

**Section 2 –
Votes per Dollar**

This section contrasts the total election financing per candidate/measure position detailed in Section 1 of this article with the votes of the People. The tables below provide calculations regarding the campaign cost per vote for different election positions. The results may be useful in evaluating the value of election propaganda and determining which campaigns had inherent popularity or grassroots strength.

Table 1 - Candidate campaign costs per vote

1st Place Candidates: Highlighted in **Green**

2nd Place Candidates: Highlighted in **Yellow**

Note: The italicized headers below (Columns 3, 7, & 9) provide alternate results based on the Total Supportive Financing regarding a candidate *minus* the Total Opposition Financing (anti-candidate \$) regarding that candidate.

Position	Total Supportive Financing	<i>Supportive Financing minus Opposition Financing</i> (Bolded below if difference)	1st Choice Votes	Final Ranked Choice Votes	Cost per 1st Choice Vote	<i>Cost per 1st Choice Vote</i> (minus anti-candidate \$)	Cost per Final Ranked Vote	<i>Cost per Final Ranked Vote</i> (minus anti-candidate \$)	Outcome
DA - Fazio	\$55,961	\$55,961	19,172	19,252	\$2.92	\$2.92	\$2.91	\$2.91	Fail
DA - Gascon	\$598,879	\$407,291	76,043	100,245	\$7.88	\$5.36	\$5.97	\$4.06	Success
DA - Trinh	\$70,758	\$70,758	6,567	6,596	\$10.77	\$10.77	\$10.73	\$10.73	Fail
DA - Onek	\$494,423	\$494,423	43,319	60,756	\$11.41	\$11.41	\$8.14	\$8.14	Fail
DA - Bock	\$691,521	\$691,521	37,854	44,311	\$18.27	\$18.27	\$15.61	\$15.61	Fail
Mayor - Avalos	\$788,090	\$757,327	37,395	57,160	\$21.07	\$20.25	\$13.79	\$13.25	Fail
Mayor - Adachi	\$278,784	\$272,002	12,515	15,670	\$22.28	\$21.73	\$17.79	\$17.36	Fail
Mayor - Baum	\$49,094	\$49,094	1,662	1,738	\$29.54	\$29.54	\$28.25	\$28.25	Fail
Mayor - Lee	\$3,280,838	\$2,860,947	59,663	84,457	\$54.99	\$47.95	\$38.85	\$33.87	Success
Mayor - Chiu	\$1,452,861	\$1,452,861	17,893	25,267	\$81.20	\$81.20	\$57.50	\$57.50	Fail
Mayor - Herrera	\$1,865,324	\$1,830,031	21,882	37,142	\$85.24	\$83.63	\$50.22	\$49.27	Fail

Position	Total Supportive Financing	Supportive Financing minus Opposition Financing (Bolded below if difference)	1st Choice Votes	Final Ranked Choice Votes	Cost per 1 st Choice Vote	Cost per 1 st Choice Vote (minus anti-candidate \$)	Cost per Final Ranked Vote	Cost per Final Ranked Vote (minus anti-candidate \$)	Outcome
Mayor - Hall	\$591,263	\$591,263	6,914	7,896	\$85.52	\$85.52	\$74.88	\$74.88	Fail
Mayor - Ascarrunz	\$49,529	\$49,529	532	583	\$93.10	\$93.10	\$84.96	\$84.96	Fail
Mayor - Alioto-Pier	\$790,360	\$790,360	6,620	7,378	\$119.39	\$119.39	\$107.12	\$107.12	Fail
Mayor - Yee	\$1,873,811	\$1,873,811	14,566	18,016	\$128.64	\$128.64	\$104.01	\$104.01	Fail
Mayor - Dufty	\$1,475,727	\$1,475,727	9,193	10,455	\$160.53	\$160.53	\$141.15	\$141.15	Fail
Mayor - Rees	\$1,038,499	\$1,038,499	3,096	3,185	\$335.43	\$335.43	\$326.06	\$326.06	Fail
Mayor - Ting	\$517,084	\$517,084	1,013	1,049	\$510.45	\$510.45	\$492.93	\$492.93	Fail
Sheriff- Mirkarimi	\$324,655	\$301,680	70,204	86,592	\$4.62	\$4.30	\$3.75	\$3.48	Success
Sheriff- Miyamoto	\$272,176	\$272,176	49,631	75,137	\$5.48	\$5.48	\$3.62	\$3.62	Fail
Sheriff - Cunnie	\$567,959	\$567,959	51,410	53,213	\$11.05	\$11.05	\$10.67	\$10.67	Fail

Table 2 - Measure campaign costs per vote

Position	Total Financing for Position	Votes	Cost/Vote	Outcome
A - Oppose	\$0	54,754	\$0.00	Fail
B - Oppose	\$0	60,741	\$0.00	Fail
F - Support	\$0	77,259	\$0.00	Fail
E - Oppose	\$9,317	121,248	\$0.08	Success
F - Oppose	\$9,344	98,800	\$0.09	Success
C - Oppose	\$46,681	58,460	\$0.80	Fail
H - Support	\$73,737	91,525	\$0.81	Fail
G - Oppose	\$95,150	100,506	\$0.95	Success
E- Support	\$80,514	59,369	\$1.36	Fail
H - Oppose	\$140,287	91,678	\$1.53	Success

Position	Total Financing for Position	Votes	Cost/Vote	Outcome
B - Support	\$246,572	129,175	\$1.91	Success
G- Support	\$301,082	86,075	\$3.50	Fail
A - Support	\$533,077	134,751	\$3.96	Success
C - Support	\$1,056,259	129,554	\$8.15	Success
D - Oppose	\$1,065,644	124,051	\$8.59	Success
D- Support	\$548,972	62,358	\$8.80	Fail

Table 3 – Alternate computations for Measures C/D contest

Note: While many measure contests are competitions between those supporting the measure and those opposed, the C and D city pension measures presented a contest that could be viewed as passing either one or the other measure (there was no committee reporting for a campaign to defeat both measures). Therefore, the results in this table were calculated by contrasting the total support of the Yes on C and No on D campaigns (Yes on C and No on D was run as a consolidated effort) against the Yes on D campaign, using the votes for C and D [“No” votes were excluded].

Position	Total Financing for Position	Votes	Cost/Vote	Outcome
D- Support	\$548,972 ⁱ	62,358	\$8.80	Fail
C - Support & D - Oppose	\$2,121,903	129,554	\$16.38	Success

Table 4 – Alternate computations for Measures E/F contest

Note: The campaigns for and against Measures E and F were linked. Both measures were sponsored by Supervisor Scott Wiener. Though Wiener’s Yes on E committee did not report spending on behalf of the Yes on F election position, Wiener campaigned on behalf of both E and F and also used his Supervisor committee’s campaign funds to advocate for both measuresⁱⁱ. To reflect the linkage between the two measures, the results in this table were calculated by contrasting the “Yes” votes on both E and F against the “No” votes on both E and F.

Position	Total Financing for Position	Averaged E & F Votes	Cost/Averaged Vote	Outcome
E & F - Oppose	\$18,661	110,024 (No)	\$0.17	Success
E & F - Support	\$80,514	68,314 (Yes)	\$1.18	Fail

ⁱ As a reminder, this amount is less than the total amount of contributions received by the Yes on D committee. The reduction reflects spending on candidate contests. See Section 1 of this article for

further explanation. If the full amount of Yes on D's contributions were included in the table above, this would have resulted in a slight increase in the Cost/Vote category.

ⁱⁱ Since SF candidates are prohibited from spending their funds in this manner, Friends of Ethics filed a complaint against Wiener with the Ethics Commission (See: www.citireport.com/2011/11/last-week-this-week/). To date, Wiener has still not complied with the law to report the value of his Supervisor committee expenditures on behalf of E and F.