\$265,274
Michels, Stanley	Participant	\$92,334	-	\$354,314	-	\$28,780	-	-	-	\$475,428
Molinaro, James	Participant	\$44,870	-	\$211,538	-	\$722,334	-	\$24,587	-	\$1,003,329
Moskowitz, Eva	Participant	\$315,131	\$16,481	\$1,138,628	\$52,110	\$48,914	-	\$2,427	-	\$1,573,691
Perkins, Bill	Participant	\$79,199	\$15	\$709,647	\$15,571	\$4,052	\$13	\$933	-	\$809,430
Popik, Barry	Participant	\$1,810	-	\$2,170	\$520	\$45	\$1,350	\$4,129	-	\$10,024
Popkin, Gary	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sica, Philip	Participant	-	-	\$74	-	\$12,118	-	\$91	-	\$12,283
Stringer, Scott	Participant	\$164,455	\$79,558	\$1,318,607	\$66,387	\$74,013	\$7,718	\$10,587	\$26,967	\$1,748,292
Wright, Keith	Participant	\$9,837	-	\$433,256	\$6,292	\$43,501	\$7	\$2,431	-	\$495,324
Total		\$1,392,048	\$202,127	\$8,483,008	\$369,692	\$2,493,711	\$35,247	\$237,284	\$52,059	\$13,265,176
Total for Participants:		\$1,392,048	\$202,127	\$8,483,008	\$369,692	\$2,493,711	\$35,247	\$237,284	\$52,059	\$13,265,176
Total for Non-Participant	s:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

		< 20	005	1/1/2005 -	9/13/2005	9/14/2005 -	11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -	1/11/2006	
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Addabbo, Joseph	Participant	\$7,641	-	\$11,106	\$2,315	\$4,316	\$1,650	-	-	\$27,028
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allen, William	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka	Non-Participant	-	-	\$22,970	-	-	-	-	-	\$22,970
Antoine, Royston	Participant	-	-	\$77,261	-	\$24	-	-	-	\$77,285
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen	Participant	-	-	\$15,162	-	\$9,967	-	\$2,435	-	\$27,564
Avella, Tony	Participant	\$50,323	-	\$4,334	\$1,120	\$134,305	-	\$187	-	\$190,269
Baez, Maria	Participant	\$19,092	\$3,000	\$39,964	\$10,444	\$10,162	\$2,000	\$6,771	\$1,014	\$92,447
Baldeo, Albert	Participant	\$6,294	-	\$148,561	\$22,564	\$2,353	\$3,581	-	-	\$183,353
Barron, Charles	Participant	\$21,184	-	\$126,450	-	\$37,328	-	\$4,874	-	\$189,836
Bernace, Victor	Participant	-	-	\$61,900	-	\$15	-	\$30	-	\$61,945
Betancourt Jr, Ismael	Participant	-	-	\$104,329	\$9,992	\$399	\$450	\$230	-	\$115,400
Beys, Michael	Participant	-	-	\$148,952	\$10,951	\$681	\$30	\$128	-	\$160,742
Bilal, Charles	Participant	-	-	\$8,027	\$640	\$40,978	\$7,675	-	-	\$57,320
Billups, Charles	Participant	\$468	-	\$8,102	-	\$39,008	-	\$15,800	-	\$63,378
Blackwell, Eric	Participant	\$1,182	-	\$12,190	\$1,052	\$14,600	-	-	-	\$29,024
Bloch, Darren	Participant	-	-	\$138,907	\$19,212	\$7,218	-	\$2,200	-	\$167,537
Bloodsaw, Daryl	Participant	-	-	\$15,156	-	\$45,027	-	\$118	-	\$60,301
Boudouvas, Peter	Participant	\$250	-	\$13,102	\$8,314	\$93,225	\$14	\$710	\$500	\$116,115
Boyland, Sr., William	Non-Participant	-	-	\$57,166	-	\$6,480	-	\$900	-	\$64,546
Bradian, Steve	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brewer, Gale	Participant	-	-	\$25,546	\$770	\$83,371	-	\$2,739	-	\$112,426

		< 2005		1/1/2005 -	1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005		11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Brightharp, Joan	Participant	\$525	-	\$36,418	-	\$1,385	-	\$2,757	-	\$41,085
Britton, A. Brinmore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	\$7,773	\$256	\$65,797	\$2,509	\$2,138	\$8,508	-	\$6,050	\$93,031
Brown Jr, Will	Participant	-	-	-	\$3,191	\$6,932	\$298	-	-	\$10,421
Campbell, Lisa Marie	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carlino, John	Participant	-	-	\$821	\$4,120	\$3,711	-	\$145	-	\$8,797
Carroll, Rodney	Participant	\$16,194	-	\$91,041	-	-	-	-	-	\$107,235
Ceder, David	Participant	-	-	\$3,719	-	\$16,817	-	\$329	-	\$20,865
Cesnik, Eric	Participant	\$1	-	\$90,154	\$3,020	\$1,222	-	\$552	-	\$94,949
Clarke, Yvette	Participant	-	-	\$125,662	\$6,779	\$21,311	\$4,750	\$5,963	\$4,000	\$168,465
Comrie, Leroy	Non-Participant	\$55,422	-	\$104,329	-	\$21,755	-	\$14,873	-	\$196,379
Cornelius, Yasmin	Participant	\$1,498	\$1,980	\$136,192	\$12,935	-	-	-	-	\$152,605
Cox, Allen	Non-Participant	-	-	\$150	-	\$420	-	\$319	-	\$889
de Blasio, Bill	Participant	\$54,985	\$10,642	\$108,864	\$14,479	\$27,579	\$3,982	\$12,384	\$1,069	\$233,984
Denis, Nelson	Participant	\$75	-	\$129,230	\$7,964	\$9,941	-	-	-	\$147,210
Dickens, Inez	Participant	-	-	\$148,662	\$38,200	\$43,759	\$7,404	\$14,390	\$9,243	\$261,658
Dilan, Erik Martin	Participant	-	-	\$18,403	\$394	\$4,511	-	\$2,500	-	\$25,808
Doty, Cynthia	Participant	-	-	\$78,498	-	\$6,019	-	-	-	\$84,517
Duggan, Essie	Participant	-	-	\$8,763	-	-	-	-	-	\$8,763
Farmer, Bryan	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Felder, Simcha	Non-Participant	\$28,986	-	\$70,475	-	\$5,029	-	\$1,289	-	\$105,779
Feliciano, Fabian	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

		< 20	005	1/1/2005 -	9/13/2005	9/14/2005 -	11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -	1/11/2006	
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Fidler, Lewis	Participant	-	-	\$110,990	\$857	\$32,931	-	-	-	\$144,778
Flanagan, Claudia	Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flores, Rodolfo	Non-Participant	\$5	-	\$11,392	-	\$275	-	-	-	\$11,672
Foglia, Philip	Participant	-	-	\$68,162	\$38	\$82,521	\$48	-	-	\$150,769
Foster, Helen Diane	Participant	\$2,508	-	\$28,457	-	\$27,458	-	\$4,546	-	\$62,969
Galarza, David	Participant	\$617	-	\$81,931	\$5,564	\$1,592	-	\$360	-	\$90,064
Gallagher, Dennis	Participant	\$39,111	\$35	\$35,463	\$1,368	\$29,901	\$86	\$1,135,591	\$27	\$1,241,582
Gallo, Russell	Participant	-	-	\$859	-	\$30,342	-	\$611	-	\$31,812
Garodnick, Daniel	Participant	\$38,516	\$1,080	\$142,302	\$14,096	\$141,671	\$1,320	\$5,337	\$569	\$344,891
Gennaro, James	Participant	\$40,084	\$3,623	\$139,536	\$57,158	\$70,920	\$5,423	\$11,474	\$8,200	\$336,418
Gentile, Vincent	Participant	\$32,047	\$4,230	\$49,033	\$4,363	\$98,566	\$1,159	\$5,851	\$516	\$195,765
Gerson, Alan	Participant	\$22,410	\$9,625	\$62,369	\$28,427	\$16,662	\$1,200	\$2,134	-	\$142,827
Gioia, Eric	Participant	\$98,809	\$33,938	\$71,474	\$29,468	\$53,035	\$8,110	\$18,852	-	\$313,686
Gonzalez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$624	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$624
Gonzalez, Sara	Participant	-	-	\$112,076	\$5,000	\$30,489	-	\$6,139	-	\$153,704
Grandoit, Tamara	Participant	-	-	\$88,772	\$1,000	\$14,513	-	-	-	\$104,285
Grupico, Salvatore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gutnik, Oleg	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hall, Jody	Participant	-	-	\$3,491	-	\$97,672	\$1,000	\$3,532	-	\$105,695
Hanks, Nancy	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Henderson, Woody	Participant	-	-	\$5,742	\$227	\$16,300	-	\$7,012	-	\$29,281
Herbert, Anthony	Participant	-	-	-	-	\$3,500	-	-	-	\$3,500

		< 2005		1/1/2005 -	1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005		11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Hoffnung, Aaron	Participant	\$14,674	\$2,250	\$113,242	\$10,153	\$1,251	\$1,875	\$849	-	\$144,294
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hooks, Erik	Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hooks, Jr., David	Participant	\$109	-	\$51,125	-	\$20,649	-	\$54	-	\$71,937
Hunter, Jereline	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jackson, Robert	Participant	\$51,632	-	\$61,548	\$5	\$10,129	-	\$2,311	-	\$125,625
James, Letitia	Participant	-	-	\$60,936	\$21,580	\$60,700	\$4,700	\$8,680	\$6,360	\$162,956
Jennings, Jr., Allan	Non-Participant	-	-	\$27,554	-	\$5,375	-	\$1,070	-	\$33,999
Jimenez, Luis	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson, Joyce	Participant	\$1,183	-	\$153,886	\$20,295	\$2,462	-	\$1,047	-	\$178,873
Junior, Pamela	Participant	\$230	-	\$33,363	-	\$15,932	-	-	-	\$49,525
Kann, Gerald	Participant	-	-	\$1,236	-	\$1,895	-	\$30	-	\$3,161
Karako, Jak	Participant	\$8,925	-	\$90,636	-	\$29,476	-	\$1,175	-	\$130,212
Katz, Melinda	Non-Participant	\$85,130	-	\$245,493	-	\$54,253	-	\$22,965	-	\$407,841
Kaufman, Stephen	Participant	\$10,281	\$20,180	\$145,487	\$39,008	\$3,652	\$10,129	\$175	\$6,066	\$234,978
Kavanagh, Brian	Participant	\$22,845	\$3,197	\$144,529	\$21,865	\$1,596	\$738	\$2,406	\$700	\$197,876
Kinard, Stanley	Participant	-	-	\$45,930	-	\$30,673	-	-	-	\$76,603
King, Danny	Participant	\$619	-	\$55,427	-	-	-	\$206	-	\$56,252
King, Erlene	Participant	\$18,561	-	\$58,075	\$1,000	\$58,100	-	-	-	\$135,736
Koppell, Oliver	Participant	\$17,235	-	\$141,400	\$4,793	\$29,027	\$700	\$7,828	\$800	\$201,783
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lanza, Andrew	Participant	\$8,083	-	\$18,226	-	\$97,789	-	\$15,510	-	\$139,608

		< 20	005	1/1/2005 -	9/13/2005	9/14/2005 -	11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Lappin, Jessica	Participant	\$28,115	\$5,168	\$134,658	\$15,718	\$124,379	\$1,336	\$39,223	\$1,383	\$349,980
Lester, Jack	Participant	\$22,382	\$575	\$112,551	\$37,334	\$16,993	-	-	-	\$189,835
Liu, John	Participant	\$62,614	\$10,353	\$16,356	\$750	\$18,222	-	\$2,125	-	\$110,420
Lobo, Renee	Participant	\$1,600	-	\$100,159	-	\$50,734	-	\$1,546	-	\$154,039
Luciano, Felipe	Participant	\$3,103	\$2,000	\$133,067	\$3,770	-	-	-	-	\$141,940
Madden, Mary	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahadeo, Robby	Participant	-	-	\$101,762	\$58,378	\$7,513	\$2,513	\$805	\$5	\$170,976
Marcial, Edwin	Participant	\$1,220	-	\$26,753	-	-	-	-	-	\$27,973
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	Participant	-	-	\$148,110	\$12,199	\$10,871	\$2,272	\$188	-	\$173,640
Martinez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$28,858	-	\$114,007	-	\$5,150	-	-	-	\$148,015
Martinez, Mildred	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMahon, Michael	Participant	\$43,883	-	\$45,828	\$17,143	\$102,723	\$1,500	\$553	-	\$211,630
McManus, Joseph	Participant	\$6,122	-	\$114,693	\$31,548	\$1,010	\$9,028	\$6,975	\$140	\$169,516
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	\$95	-	\$58,494	\$10,065	\$17,806	\$3,000	-	-	\$89,460
Mealy, Darlene	Participant	\$902	-	\$126,536	\$15,289	\$56,562	\$4,560	\$1,821	\$3,000	\$208,670
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	\$16,902	-	\$135,968	\$8,172	\$58,327	-	\$5,057	\$11,483	\$235,909
Miller, David	Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mohamed, Ali	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monserrate, Hiram	Participant	\$47,754	\$7,500	\$107,130	\$59,839	\$37,665	\$1,500	\$4,355	\$1,500	\$267,243
Montague, Virginia	Participant	\$3,089	-	\$50,475	-	\$3,476	-	-	-	\$57,040
Muhammad, Naquan	Participant	\$105	\$100	\$5,800	\$850	-	-	-	-	\$6,855
Murphy, Patrick	Participant	\$2	-	\$146,994	\$20,067	\$140,614	\$10,722	\$4,641	\$3,979	\$327,019

		< 20	005	1/1/2005 -	9/13/2005	9/14/2005 -	11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -	1/11/2006	
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Narine, Dhanpaul	Participant	-	-	\$50,620	-	\$19,700	-	\$10	-	\$70,330
Nath, Dilip	Participant	\$2,235	-	\$97,658	-	\$2,014	-	\$673	-	\$102,580
Nelson, Michael	Participant	\$23,266	\$5,709	\$18,380	\$24,155	\$89,949	\$1,722	\$8,297	\$29,339	\$200,817
Nocerino, Joseph	Participant	\$1	-	\$91,995	-	\$1,294	-	\$248	-	\$93,538
Oddo, James	Participant	\$8,003	-	\$46,430	-	\$99,742	-	\$2,335	-	\$156,510
Palma, Annabel	Participant	\$4,923	\$6,975	\$33,745	\$21,855	\$5,272	\$8,000	\$3,897	\$1,500	\$86,167
Papajohn, Christopher	Participant	\$425	-	\$29,660	-	\$2,925	-	\$50	-	\$33,060
Petelka, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pu-Folkes, Bryan	Participant	\$1,790	\$3,000	\$108,859	\$45,561	\$41,037	\$2,000	\$33	\$2,000	\$204,280
Quart, Dan	Participant	\$39,078	\$900	\$132,480	\$32,337	\$1,603	-	-	-	\$206,398
Quinn, Christine	Participant	\$82,056	-	\$82,106	\$9,049	\$14,991	\$54	\$2,216	-	\$190,472
Rahman, Masud	Participant	\$41	-	\$9,939	\$112	\$48,424	-	\$10,313	-	\$68,829
Recchia, Domenic	Participant	\$11,392	-	\$52,682	\$32,550	\$77,909	\$9,415	-	-	\$183,948
Reyna, Diana	Participant	\$60	-	\$97,633	\$17,628	\$38,440	\$5,205	\$912	\$7,599	\$167,477
Rivera, George	Participant	-	-	\$67,395	\$4,808	\$8,121	-	-	-	\$80,324
Rivera, Joel	Participant	\$4,947	-	\$60,311	-	\$9,385	-	\$15,814	-	\$90,457
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	-	-	\$114,904	\$32,628	\$540	-	-	\$1,260	\$149,332
Rosario, Antonio	Participant	\$28	-	\$22,168	-	\$21,541	-	\$197	-	\$43,934
Roth, Michael	Participant	\$66	-	\$14,571	-	\$6,353	-	\$1,118	-	\$22,108
Rubin, George	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ruiz, John	Participant	-	-	\$95,944	-	\$11,092	-	\$28	-	\$107,064
Ruks, Thomas	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

		< 2005		1/1/2005 -	1/1/2005 - 9/13/2005		11/8/2005	11/9/2005 -		
		Non		Non		Non		Non		
Candidate	Classification	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Russo, Pasqualino	Participant	-	-	\$58,824	\$7,118	\$91,710	\$917	\$2,193	\$1,117	\$161,879
Samad, Maryam	Participant	-	-	\$2,466	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,466
Sanders, Jr., James	Non-Participant	\$3,040	-	\$157,118	-	\$1,962	-	-	-	\$162,120
Schlanger, Craig	Participant	\$35	-	\$1,884	-	\$43,045	-	\$3,582	-	\$48,546
Seabrook, Larry	Participant	\$40,928	\$6,977	\$32,383	\$24,725	\$64,844	\$1,366	\$1,785	\$7,300	\$180,308
Sears, Helen	Participant	\$3,629	\$1,450	\$148,010	\$11,570	\$97,866	\$7,000	\$188	-	\$269,713
Sementilli, Egidio	Participant	-	-	\$850	\$7,077	-	-	-	-	\$7,927
Sklar, Robyn	Participant	\$54	-	\$11,977	-	\$27,442	-	\$4,355	-	\$43,828
Spitz, George	Participant	-	-	\$32,056	-	\$27,762	\$1,000	-	-	\$60,818
Stern, Steven	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stewart, Kendall	Participant	-	-	\$150,425	\$4,469	\$28,588	-	\$5,726	-	\$189,208
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	\$3,100	-	\$121,143	\$6,828	\$3,250	-	\$274	-	\$134,595
Tapper, Marlene	Participant	-	-	\$123,188	\$12,496	\$53	-	\$102	-	\$135,839
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trainer, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tsabar, Gur	Participant	\$14,777	\$40	\$111,152	\$10,096	\$7,204	\$6	\$150	-	\$143,425
Vacca, James	Participant	\$10,245	\$400	\$146,228	\$11,728	\$145,711	\$2,058	\$8,197	\$1,150	\$325,717
Vallone, Jr., Peter	Participant	\$76,299	\$19,740	\$24,662	\$12,510	\$50,790	\$2,143	\$18,286	\$2,040	\$206,470
Vann, Albert	Participant	-	-	\$35,799	\$8,500	\$2,006	-	\$302	-	\$46,607
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	Participant	-	-	\$1,418	-	\$23,676	-	\$624	-	\$25,718
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	Participant	-	-	\$313	-	\$387	-	\$50	-	\$750

		< 2	2005 1/1/2005 - 9		- 9/13/2005	9/13/2005 9/14/2005 - 11/8/2005		11/9/2005 -		
Candidate	Classification	Non Exempt	Exempt	Non Exempt	Exempt	Non Exempt	Exempt	Non Exempt	Exempt	Total
City Council										
Weir, Elias	Participant	-	-	\$8,112	\$30	\$861	-	-	-	\$9,003
Weprin, David	Participant	\$103,601	\$3,392	\$61,395	\$4,452	\$33,621	\$1,259	\$19,481	-	\$227,201
White, Jr., Thomas	Participant	\$170	-	\$151,716	\$33,732	\$46,045	\$4,565	\$5,573	\$3,271	\$245,072
Whitehead, John	Participant	\$4,002	\$713	\$8,700	\$1,185	\$850	-	-	-	\$15,450
Yablon, Joshua	Participant	-	-	\$7,449	-	\$51,118	-	\$237	-	\$58,804
Yassky, David	Participant	\$94,159	-	\$51,717	\$396	\$44,398	\$4,500	\$14,305	\$1,500	\$210,975
Zinberg, Joel	Participant	-	-	\$31,975	\$168	\$149,489	-	\$1,946	-	\$183,578
Total		\$1,585,227	\$169,028	\$9,104,286	\$1,116,115	\$3,968,348	\$164,471	\$1,559,154	\$124,680	\$17,791,309
Total for Participants:		\$1,383,162	\$169,028	\$8,293,632	\$1,116,115	\$3,867,649	\$164,471	\$1,517,738	\$124,680	\$16,636,475
Total for Non-Participants	s:	\$202,065	-	\$810,654	-	\$100,699	-	\$41,416	-	\$1,154,834
Total		\$7,731,521	\$1,040,796	\$76,180,748	\$3,208,353	\$42,368,155	\$326,971	\$16,599,919	\$253,527	\$147,709,990
Total for Participants:		\$5,406,005	\$1,040,796	\$37,520,113	\$3,208,353	\$11,689,986	\$326,971	\$2,520,907	\$253,527	\$61,966,658
Total for Non-Participants	s:	\$2,325,516	_	\$38,660,635	_	\$30,678,169	-	\$14,079,012		\$85,743,332

Data as of March 31, 2006

Candidate			Total Primary Payment	Total General Payment	Total Payment
Office: Mayor			-		
Ferrer, Fernando			1,685,000	2,212,336	3,897,336
Fields, C. Virginia			1,459,636		1,459,636
Miller, A. Gifford			2,462,951		2,462,951
Ognibene, Thomas					
Weiner, Anthony			1,710,376		1,710,376
Number of Candidates paid in F	Primary for this office:	4	7,317,963	2,212,336	9,530,299
Number of Candidates paid in G	General for this office:	1			
Number of Cand	didates for this office:	5			
Office: Public Advocate					
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon					
Golub, Jay					
Gotbaum, Betsy			1,126,440	44,260	1,170,700
Rasiej, Andrew			774,704		774,704
Siegel, Norman			662,760		662,760
Number of Candidates paid in F	-	3	2,563,904	44,260	2,608,164
Number of Candidates paid in G	General for this office: didates for this office:	1 5			
Office: Comptroller	aractor for time office.	Ü			
Thompson, Jr., William					
Number of Candidates paid in F	Primary for this office:	0			
Number of Candidates paid in G	-	0			
Number of Cand	didates for this office:	1			
Office: Boro President					
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo	Borough: Bronx				
Ellner, Brian	Borough: Manha	attan	708,950		708,950
Espaillat, Adriano	Borough: Manha	attan	498,338		498,338
Fields, Jessie	Borough: Manha	attan		141,189	141,189
Lopez, Margarita	Borough: Manha	attan	453,745		453,745
Luisi, John	Borough: Staten	Island		107,736	107,736
Manzano, Carlos	Borough: Manha	attan	544,152		544,152
Markowitz, Marty	Borough: Brookl	yn			
Marshall, Helen	Borough: Queer	ıs			
Mattera, Gloria	Borough: Brookl	yn		199,156	199,156
Michels, Stanley	Borough: Manha	otton	296,716		296,716

Candidate		Total Primary Payment	Total General Payment	Total Payment
Office: Boro President		•	•	-
Molinaro, James	Borough: Staten Island		596,660	596,660
Moskowitz, Eva	Borough: Manhattan	625,788		625,788
Perkins, Bill	Borough: Manhattan	418,334		418,334
Popik, Barry	Borough: Manhattan			
Sica, Philip	Borough: Queens			
Stringer, Scott	Borough: Manhattan	708,950		708,950
Wright, Keith	Borough: Manhattan	173,090		173,090
Number of Candidates paid in Pa Number of Candidates paid in Go Number of Cand	-	4,428,063	1,044,741	5,472,804
Office: City Council				
Addabbo, Joseph	District: 32			
Antoine, Royston	District: 41	59,900		59,900
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen	District: 17			
Avella, Tony	District: 19		75,120	75,120
Baez, Maria	District: 14			
Baldeo, Albert	District: 28	82,500		82,500
Barron, Charles	District: 42	82,500	58,577	141,077
Bernace, Victor	District: 7	48,900		48,900
Betancourt Jr, Ismael	District: 13	79,160		79,160
Beys, Michael	District: 2	82,500		82,500
Bilal, Charles	District: 28			
Billups, Charles	District: 35		44,124	44,124
Blackwell, Eric	District: 35			
Bloch, Darren	District: 2	82,500		82,500
Bloodsaw, Daryl	District: 9		37,700	37,700
Boudouvas, Peter	District: 19		81,960	81,960
Brewer, Gale	District: 6			
Brightharp, Joan	District: 2	23,848		23,848
Brodsky, Meryl	District: 4	55,776		55,776
Brown Jr, Will	District: 9			
Carlino, John	District: 2			
Carroll, Rodney	District: 9	72,420		72,420

Candidate		Total Primary Payment	Total General Payment	Total Payment
Office: City Council		- ayment	- ayment	- ayen
Ceder, David	District: 50		25,324	25,324
Cesnik, Eric	District: 5	46,248	,	46,248
Clarke, Yvette	District: 40	81,784		81,784
Cornelius, Yasmin	District: 9	82,500		82,500
de Blasio, Bill	District: 39			
Denis, Nelson	District: 8	70,500		70,500
Dickens, Inez	District: 9	82,500		82,500
Dilan, Erik Martin	District: 37			
Doty, Cynthia	District: 9	65,044		65,044
Duggan, Essie	District: 41			
Fidler, Lewis	District: 46	82,500	12,092	94,592
Flanagan, Claudia	District: 2			
Foglia, Philip	District: 13		82,500	82,500
Foster, Helen Diane	District: 16		20,625	20,625
Galarza, David	District: 38	42,760		42,760
Gallagher, Dennis	District: 30			
Gallo, Russell	District: 47		24,860	24,860
Garodnick, Daniel	District: 4	82,500	82,500	165,000
Gennaro, James	District: 24	82,500	44,704	127,204
Gentile, Vincent	District: 43		82,500	82,500
Gerson, Alan	District: 1			
Gioia, Eric	District: 26			
Gonzalez, Sara	District: 38	59,000	500	59,500
Grandoit, Tamara	District: 46	73,972		73,972
Hall, Jody	District: 49		71,540	71,540
Henderson, Woody	District: 9		21,580	21,580
Herbert, Anthony	District: 35			
Hoffnung, Aaron	District: 11	82,500		82,500
Hooks, Erik	District: 33			
Hooks, Jr., David	District: 31	54,350		54,350
Jackson, Robert	District: 7	41,484	15,640	57,124
James, Letitia	District: 35	72,844	15,760	88,604

Candidate		Total Primary Payment	Total General Payment	Total Payment
		- ayment	- aymon	. aye
Office: City Council Johnson, Joyce	District: 8	82,500		82,500
Junior, Pamela	District: 41	02,000		02,000
Kann, Gerald	District: 22			
Karako, Jak	District: 4	82,500	18,388	100,888
Kaufman, Stephen	District: 13	63,528	. 0,000	63,528
Kavanagh, Brian	District: 2	82,500		82,500
Kinard, Stanley	District: 41	58,700		58,700
King, Danny	District: 41	39,623		39,623
King, Erlene	District: 45	,-	54,378	54,378
Koppell, Oliver	District: 11	82,500	20,625	103,125
Lanza, Andrew	District: 51		82,500	82,500
Lappin, Jessica	District: 5	82,500	82,500	165,000
Lester, Jack	District: 4	82,500	11,263	93,763
Liu, John	District: 20			
Lobo, Renee	District: 24	81,984	9,180	91,164
Luciano, Felipe	District: 8	81,280		81,280
Mahadeo, Robby	District: 28			
Marcial, Edwin	District: 8			
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	District: 8	82,500		82,500
McMahon, Michael	District: 49		82,500	82,500
McManus, Joseph	District: 13	82,500		82,500
McNally, Zenobia	District: 40	45,444		45,444
Mealy, Darlene	District: 41	100,000	20,625	120,625
Mendez, Rosie	District: 2	82,500	41,250	123,750
Miller, David	District: 41			
Monserrate, Hiram	District: 21	82,500		82,500
Montague, Virginia	District: 9	82,500		82,500
Muhammad, Naquan	District: 41			
Murphy, Patrick	District: 4		82,500	82,500
Narine, Dhanpaul	District: 28			
Nath, Dilip	District: 24	78,276		78,276
Nelson, Michael	District: 48		82,500	82,500

Candidate		Total Primary Payment	Total General Payment	Total Payment
Office: City Council		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Nocerino, Joseph	District: 29	75,042		75,042
Oddo, James	District: 50		82,500	82,500
Palma, Annabel	District: 18			
Papajohn, Christopher	District: 2			
Pu-Folkes, Bryan	District: 25	82,500		82,500
Quart, Dan	District: 5	82,500		82,500
Quinn, Christine	District: 3			
Rahman, Masud	District: 25		31,084	31,084
Recchia, Domenic	District: 47		82,500	82,500
Reyna, Diana	District: 34	70,620	17,300	87,920
Rivera, George	District: 34	75,875		75,875
Rivera, Joel	District: 15			
Rodriguez, Edward	District: 38	82,500		82,500
Rosario, Antonio	District: 14		30,860	30,860
Roth, Michael	District: 48		20,392	20,392
Ruiz, John	District: 8	76,556		76,556
Russo, Pasqualino	District: 43		82,100	82,100
Samad, Maryam	District: 41			
Schlanger, Craig	District: 51		20,248	20,248
Seabrook, Larry	District: 12		71,000	71,000
Sears, Helen	District: 25	82,500	20,832	103,332
Sementilli, Egidio	District: 13			
Sklar, Robyn	District: 26		33,172	33,172
Spitz, George	District: 5			
Stewart, Kendall	District: 45	82,500		82,500
Taitt, Samuel	District: 45	82,500		82,500
Tapper, Marlene	District: 21	82,500		82,500
Tsabar, Gur	District: 2	82,500		82,500
Vacca, James	District: 13	82,500	82,500	165,000
Vallone, Jr., Peter	District: 22			
Vann, Albert	District: 36			
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	District: 38		22,780	22,780

Candidate			Total Primary Payment	Total General Payment	Total Payment
Office: City Council					
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	District: 39				
Weir, Elias	District: 46				
Weprin, David	District: 23				
White, Jr., Thomas	District: 28		82,500		82,500
Whitehead, John	District: 42				
Yablon, Joshua	District: 6			36,592	36,592
Yassky, David	District: 33				
Zinberg, Joel	District: 5			82,500	82,500
Number of Candidates paid in Pr Number of Candidates paid in Ge Number of Candi	•	59 45 126	4,352,418	2,102,175	6,454,593
Total Number of Candidate	es paid in Primary:	75		5,403,512	24,065,860
Total Number of Candidate	•	51	. ,		
Total Numl	ber of Candidates:	155			

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
Mayor										
Bloomberg, Michael R	Non-Participant	\$84,155,868	1	\$452,326	-	-	-	-	\$84,587,319	-
Blum, Seth A	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brodeur, Christopher X	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ferrer, Fernando	Participant	\$5,287,875	6,614	\$46,966	\$3,897,336	-	\$900,000	\$900,000	\$9,165,301	\$493,928
Fields, C. Virginia	Participant	\$1,756,020	4,428	\$112	\$1,459,636	-	-	-	\$3,045,650	\$65,269
Gronowicz, Anthony	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koppel, Martin G	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMillan, Jimmy	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miller, A. Gifford	Participant	\$5,181,761	5,011	\$68,052	\$2,462,951	-	-	-	\$6,975,237	\$5,644
Ognibene, Thomas V	Participant	\$78,284	985	\$14	-	-	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$78,469	\$9,590
Piccolo, Arthur	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Silk, Audrey	Non-Participant	\$240	3	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,179	-
Weiner, Anthony D	Participant	\$2,809,873	3,682	\$228,320	\$1,710,376	-	-	-	\$4,733,583	\$74,952
Total:		\$99,269,921	20,724	\$795,790	\$9,530,299	-	\$901,000	\$901,000	\$108,586,738	\$649,383
Total for Participants:		\$15,113,813	20,720	\$343,464	\$9,530,299	-	\$901,000	\$901,000	\$23,998,240	\$649,383
Total for Non-Participant	ts:	\$84,156,108	4	\$452,326	-	-	-	-	\$84,588,498	-
Public Advocate										
Brown, Michael E	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cabbagestalk, Jr., Damon L	Participant	\$2,167	36	\$1,070	-	-	-	-	\$1,227	\$370
Goetz, Bernard H	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Golub, Jay	Participant	\$55,120	65	-	-	-	\$51,150	\$38,150	\$67,584	-
Gotbaum, Betsy F	Participant	\$1,611,975	2,088	\$4,736	\$1,170,700	-	-	-	\$2,758,397	-
Lesczynski, James L	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rasiej, Andrew C	Participant	\$337,422	1,731	-	\$774,704	-	\$525,000	\$525,000	\$1,104,478	\$19,791

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
Public Advocate										
Siegel, Norman H	Participant	\$359,554	2,185	-	\$662,760	-	-	-	\$1,019,999	\$63,605
Total:		\$2,366,238	6,105	\$5,806	\$2,608,164	-	\$576,150	\$563,150	\$4,951,685	\$83,766
Total for Participants:		\$2,366,238	6,105	\$5,806	\$2,608,164	-	\$576,150	\$563,150	\$4,951,685	\$83,766
Total for Non-Participar	nts:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comptroller										
Fein, Daniel B	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moore, Ron	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thompson, Jr., William C	Participant	\$3,844,371	2,736	\$479	-	-	-	-	\$2,380,985	\$948
Total:		\$3,844,371	2,736	\$479	-	-	-	-	\$2,380,985	\$948
Total for Participants:		\$3,844,371	2,736	\$479	-	-	-	-	\$2,380,985	\$948
Total for Non-Participar	nts:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boro President										
Alatsas, Theodore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brawley, Kevin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carrion, Jr., Adolfo	Participant	\$1,079,529	1,222	\$6,643	-	-	-	-	\$1,021,668	\$2,720
Dobrian, Joseph	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ellner, Brian V	Participant	\$511,708	1,635	-	\$708,950	-	-	-	\$1,186,866	\$1,080
Espaillat, Adriano	Participant	\$570,843	1,539	\$2,500	\$498,338	-	-	-	\$1,068,170	\$65,846
Fields, Jessie	Participant	\$47,525	466	-	\$141,189	-	-	-	\$188,559	-
Hawkins, Arrin T	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lopez, Margarita	Participant	\$497,895	1,616	-	\$453,745	-	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$889,729	\$5,000
Luisi, John	Participant	\$49,375	309	-	\$107,736	-	-	-	\$157,611	\$5,000
Manzano, Carlos	Participant	\$395,208	1,974	\$78	\$544,152	-	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$936,500	\$113,424

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
Boro President										
Markowitz, Marty	Participant	\$1,652,261	2,635	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,098,757	-
Marshall, Helen M	Participant	\$254,582	784	-	-	-	-	-	\$125,381	\$5,790
Mattera, Gloria	Participant	\$61,573	849	\$25	\$199,156	-	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$262,201	\$3,073
Michels, Stanley E	Participant	\$180,927	820	-	\$296,716	-	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$465,325	\$10,103
Molinaro, James P	Participant	\$479,357	1,119	-	\$596,660	-	-	-	\$1,003,329	-
Moskowitz, Eva S	Participant	\$941,738	1,102	\$86	\$625,788	-	-	-	\$1,571,945	\$1,746
Perkins, Bill	Participant	\$381,103	1,336	\$3,466	\$418,334	-	-	-	\$796,757	\$12,673
Popik, Barry A	Participant	\$10,025	51	-	-	-	-	-	\$8,214	\$1,810
Popkin, Gary S	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sica, Philip T	Participant	\$14,000	91	-	-	-	-	-	\$12,283	-
Stringer, Scott M	Participant	\$1,006,911	1,617	\$34,878	\$708,950	-	-	-	\$1,721,090	\$27,202
Wright, Keith	Participant	\$312,991	632	\$29,114	\$173,090	-	-	-	\$495,324	-
Total:		\$8,447,551	19,797	\$76,790	\$5,472,804	-	\$242,500	\$242,500	\$13,009,709	\$255,467
Total for Participants:		\$8,447,551	19,797	\$76,790	\$5,472,804	-	\$242,500	\$242,500	\$13,009,709	\$255,467
Total for Non-Participar	nts:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City Council										
Addabbo, Joseph P	Participant	\$47,430	249	-	-	-	-	-	\$27,028	-
Alamo-Estrada, Agustin	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allen, William A	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ampry-Samuel, Alicka T	Non-Participant	\$35,082	95	-	-	-	-	-	\$22,970	-
Antoine, Royston	Participant	\$21,865	424	-	\$59,900	-	\$11,900	\$11,900	\$77,285	-
Arroyo, Maria del Carmen	Participant	\$28,660	146	\$3,585	-	-	-	-	\$26,713	\$851
Avella, Tony	Participant	\$133,307	315	-	\$75,120	-	-	-	\$190,269	-
Baez, Maria	Participant	\$90,110	239	\$55	-	-	-	-	\$88,893	\$3,554
Baldeo, Albert J	Participant	\$103,855	258	-	\$82,500	-	\$72,000	\$72,000	\$182,068	\$1,285

Data as of March 31, 2006

Bernace, Victor A Betancourt Jr, Ismael Beys, Michael P Bilal, Charles A Billups, Charles B Blackwell, Eric S	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
Bernace, Victor A Betancourt Jr, Ismael Beys, Michael P Bilal, Charles A Billups, Charles B Blackwell, Eric S										
Betancourt Jr, Ismael Beys, Michael P Bilal, Charles A Billups, Charles B Blackwell, Eric S	Participant	\$65,854	1,130	-	\$141,077	-	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$189,611	\$225
Beys, Michael P Bilal, Charles A Billups, Charles B Blackwell, Eric S	Participant	\$14,340	242	-	\$48,900	-	-	-	\$61,945	-
Bilal, Charles A Billups, Charles B Blackwell, Eric S	Participant	\$31,385	226	-	\$79,160	-	\$10,150	\$5,650	\$114,950	\$450
Billups, Charles B Blackwell, Eric S	Participant	\$81,621	321	-	\$82,500	-	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$160,742	-
Blackwell, Eric S	Participant	\$26,195	229	-	-	-	-	-	\$20,979	\$36,341
	Participant	\$16,139	227	-	\$44,124	-	-	-	\$59,760	\$3,618
Bloch Darren S	Participant	\$14,754	167	\$911	-	-	-	-	\$4,555	\$24,469
Bloom, Barron C	Participant	\$78,496	498	\$6,229	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$167,537	-
Bloodsaw, Daryl G	Participant	\$22,797	177	-	\$37,700	-	\$45,147	\$47,794	\$59,465	\$836
Boudouvas, Peter T	Participant	\$34,473	231	\$30	\$81,960	-	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$116,115	-
Boyland, Sr., William F	Non-Participant	\$63,050	125	-	-	-	-	-	\$64,546	-
Bradian, Steve M	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brewer, Gale A	Participant	\$111,118	521	-	-	-	\$13,400	\$13,400	\$112,426	-
Brightharp, Joan J	Participant	\$8,964	150	\$3,000	\$23,848	-	\$5,700	\$5,500	\$35,741	\$5,344
Britton, A. Brinmore	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brodsky, Meryl	Participant	\$63,232	161	-	\$55,776	-	-	-	\$93,031	-
Brown Jr, Will	Participant	\$10,580	65	-	-	-	-	-	\$9,900	\$521
Campbell, Lisa Marie	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carlino, John	Participant	\$9,410	34	-	-	-	-	-	\$8,297	\$500
Carroll, Rodney L	Participant	\$40,069	339	-	\$72,420	-	-	-	\$98,863	\$8,372
Ceder, David	Participant	\$10,063	136	-	\$25,324	-	-	-	\$20,865	-
Cesnik, Eric A	Participant	\$45,352	320	\$3,184	\$46,248	-	\$5,000	\$1,822	\$93,284	\$1,665
Clarke, Yvette D	Participant	\$89,166	400	-	\$81,784	-	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$156,965	\$11,500
Comrie, Leroy G	Non-Participant	\$211,624	683	-	-	-	-	-	\$193,629	\$2,750
Cornelius, Yasmin H	Participant	\$90,112	394	-	\$82,500	-	\$6,708	\$6,708	\$148,783	\$3,822
Cox, Allen	Non-Participant	\$890	14	-	-	-	-	-	\$889	-

Data as of March 31, 2006

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
City Council										
de Blasio, Bill	Participant	\$205,458	455	\$27,260	-	-	-	-	\$233,984	-
Denis, Nelson A	Participant	\$64,727	259	\$2,821	\$70,500	-	-	-	\$138,310	\$8,900
Dickens, Inez	Participant	\$183,456	563	\$106	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$261,658	-
Dilan, Erik Martin	Participant	\$37,165	110	-	-	-	-	-	\$25,808	-
Doty, Cynthia L	Participant	\$24,551	238	\$10,462	\$65,044	-	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$84,517	-
Duggan, Essie M	Participant	\$7,150	143	-	-	-	\$3,000	-	\$4,313	\$4,450
Farmer, Bryan	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Felder, Simcha	Non-Participant	\$287,862	216	-	-	-	-	-	\$105,779	-
Feliciano, Fabian A	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fidler, Lewis A	Participant	\$43,013	259	\$5,965	\$94,592	-	-	-	\$144,778	-
Flanagan, Claudia	Participant	\$475	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flores, Rodolfo	Non-Participant	\$13,005	100	-	-	-	-	-	\$11,672	-
Foglia, Philip F	Participant	\$79,802	324	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$137,475	\$13,294
Foster, Helen Diane	Participant	\$92,902	467	\$10	\$20,625	-	-	-	\$62,969	-
Galarza, David	Participant	\$25,221	247	-	\$42,760	-	-	-	\$60,855	\$29,209
Gallagher, Dennis P	Participant	\$122,806	439	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,241,582	-
Gallo, Russell C	Participant	\$6,985	148	-	\$24,860	-	-	-	\$31,812	-
Garodnick, Daniel R	Participant	\$196,399	850	-	\$165,000	-	-	-	\$344,891	-
Gennaro, James F	Participant	\$214,792	404	\$395	\$127,204	-	-	-	\$336,418	-
Gentile, Vincent J	Participant	\$125,935	418	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$195,256	\$509
Gerson, Alan J	Participant	\$137,651	536	\$82	-	-	-	-	\$121,870	\$20,957
Gioia, Eric N	Participant	\$554,936	1,049	\$53,759	-	-	-	-	\$313,686	-
Gonzalez, Miguel M	Non-Participant	\$624	1	-	-	-	-	-	\$624	-
Gonzalez, Sara M	Participant	\$72,776	286	-	\$59,500	-	-	-	\$128,988	\$24,716
Grandoit, Tamara	Participant	\$22,248	262	\$8,000	\$73,972	-	-	-	\$100,522	\$3,763
Grupico, Salvatore A	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
City Council										
Gutnik, Oleg	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hall, Jody	Participant	\$42,761	284	-	\$71,540	-	-	-	\$100,945	\$4,750
Hanks, Nancy	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Henderson, Woody	Participant	\$8,080	163	-	\$21,580	-	-	-	\$29,272	\$9
Herbert, Anthony L	Participant	\$8,730	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$3,500
Hoffnung, Aaron M	Participant	\$75,164	274	\$15	\$82,500	-	\$9,500	\$9,500	\$129,310	\$14,984
Holly, I. Ronnie	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hooks, Erik L	Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hooks, Jr., David R	Participant	\$36,938	260	\$21	\$54,350	-	-	-	\$66,067	\$5,870
Hunter, Jereline	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jackson, Robert	Participant	\$83,065	327	\$2,750	\$57,124	-	-	-	\$109,051	\$16,574
James, Letitia	Participant	\$65,026	386	-	\$88,604	-	-	-	\$152,296	\$10,660
Jennings, Jr., Allan W	Non-Participant	\$32,610	159	-	-	-	-	-	\$33,999	-
Jimenez, Luis	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson, Joyce S	Participant	\$67,618	340	\$139	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$157,650	\$21,223
Junior, Pamela M	Participant	\$32,976	279	-	-	-	-	-	\$25,345	\$24,180
Kann, Gerald F	Participant	\$5,490	117	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,353	\$808
Karako, Jak J	Participant	\$40,728	366	-	\$100,888	-	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$130,212	-
Katz, Melinda R	Non-Participant	\$723,320	699	-	-	-	-	-	\$407,841	-
Kaufman, Stephen B	Participant	\$129,141	283	-	\$63,528	-	\$77,500	\$77,500	\$196,338	\$38,640
Kavanagh, Brian P	Participant	\$114,504	569	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$196,511	\$1,365
Kinard, Stanley	Participant	\$18,470	208	-	\$58,700	-	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$76,603	-
King, Danny	Participant	\$29,377	293	-	\$39,623	-	-	-	\$55,191	\$1,061
King, Erlene J	Participant	\$23,519	235	-	\$54,378	-	-	-	\$88,768	\$46,968
Koppell, Oliver	Participant	\$102,186	357	\$5,703	\$103,125	-	-	-	\$201,783	-
Lacomba-Walker, Raquel	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
City Council										
Lanza, Andrew J	Participant	\$58,315	259	\$210	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$139,560	\$48
Lappin, Jessica S	Participant	\$189,483	624	\$428	\$165,000	-	-	-	\$349,980	-
Lester, Jack L	Participant	\$78,488	352	-	\$93,763	-	\$67,000	\$67,000	\$159,232	\$30,603
Liu, John C	Participant	\$230,384	339	-	-	-	-	-	\$110,420	-
Lobo, Renee	Participant	\$63,040	290	-	\$91,164	-	-	-	\$153,265	\$774
Luciano, Felipe	Participant	\$75,623	375	-	\$81,280	-	-	-	\$112,265	\$29,675
Madden, Mary E	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahadeo, Robby	Participant	\$24,975	164	-	-	-	\$115,000	-	\$155,647	\$15,329
Marcial, Edwin	Participant	\$12,600	137	-	-	-	-	-	\$10,992	\$16,981
Mark-Viverito, Melissa	Participant	\$88,327	418	\$4,316	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$173,640	-
Martinez, Miguel	Non-Participant	\$183,817	383	-	-	-	-	-	\$148,015	-
Martinez, Mildred R	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMahon, Michael E	Participant	\$138,823	545	\$141	\$82,500	\$9,834	-	-	\$211,630	-
McManus, Joseph A	Participant	\$100,355	480	-	\$82,500	-	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$161,230	\$8,286
McNally, Zenobia	Participant	\$23,968	238	-	\$45,444	-	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$87,851	\$1,692
Mealy, Darlene	Participant	\$113,968	610	-	\$120,625	-	-	-	\$206,857	\$1,813
Mendez, Rosie	Participant	\$108,545	687	-	\$123,750	-	-	-	\$229,426	\$6,483
Miller, David R	Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mohamed, Ali	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monserrate, Hiram	Participant	\$185,352	706	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$267,243	-
Montague, Virginia M	Participant	\$41,148	284	\$2,000	\$82,500	-	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$38,150	\$18,890
Muhammad, Naquan A	Participant	\$11,270	121	-	-	-	-	-	\$5,880	\$975
Murphy, Patrick	Participant	\$252,831	617	-	\$82,500	-	\$25,000	\$23,000	\$326,419	\$600
Narine, Dhanpaul	Participant	\$19,862	176	-	-	-	\$5,000	-	\$26,513	\$43,817
Nath, Dilip	Participant	\$24,867	268	-	\$78,276	-	-	-	\$102,511	\$69
Nelson, Michael C	Participant	\$97,654	330	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$189,717	\$11,100

Data as of March 31, 2006

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
City Council										
Nocerino, Joseph R	Participant	\$18,736	132	-	\$75,042	-	\$100	\$100	\$93,537	\$1
Oddo, James S	Participant	\$75,000	249	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$156,004	\$506
Palma, Annabel	Participant	\$92,703	194	-	-	-	-	-	\$67,803	\$18,364
Papajohn, Christopher J	Participant	\$21,483	99	-	-	-	\$7,360	\$118	\$27,492	\$5,568
Petelka, Michael	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pu-Folkes, Bryan R	Participant	\$88,460	635	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$169,902	\$34,378
Quart, Dan	Participant	\$124,299	461	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$206,398	-
Quinn, Christine C	Participant	\$274,528	437	\$31,718	-	-	-	-	\$190,472	-
Rahman, Masud M	Participant	\$15,977	157	\$20	\$31,084	-	\$6,400	\$2,500	\$46,917	\$21,912
Recchia, Domenic M	Participant	\$140,530	402	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$183,948	-
Reyna, Diana	Participant	\$96,227	351	\$8,000	\$87,920	\$675	-	-	\$159,007	\$8,470
Rivera, George	Participant	\$20,125	254	-	\$75,875	-	-	-	\$80,324	-
Rivera, Joel	Participant	\$102,836	351	-	-	-	-	-	\$90,091	\$366
Rodriguez, Edward	Participant	\$63,640	286	\$1,490	\$82,500	-	\$37,000	\$32,000	\$148,072	\$1,260
Rosario, Antonio	Participant	\$13,005	104	-	\$30,860	-	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$43,934	-
Roth, Michael	Participant	\$12,270	119	-	\$20,392	-	-	-	\$22,040	\$68
Rubin, George E	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ruiz, John	Participant	\$26,695	307	-	\$76,556	-	\$2,500	-	\$107,064	-
Ruks, Thomas	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Russo, Pasqualino	Participant	\$118,446	393	-	\$82,100	-	-	-	\$161,836	\$43
Samad, Maryam A	Participant	\$5,765	87	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,466	-
Sanders, Jr., James J	Non-Participant	\$162,462	221	-	-	-	-	-	\$161,825	\$295
Schlanger, Craig	Participant	\$6,792	131	-	\$20,248	-	-	-	\$48,511	\$35
Seabrook, Larry B	Participant	\$42,717	230	-	\$71,000	-	-	-	\$121,615	\$58,693
Sears, Helen	Participant	\$139,885	443	\$38,984	\$103,332	-	-	-	\$269,713	-
Sementilli, Egidio J	Participant	\$9,360	14	-	-	-	-	-	\$7,927	-

Data as of March 31, 2006

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
City Council										
Sklar, Robyn L	Participant	\$10,399	217	-	\$33,172	-	-	-	\$43,458	\$370
Spitz, George N	Participant	\$27,192	243	-	-	-	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$26,142	\$34,676
Stern, Steven M	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stewart, Kendall B	Participant	\$87,818	421	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$170,408	\$18,800
Taitt, Samuel	Participant	\$44,207	360	\$3,000	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$124,906	\$9,689
Tapper, Marlene J	Participant	\$35,033	190	-	\$82,500	-	\$36,500	\$26,250	\$134,726	\$1,113
Taylor, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trainer, Richard	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tsabar, Gur J	Participant	\$79,606	451	-	\$82,500	-	\$550	\$550	\$141,666	\$1,759
Vacca, James	Participant	\$177,629	571	-	\$165,000	-	-	-	\$324,167	\$1,550
Vallone, Jr., Peter F	Participant	\$186,110	423	\$45,629	-	-	-	-	\$206,470	-
Vann, Albert	Participant	\$23,280	189	\$6,500	-	-	-	-	\$30,107	\$16,500
Vargas, Ruben Dario	Non-Participant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vazquez-Hernandez, Viviana	Participant	\$7,635	153	-	\$22,780	-	-	-	\$25,718	-
Velazquez Bennett, Yvette	Participant	\$1,800	21	-	-	-	-	\$1,000	\$750	-
Weir, Elias J	Participant	\$3,135	18	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,065	\$6,938
Weprin, David I	Participant	\$507,316	655	\$206,029	-	-	-	-	\$227,201	-
White, Jr., Thomas	Participant	\$120,822	434	\$3,000	\$82,500	-	\$7,000	-	\$215,159	\$29,913
Whitehead, John C	Participant	\$11,540	153	-	-	-	-	-	\$15,450	-
Yablon, Joshua	Participant	\$16,570	273	\$146	\$36,592	-	-	-	\$52,047	\$6,757
Yassky, David	Participant	\$567,483	1,447	\$95,045	-	-	-	-	\$210,975	-

Candidate	Classification	Net Contributions	Number of Contributors	Misc. Receipts	Public Funds Payments	Public Funds Returned	Loans Received	Loans Paid\ Forgiven	Net Expenditures	Outstanding Liabilities
City Council										
Zinberg, Joel M	Participant	\$101,553	380	-	\$82,500	-	-	-	\$183,578	-
Total:		\$11,564,399	43,019	\$581,138	\$6,454,593	\$10,509	\$726,915	\$561,792	\$16,923,740	\$867,652
Total for Participant	ts:	\$9,850,053	40,323	\$581,138	\$6,454,593	\$10,509	\$726,915	\$561,792	\$15,771,951	\$864,607
Total for Non-Partic	cipants:	\$1,714,346	2,696	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,151,789	\$3,045
Total:		\$125,492,480	92,381	\$1,460,003	\$24,065,860	\$10,509	\$2,446,565	\$2,268,442	\$145,852,857	\$1,857,216
Total for Participant	ts:	\$39,622,026	89,681	\$1,007,677	\$24,065,860	\$10,509	\$2,446,565	\$2,268,442	\$60,112,570	\$1,854,171
Total for Non-Partic	cipants:	\$85,870,454	2,700	\$452,326	-	-	-	-	\$85,740,287	\$3,045

APPENDIX J

Click here to return to main menu



INTERIM REPORT OF THE NEW YORK CITY CAMPAIGN FINANCE BOARD ON "DOING BUSINESS" CONTRIBUTIONS

June 19, 2006

Pursuant to New York City Administrative Code § 3-713, the Board reviews the results of each election and submits a report to the Mayor and the City Council in September of the year following the election, and "at such times as the Board deems appropriate." A separate mandate of the Board, under New York City Charter § 1052 (a) (12), is to consider rules regulating campaign contributions from those "doing business" with the City. The New York City Campaign Finance Board is issuing this interim report pursuant to these mandates and in anticipation of its September 2006 Post-Election Report to make public the first-ever attempt to quantify "doing business contributions" in New York City. The Board commissioned a team of graduate students in the Master's of Public Administration program at New York University's Wagner School of Public Service, participants in the school's Capstone Program, to analyze available databases and, to the extent possible, to quantify contributions to New York City candidates from those who "do business" with the City of New York. This report presents a comparison of the information available in the City's new on-line VENDEX and lobbyist databases with the information maintained in the CFB's Searchable Campaign Finance Database. The Board is in the process of independently reviewing the data. If necessary, any updates will be included in the Board's Post-Election Report published in September.

Among the initial findings of this study is the significant role that "doing business" contributors played in both the 2001 and 2005 election cycles. Specifically, the study preliminarily indicates that individuals or entities "doing business" with the City accounted for some 27.5 percent of donations in the 2001 election cycle (\$15.6 million out of \$56.8 million donated) and 22.3 percent of donations in the 2005 election cycle (\$9.4 million out of \$42.3 million donated).

History of the "Doing Business" Issue and the New York City Campaign Finance Program

The Board has been engaged in this subject since a 1998 amendment to the Charter Commission required the Board to propose "rules as it deems necessary" to regulate campaign contributions from those "doing business" with the City. In its consideration of possible rules, the Board, as directed by the Charter, balanced factors including "(1) the effectiveness of the voluntary system of campaign finance reform, (2) the costs of such system, [and] (3) the maintenance of a reasonable balance between the burdens of such system and the incentives to candidates to participate in such system."

The Board conducted an extensive study of the issue and issued three alternative versions of "doing business" rules for public comment in the hopes of identifying an effective way to regulate this area. The Board, however, received very limited responses and no consensus on an approach. Board staff then met both with the Mayor's Office of Contracts and with the City Clerk's Office to determine the extent to which the information maintained by those agencies, as examples, could assist the

Board in the enforcement of such a rule. Unfortunately, the information collected by both these agencies was inadequate for the purposes of regulation. The Board concluded in November of 2000 that it had met its Charter obligations as of that time and that it would be useless to proceed further to consider promulgating rules without the means to enforce them effectively.

More recently, the current Administration has developed two public databases—one of VENDEX, containing information about who has contracts with the City, and one for lobbyists registered with the City Clerk's office. These databases were made available on-line in April and June of 2005 respectively, but they were not originally designed for the purposes of public disclosure or regulating "doing business" contributions. The Board has been and will continue to be assisting the Administration in the further development of these and other "doing business" databases to make them reliable, searchable, available to the general public, and, ultimately, compatible with the Board's searchable database. This effort will ultimately permit disclosure and possibly other restrictions on contributions from those doing business with the City. By itself, the development of these databases will be a major achievement and the Board hopes that further progress can be made by collaborative efforts among the Administration, the Council, the Board, and concerned citizens.

In April of this year, the Board held its 4th and final public hearing on the subject of campaign contributions from those who "do business" with the City. The hearing continued the Board's general examination of "doing business" contributions, while focusing on the issues of land use, franchises, concessions, revocable consents, and licenses. The testimony heard at this and previous hearings, as well as the findings of the Capstone Report and the Board's independent study of the issue, will inform the Board's future rule-makings and recommendations on the regulation of "doing business" contributions. The Board remains convinced that the best way to regulate these contributions is by legislation, rather than rule-making. Legislation can regulate, with a targeted approach, those who "do business" rather than addressing the candidates or contributors generally. This targeted approach was adopted by the SEC and has been implemented successfully in the instance of municipal board professionals, and it is also the approach adopted in New Jersey and Connecticut.

Issues for Consideration

While the work and analysis that went into this report are an important beginning, certain constraints will require continued examination and comment:

- 1. The labor-intensiveness of the analysis due to the incompatibility of the VENDEX and lobbyist databases with the searchable Campaign Finance database, as well as the lack of quality assurance of the VENDEX and lobbyist data themselves, which are entirely self-reported, makes duplicating or expanding upon the exercise extremely difficult. Thus, any figures discussed in the report may be somewhat unreliable.
- 2. The analysis is drawn from a sample of available data and thus, while the numerical values are stated as absolute, they are actually subject to a range of variations, which is not reflected.

- 3. Although it appears that a significant amount of total contributions came from "doing business" contributors, the quantitative analysis makes no attempt to identify how many "doing business contributions" were claimed as matchable. It is thus unclear how much in public matching funds may have been claimed or awarded based upon these contributions.
- 4. The report indicates that contributions under \$2,000 make up 95 percent of all contributions to municipal offices and that 75 percent of all contributors give contributions of \$250 or less. Therefore, lowering contribution limits for all offices is a possible alternative that might more quickly and efficiently address perceived problems of undue influence through campaign contributions.
- 5. Contributions from those who "do business" with the City account for a large portion of campaign funds. Diminishing the value of these contributions—including invalidating public matching funds for them—may seriously diminish candidates' resources. Solutions to the perceived problem may then require examination of other adjustments to account for potential losses in resources for candidates.

* * *

This interim report anticipates the Board's mandated post-election report, which will be submitted to the Mayor and City Council in September of 2006. This report is intended to make public important initial data analysis, which may be useful to other interested parties as they study ways in which to address this challenging subject.

Municipal Campaign Finance and "Pay-to-Play" An Analysis of *Doing Business* Contributors in New York City



PREPARED FOR
The New York City Campaign Finance Board

BY
NYU Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
CFB Capstone Team

Mary Fischietto
Eric Friedman
Kara Merrill Verma
Paul Nelson
Anat Tamir

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Our Capstone team submits the enclosed final report to the New York City Campaign Finance Board. Our study speaks to the mandate of the 1998 City Charter revision that the CFB propose regulation of those entities and individuals who *do business* with the City. The following analysis builds upon the interim report submitted to the Board in January 2006. Our research addresses two main questions:

- 1. How can doing business with the City of New York be defined?
- 2. Is there a relationship between those entities making campaign contributions and those doing business with the City?

We have organized our study into two main parts: Part I focuses on our quantitative analysis, built around a working definition of *doing business* with the City. Part II uses a more qualitative approach to propose a broader definition for *doing business*.

Part I: Quantitative Analysis

Section 1 of Part I describes the working definition of *doing business* that reflects the scope of our quantitative analysis. Section 2 explains the methodology used for our statistical study, along with descriptive statistics of all campaign contributions from the 2001 and 2005 election cycles. Using our working definition of *doing business*, we analyzed the 2001 and 2005 election cycles by drawing a random sample from the CFB's database of donors and looking at the giving trends among those *doing business* with the City – as captured in the VENDEX and New York City Lobbyist Search databases.

Section 3 lays out our findings. Our primary finding from the quantitative analysis is that *doing* business contributors played a significant role in both the 2001 and 2005 election cycles. Specifically, we found that individuals or entities *doing business* with the City accounted for:

- 27.5% of donations in the 2001 election cycle (\$15.6 million out of \$56.8 million donated); and,
- 22.3% of donations in the 2005 election cycle (\$9.4 million out of \$42.3 million donated).

Section 4 describes the limitations and technical constraints of the study's data sources.

Part II: Qualitative Analysis

In Section 1 of Part II, we establish our proposed definition of *doing business*, which encompasses a broader range of *doing business* activities. To explore the issues and implications raised by this more comprehensive definition, we provide several subgroup analyses in Section 2. We first present a "Micro-Sample Analysis," probing a segment of the donors we studied in our larger sample. Here we attempted to capture those donors who *do business* with the City under our expanded definition with research in various sources outside the VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist Search databases, focusing on the 2005 mayoral and City Council campaigns, as well as intermediaries for the 2005 election cycle.

This exercise yielded a fairly marked disparity between our proposed definition and the working definition used in the random sample analysis:

- Under the working definition, we found that 5.4% of contributors to mayoral campaigns were doing business donors; under our proposed definition, we found that 14.0% of contributors to mayoral campaigns were doing business with the City.
- Under the working definition, we found that 4.0% of contributors to City Council were doing business donors; under our proposed definition, we found that 11.7% of contributors to City Council campaigns were doing business with the City.
- Under the working definition, we found that 23.1% of intermediaries were doing business with the City; under the proposed definition, we found that 41.2% of intermediaries were doing business.

We continue this more intensive analysis with three case studies, to help further illuminate the limits of the working definition used in our quantitative analysis. The studies also highlight some of the complexities and trade-offs that must be considered as part of any discussion of a broader *doing business* definition. Our first case study focuses on a company that holds a concession to sell pretzels via pushcarts in City parks. Our section on land use presents a pair of case studies, putting a spotlight on the campaign contributions of a large Manhattan development firm and an LLC formed to redevelop an abandoned industrial site in Brooklyn. Lastly, we look at the not-for-profit sector, which holds a significant number of large City contracts, examining the campaign contributions of not-for-profit board members and employees.

The information contained in this report does not in any way demonstrate a causal relationship between *doing business* and making campaign contributions, though our analysis shows an overlap between the two activities indeed exists. In addition, our findings cannot demonstrate a causal relationship between making campaign contributions and receiving benefits from any particular City decision. There is nothing in our data that allows us to conclude that contributions have influenced the awarding (or refusal) of any contract or other benefit.

As such, our data do not provide direct evidence of a "pay-to-play" culture in New York City, much less define its scope. Nevertheless, there are still citizens and businesspeople who believe that special interest donors wield undue influence over government officials, and that "pay-to-play" is the dominant *modus operandi*. We believe this perception is corrosive in and of itself. While stricter rules on giving can close off potential loopholes and preempt wrongdoing, any *doing business* regulation we propose is meant, in large part, to help reverse those perceptions and restore the electorate's confidence in City government.

We must also note the limitations posed by data constraints. The records in VENDEX are not regularly audited or quality-assured, and some necessary information is incomplete, outdated or simply not collected. This may have resulted in an underestimate of the overlap between *doing business* entities and campaign contributors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	2
Part I: Quantitative Analysis	3
Section 1: Working Definition of <i>Doing Business</i>	4
Section 2: Methodology	5
Section 3: Findings	12
Section 4: Technical Constraints and Recommendations	18
Part II: Qualitative Analysis	21
Section 1: Proposed Definition of <i>Doing Business</i>	22
Section 2: Qualitative "Micro-Sample" Analysis	25
Section 3: Case Studies	28
Conclusion	41
Part III: Appendices	43
Appendix A: Data Sources	44
Appendix B: Aggregation Process	46
Appendix C: Process for Searching VENDEX and Lobbyist Databases	49
Appendix D: Data Cleaning Process	52
Appendix E: Definitional Considerations	54
Appendix F: Government Actors in Land Use Decisions	60
Acknowledgements	61

INTRODUCTION

As charged by the Campaign Finance Board in the fall of 2005, our Capstone team has attempted to define what it means to *do business* with the City of New York. We have applied our definitions to existing data to highlight the relationship between those *doing business* with the City and those making political donations in City campaigns. This is more than a purely theoretical exercise. We hope the study informs future efforts to regulate campaign contributions from *doing business* donors.

The New York City Campaign Finance Board and the Campaign Finance Program were created in the mid-1980s as a response to corruption scandals in City government. Since then, City voters have supported charter revisions that strengthened the ability of the CFB to limit the influence of large donations from private sources. The 1998 Charter Revision mandated the CFB specifically to propose rules to "regulate the acceptance by candidates...of campaign contributions from individuals and entities doing business with the city." This charge provides the rationale for our study.

•

¹ New York City Charter, §1052(11)(a).

PART I: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

SECTION 1: WORKING DEFINITION OF DOING BUSINESS

Working Definition

For the purpose of quantifying the frequency of *doing business* contributions in citywide elections, our working definition of *doing business* includes:

- Firms or individuals who are principals of firms who have contracts with the City valued at \$100,000 or more; and/or
- Registered lobbyists and lobbyist clients.

For the quantitative analysis, our working definition was guided wholly by two factors: the availability of data from the VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist Search databases, and the lack of any other similarly comprehensive data source on individuals' business dealings with the City. This practical, working definition provides a good start from which to examine the relationship between campaign contributors and those *doing business* with the City. A firm with a City contract is clearly involved in a business relationship with New York City government, and for practical purposes, lobbyists and their clients represent a broad cross-section of interests seeking influence over policy decisions.

A report prepared in 2000 by the New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG) on the City's top lobbying interests notes:

"Most people associate lobbying with pending legislation and budgetary decisions... However, our review shows that it is real estate and land use concerns which dominate the agenda of these big spenders... A careful review of lobbyist disclosure forms reveals a good deal. Topics and issues lobbied ranged from the Commercial Rent Tax, sound stages for Kaufman Astoria Studios, housing developments in Brighton Beach and the JFK Airport rail link."²

A similar analysis of expenditures on lobbyists over the past few years would find a comparable range of issues, from large retail firms seeking approval to develop a site for a new store to non-profit hospitals seeking capital funding. There is some currency to the position that a regulation on lobbyist contributions would make a significant contribution towards lessening the influence of campaign money from "business-doers" who are not City contractors.

City policymakers share a concern for diminishing the influence of lobbyists on the policy process. In February, Mayor Bloomberg and City Council Speaker Christine Quinn introduced a set of reforms to New York City's lobbying laws, including a prohibition on matching funds for campaign contributions from lobbyists.³ With the VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist databases in place, enforcement is all the more feasible. In terms of viability, this limited working definition is the most logical basis for an immediate, if preliminary, assessment of *doing business* regulation.

³ This bill was unanimously passed into law by the City Council on May 24, 2006.

4

NYPIRG, "The Big Apple's Big Spenders: The City's Top Lobby Interests." http://www.nypirg.org/spenders/default.html

SECTION 2: METHODOLOGY

Overview

Our team conducted a statistical analysis of New York City campaign contributions from the 2001 and 2005 election cycles. Using a database of information on donations and donors provided to us by the Campaign Finance Board, in conjunction with publicly available data on contributors' business dealings contained in the City's VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist Search databases, our analysis examines the magnitude of the "pay-to-play" phenomenon. Given the constraints of these two data sources (which are described in detail in Section 4) the prevalence of "pay-to-play" may be considerably understated by our study. A detailed description of each data source is available in Appendix A.

In conducting this analysis, our primary research question was: is there a relationship between individuals and entities that make municipal campaign contributions and entities that *do business* with the City? More specifically, our study aimed to answer the following questions:

- What is the nature of that relationship and how strong is it?
- What proportion of campaign contributors do business with the City?
- Are certain municipal offices more likely to attract contributions from those who do business with the City than others?
- Are donors who contribute above a certain dollar amount more likely to be doing business with the City than smaller contributors?

In order to answer these questions, we designed and applied a random sampling methodology to analyze the 2001 and 2005 New York City election cycle campaign contributions. Our examination of contributions involved redefining the unit of analysis and performing three distinct analyses.⁵

Unit of Analysis: Contribution vs. Contributor

In its database, the CFB keeps individual records for each individual campaign contribution. For example, if one individual gives one contribution each to three City Council candidates, the CFB database lists each of these transactions separately, for a total of three records. To better answer our research question, we aggregated these individual records so that only one record exists for each individual contributor who donated to candidates for each of the five levels of municipal office (Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, Borough President and City Council).

The rationale for aggregating from individual contribution to individual contributor to municipal office is based largely on our research team's questions regarding the nature of the "pay-to-play" phenomenon. Because we are examining the relationship between campaign contributors and those who *do business* with the City, we focused on the individual contributor, not the individual contribution. In their original format, the data fail to capture the overall impact of an individual's campaign contributions. For example, suppose that Mary Martinez made four contributions of \$1,000 each to three mayoral candidates during the 2001 election cycle. If we analyzed the campaign contribution data without aggregating them, our analysis would yield 12 individual contributions of \$1,000 each. By aggregating the records to the level of individual

⁴ The 2001 election cycle includes contributions given between January 12, 1998 and January 11, 2002. The 2005 election cycle includes contributions given between January 12, 2002 and January 11, 2006.

⁵Additional subgroup analyses, more qualitative in nature, were also conducted to explore in more detail the campaign contributions of certain entities that were not fully or partially observable in the VENDEX or Lobbyist databases. These analyses are described in the Subgroup Analyses section of this report.

contributor to municipal office, however, our analysis focused on Mary Martinez and the \$12,000 she contributed to mayoral candidates. Aggregating the data as such provides a more accurate picture of an individual contributor's giving behavior than the disaggregated data.

Furthermore, because we assumed that no individual contributor can truly know the outcome of an election before it takes place, we focused on the individual's total contributions to all candidates for a municipal office, rather than an individual's total contributions to a specific candidate. Not only did this allow our research team to examine differences in contribution trends among the five municipal offices, it further centered the analysis on the individual contributor (rather than on individual candidates). To return to the example of Mary Martinez, looking at three contributions of \$4,000 to three individual mayoral candidates tells us less about her potential desire to gain influence than the fact that she donated a total of \$12,000 to all mayoral candidates in the 2001 election cycle.

Finally, the aggregation process allowed our team to segregate donors by their total contribution amount. It was important to be able to provide solid data on the number of contributors who are giving at various levels to the five municipal offices. Specific details on how this aggregation was performed are available in Appendix B.

Statistical Analyses

1. Population of 2001 and 2005 Election Cycle Contributors

In order to get a more complete sense of the universe of campaign contributors, we first conducted an analysis of the entire pool of 2001 and 2005 election cycle campaign contributors. Using our aggregated data, we segmented the 123,234 and 84,857 contributors from the 2001 and 2005 election cycles by the five municipal offices (Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, Borough President and City Council). We then further segmented these data into three contribution categories. Those contributors who gave a total of \$250 or less to a given municipal office in an election cycle were grouped into the low contribution category. Those who gave between \$251 and \$1,999 to a given municipal office in an election cycle were grouped into the medium contribution category, while those who gave \$2,000 or more were grouped into the high contribution category.

This comprehensive quantitative analysis allowed our research team to get a better sense of the characteristics of campaign contributors and provided the lens through which we would examine the "pay-to-play" phenomenon.

2. Doing Business Sample of Contributors

Although the aggregation process described in the unit of analysis discussion above significantly reduced the number of individual records in the population, the number of 2001 and 2005 election cycle contributors to municipal office (208,091) was still too large to be able to analyze each individually. For this reason, we conducted our analysis of *doing business* campaign contributors using a stratified random sample of 2001 and 2005 election cycle campaign contributors. Samples of 50 were drawn from each giving category (low, medium and high) within each municipal office for both election cycles. Intermediary contributors, discussed in detail below, were excluded from this analysis and examined separately.

Drawing and cleaning the samples gave us a total random sample of 758 contributors for the 2001 election cycle and 760 contributors for the 2005 election cycle. We then searched the VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist Search databases to determine which of these randomly selected

contributors *do business* with the City. For the purposes of this analysis, our definition of *doing business* – the "working definition" – was limited to the data available in the aforementioned sources. A contributor must therefore fulfill one of the following two conditions in order to be deemed as *doing business* with the City. They must be:

- 1) listed in the VENDEX database; or
- 2) listed as a lobbyist or client in NYC Lobbyist Search.

Given the paucity of publicly available data on individuals' and entities' business dealings with the City, this working definition is the most reasonable definition of *doing business* for the broad quantitative analysis.

3. Doing Business Sample of Intermediaries

According to the CFB's New York City Campaign Finance Handbook, intermediaries "are people who, or organizations that, solicit, collect, and deliver contributions to a campaign from other people or organizations." Also called 'bundlers,' these contributors are subject to special reporting requirements by the CFB because of their potential to influence candidates. For this reason, we focused our statistical analysis on this group of donors as well.

To examine the extent to which intermediaries *do business* with the City, we performed a separate statistical analysis of intermediated contributions. For this study, all contributions that had a value in the "intermediary name" field of the CFB database were extracted and aggregated as described above. After aggregation only a small number of records remained (1,313 and 356 for the 2001 and 2005 cycles, respectively), and therefore a representative random sample was drawn for each election cycle from the entire aggregated population. These records were then cleaned and researched in the VENDEX and Lobbyist databases using the same methods employed for the large sample.

Population Statistics

The deletion and aggregation processes significantly reduced the number of individual records in the CFB 2001 and 2005 election cycle datasets (from 186,067 to 123,234 records for 2001, and from 122,205 to 84,857 records for 2005). The 123,234 contributors from the 2001 election cycle and the 84,857 contributors from the 2005 election cycle constituted the populations from which our research team conducted its comprehensive analysis of campaign contributions.

A total of 123,234 donors gave \$47,368,202 to 299 candidates in the 2001 election cycle, and 84,857 donors contributed \$40,212,516 to 192 candidates in the 2005 election cycle (see Tables 1 and 2). For purposes of this analysis, we excluded Mayor Michael Bloomberg's donations to his own campaign for the 2001 and 2005 election cycles, which totaled \$73,000,000 and \$78,655,868, respectively. Including these significant outliers in our sample would have skewed our population statistics.

The total dollar amount of contributions decreased slightly in the 2005 election cycle, while the number of candidates receiving those contributions dropped from 299 in the 2001 election cycle to 193 in the 2005 election cycle. When term limits took effect in 2001, many municipal office seats that had been held for years became vacant, giving rise to a competitive election

⁶ Given the limitations of the data, it cannot be guaranteed that an entity or individual selected for the sample would be found in the VENDEX or Lobbyist databases. The processes used to clean the sample and determine if those individuals and entities randomly selected into the sample were in the VENDEX and/or the NYC Lobbyist Search databases are described in detail in Appendix D and C, respectively.

⁷ New York City Campaign Finance Board, *New York City Campaign Finance Handbook*, New York, 2005, pp. 2-14.

⁸ This method differed from that used for the large sample where entities and individuals were grouped by contribution category and office before sampling was performed.

that saw several challengers running for these open seats. In the 2005 election cycle, there were many more incumbents on the ballot, narrowing the number of challengers, the number of total candidates, the number of individual campaign contributors, and the total amount of money spent.

TABLE 1

Number of Individual Contributors to Municipal Campaigns, by Office:

New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles

	2001 Elec	tion Cycle	2005 Election Cycle		
Municipal Office	Number of Contributors	% of Total Contributors	Number of Contributors	% of Total Contributors	
Mayor	24,803	20.1	18,662	22.0	
Public Advocate	10,308	8.4	6,054	7.1	
Comptroller	5,239	4.3	3,227	3.8	
Borough President	19,449	15.8	18,078	21.3	
City Council	63,434	51.5	38,302	45.1	
Undeclared	1	0.0	534	0.6	
Total	123,234	100.0	84,857	100.0	

TABLE 2
Contribution Dollar Totals, by Office:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles

Municipal Office	2001 Electio	n Cycle	2005 Election Cycle		
	Total Contribution Amount in Dollars	% of Total Contribution Amount	Total Contribution Amount in Dollars	% of Total Contribution Amount	
Mayor	22,688,457	47.9	14,064,916	35.0	
Public Advocate	4,472,960	9.4	2,324,483	5.8	
Comptroller	3,117,100	6.7	4,004,761	10.0	
Borough President	5,443,505	11.5	8,111,852	20.2	
City Council	11,645,680	24.6	11,567,046	28.7	
Undeclared	500	0.0	139,458	0.3	
Total	47,368,202	100.0	40,212,516	100.0	

Candidates for City Council (259 in 2001 and 153 in 2005) attracted the greatest number of contributors in both election cycles. However, in total dollar amount of contributions, they trailed candidates for Mayor by significant margins in both elections.

The vast majority of contributors still gave "small" donations in both election cycles. Approximately three-quarters of all contributors gave less than \$250 to a municipal office in 2001 and 2005, and approximately 95% of all contributors gave less than \$2,000 to a municipal office. Only the top 5% of contributors in both election cycles gave more than \$2,000 to a municipal office in the 2001 and 2005 election cycles.

TABLE 3
% Distribution of Contributors, by Contribution Category and Office:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles

			2001 EI	ection Cycle		
Contribution Category	Mayor	Public Advocate	Comptroller	Borough President	City Council	% of All Contributors
\$0 - \$250	11.7	6.3	2.8	12.6	45.2	78.8
\$251 - \$1,999	5.4	1.5	1.0	2.7	5.6	16.3
\$2,000 and greater	3.1	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	5.0
% of All Contributors	20.1	8.4	4.3	15.8	51.5	100.0

			2005 Ele	ction Cycle		
Contribution Category	Mayor	Public Advocate	Comptroller	Borough President	City Council	% of All Contributors
\$0 - \$250	14.0	5.8	1.5	15.4	37.2	74.0
\$251 - \$1,999	5.4	1.0	1.4	4.6	6.5	19.0
\$2,000 and greater	2.7	0.4	0.9	1.4	1.7	7.0
% of All Contributors	22.1	7.2	3.8	21.4	45.4	100.0

As would be expected, in terms of absolute dollar amounts, the largest donors (those giving \$2,000 or more) account for a much greater share of the total dollars going to candidates for office than those giving up to \$2,000. More than half of the total dollars contributed to municipal offices in the 2001 and 2005 election cycles came from donors giving \$2,000 or more.

In three of the five municipal offices, the proportion of campaign dollars coming from the largest contributors increased dramatically between the 2001 and 2005 election cycles. Only 28.8% of all campaign dollars for the office of Borough President were contributed by those giving more than \$2,000 in the 2001 election cycle. In the 2005 election cycle, that figure increased to 48.6%. Similar trends were recorded for the offices of Comptroller and City Council. Not only were there more donors giving in this largest contribution category, but they contributed a much greater proportion of the total dollar amounts going to municipal campaigns.

TABLE 4
% Distribution of Contribution Totals, by Contribution Category and Office:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles*

	20	2001 Election Cycle			2005 Election Cycle		
Municipal Office	\$0 - \$250	\$251 - \$1,999	\$2,000 and greater	\$0 - \$250	\$251 - \$1,999	\$2,000 and greater	
Mayor	7.6	22.5	69.9	10.6	24.2	65.2	
Public Advocate	19.6	29.4	51.0	24.7	25.9	49.4	
Comptroller	16.8	31.0	52.1	5.3	23.6	71.1	
Borough President	32.1	39.7	28.1	17.9	33.5	48.6	
City Council	41.1	34.5	24.4	24.4	31.8	43.9	
All Offices	20.4	28.6	51.0	16.3	28.3	55.4	

^{*}Contributions to "Undeclared" are excluded from this analysis: \$500 in the 2001 election cycle and \$139,458 in the 2005 election cycle

The number of intermediary contributors decreased dramatically (by more than 72%) in the 2005 election cycle. This decrease was coupled with a drop in the total dollars funneled to municipal candidates through intermediaries (see Tables 5 and 6).

TABLE 5

Number of Intermediary Contributors to Municipal Campaigns, by Office:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles

	2001 Elec	tion Cycle	2005 Election Cycle		
Municipal Office	Number of Intermediaries	% of Intermediaries	Number of Intermediaries	% of Intermediaries	
Mayor	666	50.7	111	31.2	
Public Advocate	100	7.6	12	3.4	
Comptroller	84	6.4	10	2.8	
Borough President	95	7.2	110	30.9	
City Council	368	28.0	103	28.9	
Undeclared	0	0.0	10	2.8	
Total	1,313	100.0	356	100.0	

TABLE 6
Intermediary Contribution Dollar Totals, by Office:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles

	2001 Election	Cycle	2005 Election Cycle		
Municipal Office	Intermediary Contribution Amount in Dollars	% of Total Intermediary Contribution Amount	Intermediary Contribution Amount in Dollars	% of Total Intermediary Contribution Amount	
Mayor	7,719,822	81.6	1,446,038	62.6	
Public Advocate	437,550	4.6	41,835	1.8	
Comptroller	659,827	7.0	53,425	2.3	
Borough President	313,557	3.3	412,983	17.9	
City Council	326,133	3.4	324,288	14.0	
Undeclared	0	0.0	32,750	1.4	
Total	9,456,889	100.0	2,311,319	100.0	

11

SECTION 3: FINDINGS

Under our working definition, individuals and entities that appear either in VENDEX or NYC Lobbyist Search are considered to be *doing business* with the City of New York. Based upon our analysis of the random sample of donors drawn from the entire population of donors described above, it is clear that *doing business* contributors played a significant role in both the 2001 and 2005 election cycles.

According to the results of our analysis:

- Of the \$56,824,591⁹ contributed in the 2001 election cycle, 27.5% or \$15,647,574 was donated by individuals or entities deemed to be *doing business* with the City of New York.
- Of the \$42,384,377¹⁰ contributed in the 2005 election cycle, 22.3% or \$9,433,261 was donated by individuals or entities deemed to be *doing business* with the City of New York.

These numbers reflect the total contributions of all *doing business* donors, both intermediaries and non-intermediated contributors (hereafter referred to as *contributors*). In order to glean more information on the giving trends of these two classes of donors, we examined them separately. Findings from these analyses are discussed in detail below.

Analysis of 2001 and 2005 Election Cycle Contributors

The results of our statistical analysis of contributors show that while *doing business* subjects made up a relatively small percentage of the total number of contributors in both election cycles, they gave a disproportionately large percentage of the total dollars donated to candidates.

In the 2001 election cycle:

- 3.8% of all contributors to office were doing business with the City;
- 25.2% of the total dollars contributed were from doing business donors; and
- Of the \$47,367,702 in contributions, \$11,931,017 was from *doing business* donors.

In the 2005 election cycle:


·

- 5.3% of all contributors to office were doing business with the City;
- 21.5% of the total contributions were from doing business donors; and
- Of the \$40,073,058 in contributions, \$8,626,611 was from doing business donors.

⁹ Our analysis of the 2001 election cycle campaign contributions excluded Mayor Michael Bloomberg's \$73,000,000 contribution to his own campaign, as an outlier, as well as \$500 designated as "undeclared."

¹⁰ Our analysis of the 2005 election cycle campaign contributions excluded Mayor Michael Bloomberg's \$78,655,868 contribution to his own campaign, as an outlier, as well as \$139,458 designated as "undeclared."


Chart 1:
% of Contributors *Doing Business* and Their Share of Total Dollars Contributed:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles



In other words, 3.8% of contributors to office donated 25.2% of the money to candidates in the 2001 election cycle, while 5.3% of contributors to office donated 21.5% of the money to candidates in the 2005 election cycle. *Doing business* donors, though few in number, served as significant sources of money for candidates in both election cycles.

This trend holds across municipal office. For all offices, while *doing business* contributors represented a relatively small percentage of contributors, they contributed a disproportionately large percentage of the money to municipal campaigns. Perhaps nowhere is this trend more evident than in races for Borough President in the 2001 election cycle. Although only 8.0% of contributors to Borough President candidates were determined to be *doing business* with the City of New York, they contributed more than 81% of the money to campaigns for the office (see Chart 2a).

Chart 2a:
% of Contributors *Doing Business* and Their Share of Total Dollars Contributed:
New York City, 2001 Election Cycle



While the Borough President race in the 2001 election cycle is certainly exceptional, it follows the trend among offices across election cycles. In the 2005 election cycle races for City Council, for example, *doing business* contributors represented only 4.0% of total contributors to the office. However, these *doing business* donors gave 33.9% of the total dollars contributed to the race (see Chart 2b). This differential, consistent across all offices and across both election cycles, indicates that *doing business* contributors are an important source of campaign funds for all offices.




Chart 2b:
% of Contributors *Doing Business* and Their Share of Total Dollars Contributed:
New York City, 2005 Election Cycle

Given the differential between the small number of contributors and the significant amount of money they contribute, it is not surprising that among the three different contribution categories used in this analysis, the highest contribution categories in both election cycles contained the greatest number of *doing business* donors. While only 1.6% of donors in the lowest contribution category were *doing business* with the City of New York, a full 20.8% of donors in the high contribution category were found to be *doing business* in the 2001 election cycle.





Chart 3a:
% of Contributors *Doing Business*, by Contribution Category:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles


The difference between the number of *doing business* contributors in low and high contribution categories decreased slightly in the 2005 election cycle. Of the total dollars given by those donors in the highest contribution category, *doing business* contributors donated 26.1% and 19.5% of high contribution category campaign dollars in the 2001 and 2005 election cycles, respectively.

Chart 3b:
% of Total Contributions from *Doing Business* Donors, by Contribution Category:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles



The large majority of *doing business* contributors represented contractors with the City of New York. In both election cycles, approximately 70% of all *doing business* contributors were listed in VENDEX (see Chart 4a). In the 2001 election cycle, 25.1% of *doing business* contributors could be found in NYC Lobbyist Search, either as registered lobbyists or as clients of lobbyists. This number decreased slightly in the 2005 election cycle as more *doing business* donors (9.8% in 2005 as opposed to 5.8% in 2001) could be found in both VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist Search.


Chart 4a:
% Distribution of *Doing Business* Contributors, by Type of *Doing Business*:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles



Whether *doing business* contributors were in VENDEX or NYC Lobbyist Search, the relative amount of money they contributed to campaigns was consistent with the respective number of contributors in the *doing business* category. For example, the 70.6% of *doing business*

contributors who were in VENDEX in the 2005 election cycle contributed 71.2% of the total *doing business* dollars, while the 19.6% of *doing business* contributors found in NYC Lobbyist Search for the same election cycle contributed 20.5% of total *doing business* dollars.

Chart 4b:
% Distribution of Total *Doing Business* Dollars, by Type of *Doing Business*:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycle



Analysis of 2001 and 2005 Election Cycle Intermediaries

Among the intermediaries in our random sample, there was a much greater number of *doing* business donors than among non-intermediated contributors.

In the 2001 election cycle:


- 29.1% of intermediary contributors were *doing business* with the City (as compared to 3.8% of non-intermediated contributors).
- **39.3**% of total intermediary contributions were made through *doing business* intermediaries; of the \$9,456,889 donated through intermediaries, \$3,716,557 came from *doing business* intermediaries.

In the 2005 election cycle:

- **23.1%** of intermediary contributors were *doing business* with the City (as compared to 5.3% of non-intermediated contributors).
- 34.9% of total intermediary contributions were made through doing business intermediaries; of the \$2,311,319 donated through intermediaries, \$806,650 came from doing business intermediaries.


Our examination of intermediaries reveals a clear trend that developed between the 2001 and 2005 election cycles: lobbyists took a much more active role as intermediaries during the 2005 election cycle. While lobbyists represented only 28.1% of intermediary *doing business* donors in the 2001 election cycle, by 2005 they made up almost half of all *doing business* contributors (48.0%).

Chart 5a:
% Distribution of *Doing Business* Intermediaries, by Type of *Doing Business*:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles



The explosion in the proportion of intermediary contributors listed in NYC Lobbyist Search in the 2005 election cycle was also reflected in the amount of money contributed by these intermediaries. For the 2001 election cycle, lobbyists comprised 28.1% of the *doing business* intermediaries, and contributed only 24.1% of the total intermediary *doing business* dollars. However, in the 2005 election cycle, lobbyists represented 48% of the *doing business* intermediaries, and bundled almost 70% of the intermediated *doing business* dollars, a remarkable increase.

Chart 5b:
% Distribution of Intermediary *Doing Business* Dollars, by Type of *Doing Business*:
New York City, 2001 and 2005 Election Cycles



SECTION 4: TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of this analysis was to quantify the extent to which campaign contributors *do business* with the City of New York, insofar as it could be determined from the data contained in our three primary sources. Reliance on these databases for our analysis posed a number of difficulties because the data were limited, difficult to access and not fully representative of all the possible transactions that constitute *doing business*.

Some technical constraints and concerns are set forth below. To be implemented, each recommendation would require a different level of commitment and resources from various City agencies to address the constraints. Clearly, additional research would need to be conducted to determine the true feasibility and priority of implementing any recommendation. Any changes should aim to effectively and efficiently increase the CFB's ability to more accurately and comprehensively determine—and monitor—those who *do business*.

1. Difficulty Accessing and Searching VENDEX Database

A limitation our team faced was an inability to perform broad-based searches. We were unable to obtain back-end VENDEX data (i.e. database tables) from the New York City Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (DOITT), which limited the means available for matching data to the online access page. The online system, although inclusive of all data, allows searches by last name or entity name only. The online search is cumbersome because it allows only one name or entity to be researched at a time, and requires that names be searched using last name only. Some practical implications of this constraint are:

- You must enter the name of an entity exactly as it is recorded in the databases. For instance, if you enter "Salvation Army," but the record is stored as "The Salvation Army," no data will be returned. Therefore, each entity/individual selected in the sample must be entered individually in a variety of manners to ensure that, if it is in the databases, it is discovered.
- Because you cannot enter a first name, common last names return multiple pages of records. For example if you enter Smith, 23 pages of records are returned that must be sorted through manually in order to find the record you are aiming to retrieve.

2. Difficulty Accessing and Searching Lobbyist Database

Our team was also unable to obtain back-end Lobbyist data from DOITT. However, unlike VENDEX, any part of an individual or entity's name may be entered to receive results in NYC Lobbyist Search. Despite this capability, the Lobbyist database is flawed because many pages of material wholly unrelated to the name entered are often returned.

3. Inability to Reconcile Data in Multiple Databases

Data are stored differently in each of the three databases used in our study. Therefore, performing a review of all contributors is extremely difficult because running queries between the CFB database and the VENDEX or Lobbyist databases is not currently possible. For example, running a query between the CFB and VENDEX databases based on matching names would yield many incorrect results, because entity and individual names may be common or spelled in a variety of manners. The CFB noted this concern in an April 2005 press release:

"The new VENDEX system – until it is 'cleaned up' – will yield both materially over-inclusive and materially under-inclusive results for those looking at overlaps between the

information VENDEX contains and the information in the Board's comprehensive, searchable database of campaign contributions. As a result, use of this system at this stage would create a high risk of error and potential embarrassment. Most important for the Board's purposes, the VENDEX system is not at this stage compatible with the Board's searchable database."

4. Limited Data Sources

Our review of the relationship between campaign contributors and *doing business* with the City was based upon a limited amount of publicly available data. For instance, the VENDEX and Lobbyist databases do not capture all land use activities deemed *doing business* transactions. Similarly, if land use transactions are determined to constitute *doing business*, information from applications to land use boards will have to be compiled and stored in a database. This clearinghouse of information could be referenced by campaigns, regulators, or the public to determine if a particular contributor *does business* with the City.

5. Validity and Comprehensiveness of Data Entered in City Databases

The process by which data are received and entered into the VENDEX and Lobbyist databases varies across agencies. Because a wide variety of City agencies award contracts, it is difficult to determine if information is cleanly and comprehensively entered into VENDEX. These concerns created some uncertainty about our ability to accurately capture all matches when searching the selected contributors in these databases.

Among unresolved questions are:

- Who is responsible for entering data?
- What, if any, protocol is followed to ensure these data are entered accurately?
- How often are entries made?
- How complete are the data that currently reside on the site?
- Could additional information be added to the databases?
- Does the information found in a sample of current paper contracts match the information stored in VENDEX?

Armed with this information, appropriate steps can be taken to strengthen data collection, entry and storage, which will in turn enhance capacity to recognize contributors that *do business* and enforce regulation.

6. Comprehensiveness and Accuracy of VENDEX Principal Listings

With regard to our analysis, the listing of principals is flawed in three manners. First, principals are not assigned to specific contracts, so it is not possible to determine whether the principal is associated with the listed contract. For example, when conducting a search using an individual's name in VENDEX yields one company with five contracts, it is not possible to determine if that individual is involved in those contracts. You may search for "John Doe," which returns one company name with a list of 20 other principals and 100 accompanying contracts. From this list, you cannot determine if any of the 100 contracts are associated with the principal in question. Second, it is not required that all managers complete a VENDEX questionnaire. ¹¹ Therefore, an individual who is a primary City contact for obtaining the contract and delivering the services may

-

¹¹ The principal questionnaire requires that all of the submitting vendor's principal owners and the three officers who exercise the most substantial degree of control over the submitting vendor submit a questionnaire. The City defines a principal as: An individual, partnership, joint venture or corporation that holds a ten (10) percent or greater ownership interest in a submitting vendor or subcontractor. An officer is defined as: Any individual who serves as or performs the functions of chief executive officer, chief financial officer, or chief operating officer of the submitting vendor, without regard to such individual's title, e.g., president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, board chairperson, trustee, (individual or entity who administers a trust) or their equivalents.

not be present in the system. Finally, retired principals or persons no longer employed by the company may be listed in VENDEX, even if they are not associated with any contracts from the election cycle under study.

7. Small Contracts Unrecorded

Currently, VENDEX only captures contracts from companies that have \$100,000 or more in business contracts. It does not capture awards for smaller figures, which may be more likely to be granted through discretionary processes and could represent a large proportion of total revenue, especially for smaller companies. This limitation prevents the study of any of these entities that may be *doing business* with the City.

PART II: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

SECTION 1: PROPOSED DEFINITION OF DOING BUSINESS

For the purpose of assessing the true nature of *doing business* in the City in its broadest possible sense, with the idea of discussing areas for future regulation, our proposed *doing business* definition is as follows:

a) Contractors and prospective contractors

- Firms (including not-for-profits) that have contracts with a City agency totaling \$100,000 or more in any given year;
- Firms that have submitted a bid for such a contract;
- Firms that have entered into a franchise or concession agreement with a City agency;
- Subsidiaries of such a firm, or subcontractors named in a qualified proposal whose portion of such contract is valued at \$100,000 or more;
- Individuals who are chief executives, officers, owners of a ten percent share of such a firm, or any other individual who is authorized to represent the prospective contractor before the City;
- Political action committees formed by a regulated firm or individual;

b) Parties to land use decisions

- Firms who submit an application to the City Planning Commission subject to the Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP), to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA), or the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC);
- Individuals who are chief executives, officers, owners of a ten percent share of such a firm;
- Professionals who are authorized to represent an applicant before these boards and commissions;
- Subsidiaries of or entities owned wholly by such a firm;

c) Lobbyists

- Individuals registered as lobbyists with the City Clerk's office;
- Firms that hire a lobbyist.

It is self-evident to most any observer of government that influence-seeking is not limited to current City contractors and lobbyists. However, if there is any hope of enforcing a regime that will reduce influence-seeking donations from other sources, it is necessary to define these other sources with some precision.

We weighed several factors when considering whether a particular entity should be subject to a *doing business* regulation that restricts its ability to make campaign contributions:

- Would the donor receive financial benefit from a particular decision by a City board, commission or agency?
- Did the donor affirmatively participate in the decision-making process?
- Is it possible to easily and clearly identify the donor's participation in this decision-making process? (Is there a "paper trail"?)
- Is it possible to create an enforcement mechanism that would give campaigns an ability to identify those donors who are targeted by this regulation?
- Are 'false positives' likely? That is, how likely is it that this donor is not seeking influence, but is donating for partisan, personal or other reasons?
- Would restrictions on this donor place an unfair burden on the way he conducts his business?
- Would restrictions on this donor represent an undue limit on his right to participate in the political process?

Is it likely this donor is giving to circumvent a regulation placed on another donor?

Discussion

Classes of Potential Donors Subject to Proposed Definition

Contractors

Individuals or firms who are party to a contract with the City are the easiest to include in our definition, for contracts clearly represent a financial benefit. Because the specifications of an RFP can be drawn to exclude or target particular firms, it is important that the definition include competitively bid as well as no-bid contracts. Regulation should be triggered by contracts totaling \$100,000 because the identification mechanism, through VENDEX, is part of the way to being complete.

Bidders

Bidders are seeking the financial benefit of a contract. With the submission of a bid, their participation can be clearly identified. This may present challenges with RFPs that call for sealed bidding, but a requirement that prospective vendors complete a VENDEX form to respond to an RFP, or be included on an agency's Bidders List, could help establish a more complete bidders database to inform a regulation that would be triggered with the submission of a bid. We are inclined to follow the lead of other governments and release the losing bidders from *doing business* restrictions after a contract is awarded to another firm.

Franchises and concessions

Franchises and concessions are both types of agreements with the City for the use of City land for which the City receives fees. Franchises are grants by the City of the right to occupy City property to provide a public service such as bus transportation or cable television. Concessions are grants by the City for the private use of City-owned property, such as the use of a City park for a restaurant. Some franchises and concessions are subject to the ULURP process, while others are not. All should be subject to a *doing business* regulation. [Note: Section 3 provides a case study and further discussion of concessions.]

Subcontractors, subsidiaries, LLCs and PACs

Insofar as subcontractors are identified in a firm's response to an RFP, they should be covered by a *doing business* regulation, as should any subsidiary of a regulated firm, including limited liability corporations owned by a firm's principals, or political action committees associated with a firm. Potentially, a firm or donor could employ these as "end-around" methods to circumvent restrictions.

Officers, owners and executives

The definition includes chief executives, officers, owners (of a minimum ten percent stake, to match current VENDEX requirements), or any other individual who is authorized to represent the contractor before the City. That is, any individual who deals with City officials on behalf of his employer, in effect, acts as a lobbyist for that firm. To facilitate enforcement, this information should be required through VENDEX.

Land use

Applicants in most land use decisions are asking the City to grant them the ability to maximize the financial return on their investment. When developers ask for special dispensation to employ a piece of land in what they see as its most profitable use, we should take interest. The limited results of our "micro-sample" study (see Section 2) echo the conventional wisdom that land-use actors do regularly seek to influence the political process. For this reason, the definition focuses on applications subject to the Uniform Land Use and Review Process

(ULURP), which includes zoning changes, street modifications, sales of City land, designations of urban renewal projects; applications to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA), for zoning variances; and applications to the Landmarks and Preservation Commission (LPC), for permission to renovate or modify a landmark-designated building. These are decisions triggered by a landowner's application. One difficulty is the lack of a central, searchable database (like VENDEX) for land use applicants. While each keeps its own records, these boards and commissions must improve their accessibility if they are to participate in a *doing business* enforcement regime.

The focus on ULURP and on BSA and LPC is meant to draw a line between decisions that are discretionary, rather than ministerial (that is, subject to approval based solely on meeting certain conditions set by law), and on decisions whose impacts are individual, rather than diffuse. Nevertheless, these lines can be easily blurred, for example, in rezoning matters. Some rezonings are proposed by particular developers, while others are submitted by the City Planning Commission (CPC). While a CPC-sponsored plan may benefit a particular developer, it will likely be difficult to establish a paper trail that connects the developer to any request for that rezoning. A regulation that limits donations from all landowners within a particular rezoned area would be too broad, would present significant enforcement challenges, and likely create a problem of "false positives." For any reasonable enforcement regime, the decisive factor must be that an applicant asks for a particular decision and goes through the acts of supporting its case. [Note: Section 3 provides case studies and a further discussion of land use issues.]

Not-for-profits

Not-for-profits (NFPs) hold some of the largest City contracts, many of which provide essential social services. They participate in the same bidding processes as other for-profit firms when competing for City business. As such, they should be equally regulated. While paid staff members and executives of a not-for-profit should be subject to the same treatment as those of for-profit firms, questions arise about possible exceptions for members of non-profit boards – both because the City may not wish to place a burden on people who choose to serve on the board of a not-for-profit, and because those who do serve often serve on more than one board, making it difficult to disentangle any relationship between a donor and a particular decision. ¹² [Note: Section 3 provides a case study and further discussion of not-for-profits.]

Lobbvists

Lobbyists are in business to influence City decisions on behalf of their clients. They are already registered with the City Clerk's office, which keeps a database online. Firms or individuals who hire lobbyists are also likely to be seeking business with the City, and they are similarly identified in the City Clerk's database. In this way, the NYC Lobbyist Search database captures influence-seeking activities that may not otherwise leave a paper trail. At the same time, many lobbyists are hired to influence policy decisions that are unrelated to contracting or land use matters. These might range from issues that are closely related to a specific firm's business interests (a company that makes cigars hiring a lobbyist to organize opposition to the smoking ban) to those that are more clearly in the public interest (a not-for-profit group hiring a lobbyist to advocate for better conditions for bicycle riders on City streets). Though issue advocacy is beyond the scope of this study, there is a compelling City interest in ensuring policy decisions are based on good policy, not on the influence money may have on the political process.

Classes of Donors Excluded from Proposed Definition

For purposes of this study, spouses and dependents and unions were excluded from the proposed definition.

¹² It should be noted that this broader definition also does not include members of a board of directors of a for-profit enterprise.

SECTION 2: QUALITATIVE "MICRO-SAMPLE" ANALYSIS

Our research shows that *doing business* donors are a significant source of funding for City political campaigns. Still, the working definition that informs our quantitative analysis limits our findings, providing a narrow view of the extent of the "pay-to-play" phenomenon. While no readily-available data source aggregates data about the various classes of donors identified by our proposed definition, anecdotal research employing a variety of sources reveals that the proportion of campaign donors who *do business* with the City under a broader definition is considerably larger than our quantitative research suggests.

To illuminate the distance between the working definition and our proposed definition, we performed a richer, more intensive analysis of *doing business* on a smaller, selected sample. In doing so, we re-examined our random sample of contributors from the 2005 election cycle races for Mayor and City Council across all categories of giving. We also re-examined the sample of intermediaries for the 2005 cycle. Our analysis reveals how many more current donors might be identified as *doing business* contributors under our more comprehensive definition.

Findings

When the findings from the micro-sample analysis are weighted to reflect the same proportions as those used for the random sample, the data show that a considerably larger proportion of donors are captured by the proposed definition of *doing business* (see Chart 6).




Chart 6: % of Contributors *Doing Business* Under Working and Proposed Definitions: New York City, 2005 Election Cycle

Mayor: Under the **working definition** used in the random sample analysis, **5.4**% of contributors to Mayor were *doing business* with the City. With the **proposed definition**, the qualitative analysis found that **14.0**% of contributors to Mayor were *doing business* donors.

City Council: Under the **working definition** used in the random sample analysis, **4.0**% of contributors to City Council were *doing business* with the City. With the **proposed definition**,

the qualitative analysis found that **11.7**% of contributors to City Council were *doing business* donors.

Intermediaries: Under the working definition used in the random sample analysis, 23.1% of intermediaries were *doing business* with the City. With the proposed definition, the qualitative analysis found that 41.2% of intermediaries were *doing business* with the City of New York.

Additionally, donors who were *doing business* gave more, on average, than those who were not (see Chart 7):




Chart 7:
Average Donations of Doing Business Contributors vs. Regular Contributors:
New York City, 2005 Election Cycle

Mayor: Among the largest (\$2,000 and over) donors in our random sample, those who were doing business donated an average of \$4,967, while those who were not made an average donation of \$3,407.

City Council: Among the largest (\$2,000 and over) donors, those who were *doing business* donated an average of \$4,974, while those who were not made an average donation of \$3,357.

Intermediaries: Intermediaries who were *doing business* bundled an average of \$9,116 in donations, while those who were not bundled an average of \$4,576.

Discussion

We researched each of the names in these samples (152 mayoral donors, 157 City Council donors, and 109 intermediaries) to find links between donors and/or employers and City business (as defined in our proposed definition) using Google, Lexis-Nexis, and CityAdmin, among other sources. Our research was supplemented by consultation with Peri Horowitz, Chief of Compliance and Investigations at the CFB, to help us identify and target donors in these samples who might be *doing business* with the City.

¹³ CityAdmin is an online library of decisions made by New York City agencies maintained by the Center for New York City Law.

Without the same methodological rigor or reliability of the original analysis, it is unadvisable to rely on these numbers as the true proportion of donors who are *doing business* with the City. Indeed, there are several ways in which these numbers might still underestimate the true extent of the issue. A firm might be applying to land use boards under the name of an LLC, while its principals donate to political campaigns, or vice versa. Some donors may have familial connections to individuals who are *doing business* that were not identified in our Internet research. More exhaustive research of public records may have uncovered links we were unable to identify. Still, these numbers give a general indication of how our primary quantitative analysis of donors likely underestimates the true extent of *doing business* contributions, and by what general magnitude.

SECTION 3: CASE STUDIES

We continue our qualitative research with three case studies, looking more closely at classes of potential donors included in our more expansive proposed definition. The first case study examines the giving patterns of concessionaire brothers George and Thomas Makkos, known as "The Pretzel Kings" for their dominion over the pretzel pushcart business in City parks. This case study provides a look at how *doing business* can intersect with campaign contributions in New York City. Particularly, it highlights some of the inadequacies of VENDEX in its current form.

Next, we put the spotlight on land use with a pair of case studies. Unlike concessions, which are already recorded in VENDEX, land use represents a range of City dealings that may elude a *doing business* definition based solely on existing datasets. We look at two New York City real estate development firms, The Witkoff Group and 160 Imlay Street LLC, both of which have achieved favorable decisions from City land use boards. These case studies illustrate the difficulty of including land use in a *doing business* regulation.

And finally, we examine the scope of the City's partnership with the not-for-profit sector. A study of the City's top not-for-profit contractors compels us to grapple with the delicate issue of regulating donations from wealthy and influential board members of these entities without discouraging philanthropic activity.

Each of these studies takes a different view of "pay-to-play" in New York City and helps build the case for the adoption of a more comprehensive definition of *doing business* that captures the spectrum of business activity beyond VENDEX and the NYC Lobbyist Search database. Along with our micro-sample analysis, these case studies help bridge the gap between our working and proposed definitions of *doing business*, and move us toward a more accurate reflection of the City's manifold business dealings. They also help demonstrate the tensions between curbing possible "pay-to-play" activity and preserving free speech rights, as well as the potential for broad regulations on campaign donations to chill contributions and desirable philanthropic activity.

Case Study: Concessions

"Pay-to-Play" and the Pretzel Kings: The Makkos Brothers

The New York City Charter defines concessions as "grant[s] made by an agency for the private use of city owned property," and treats them as types of contracts. According to Chapter 14, Section 375 of the Charter, when registering with the Comptroller, "the terms 'vendor' and 'contractor' shall be deemed to apply to the holders of...concessions." But unlike other city contracts, in which the city pays entities for goods and services, concessions represent money flowing *into* city coffers.

All concessions are reviewed by the Franchise and Concession Review Committee (FCRC), as empowered by the City Charter. The Committee consists of the Mayor, the City Comptroller, the Corporation Counsel, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Borough President of each borough impacted by the decision, and an additional mayoral appointee. All concessions, except "major concessions," 14 must be approved by the FCRC. Major concessions are subject to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) instead.

This case study focuses on concessionaire brothers George and Thomas Makkos, whose business holdings include M&T Pretzel, Inc. (a pushcart company which sells pretzels baked by Makkos of Brooklyn, also owned by the brothers), Terrace on the Park in Flushing Meadows, Battery Wave in Battery Park, and the Central Park Carousel. ¹⁵ Through this case study, we intend to illustrate some of the inadequacies of VENDEX in its current form and to provide additional justification for the inclusion of concessionaires in our broader *doing business* definition.

Records of the brothers' business with the City appear in VENDEX, but these records are incomplete. For example, information about M&T Pretzel's pushcart contracts includes mostly contracts that have an "end date" of 1995, and thus appear to have expired. Indeed, based on the information available in VENDEX, it appears that M&T Pretzel's only active pushcart concession is valued at \$1,005. Yet numerous media accounts indicate that the dollar value of M&T Pretzel's business with the City far exceeds the VENDEX figures, some estimating the total at \$3 million per year. The brothers own 60% of the carts in Central Park, as well as the pushcarts in the coveted spot outside The Metropolitan Museum of Art – for which they paid a reported \$536,100 in 2004.

Campaign Contributions & Lobbyist Activity

In the 2001 election cycle, Thomas gave \$2,500, George gave \$7,500 and his wife, Antonia—a self-identified "homemaker"—gave \$2,500. George also intermediated \$4,350 in contributions, bringing their combined total campaign contributions to \$16,850. Of that, \$15,850 was directed toward mayoral candidates, while the rest went to candidates for Borough President. By comparison, the Makkos brothers gave a *combined* \$1,150 in the 2005 election cycle.

29

¹⁴ The Charter defines major concession as "a concession that has significant land use impacts and implications, as determined by the [city planning] commission, or for which the preparation of an environmental impact statement is required by law."

¹⁵ "Brothers to Buy Long Island, N.Y., Waterfront Restaurant," by Alan J. Wax, *Newsday*, August 24. 2004. ¹⁶ Ibid

¹⁷ "Pushcart Vendors Gain Victory in a Labor Deal," by Steven Greenhouse, The New York Times, November 23, 2004.

¹⁸ "Riches a la Cart," by Dan Kadison, New York Post, April 5, 2004.

We also examined the lobbying activity of the Makkos brothers. The concessionaires hired lobbying firm Bolton St. Johns, Inc. in 1999 and Greenberg Traurig in 2002, paying the firms \$32,000 and \$32,331.50 respectively. Their target in 1999 was the Parks Department, as well as a City Councilmember, in matters relating to M&T Pretzel, Inc. The NYC Lobbyist database does not list the target of the Makkos' lobbying in 2002. (M&T Pretzel, Inc. also employed Greenberg Traurig in 2003, but details of their transactions are not provided in the database.) None of the brothers' businesses is listed thereafter as a lobbyist client.

Principals

We also investigated the principals of The Crystal Ball Group, which operates Terrace on the Park in Flushing Meadows. The principals listed in VENDEX (besides the Makkos brothers) are Charles, Vasilios and Konstantinos Marangoudakis, also owners of Marangos Construction Corporation. According to CFB records, the three gave a combined \$53,315 and \$24,300 in the 2001 and 2005 election cycles, respectively. (Included in the 2005 total is \$250 contributed by Vasilios's wife, Athena, another self-identified "homemaker.")

Sixty-three percent of the two-cycle total was donated through intermediaries. While we cannot establish with certainty what aspect of their business the Marangoudakis family was seeking to influence, its extensive gifts are worth noting when discussing their business partners, the Makkos brothers.

Spouses

Antonia Makkos gave \$2,500 (or 14.8% of the Makkos' 2001 contributions), and Athena Marangoudakis gave \$250 (or 1% of the Marangoudakis' 2005 contributions). Making a contribution through a spouse with the same last name is one potential way to circumvent donation limits while guaranteeing the contribution is associated with the family name. Because of the variability in their giving amounts, however, it would be impossible to ascertain the wives' true intentions. The danger of "false positives" suggests that the inclusion of spouses in a *doing business* definition may unfairly impinge on their First Amendment rights.

Analysis

This case study provides further justification for including concessionaires, their business principals and lobbyists in a *doing business* definition. It also raises the question of whether spouses ought to be included, offering justification for inclusion in an ideal definition, but advising against inclusion in a more practical one. Finally, this study demonstrates the inadequacies of VENDEX, and the system's failure to capture some contracts worth upwards of \$100,000.

Case Study: Land Use

Ethics enforcement for the process that assigns City contracts is a public policy imperative because there are so many contracts to go around. New York City's budget is larger than that of any other American city *and* 48 of the 50 states. At the same time, land use decisions in New York City may be even more important because of the scarcity of land. The City must constantly make decisions about how to re-use already-developed land in order to ensure it is occupied by its highest and best use. As CFB Chairman Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr. wrote in his account of the proceedings of the 1989 Charter Revision Commission, which he chaired, "Through City decisions about land use, communities can be created, fortunes can be made or lost, and the power of various political offices or agencies can wax or wane." 19

With such concerns at stake, it comes as no surprise that the parties interested in land use decisions would be active in the political process. The brief findings in this study are typical of previous observations about political activity by real estate entrepreneurs; developers have long been among the most generous sources of campaign donations to candidates for City office. This is not a phenomenon unique to New York City. Indeed, most major candidates in local elections receive their largest contributions from property entrepreneurs.²⁰

In a 1985 study of contributors to members of the Board of Estimate between 1981 and 1985, former State Senator Franz Leichter found that 16 of the top 25 donors had some matter of business pending before City government. He cited ten specific instances where donors increased their political giving when they had decisions before the Board of Estimate; these included beneficiaries of variances, zoning changes, City leases, and the sale of City land.²¹

In a subsequent study, released in 1986, Leichter estimated that 60 percent of the 200 largest donors did some sort of business with the City. Of the top 20 givers, 12 were "real estate giants whose projects frequently require Board of Estimate approval." ²²

When the 1989 Charter Revision Commission abolished the Board of Estimate, its power to decide certain land use decisions was spread among several actors. To preserve a political voice in the land use process, the City Council was granted the power to review decisions as part of the Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP).

While contract decisions affect all New Yorkers generally, through the services the City provides and the taxes levied to pay for them, land use decisions can impact particular New Yorkers where they live, in their homes and neighborhoods. While that is a compelling rationale for allowing a political review, allowing politics into the process has the potential to invite the influence of money as well.

The appointed City Planning Commission (CPC) is the gatekeeper for many land use decisions, certifying applications before they pass through ULURP. Amendments to the zoning resolution, which places limits on the size and use of buildings, must go through ULURP, as do certain

31

¹⁹ Schwarz, Jr., Frederick A.O. and Eric Lane. "The Policy and Politics of Charter Making: The Story of New York City's 1989 Charter." *The New York Law School Review*. Vol 42, 1998.

²⁰ Logan, John. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. University of California Press, 1987. p. 231.

²¹ Kraus, Jeffrey. 2006. "Campaign Finance Reform Reconsidered: New York City's Public Finance Program After Fifteen Years", *The Forum*: Vol. 3: No. 4, Article 6. http://www.bepress.com/forum/vol3/iss4/art6

²² Connelly, Mary and Carlyle C. Douglas. "City Vendors and Campaign Giving." The New York Times, December 28, 1986.

special permits, site selection for capital projects, urban renewal designations, and many other projects. After applications are certified as complete by CPC, they pass first to the local community board and the Borough President for recommendations, then to the CPC, which approves or disapproves the application, and finally to the Council, which automatically reviews some decisions and can elect to review any decision.

Two other appointed boards make individual, discretionary decisions about what owners can do with their land. The Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) can grant individual variances to the zoning codes. The Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) designates buildings or historic districts; owners must apply to the LPC to approve any modifications to a landmark building. [See Appendix F for a breakdown of land use boards and commissions, and the decisions they are responsible for.]

To be sure, there are several ways developers can exercise influence over the land use processes. Many members of boards are appointed because of a background or particular expertise in some aspect of the real estate industry, and may therefore be more sympathetic to developers. Some may desire jobs in the industry upon completing their service. And to the extent that major developers or their representatives have "repeat business" before the land use boards, they may develop personal relationships with their members that can influence their judgment.²³

The following two case studies help illuminate the issues and difficulties with regulating donations from entities or individuals with pending land use decisions.

The Witkoff Group

Steven C. Witkoff and his firm, The Witkoff Group, are among the most prominent real estate developers in the city. The group's current New York City holdings include a 398-foot, 37-floor mixed-use high rise at 6th Avenue and 26th Street, the Cipriani Club Residences, a 9-floor, 109-unit luxury condo complex on Wall Street, and the iconic Woolworth Building at 233 Broadway in downtown Manhattan.

Donations

For the 2001 and 2005 campaign cycles, campaign donations to candidates for City office from Steven Witkoff, his immediate family, officers of the Witkoff Group, and Witkoff's LLCs totaled \$93,675.

The amount of Witkoff-related donations was relatively consistent across cycles – \$49,750 for 2001, and \$43,925 for 2005 (there are no listed contributions for Witkoff dated earlier than 2001 in the CFB database). In the 2001 election cycle, Witkoff focused its giving entirely on mayoral candidates, putting together nine contributions for the maximum \$4,500²⁴ to Mark Green, and two \$4,500 contributions to Alan Hevesi.²⁵

In the 2005 election cycle, Witkoff donated \$22,425 to Council Speaker Gifford Miller's mayoral campaign, and \$21,500 to candidates for City Council. Of those, \$7,000 was given directly from Steven Witkoff and Witkoff Group LLCs to three members of the Land Use Committee. Councilmember Christine Quinn, who represents the West Village, was widely discussed prior to the 2005 election as a leading candidate for Council Speaker. Her campaign

²³ Ellickson, Robert and Vicki Been. *Land Use Controls*, third ed. Aspen Publishers, 2005. p. 306

²⁴ The maximum donation to mayoral candidates was raised to \$4,950 for the 2005 election cycle.

²⁵ The remaining \$250 was a donation by Witkoff principal Jeffrey Goldberger to an exploratory committee formed by Giuliani aide Fran Reiter, who was considering a run for mayor.

received maximum \$2,750 donations from Witkoff, his wife, and two Witkoff executives, for a total of \$11,000.

The Witkoff Group seems to have focused its political expenditures on campaign donations rather than lobbying; the Group's expenditures for lobbying total only \$14,637.50 between 2000 and 2005. (The firm does not seem to have hired lobbyists through one of the LLCs they own.)

Decisions

In the course of their work, Witkoff and his partners must bring business before many of the City's land use boards and commissions. These are a selection:

Woolworth Building: After purchasing the Woolworth Building in 1998 through an LLC, 233 Broadway, Witkoff planned renovations and modifications, turning 27 floors atop what was once the world's tallest building into condos, building two glass-walled penthouses on the 29th floor, restoring ground-floor storefronts to their original condition, and adding a 100-car garage.²⁶ Since the building has landmark status, the modifications required approval by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The plan was controversial. Though the community boards have no role in the landmark process, the local board voted unanimously to oppose the project, which they called "grotesquely inappropriate." After a long review period, the LPC granted a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Witkoff plan on December 30, 2002. According to Crain's, the Witkoff Group sought access to tax-free Liberty Bond financing from the City for the project.²⁸

1129-1133 York Avenue: In April 2005, under the name of Witkoff York LLC (incorporated in Delaware), Witkoff applied to the CPC for a zoning map amendment that would allow them to build a 26-story, mixed residential/retail tower at 1129-1133 York Avenue, and a special permit that would allow a 100-space public parking garage on the site. The applications were certified as complete by CPC on April 11, 2005 and referred to Manhattan Community Board 8, which approved both the zoning change and the special permit June 8. The Borough President's office gave its sanction July 12, the CPC on August 24, and the City Council voted its approvals on September 28.

866 Third Avenue: On March 16, 2004, the 866 3rd Next Generation Hotel LLC, another Witkoff-owned entity, applied to the BSA for a zoning variance to waive a rear yard-space requirement for a building that encompasses a Courtyard Marriott Hotel, retail establishments and a Memorial Sloan Kettering outpatient center. Attorney Jay Segal of Greenberg Traurig represented Witkoff before the BSA. Segal represents many clients with real estate interests; many of them are listed as his clients in the City Clerk's lobbyist database, though Witkoff does not claim Segal as a lobbyist.²⁹ Witkoff was granted its request on July 13.

West Village down-zoning: The Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation (GVSHP) led an 18-month-long battle to rezone parts of the West Village and restrict density, which culminated in a CPC rezoning proposal that was certified to begin its passage through the ULURP process on July 11, 2005. The plan drawn by the CPC included "carve-out" exemptions for two sites: the Superior Ink Factory site at West Street and W. 12th, and the Whitehall Storage warehouse site at 303 W. 10th Street, at the corner of Charles Street, owned by the Witkoff Group. While the buildings around the site would be limited to 70 or 80 feet, the plan allowed a 200-foot tall tower at the Whitehall site.³⁰

On July 21, Community Board 2 approved the plan, with a request to reconsider including the two sites in the down-zoning plan. Borough President approval came August 29, echoing the comments of the Community Board. The plan, which nevertheless remained unchanged, was approved after a public hearing by the CPC September 26, and approved by the City Council on October 11.

²⁶ Dunlap, David W. "Condos to Top Vaunted Tower of Woolworth." The New York Times, November 2, 2000.

²⁷ Dunlap, David W. "Change the Woolworth? No Way, a Board Says." The New York Times, October 18, 2000.

²⁸ "New Projects Seek Liberty Bonds," Crain's New York Business, June 2, 2003.

²⁹ Segal's campaign donations between 2000-2005 total \$6,505; of those, \$4,400 were split between Miller, Quinn, and Land Use Committee chair Melinda Katz.

³⁰ Richels, Heather. "Rezoning Plan for Greenwich Village Waterfront Advances." The New York Sun, July 14, 2005. p. 10.

160 Imlay Street LLC

Along the Red Hook waterfront, overlooking the marine terminal, is a six-story concrete industrial building at 160 Imlay Street. It had previously been a warehouse, and before its purchase by Industry City Associates in 2000, the building was used primarily for book storage. After trying to find industrial tenants, Industry City and its principal Bruce Federman entered into a partnership with residential developer Bruce Batkin and his partners under the corporate name of 160 Imlay Street LLC.³¹

Donations

Developers Batkin and Federman, both as individuals and through the 160 Imlay Street LLC, made \$10,500 in campaign contributions during the 2005 campaign cycle. Of those, \$8,000 was given to candidates more than two years before the election, including two \$2,500 donations to Council Speaker Gifford Miller's campaign for Mayor and a \$2,750 donation to the re-election campaign of City Councilmember Melinda Katz, chair of the Council's Land Use Committee. All these contributions were made during the two months preceding a crucial BSA decision in December 2003.³²

Before initiating their partnership to redevelop the 160 Imlay Street site, neither Batkin nor Federman were significant campaign donors. Prior to the 2005 cycle, the CFB database lists only two contributions between them: a \$1,000 donation by Federman in 2001 to Mark Green's mayoral campaign; and a \$250 donation from Batkin to Rudy Giuliani's 1993 mayoral campaign.

The 160 Imlay Street LLC incurred more than \$170,000 in lobbying expenses between 2002 and 2005, employing three separate firms – George Arzt Communications, LoCicero & Tan, and the Law Offices of Howard Goldman, the firm that represented the project before the BSA.

Decision

Their proposal for a renovation to offer two floors of retail and four floors of luxury condominiums required a variance from the area's industrial-only zoning. The project was opposed by Brooklyn's Community Board 6, which is committed to preserving industrial uses on the waterfront, and by the Red Hook-Gowanus Chamber of Commerce, which feared the condos would "kill local business." 33

160 Imlay Street applied to BSA for its zoning variance September 18, 2002. After an exceptionally long deliberation including two hearings and a site visit, on December 23, 2003 BSA voted 3-1 to grant the variance for the retail/residential renovation. Though opponents filed a lawsuit to prevent the 160 Imlay renovation, the court gave the developers a go-ahead last spring, and the renovation is proceeding.

Analysis

It is true of the Witkoff Group – and of all large-scale developers – that it relies on City decisions to conduct its business and generate profits.

Looking at Witkoff's development activities, it is clear that in the interest of transparency, any regulation that includes a limit on donations related to land-use decisions should limit donations

35

³¹ Vitullo-Martin, Julia. "Thinking about the Brooklyn Waterfront." The Manhattan Institute, December 2004.

³² After the decision was granted, Batkin and Federman gave \$1,000 more between them to Miller's mayoral campaign in 2004, as well as \$750 to Brooklyn borough president Marty Markowitz, \$500 to Councilman Eric Gioia, a member of the Land Use Committee, and \$250 through their LLC to Comptroller William Thompson, Jr.

³³ Kolben, Deborah. "Red Hook Green Light." New York Daily News, May 13, 2005.

from all LLCs, or ban them altogether.³⁴ Though none of the LLCs Witkoff employed in these transactions were used to fund campaign contributions, several were made under The Witkoff Group LLC. These entities can be used to circumvent a restriction on a particular individual, or to mask the source of a contribution.

Included in the New York City Administrative Code definition of lobbying is: "the attempt to influence... [any] determination by elected officials, city planning commission, borough board, or community board concerning zoning or development or improvement of real property subject to city regulation." However, the example of attorney Segal's failure to report Witkoff as a client suggests that if the Code does not require professionals who represent developers before such boards to register as lobbyists, any *doing business* regulation should include these advocates as well.

Decisions without an easily identifiable paper trail – like Witkoff's request for Liberty Bonds – represent a quandary for any regulation. Interactions with quasi-governmental entities that lack transparency, like the NYC Economic Development Corporation, present a similar dilemma. Still, the scope of Witkoff's activities suggests that these larger developers are likely also to have identifiable projects pending that will trigger regulation.

Of particular interest to our study is the case of the West Village downzoning, which exposes a gap in our definition. We cannot say with certainty that the Witkoff Group even requested its "carve-out" from the CPC proposal; there is simply no paper trail to inform that theory. Coalco, another development firm, purchased two buildings at 389-391 W. 12th Street, and planned a "modern, glass cluster of townhouses" for the site. Then came the re-zoning plan:

The managing partner of Coalco, Edward Baquero, said that the impending downzoning, which will limit building height to 80 feet, will lower property value by one-third and make development unfeasible. "We paid up. Suddenly, we lost a third of our rights," Mr. Baquero told The New York Sun. "You say, 'Wait a minute, that doesn't happen in this country...'

'I do feel some sympathy for the Coalco folks,' [Andrew] Berman [of the GVSHP] said. 'Clearly they are not getting the same accommodation from the city as Related and Witkoff are getting.'"³⁵

Coalco made no contributions to any candidates for City office. They did spend \$10,050 on lobbyists, hiring Greenberg Traurig only after the rezoning plan was introduced by the CPC. While the policy rationale behind the zoning "carve-out" is unknown, the *perception* that campaign donations can influence the land use process undermines public confidence in City government and fosters the notion that developers must indeed "pay to play" to be successful.

As the BSA comprises members appointed by the Mayor, there is no direct link between a BSA decision and donations to members of the City Council. Still, given the Council's role in the land use process, there is no utility to be gained by drawing distinctions between candidates for different offices, or between decisions reviewed by the Council and those that are not.

A generous contribution puts a donor in the position to open a line of dialogue with a public official, or ask for a favor. However indirect this influence may be on any particular policy

36

³⁴ Though LLCs clearly owned by a regulated entity would be subject to restrictions on subsidiary entities, there is often no available information about LLCs or their ownership. To ban LLCs from campaign giving, however, may require changes in State law.

³⁵ Lombino, David. "Developer seeks to Ease Restrictions in Far West Village." *The New York Sun*, September 19, 2005. p. 2.

decision, it is in the public interest to limit donations from these sources – and to end the expenditure of public funds that amplify their impact. This suggests the necessity of an expansive regulation of donations from parties with pending land use decisions.

Case Study: Not-For-Profit Organizations

"Pay-to-Play" and Philanthropy: How to Regulate the Not-for-profit Sector

In 2004, 18 of the 50 largest City contracts were held by 16 not-for-profit organizations.³⁶ These contracts (some of them for multiple years of service) totaled nearly \$1.2 billion, and were mainly social service contracts for foster care services and homeless shelters. (A large exception was the New York Public Library, which is discussed further below.) Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code bars not-for-profit organizations from giving directly to political campaigns.³⁷ However, individual officers, directors, and board members do not face such prohibitions. Theoretically, then, a not-for-profit entity seeking to *do business* with the City could curry favor with a particular candidate through donations from these individuals.

But precisely which individuals associated with a not-for-profit should be regulated? Ideally, we would regulate donations from senior managers and decision-makers. To illuminate the sources of not-for-profit political gifts, we researched IRS 990 forms from 2004 for those 16 agencies to find the names of their highest paid employees, board members and trustees.³⁸ Along with these names, the 990 form requests that agencies detail the "compensation of the five highest-paid employees other than officers, directors, and trustees." These data helped us identify the most influential figures in the agencies regardless of title. We checked lists of board members against agency websites. Through this research, we identified 576 executives and persons of interest, and checked these names against the CFB database to examine their political giving.³⁹

2001: Of the officers, directors, trustees and highest-paid employees at those 16 agencies, we found that **139** individuals, or nearly **24**%, donated to a City political campaign in the 2001 election cycle. (Only 2.8% of all contributors for the 2001 cycle were *doing business* by our working definition.) The donations totaled **\$314,926**, for an average of \$2,298 per donor.

2005: Of the officers, directors, trustees and highest-paid employees at those 16 agencies, we found that **84** individuals, or **15**%, donated to a City political campaign in the 2005 election cycle. 40 (Only 4.3% of contributors in the 2005 cycle were *doing business* by our working definition.) The donations totaled **\$201,545** for an average of **\$2,399** per donor.

Though 990 forms list independent contractors as well, we did not analyze their political donations; a relationship with a contractor is most likely too tenuous to garner influence for a particular not-for-profit agency. IRS Code supports this decision, excluding independent contractors from consideration as key decision-makers in a not-for-profit.⁴¹

We considered contribution data from both the 2001 and 2005 election cycles. This period captures the period leading up to and immediately following the award for all of the contracts in this analysis (most started in 2003 and run through 2006). According to VENDEX, all of these agencies appear to have held contracts prior to 2004.

Given that the total amount of donations in an election year ranges in the tens of millions, the totals we found may appear negligible. However, from a relatively small group of individuals,

-

³⁶ City Law, November/December 2004.

³⁷ NFPs can engage in issue advocacy and can support political candidates or parties through associated PACs, however.

³⁸ One agency was missing its 990 form for 2004, so we used 2003 IRS data.

³⁹ Given the qualitative nature of this study, we advise that these figures be treated as approximations.

⁴⁰ We had to discard six names because we could not make a positive match in the CFB database for them.

⁴¹ IRS Code Section 4958 (1996).

this sum shows a concerted effort to take part in political campaigns. We might be concerned that certain organizations are targeting specific candidates to gain influence. Our data do not permit us to draw such firm conclusions, but we can describe particular cases.

There are some trends among the top not-for-profit contracts that give pause. For example, we find that the Board President, Chair of the Executive Committee and three Board Members from the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services made donations to mayoral candidates totaling \$13,350 in the 2005 cycle. The organization had a contract totaling over \$81 million in 2004.

To consider another case: as noted above, the New York Public Library is among the City's top 50 contractors, with a contract in excess of \$38 million. This organization's top employees and board members show substantial donor participation in City campaigns. Of the Library's 66 employees and board members, 25 (38%) made donations totaling \$130,890 in the 2001 election cycle, while 22 (33%) made donations amounting to \$99,287 in the 2005 cycle. In the 2005 cycle, 21 of the 22 made aggregated donations of at least \$250, and 15 made aggregated donations in excess of \$1,000. (The giving pattern was similar for the 2001 election cycle).

Meanwhile, the Chair of the New York Public Library's board wrote in the Library's 2004 Annual Report:

At the end of fiscal year 2003, finalized agreements between the Mayor's office and the City Council resulted in a nearly complete restoration of proposed cuts for this year...We are pleased that the FY 2005 City budget did not include the proposed \$5.4 million cut to the Library. In addition, \$4.427 million was provided for the Branch and Research Libraries. We are deeply appreciative of the support given to us by Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, Speaker A. Gifford Miller, and the members of the City Council. And we are especially grateful to everyone who served as extraordinary advocates for the Library, particularly our Trustees...

Analysis

We are careful not to draw overly broad conclusions from this information. To take just one example, one of the largest campaign donors on the Library's board is Dorothy Cullman, who gave \$11,150 to various campaigns during the 2005 cycle, and \$18,000 during the 2001 cycle. Ms. Cullman is a major philanthropist who serves on several other not-for-profit boards (including Human Rights Watch, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and others) and runs a foundation with her husband, Lewis. It is impossible to say which of her affiliations she wished to highlight during her interactions with City officeholders—or if she wished to garner influence at all. Of course, it is part of board members' duties to raise funds and advocate for their organization, so we should not necessarily attribute pernicious motivations to political contributions.

Admittedly, board members could make contributions to gain undue influence for their preferred charity.⁴² It could be argued that board members often have longer tenures with an agency – and perhaps greater loyalty – than some senior staff, who often work for (relatively) lower pay than their for-profit counterparts, and may frequently move to other agencies for better salary.

The question arises whether there is a risk of false positives too great to warrant the regulation of board members and trustees. Many individuals who are asked to serve on boards are likely

⁴² The term "board members" also refers to trustees serving as unpaid volunteers on a board of trustees. In addition, the term "director" is used similarly by some not-for-profits.

to be both wealthy and community-minded, and may be likely to offer financial support to political candidates regardless of their not-for-profit activities. Further, such individuals might sit on several boards, may own a business, or may work with another firm involved in City business, so it may be difficult to discern which "hat" they wear when they make a contribution.

Similarly, a question arises whether undue burdens may be imposed on charities attempting to recruit individuals to serve on their boards. Such service is typically unpaid and can be valuable to the community, and therefore should not be discouraged. It is worthwhile to note here that unpaid board members, unlike for-profit boards, cannot take benefits privately from an agency's activities.

CONCLUSION

Our quantitative analysis of campaign donations from the 2001 and 2005 election cycles showed convincing evidence that *doing business* contributors—as defined by the available data on contractors, lobbyists, and lobbyist clients—play a substantial role in financing campaigns for public office in New York City, accounting for more than one out of five dollars raised. It is likely these findings understate the true proportion of donors who are *doing business* with the City.

Our qualitative research showed that a broader definition, encompassing a more comprehensive range of *doing business* activities, could be warranted. Employing our proposed definition, qualitative research with a smaller sample of donors identified a considerably larger proportion as *doing business* donors. Case studies helped illuminate some of the issues we considered as we created our proposed definition, as well as some of the challenges of enforcing any potential regulation.

Nothing in this report can show conclusively that any particular campaign donor has sought to influence City contracting or land use policy. Still, a skeptical public may believe differently. We hope the report has shown that a regulation limiting contributions from *doing business* donors would help restore public confidence in City government and the way it does business.

PART III: APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: DATA SOURCES

To conduct this analysis, we relied on a variety of data sources, including the CFB's Searchable Campaign Finance Database, the New York City VENDEX online database, and the New York City Lobbyist Search online database. The CFB's Searchable Campaign Finance Database served as the primary source of information for all municipal campaign contributions. VENDEX and NYC Lobbyist Search provided information on business dealings that individuals and entities may have with the City of New York.

The CFB Searchable Campaign Finance Database: The primary dataset used in all analyses was the CFB's Searchable Campaign Finance Database. The CFB's database contains records of all contributions to candidates for the offices of Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, Borough President and City Council who participate in the campaign finance program. The data presented in the Searchable Campaign Finance Database were provided to the CFB as reported by campaign committees, and were subject to change as a result of ongoing audits or additional amendments to filings.

For the purposes of this analysis, data from the 2001 and 2005 citywide election cycles were used. The 2001 election cycle data contain records of 186,067 individual campaign contributions made to 299 candidates between January 1, 1997 and December 31, 2001. The 2005 election cycle data contain records of 122,025 individual campaign contributions made to 193 candidates between January 1, 2002 and December 31, 2005.

The data on 2001 and 2005 election cycle contributions were provided to our research team by the CFB in a .dbf file. Each record contains information on the contributor's name and address, the contributor's employer and address, the contribution amount, the amount matched by public funds, the candidate who received the contribution, as well as other information.

- VENDEX: The information presented in the New York City Vendor Search is derived from a subset of data from the City's Vendor Information Exchange System (VENDEX) system, which is maintained by the Mayor's Office of Contract Services (MOCS). The information available in this database is either self-reported by vendors through questionnaires that are submitted to MOCS or is captured by the City's financial management system. The questionnaires are not routinely independently verified by MOCS. VENDEX stores information for New York City franchises, concessions, and for many, but not all, contracts and subcontracts held by vendors who do over \$100,000 in annual business with the City. 43
- NYC Lobbyist Search: The information presented through the NYC Lobbyist Search is derived from the export of the lobbyist database maintained by the Office of the City Clerk. The information available in this database is self-reported by lobbyists and their clients through initial annual registration forms and quarterly reports that are submitted to the Office of the City Clerk. The reports are checked for accuracy by the Office of the City Clerk, but are not independently verified or certified by a third party. Although all attempts have been made to ensure the accuracy of these data, neither the City of New York nor the Office of the City Clerk assumes any liability resulting from any inaccuracies herein. In the event of any variance between these data and any printed compilation of lobbyist data published by the Office of the City Clerk since 2002, such

_

⁴³ Taken from the VENDEX website available at: http://slnx-prd-web.nyc.gov/cfb/cfbSearch.nyc?method = search

printed data will be controlling. Some data may have been subsequently ame	ended,
which may not be reflected in the database. ⁴⁴	


⁴⁴ Taken from the Lobbyist Search website available at: http://www.nyc.gov/lobbyistsearch/index.jsp

APPENDIX B: AGGREGATION PROCESS


For the 2001 and 2005 election cycles, the total number of contribution records in the data files provided to our research team by the CFB was 186,067 and 122,025, respectively. Steps were taken using Microsoft Access to format the data found in the CFB 2001 and 2005 election cycle *Cont.dbf* files. The purpose of these processes was to construct as accurate a population of campaign contributors as possible. Graphical representations of this process can be found below in Figures 1 and 2. Please note that all of these steps, excluding step 2, were also performed to aggregate the intermediary data.

- Deletion of Refund Records. Under some circumstances, donations are refunded to donors.
 The CFB codes these donations as Schedule M. Because these records are coded as
 positive amounts and do not represent actual donations, these funds were deleted. In this
 step a total of 2,587 and 1,697 records were deleted from the 2001 and 2005 election
 cycle data, respectively.
- Separation of Donations Made Through Intermediaries. Intermediaries were examined as
 part of a separate analysis. Therefore, these records were deleted from the data by running
 a query which eliminated any record where the intermediary name field was not null. The
 total number of records deleted in this step was 15,370 for 2001 election cycle and 4,600
 for 2005 election cycle.
- 3. Deletion of Donations from the CFB. Through the matching funds program, the CFB distributes public matching funds to candidates. For the 2001 election cycle only, three records were deleted from the donation file that showed reimbursement of public funds by the CFB. This was completed by searching the donor name field for words such as the CFB, campaign, finance and board.
- 4. Grouping of Records by Donor to Office and Summed Donation Amount. To aggregate the data to the unit of analysis described in the section above, a group-by query was performed. This query grouped together all people with the same name contributing to the same office, as signified by the office code [Mayor (1), Public Advocate (2), Comptroller (3), Borough President (4), and City Council member (5), or undeclared (6)]. The query also summed the contributions amounts by each individual to each office.

APPENDIX B, FIGURE 1: 2001 Election Cycle



APPENDIX B, FIGURE 2: 2005 Election Cycle



APPENDIX C: PROCESS FOR SEARCHING VENDEX AND LOBBYIST DATABASES

Steps for VENDEX Look-up

- Go to the VENDEX web page: http://slnx-prd-web.nyc.gov/cfb/cfbSearch.nyc?method = search
- 2. Look up the name or entity
 - a. For individuals: In the box on the left labeled "Search by Principal" enter the last name of the person in the white box and click search
 - b. For entities: In the box on the right labeled "Search by Entity" enter the last name of the entity in white box and click search
 - i. If data are returned proceed to step 4
 - ii. If no data are returned proceed to step 5
- 3. Determine if the match that was found is accurate
 - a. To determine if the match found is accurate must answer yes to the following questions:
 - i. For Individuals:
 - 1. Does the last name match the name in VENDEX?
 - 2. Does the first name match the name in VENDEX?
 - a. Note: When scanning the names in VENDEX examine common nicknames versions. For example, if the individual is named Jim search for James or if the individual is named Sue search for Susan.
 - b. Note: Slight variations in names are considered a match if answers to questions 1 and 3 are also yes.
 - 3. Does the employer listed in the excel file match the employer in VENDEX?
 - a. Answered yes to all three questions?
 - i. Proceed to step 5
 - b. Answered no to one or more questions?
 - i. Proceed to step 4
 - ii. For Entities:
 - Does the entity name match the name in VENDEX? (Note: slight variations in names are considered a match if answers to questions 2 is also yes)
 - 2. Does the entity's address match the address in VENDEX?
 - a. Answered yes to both questions?
 - i. Proceed to step 5
 - b. Answered no to either question?
 - i. Proceed to step 4
- 4. Initial match not found
 - a. Try to enter the name/entity differently for example by adding or dropping the word "the" or "A"
 - i. If match found return to step 3 to determine accuracy
 - ii. If no match is found enter "0" in the spreadsheet columns listed below and then return to step 1 for the next name on the spreadsheet

VENDEX: DOES	VENDEX:	VENDEX:
BUSINESS WITH	CONTRACT	CONTRACT
NYC (N=0, Y=1)	1/97 OR LATER	1/01 OR LATER
	(N=0, Y=1)	(N=0, Y=1)

- 5. Initial match is found
 - a. Click on business name (Note: for entity search this step is not required)
 - b. What is the answer under the heading "Business with NYC?"
 - i. Yes:
 - 1. Enter "1" on Excel spreadsheet under "Does Business with NYC?"
 - 2. Click on "View Info"
 - 3. Review dates under "Registration/Approval Date" column
 - a. Any date listed of 1/1/1997 or later?
 - i. Yes
 - Enter "1" on Excel spreadsheet under "VENDEX contract from 1/97 or later"
 - ii. No
- Enter "0" on Excel spreadsheet under "VENDEX contract from 1/97 or later"
- b. Any date listed 1/1/2001 or later?
 - i. Yes
 - Enter "1" on Excel spreadsheet under "VENDEX contract from 1/01 or later"
 - 2. Begin at step 1 for next name on spreadsheet
 - ii. No
- Enter "0" on Excel spreadsheet under " VENDEX contract from 1/01 or later"
- 2. Begin at step 1 for next name on spreadsheet

- ii. No
- 1. Enter "0" on Excel spreadsheet under:

VENDEX: DOES	VENDEX:	VENDEX:
BUSINESS WITH	CONTRACT	CONTRACT
NYC (N=0, Y=1)	1/97 OR LATER	1/01 OR LATER
	(N=0, Y=1)	(N=0, Y=1)

2. Begin at step 1 for next name on spreadsheet


Steps for Lobbyist Look-up

- 1. Copy the last name or entity name from the excel file that lists those in the sample
- 2. Go to the lobbyist web page: http://www.nyc.gov/lobbyistsearch/index.jsp
- 3. Look up the name or entity
 - a. In the white box on the left labeled "Search by Name" enter the last name of the person, or the full entity name and click search.
- 4. Determine if match is found
 - a. To determine if a match is present must answer yes to the following questions:
 - i. Does the individual/entity name match the name in the Lobbyist database? (note: slight variations in names are considered a match if answers to question 2 is also yes)
 - ii. Does the lobbyist address listed in the Lobbyist database match either the employer or home address listed in the excel file?
 - b. Matching name or entity returned?

- 1. If, yes for a Lobbyist
 - a. Enter "1" on Excel spreadsheet under "Listed as a lobbyist"
 - b. Begin at step 1 for next name on spreadsheet
- 2. If, yes for a Client
 - a. Enter "1" on Excel spreadsheet under "Listed as a lobbyist client"
 - b. Begin at step 1 for next name on spreadsheet
- 3. If, no
 - a. Enter "0" on Excel spreadsheet under "Listed as a lobbyist"
 - b. Begin at step 1 for next name on spreadsheet

APPENDIX D: DATA CLEANING PROCESS

- 1. Open database "Data Cleanse" which contains queries to check original donor and intermediary data
- 2. Copy the last name and first initial or entity name from the excel file that lists those in the sample. (Note: you will use this copied information in later in step 5 or 6)
- 3. Click on the appropriate query.
 - a. To check individual name select appropriate query from this list:
 - i. 2001 Donor Query for Individuals
 - ii. 2005 Donor Query for Individuals
 - iii. 2001 Intermediary Query for Individuals
 - iv. 2005 Intermediary Query for Individuals
 - b. To check entity name select appropriate query from this list:
 - i. 2001 Donor Query for Entities
 - ii. 2005 Donor Query for Entities
 - iii. 2001 Intermediary Query for Entities
 - iv. 2005 Intermediary Query for Entities
- 4. After you select one of these options the following box will appear. In this box enter the identifying office code the race you are searching.



- a. For Mayor enter "1"
- b. For Public Advocate enter "2"
- c. For Comptroller enter "3"
- d. For Borough President enter "4"
- e. For City Council enter "5"
 - i. Click "OK"
- 5. For any of the individual name queries the following box will appear



- a. In this box enter the last name of the person you are search followed by a comma and a space and their first initial. Click "OK"
 - i. For example, to search for Steven Fisher. Enter "Fisher, S"
- b. Proceed to step 7

6. For any of the entity name queries the following box will appear



- a. In this box enter the most unique part of the entity name you are searching for. Click "OK"
 - i. Examples:
 - 1. If the name is West L.L.C. enter "West"
 - 2. If the name is The Salvation Army enter "Salvation"
 - 3. If the name presented is abbreviated such as "Benev Assoc" do two searches one for "Benev" and another for "Benevolent"
- b. Proceed to step 7

NOTE: These searches are NOT case sensitive. Therefore the results when entering Fisher, S will be the same as fisher, s.

- 7. Are there multiple names listed for the entity/individual you are searching for?
 - a. No: In the excel file in the column "Data Checked?" enter "1". Begin at step one for the next name on the spreadsheet
 - b. Yes: Use ONLY the address to determine if the aggregation was performed correctly.
 - i. Examples
 - 1. If three records for Steven Fisher are present and they have the same address the aggregation was performed correctly. Proceed to step 7a
 - 2. If three records have different addresses note the correct donation amount for the Steven Fisher on the Excel spreadsheet under the heading "New Amount" and under the heading "Corrected Amount?" enter "1" In this case the record will be removed from the sample and a new record will be randomly selected to take its place. This record will then be reviewed in the same fashion

APPENDIX E: DEFINITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Would the donor receive financial benefit from a particular decision by a City board, commission or agency?
- Did the donor affirmatively participate in the decision-making process?
- Is it possible to easily and clearly identify the donor's participation in this decisionmaking process?
- Is it possible to create an enforcement mechanism that would give campaigns an ability to identify those donors who are targeted by this regulation?
- Are 'false positives' likely? That is, how likely is it that this donor is not seeking influence, but is donating for partisan, personal or other reasons?
- Would restrictions on this donor place an unfair burden on the way he conducts his business?
- Would restrictions on this donor represent an undue limit on his right to participate in the political process?
- Is it likely this donor is giving to circumvent a regulation placed on another donor?

CONTRACTORS

Financial benefit?	YES; proceeds of contract.
Affirmative participation?	YES; party to contract.
Clear identification possible?	YES; firms are identified through VENDEX. Identification of principals/officers not currently uniform, but could be standardized through regulation.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES; through VENDEX.
False positives?	NO; very unlikely.
Unfair burden on business?	NO. Firms or individuals receive benefit for burden of disclosure or paperwork.
Limit on right to participate?	NO . Firms or individuals receive benefit from City for giving up full right to donate.
Used to circumvent regulation?	NO

BIDDERS

Financial benefit?	YES. Firms are seeking proceeds of contract.
Affirmative participation?	YES; submission of bid, response to RFP or request to be added to bidders list.
Clear identification possible?	YES. Bidding firms are not currently identified through VENDEX; however, new regulation would be required for enforcement.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES; through VENDEX.
False positives?	NO; very unlikely.
Unfair burden?	NO. Firms or individuals receive benefit for burden of disclosure or paperwork.
Limit on right to participate?	NO. Firms or individuals give up the right to participate fully in pursuit of a benefit. If benefit is not procured (i.e. if bid is unsuccessful) then right to participate should be restored.
Used to circumvent regulation?	NO

FRANCHISES / CONCESSIONS

Financial benefit?	YES. Concessionaires receive right to make money on city land; franchisees receive direct financial benefit from City.
Affirmative participation?	YES; both enter into a contract with City.
Clear identification possible?	YES. Concessionaires and franchisees should be listed in VENDEX, though there may be some that escape disclosure.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES; through VENDEX.
False positives?	NO; very unlikely.
Unfair burden?	NO. Firms or individuals receive benefit for burden of disclosure or paperwork.
Limit on right to participate?	NO . Firms or individuals receive benefit in exchange for giving up full right to donate.
Used to circumvent regulation?	NO

SUBCONTRACTORS/SUBSIDIARIES

Financial benefit?	YES; firms receive some proceeds of contract.
Affirmative participation?	YES, to extent that subcontractors or subsidiaries are involved response to RFP.
Clear identification possible?	YES. Subcontractors currently must be identified in response to RFP; subsidiaries can be covered with additional regulation.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES; through VENDEX.
False positives?	MAYBE. Levels of coordination between parent firms and subsidiaries may vary.
Unfair burden?	NO; burden of disclosure falls on parent firm.
Limit on right to participate?	NO. Firms or individuals receive benefit in exchange for giving up full right to donate.
Used to circumvent regulation?	MAYBE

EMPLOYEES / OFFICERS / EXECUTIVES / PRINCIPALS

Financial benefit?	MAYBE. For principal owners or chief executives, the benefit is clear. For lower-level employees, there may be no direct benefit from a City contract.
Affirmative participation?	MAYBE. Again, the distinction is between principal owners, chief executives, and officers on one side and lower-level employees on the other.
Clear identification possible?	YES, if complete information on principal owners, executives and officers is collected through VENDEX.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES, through VENDEX.
False positives?	NO; unlikely.
Unfair burden?	NO. Burden of disclosure or paperwork is a condition of receiving benefit.
Limit on right to participate?	NO . For owners, officers or executives seeking City benefit, restriction on right to donate is a reasonable condition.
Used to circumvent regulation?	MAYBE. If executives or officers are restricted from donating in large amounts, lower-level employees could be encouraged to donate as a way to compensate.

DEVELOPERS WITH AN INTEREST IN LAND USE DECISIONS

Financial benefit?	YES. Applicants are looking for a decision that will affect the value of their land.
Affirmative participation?	MAYBE. For many decisions, such as map amendments, variances or special permits, a landowner must apply to appropriate board or commission. For others, such as larger-scale re-zonings, the action may originate with the Planning Commission. A landowner may not have officially requested the particular action, even if he stands to benefit. For yet others, such as DOB permitting decisions, a builder has no discretion about whether or not to seek approval.
Clear identification possible?	MAYBE. Currently, CPC and BSA documents do not systematically identify the landowner affected by a particular decision. While every piece of land has an owner attached to it, much development is done in the name of shell companies or LLCs meant to obscure the principals behind a particular transaction.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES. No infrastructure currently exists, however. Enforcement would require additional collection of data on landowners (and principals of development firms) from such applicants before relevant boards and commissions, as well as a database where information can be aggregated and examined by campaigns, the CFB and the public.
False positives?	MAYBE. The risk of false positives can be minimized by focusing on those decisions that are both discretionary (that is, a special permit as opposed to a building permit) and individual (that is, a zoning variance as opposed to a rezoning) in nature.
Unfair burden?	NO. Enforcement would not require much in the way of additional paperwork; added burden of data collection and organization would fall primarily on boards and commissions.
Limit on right to participate?	NO. Entities would agree to limits on right to donate as a condition of asking for a particular benefit.
Used to circumvent regulation?	MAYBE. There is a potential LLCs can be used to obscure identities and protect the ability of principals to donate up to the full limits.

NOT-FOR-PROFITS

Financial benefit?	YES. While the financial imperative may not be as strong as it is in a for-profit enterprise, contracts with the City to provide social services – which in many cases are quite lucrative – provide a boost to an organization's bottom line, and enable them to grow.
Affirmative participation?	YES. Non-profits who receive contracts participate in the same competitive bidding processes as for-profit firms.
Clear identification possible?	YES, through VENDEX. Identification of principals is not uniform – board members do not have to be identified, for instance – but can be addressed through regulation.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES, through VENDEX.
False positives?	MAYBE. People who serve on not-for-profit boards often serve more than one not-for-profit. These individuals are likely the sort of well-off, civic-minded people who would participate by giving campaign donations regardless of their board service.
Unfair burden?	MAYBE. Not-for-profits may find it harder to attract people to serve on boards if their campaign donations are restricted.
Limit on right to participate?	NO. For directors or managerial decision-makers, limits on donations are a reasonable condition of gaining business.
Used to circumvent regulation?	NO.

LOBBYISTS

Financial benefit?	YES. Lobbyists earn fees from clients to access City officials or influence City decisions.
Affirmative participation?	YES.
Clear identification possible?	YES. Lobbyists must register with City Clerk's office, which maintains database that is published online.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES; through NYC Lobbyist database.
False positives?	NO; very unlikely.
Unfair burden?	NO. Lobbyists must already register; enforcement should provide no additional burden.
Limit on right to participate?	NO. Accepting limits on right to donate to campaigns should be acceptable price of access to lobbying profession.
Used to circumvent regulation?	NO

LOBBYIST CLIENTS

Financial benefit?	MAYBE. Many clients of lobbyists have financial interests before the city, while others are interested only in policy. Further study might illuminate what proportion of lobbyist clients are business-based or issue-based.
Affirmative participation?	YES.
Clear identification possible?	YES. Lobbyists must list their clients for the City Clerk's database.
Enforcement mechanism possible?	YES; through NYC Lobbyist database.
False positives?	YES, to the extent that it captures clients who have no financial interest in the policy decision they hope to affect. Crafting language to separate <i>doing business</i> clients from issue-advocacy clients would prove difficult.
Unfair burden?	NO. Enforcement should provide no additional burden.
Limit on right to participate?	MAYBE. The question of whether a particular firm or individual should be forced to give up his full right to participate financially when he hires a lobbyist may warrant further consideration.
Used to circumvent regulation?	NO.

APPENDIX F: GOVERNMENT ACTORS IN LAND USE DECISIONS

	1. Community Boards	Applications subject to ULURP	Appointed by Borough
		include: changes to the City Map; maps of subdivisions and the platting of land into streets, avenues, etc.; zoning changes*;	Presidents, half on recommendations from City Council members
ULURP	2. Borough Presidents	certain special permits under the jurisdiction of CPC; site selection for City capital projects; revocable consents, solicitations for franchises and major concessions; improvements in real property, the costs of which are payable other than by the City; housing and urban renewal plans and projects*; sanitary or waterfront landfills; disposition of city-owned real	Elected
	3. City Planning Commission (CPC)		13 members: 7 appointed by Mayor, 1 appointed by each Borough President, 1 by Public Advocate
	4. City Council	property*; acquisition of real property by the City (except office leases); certain other matters. * = automatically reviewed by City Council	Elected; Land Use Committee (which acts before full Council on land use matters) has 21 members.
Other land use decisions	Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA)	Grants special permits and variances; can modify or revoke certificates of occupancy.	Five members, appointed by Mayor
	Landmarks Preservation Commission	Designates buildings as a landmark or historic district; can prohibit work on landmark building or in historic district.	11 members, appointed by Mayor
	Loft Board	Resolves regulation issues surrounding loft buildings converted to residential use; settles landlord-tenant disputes; enforces residential legalization deadlines set forth in the Loft Law; enforces maintenance standards.	Nine members, appointed by Mayor
	Department of Buildings	Reviews construction and demolition plans and issues building permits; inspects buildings to ensure compliance with laws; licenses various construction trades; investigates complaints.	Commissioner appointed by Mayor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our Capstone team wishes to thank the members and staff of the New York City Campaign Finance Board for their ongoing assistance throughout this project. In particular, we would like to acknowledge Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr., Nicole Gordon, Erik Joerss, Peri Horowitz, Diana Kirby, Andrea Lynn and Kenneth O'Brien.

We would also like to thank the CFB Intern Mike Muller for his invaluable assistance in conducting the quantitative and qualitative analyses sections of the report.

Additionally, we would like to acknowledge the various experts who lent their time and expertise: Frank Barry of the New York City Mayor's Office, Greg J. Brooks and John Graham of the New York City Comptroller's Office, Martha Mahan Haines of the Securities Exchange Commission, Eric Lane of the Hofstra University School of Law, Harry Pozycki of Common Cause New Jersey, Gene Russianoff of New York Public Interest Research Group, and Paul Ryan of the Campaign Legal Center.

Finally, we would like to thank our Capstone advisor, Charles M. Brecher, Professor of Public and Health Administration at the NYU Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, for his support and guidance throughout the project.