

Section 1 –
Total Receipts, Public Financing & Independent Spending
for Candidates & Ballot Measure Committees

Due to the great difficulty the San Francisco Ethics Commission online database poses for easily seeing total financing for all campaigns for a particular election, this article continues the work done by other CitiReport articles and provides an easy-to-read table of cumulative financing for the last San Francisco election's candidate and measure contests (based on the data portrayal method of the Los Angeles City Ethics Commission). In this Section, I have provided three tables. The first table lists cumulative-to-date contributions and public financing received by all major 2011 candidates, as well supportive and oppositional third party independent spending. A second table provides total funds received by all of the 2011 Ballot Measure Committees and total support for all ballot measure positions. A third table breaks down the sources of independent spending regarding candidates and measures.

Table 1 - San Francisco November 2011 Election Candidate Campaign Financing, current to 12/31/11ⁱ

Candidates by contest	Contributions received by candidatesⁱⁱ	Public Financing Received (as of 12/16/11)	Unpaid Debts Exceeding Cash on Handⁱⁱⁱ	Third Party Support^{iv}	Total Support (contributions, public financing, unpaid debts, & third party)	Third Party Opposition^v
DISTRICT ATTORNEY						
Bock, Sharmin	\$644,371	n/a	\$6,538	\$40,612	\$691,521	\$0
Fazio, Bill	\$54,750	n/a	\$0	\$1,211	\$55,961	\$0
Gascón, George	\$395,323	n/a	\$115,292	\$88,264	\$598,879	\$191,588
Onek, David	\$439,210	n/a	\$0	\$55,213	\$494,423	\$0
Trinh, Vu	\$70,758	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$70,758	\$0
DA Total:	\$1,604,412	n/a	\$121,830	\$185,300	\$1,911,542	\$191,588
MAYOR						
Adachi, Jeff	\$193,626	\$0	\$0	\$85,158	\$278,784	\$6,782
Alioto-Pier, Michela	\$281,519	\$488,875	\$263	\$19,703	\$790,360	\$0
Ascarrunz,	\$49,529 ^{vi}	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$49,529	\$0

Candidates by contest	Contributions received by candidates ⁱⁱ	Public Financing Received (as of 12/16/11)	Unpaid Debts Exceeding Cash on Hand ⁱⁱⁱ	Third Party Support ^{iv}	Total Support (contributions, public financing, unpaid debts, & third party)	Third Party Opposition ^v
Cesar						
Avalos, John	\$232,665	\$461,479	\$0	\$93,946	\$788,090	\$30,763
Baum, Terry	\$49,094	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$49,094	\$0
Chiu, David	\$667,953	\$572,050	\$0	\$212,858	\$1,452,861	\$0
Dufty, Bevan	\$724,902	\$682,108	\$0	\$68,717	\$1,475,727	\$0
Hall, Tony	\$163,207	\$428,056	\$0	\$0	\$591,263	\$0
Herrera, Dennis	\$831,031	\$720,690	\$0	\$313,603	\$1,865,324	\$35,293
Lee, Edwin	\$1,592,436	\$0	\$278,788	\$1,409,614	\$3,280,838	\$419,891
Rees, Joanna	\$453,937	\$492,480	\$0	\$92,082	\$1,038,499	\$0
Ting, Phil	\$191,178	\$312,564	\$0	\$13,342	\$517,084	\$0
Yee, Leland	\$832,455	\$539,014	\$80,698	\$421,644	\$1,873,811	\$0
Mayor Total:	\$6,263,532	\$4,967,316	\$359,749	\$2,730,667	\$14,051,264	\$492,729
SHERIFF						
Cunnie, Chris	\$306,965	n/a	\$14,893	\$246,101	\$567,959	\$0
Mirkarimi, Ross	\$270,512	n/a	\$0	\$54,143	\$324,655	\$22,975
Miyamoto, Paul	\$238,619	n/a	\$0	\$33,557	\$272,176	\$0
Sheriff Total:	\$816,096	n/a	\$14,893	\$333,801	\$1,164,790	\$22,975
Total for all contests:	\$8,684,040	\$4,967,316	\$496,472	\$3,249,768	\$17,152,717	\$707,292

Table 2 - San Francisco November 2011 Election Ballot Measure Campaign
Financing, current to 12/31/11

Measure Position	Ballot Measure Committee (BMC)	BMC Financing^{vii} (contributions, misc. cash increases, & unpaid debt exceeding cash, less amounts to other BMCs or for candidates)	Third Party Agreement^{viii}	Total for Measure Position
A - School Bonds				
Yes on A	One California For All – Yee for A	\$51,486 ^{ix}	\$74,532	\$533,077
	Rebuilding San Francisco Schools, Yes on Proposition A	\$407,059 ^x		
No on A	none	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total regarding Measure A:				\$533,077
B - Road Paving & Street Safety Bonds				
Yes on B	Fix Our Streets – Yes on B	\$163,229	\$83,343	\$246,572
No on B	none	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total regarding Measure B:				\$246,572
C - City Pension & Health Care Benefits				
Yes on C	Standing Up For Working Families, Yes on C, No on D, A Coalition of Teachers, Nurses, Firefighters, Public Employees and Health Care Advocates	\$343,903 ^{xi}	\$31,683	\$1,056,259
	San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798, Yes on C, No on D	\$1,647 ^{xii}		
	San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D, a coalition of public employees, taxpayers, and business groups	\$679,026 ^{xiii}		
	The Municipal Attorneys Association, Yes on C, No on D	\$0 ^{xiv}		
No on C	Protect Our Benefits – No on Prop C	\$46,681 ^{xv}	\$0	\$46,681
Total regarding Measure C:				\$1,102,940
D - City Pension Benefits				
Yes on D	Yes on Proposition D,	\$548,972 ^{xvii}	\$0	\$548,972

Measure Position	Ballot Measure Committee (BMC)	BMC Financing^{vii} (contributions, misc. cash increases, & unpaid debt exceeding cash, less amounts to other BMCs or for candidates)	Third Party Agreement^{viii}	Total for Measure Position
	supported by Public Defender Jeff Adachi, Basic American Foods executive George Hume & business investor Michael Moritz ^{xvi}			
No on D	Standing Up For Working Families, Yes on C, No on D, A Coalition of Teachers, Nurses, Firefighters, Public Employees and Health Care Advocates	\$343,903 ^{xviii}	\$41,068	\$1,065,644
	San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798, Yes on C, No on D	\$1,647 ^{xix}		
	San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D, a coalition of public employees, taxpayers, and business groups	\$679,026 ^{xx}		
	The Municipal Attorneys Association, Yes on C, No on D	\$0 ^{xxi}		
Total regarding Measure D:				\$1,614,616
E - Amending or Repealing Legislative Ordinances & Declarations of Policy				
Yes on E	Yes on E, San Franciscans for Ballot Measure Reform, Supported by Supervisor Scott Wiener	\$38,000	\$42,514	\$80,514
No on E	Friends of Ethics, Committee Opposed to Measures E & F	\$7,051 ^{xxii}	\$2,266	\$9,317
Total regarding Measure E:				\$89,831
F - Campaign Consultant Ordinance				
Yes on F	none	\$0	\$0	\$0
No on F	Friends of Ethics, Committee Opposed to Measures E & F	\$7,051 ^{xxiii}	\$2,293	\$9,344
Total regarding Measure F:				\$9,344
G - Sales Tax				

Measure Position	Ballot Measure Committee (BMC)	BMC Financing ^{vii} (contributions, misc. cash increases, & unpaid debt exceeding cash, less amounts to other BMCs or for candidates)	Third Party Agreement ^{viii}	Total for Measure Position
Yes on G	Yes on Proposition G 2011, a Committee in Support of Public Safety, Children, and Seniors, Supported by SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee	\$189,815 ^{xxiv}	\$71,074	\$301,082
	SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee – Yes on Measure G ^{xxv}	\$40,193 ^{xxvi}		
No on G	Committee for a Fair & Better San Francisco, No on G	\$95,150	\$0	\$95,150
Total regarding Measure G:				\$396,232
H - School District Student Assignment				
Yes on H	Students First – Yes on H	\$34,119 ^{xxvii}	\$0	\$73,737
	Support Quality Neighborhood Schools for All – Yes on H, Supported by Entrepreneur Joanna Rees and Education Reform Advocates	\$39,618 ^{xxviii}		
No on H	H No! Let Parents Decide, sponsored by: United Educators of San Francisco	\$136,701	\$3,586	\$140,287
Total regarding Measure H:				\$214,024
Total for all measures:				\$4,206,636

Table 3 - San Francisco November 2011 Election Third Party Independent Spending on Candidates & Measures^{xxix}

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender
Bock – DA	Support	\$40,612 ^{xxx}	Committee for a Safer San Francisco, Supporting Sharmin Bock, Opposing George Gascon for District Attorney 2011	\$35,412

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$5,200
Fazio – DA	Support	\$1,211	Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$1,211
Gascon – DA	Support	\$88,264	San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$84,200
			San Franciscans for Safe Streets and Sound Government - a committee for Lee Mayor 2011, Gascon District Attorney 2011 & Cunnie Sheriff 2011	\$1,667
			Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$1,211
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$1,186
	Oppose	\$191,588	Committee for a Safer San Francisco; Supporting Sharmin Bock, Opposing George Gascon for District Attorney 2011	\$191,588
Onek – DA	Support	\$55,213	SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$38,672
			San Francisco Young Democrats	\$16,541
Adachi – Mayor	Support	\$85,158	Yes on Prop. D, supported by Public Defender Jeff Adachi, Basic American Foods executive George Hume & business investor, Michael Moritz	\$85,158
	Oppose	\$6,782	Educating Voters for Jobs Against Avalos and Adachi for Mayor 2011 a coalition of police and construction workers unions	\$6,782 ^{xxxi}
Alioto-Pier – Mayor	Support	\$19,703	Coalition For Sensible Government with major funding by San Francisco Association of Realtors	\$13,996
			UA Local 38 COPE Fund	\$5,077
Avalos – Mayor	Support	\$93,946	Service Employees International Union 1021 Candidate PAC	\$21,772
			California Nurses Association PAC	\$21,584
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$15,261
			SF Tenants Union	\$11,671
			SEIU Local 1021 Independent Expenditure PAC	\$10,133
			Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club	\$9,314
			SF Rising Action Fund Committee	\$1,605
			San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D	\$1,341

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender
			Coleman Action Fund for Children Committee	\$1,265
	Oppose	\$30,763	Educating Voters for Jobs Against Avalos and Adachi for Mayor 2011 a coalition of police and construction workers unions	\$30,763
Chiu – Mayor	Support	\$212,858	Californians for Trust, Responsibility, Unity & Empowerment PAC	\$141,120
			California Nurses Association PAC	\$21,584
			Coalition For Sensible Government with major funding by San Francisco Association of Realtors	\$16,993
			Unite Here Local 2 PAC	\$13,440
			Golden State Leadership Fund PAC	\$13,342
			San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D	\$5,168
			Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$1,211
Dufty – Mayor	Support	\$68,717	Gay & Lesbian Victory Fund	\$20,343
			Service Employees International Union 1021 Candidate PAC	\$20,091
			Coalition For Sensible Government with major funding by San Francisco Association of Realtors	\$11,994
			SEIU Local 1021 Independent Expenditure PAC	\$10,054
			San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D	\$3,339
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$1,685
			Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$1,211
Herrera – Mayor	Support	\$313,603	Unite Here Local 2 PAC	\$189,989
			San Franciscans for New Priorities and Dennis Herrera for Mayor 2011	\$62,618
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$42,736
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$11,489
			Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club	\$4,664
			Richmond District Democratic Club	\$1,107
			Philip Muller	\$1,000

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender		
	Oppose	\$35,293	Citizens for Strength and Security	\$25,121 ^{xxxii}		
			Gay & Lesbian Victory Fund	\$10,172		
Lee – Mayor	Support	\$1,409,614	San Franciscans for Jobs and Good Government, Supporting Ed Lee for Mayor 2011	\$638,772		
			SF Neighbor Alliance for Ed Lee for Mayor 2011 ^{xxxiii}	\$218,886		
			Committee for Effective City Management-- A Committee in Support of Ed Lee for Mayor 2011	\$142,309 ^{xxxiv}		
			Progress for All ^{xxxv}	\$119,118		
			Coalition For Sensible Government with major funding by San Francisco Association of Realtors	\$69,464		
			San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$66,412		
			Coalition for a Safer California	\$46,035		
			Yes on Proposition G 2011, a Committee in Support of Public Safety, Children, and Seniors, Supported by SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee	\$35,322		
			Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$26,211		
			Golden State Leadership Fund PAC	\$13,342		
			SEIU United Healthcare Workers West	\$11,181		
			Support Drafting Ed Lee for SF Mayor 2011	\$7,730		
			San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D	\$7,229		
			Michael Breyer	\$4,866		
			San Franciscans for Safe Streets and Sound Government - a committee for Lee Mayor 2011, Gascon District Attorney 2011 & Cunnie Sheriff 2011	\$1,667		
			SF Rising Action Fund Committee	\$1,070		
			Oppose	\$419,891	City Residents Opposing Ed Lee for Mayor 2011, sponsored by American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees AFL-CIO and AFSCME CA People ^{xxxvi}	\$371,907 ^{xxxvii}
					Unite Here Local 2 PAC	\$43,923

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender
			Yes on Prop. D, supported by Public Defender Jeff Adachi, Basic American Foods executive George Hume & business investor, Michael Moritz	\$4,061
Rees – Mayor	Support	\$92,082	Support Quality Neighborhood Schools for All - Yes on H, Supporting by Entrepreneur Joanna Rees and Education Reform Advocates	\$92,082
Ting – Mayor	Support	\$13,342	Golden State Leadership Fund PAC	\$13,342
Yee – Mayor	Support	\$421,644	City Residents Opposing Ed Lee for Mayor 2011, sponsored by American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees AFL-CIO and AFSCME CA People	\$318,087
			One California For All - Yee for A	\$36,984
			Service Employees International Union 1021 Candidate PAC	\$21,772
			California Nurses Association PAC	\$21,584
			SEIU Local 1021 Independent Expenditure PAC	\$10,133
			Coalition For Sensible Government with major funding by San Francisco Association of Realtors	\$5,081
			Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club	\$4,664
			San Franciscans United for Pension and Health Reform, Yes on C, No on D	\$3,339
Cunnie – Sheriff	Support	\$246,101	Cunnie for Sheriff 2011 sponsored by the San Francisco Police Officers Association ^{xxxviii}	\$184,196 ^{xxxix}
			San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$49,834
			Coalition for a Safer California	\$8,016
			San Franciscans for Safe Streets and Sound Government - a committee for Lee Mayor 2011, Gascon District Attorney 2011 & Cunnie Sheriff 2011	\$1,667
			Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$1,211
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$1,177
Mirkarimi – Sheriff	Support	\$54,143	California Nurses Association PAC	\$17,165
			San Francisco Young Democrats	\$16,541
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$11,657

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender
			California Nurses Assn. Quality Health Care Committee	\$8,780
	Oppose	\$22,975	Coalition for a Safer California	\$14,497
			Cunnie for Sheriff 2011 sponsored by the San Francisco Police Officers Association	\$8,478
Miyamoto – Sheriff	Support	\$33,557	SF Deputy Sheriffs’ Association PAC	\$19,474
			SF Sheriffs Managers & Supervisors Political Action Committee	\$12,872
			Building Owners & Managers Assn. of SF PAC – Independent Expenditures	\$1,211
Total independent financing regarding candidates:				\$3,274,889
Measure A	Support	\$74,532	SF Forward Sponsored by SF Chamber of Commerce	\$35,607
			Asian Pacific Democratic Club	\$16,500
			SF Fire Fighters PAC	\$12,500
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$5,296
			San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$2,379
			Recology PAC	\$1,250
			Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe California Political Action Committee	\$1,000
Measure B	Support	\$83,343	San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$46,954
			Webcor Builders	\$15,000
			SF Fire Fighters PAC	\$12,500
			Forest City	\$6,000
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$1,639
			Recology PAC	\$1,250
Measure C	Support	\$31,683	SEIU Local 1021 Issues PAC	\$12,808
			Golden State Leadership Fund PAC	\$4,635
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$4,078
			California Nurses Association PAC	\$2,500
			San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$2,380
			SF Rising Action Fund Committee	\$1,910
			Recology PAC	\$1,250
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$1,122

Contest	Position	Total Amount for Position	Spenders	Amount by Spender
			Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe California Political Action Committee	\$1,000
Measure D	Oppose	\$41,068	SEIU Local 1021 Issues PAC	\$24,202
			Golden State Leadership Fund PAC	\$4,918
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$3,990
			California Nurses Association PAC	\$2,500
			San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$2,426
			SF Rising Action Fund Committee	\$1,910
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$1,122
Measure E	Support	\$42,514	Coalition For Sensible Government with major funding by San Francisco Association of Realtors	\$39,032
			San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$2,425
			Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club PAC	\$1,057
	Oppose	\$2,266	SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$2,266
Measure F	Oppose	\$2,293	SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$2,293
Measure G	Support	\$71,074	San Francisco Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth PAC	\$58,250
			Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club	\$9,968
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$1,606
			Recology PAC	\$1,250
Measure H	Oppose	\$3,586	SF Rising Action Fund Committee	\$1,955
			SF Democratic County Central Committee	\$1,631
Total independent financing regarding measures:				\$352,359
Total independent financing:				\$3,627,248

ⁱ Includes any amended data filed as of February 8, 2012.

ⁱⁱ Includes monetary contributions, non-monetary (in-kind) contributions, & loans not yet paid back. Includes fundraising by candidates done in 2009, 2010, and 2011.

ⁱⁱⁱ These amounts are outstanding debts, accrued and unpaid by a candidate as 12/31/11 and which exceed the candidate's cash on hand available as of 12/31/11. Committees with such outstanding debt were insolvent as of 12/31/11.

^{iv} These amounts do not include spending of less than \$1,000 per candidate (cumulative). The amounts were computed by contrasting (i) the Ethics Commission's summary (current to 11/15/11) of Third Party Disclosure Reports (including independent expenditures, electioneering communications, and membership communications of \$5,000 or more), (ii) filed Form 465 and 496 independent expenditure reports (independent expenditures of \$1,000 or more), and (iii) the finances for independent committees formed primarily to support or oppose one or more San Francisco candidates. For the latter committees, the amount included in the table above was their total reported expenditures (unlike general purpose committees, primarily-formed committees can be assumed to have spent all of their funds regarding the candidate(s) for which they were formed, unless they otherwise report a specific amount spent for some other candidate or measure). In cases where the primarily-formed committee concerned multiple candidates and had higher total expenditures than expenditures explained in supplemental disclosures, the total amount of expenditures was divided amongst the candidates based on the spending proportions disclosed by the committees in their supplemental reports (see endnotes below specific to each such committee for the details).

^v See Endnote #iv for methodology explanation.

^{vi} Ascarrunz's reports claim that the committee's sole contribution was a \$300,000 loan from the candidate. Since the reports also claim that over \$250,000 of that amount was paid back to the candidate, the candidate's total contributions to date equal the amount of the loan that was forgiven. If the amount of the loan to the candidate's committee was truthfully disclosed, it would illegally exceed the \$15,000 limit under San Francisco law regarding candidate loans to their own committees. Additionally, the law mandates that any loan amount over \$15,000 automatically converts to a permanent monetary contribution to the committee and may not be repaid to the candidate.

^{vii} Methodology note: The amount reported in the table equals the committee's contributions received plus reported miscellaneous increases to cash for 2011 (unless a different time frame was provided – see subsequent end notes for individual Ballot Measure Committees), combined with the amount of unpaid outstanding accrued debts exceeding available cash as of 12/31/11, less any amounts spent by the BMCs on either contributions to other BMCs in the table or spending regarding candidates. For BMC's formed to support two measures, the total amount of funds received was divided between the measures (the resulting figures appear in the table above). While such division does not necessarily reflect the true priorities of the campaign and though ballot contests such as Measures C versus D might more realistically be considered a single campaign fight rather than two, this methodology was employed for the sake of simplicity and in order to determine total relative financial support for each individual measure position.

^{viii} Excludes independent spending of less than \$1,000 per measure (cumulative). Note that the third party disclosure requirements for candidates are enhanced per local law in San Francisco, but, by contrast, third party spending regarding San Francisco ballot measures is disclosed only as required under state law, resulting in less disclosure of independent spending regarding measures than of independent spending regarding candidates.

^{ix} One California for All originally began as Yee's committee to support Measure C (Candlestick Park Naming Rights) in the November 2010 election. In September of 2011, the committee amended its status to become in support of Measure A in the current election. The committee's starting cash on 1/1/11 was \$13,608 and its 2011 expenditures totaled \$102,077. In 2011, One California for All raised \$82,200 in contributions. In addition, as of 12/31/11, One California for All's reported unpaid accrued debt exceeded available cash on hand was \$7,270. From the total of the latter two amounts (88,470), candidate advocacy spending of \$36,984 (support of Yee for Mayor) was deducted, resulting in the total committee financing regarding Measure A listed in Table 2 above. The independent spending on a candidate is incorporated into figures in Tables 1 and 3.

^x Rebuilding San Francisco Schools Yes on Proposition A received \$407,023 in contributions and \$36 in miscellaneous increases to cash.

^{xi} Standing Up For Working Families (SUWF), a sponsored committee of SF Fire Fighters Local 798, was originally formed to oppose Measure B in the November 2010 election (Adachi's original pension measure). In June of 2011, the committee amended its status to become in support of Measure C and opposed to Measure D of the current election. Beginning on 1/1/11, the committee had Cash on Hand of \$29,729. For 2011, the committee reported raising \$257,806 in contributions, spending \$741,175 (including on paying accrued debts from last year), and, most unusual of all, receiving \$460,000 in miscellaneous increases to cash from various unions. The committee's reports do not provide a description to indicate the type of miscellaneous cash increase that occurred with the \$460,000 amount. For purposes of the methodology used in the BMC table above, SUWF's activity on C and D was \$343,903 each (\$257,806 + \$460,000, minus \$30,000 in contributions made by SUWF and reported as received by San Franciscans United for Pension & Health Reform, remaining total divided by 2).

^{xii} SF Fire Fighters Local 798's Ballot Measure Committee was originally formed to oppose Measure B in the November 2010 election (Adachi's original pension measure). In September of 2011, the committee amended its status to become in support of Measure C and opposed to Measure D of the current election. While the committee technically raised \$112,294 in 2011, it is listed in the table above as raising only \$1,647 (\$3,294 total for C and D) because it spent all of its other funds on contributions to the other two BMCs which share its goals and reports a \$0 cash balance. Specifically, it contributed \$34,000 to Standing Up For Working Families and \$75,000 to San Franciscans United for Pension & Health Reform, which is incorporated in the totals for those committees in the table above.

^{xiii} San Franciscans United for Pension & Health Reform received total contributions of \$1,369,973 and total miscellaneous increases to cash of \$1,817. From that total, independent spending amounts of \$1,341 (support of Avalos for Mayor), \$5,168 (support of Chiu for Mayor), and \$7,229 (support of Lee for Mayor) was deducted, resulting in total committee financing of \$1,358,052. For purposes of Table 2 above, the remaining total was equally divided among C and D (\$679,026 each). The independent spending on candidates is incorporated into figures in Tables 1 and 3.

^{xiv} In early November of 2011, this committee filed its first reports with the SF Ethics Commission, identifying itself as The Municipal Attorneys Association, Yes on C, No on D. On November 7, 2011, the day before the election, the committee filed numerous severely late reports, disclosing its financing for reporting periods ending 10/16/10, 12/31/10, 6/30/11, 9/24/11, & 10/22/11. The reports indicate that, as of 6/30/11 and earlier, this committee's name was "The Municipal Attorneys Association, No on B" and the committee was formed for Measure B in the November 2010 election (Adachi's original pension measure). The committee's 2011 activity is listed as \$0 in the table above because its funds received and spent during that year were used exclusively in support of Standing Up For Working Families and San Franciscans United for Pension & Health Reform (which reported the amounts), including early spring activity regarding No on B (for the original version of Standing Up For Working Families) and activity from August to October regarding Yes on C, No on D. By law, the committee appears to owe a large amount of per diem late filing fees to the City & County of San Francisco.

^{xv} The Protect Our Benefits committee has been around since at least 1999 and reported a Cash on Hand balance of \$60,610 beginning 1/1/11. In September of 2011, the committee amended its status to become opposed to Measure C of the current election. In 2011, the committee received contributions and miscellaneous increases to cash of \$46,599 and \$82, respectively, and spent a total of \$60,517.

^{xvi} The original name of the Yes Proposition D committee was San Franciscans For Pension Reform Supported by Public Defender Jeff Adachi, George Hume & Michael Moritz.

^{xvii} Yes on Proposition D received in \$637,734 in contributions and \$457 in miscellaneous increases to cash. From that total, candidate spending amounts of \$85,158 (support of Adachi for Mayor) and

\$4,061 (opposition to Lee for Mayor) was deducted, resulting in the total committee financing regarding Measure D listed in Table 2 above. The independent spending on candidates is incorporated into figures in Tables 1 and 3.

^{xviii} See Endnote #xi regarding Standing Up For Working Families amount.

^{xix} See Endnote #xii regarding the SF Fire Fighters Local 798's BMC amount.

^{xx} See Endnote #xiii regarding the San Franciscans for Pension & Health Reform amount.

^{xxi} See Endnote #xiv regarding The Municipal Attorneys Association, Yes on C, No on D amount.

^{xxii} Friends of Ethics Committee Opposed to Measures E & F raised total contributions of \$13,212 and received miscellaneous increases to cash of \$890.

^{xxiii} See Endnote #xxii regarding the Friends of Ethics amount.

^{xxiv} Yes on Proposition G 2011, a Committee in Support of Public Safety, Children, and Seniors, Supported by SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee received \$225,137 in contributions. From that amount, independent spending of \$35,322 (support of Lee for Mayor) was deducted, resulting in the total committee financing regarding Measure G listed in Table 2 above. The independent spending on a candidate is incorporated into figures in Tables 1 and 3.

^{xxv} In the past, this committee was known as Health Care Workers Union, SEIU Local 250 Political Issues Committee. During the 2011 election, the committee's name was SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee - Yes on Measure G, which is listed in the table above. After the election, the committee amended its name to SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee. As of the publication of this article and for a length of time prior, the Ethics Commission has incorrectly listed this committee as a No on G Ballot Measure Committee, under the 11/8/11 election pull-down in their online database.

^{xxvi} On October 11, 2011, the SEIU United Healthcare Workers West Political Issues Committee filed an amendment to its registered committee status to become a San Francisco Ballot Measure Committee (BMC) in support of G. The committee's beginning cash balance on July 1, 2011 was \$10,350. While the committee reported raising \$125,180 during the period of 7/1/11-12/31/11, its contribution total is listed in the table as \$40,193 due the amount it contributed to the Yes on Proposition BMC (\$125,180 received, less \$84,987 spent for nonmonetary contributions for the benefit of and reported as received by Yes on Proposition G, equals \$40,193 net).

^{xxvii} Students First's contributions totaled \$33,959. Its miscellaneous increases to cash were \$160. These amounts include its activity in 2010 and 2011.

^{xxviii} Support Quality Neighborhood Schools for All – Yes on H, Supported by Entrepreneur Joanna Rees and Education Reform Advocates received \$131,700 in contributions. From that amount, spending of \$92,082 regarding candidate advocacy (support of Rees for Mayor) was deducted, resulting in the total committee financing regarding Measure G listed in Table 2 above. The spending on a candidate is incorporated into figures in Tables 1 and 3.

^{xxix} See Endnotes iv and ix regarding methodology.

^{xxx} In Section 1 of the October 20, 2011 Citireport.com article regarding election financing, the total third party support for Bock was listed much higher (over \$100,000), due to the methodology employed in that article (total funds *received* by Committee for a Safer San Francisco (Supporting Sharmin Bock) were attributed as third party support for only Bock). The lower third party support of Bock detailed in the present article is based on subsequent reporting from Committee for a Safer San Francisco, including that the majority of its funds were spent in opposition to another candidate (Gascon).

^{xxxi} Since this committee reported total 2011 expenditures of \$37,545 and reported spending \$30,763 regarding Avalos, the remainder was attributed as being spent regarding Adachi.

^{xxxii} Though the Ethics Commission's online chart of Third Party Disclosures (as of the 11/15/11 update) identifies the third party spending of Citizens for Strength and Security as in support of Herrera for

Mayor and in the amount of only \$8,817, a close examination of the reporting by this group reveals a very different scenario. First, the total spending related to Herrera was \$25,121, including amounts disclosed well after the election, which may be indicative of reporting a post-election payment date rather than a pre-election expenditure accrual date. Second, while the group's filed reports claim that its spending regarding Herrera was for neutral electioneering communications, the attached content is highly suggestive of opposition to Herrera for Mayor. In addition, the disclosed funding for the group was \$38,000 received from the Asian Pacific Democratic Club, a general purpose campaign committee actively involved in elections. For these reasons, the full spending by Citizens for Strength and Security was attributed in Table 3 as for opposition to Herrera for Mayor.

^{xxxiii} Some of this committee's campaign reports refer to its name as "SF Neighborhood Alliance for Ed Lee for Mayor 2011." However, the most recent Statement of Organization registered with the Ethics Commission and available in its online database at the time of publication indicates that the committee's name remains "SF Neighbor Alliance for Ed Lee for Mayor 2011."

^{xxxiv} While Committee for Effective City Management, a primarily formed committee, reported total expenditures of \$ 160657, it also reported spending \$18,348 on in-kind contributions to SF Neighbor Alliance for Ed Lee for Mayor 2011, which reported receipt of the contributions. Therefore, the \$18,348 amount was deducted from the total financing attributed to Committee for Effective City Management in Table 3.

^{xxxv} Though the Progress for All committee never reported its activity as a committee primarily formed to support a particular candidate (Edwin Lee), it is well known as the source of the Run Ed Run campaign and has not disclosed activity concerning any other election contests. Therefore, its finances have been included in the table above as if it were a primarily-formed committee in support of Lee.

^{xxxvi} This committee was originally named City Residents Supporting Leland Yee for Mayor 2011, sponsored by American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees - CA People.

^{xxxvii} Though City Residents Opposing Ed Lee for Mayor 2011 reported spending only \$ 359,400 on Lee & \$307,648 on Yee (\$667,048 total), its total expenditures for 2011 were \$689,994. Since the committee was primarily formed regarding a particular candidate and did not report advocacy for any other election position other than opposition on Lee and support of Yee, the entire amount of its 2011 expenditures were attributed to those two candidates, according to the proportions reported by the committee (see Table 3 for specific amounts to each).

^{xxxviii} In 2012, the committee, Cunnie for Sheriff 2011 sponsored by the San Francisco Police Officers Association, amended its registered name. It is now called San Francisco Police Officers Association Independent Expenditure Committee.

^{xxxix} Though Cunnie for Sheriff 2011 (its name for 2011) reported spending only \$8,088 on Mirkarimi & \$174,771 on Cunnie (\$182,859 total), its total expenditures for 2011 were \$192,674. Since the committee was primarily formed regarding a particular candidate and did not report advocacy for any other election position other than opposition on Mirkarimi and support of Cunnie, the entire amount of its 2011 expenditures were attributed to those two candidates, according to the proportions reported by the committee (see Table 3 for specific amounts to each).