

12/11/96
Duane Bay.

December 2, 1996

Dear Friends, Volunteers, Contributors,

We did it! Thank you all. Of course you know the campaign, tiring as it was, was the easy part. Now I'm counting on you to **help keep me informed; to keep me on track.** I'm elected because of your time, your money and your votes. So I'm writing to share with you the workings of *your* campaign, as I will share with you what I come to know about the workings of *your* city.

Back in May when we launched the campaign we agreed to some operating principles. The campaign itself must enhance the positive image of the City, and must not demean the leadership (including opponents).

This led naturally to our "referendum on progress" positioning on the contribution I could make to responsible economic development. The decision later in the campaign to join forces with the incumbents was a natural outgrowth.

Of course I'm gratified that the slate won. But I can't tell you how delighted I am about the **underlying messages I read into the margin of victory.** Voters demanded progress on their very highest priorities: crime and economic development. And since they saw it, they had the maturity to temporarily subordinate some strong concerns on other issues. This means that even with continued progress on crime and tax-base, **future elections will be about streets, traffic, affordable housing, cultural diversity and community services.** Now your job is to remind us that we must make progress in those other areas as well, as our means allow.

Cross-over voting among various camps also tells the story of compromise and guarded optimism. Many of R.B.'s core supporters were uneasy voting for 'the white business guy', but R.B. told them he wanted my skills on the team. Similarly, many of you are uncomfortable with R.B.'s rogue reputation and history of challenging liberal and progressive organizations, but many of you supported the slate for continuity, and supported R.B. because he has taken political risks to bring his constituency into the pro-City consensus. Now your job is to be constructively skeptical as I work to find common ground, and to be vigilant that I don't compromise on fundamentals.

So how did it go?

Strategy. Run as an independent in a tight four-way race—we assumed that all incumbents, including Bill Vines would run—highlight economic development, acknowledge the strengths of the incumbents, and ask voters to add my skills to the team. At the precinct level this meant: (a) consolidating our strong 1994 showing in the smaller predominantly White, renter

precincts (7,10,11,12) through Council of Tenants volunteers, (b) focusing on improving in the larger predominantly African-American, homeowner precincts (4,5,8,9), and (c) winning the second or third vote of voters in each incumbent's camp.

It worked, and probably would have, even if all three incumbents had run.

Volunteers. More than one hundred of you contributed money or gave your time phoning, walking, putting out signs. Pat and Barbara put in huge hours on the field campaign and literature and data production. Armond and Jim, your advice was invaluable. Judith, Diane, Rebekah, Esther, Marge and others really hit the phones (identifying and confirming nearly half of our 1800 vote by name!). EPACT pounded the streets! Bill, thanks for all the signs. And many thanks to Marge, Michael, William and the rest of Rose's campaign and to R.B.'s committee. I wish I could mention everyone. Thanks to all!

Programs. Here's the blow by blow.

Name Recognition Postcard mailer, with call-back phone number to get a Question & Answer paper. Sent to all likely voters, as a name recognition piece, it was fantastic. It was supposed to make people ask their friends "Who is this guy?" Going door-to-door, I'd show it and they'd say "Oh, so you're that guy. I got the card." However, few people called for the Q & A.

Strong Neighborhood / Strong City Hand Out. Well received. Designed to cue volunteers on key points. As it turned out, they were mostly left at doors without benefit of conversation due to limited number of walkers.

Signs. Placed 300 this time. Getting co-placements with R.B. Jones in the Gardens was important for visibility. \$800 was a lot, but minimum order.

Slate mailer. Bright yellow. Very effective. Simple. Strong.

Endorsement Flyer with Map. This piece was sharp! Feedback says it successfully communicated that our support base was relatively broad. Don't know whether it communicated our general vision of the beneficial coexistence of the (light green) strong residential neighborhoods and the (darker green) development corridor.

Local Endorsements. CEPA sent a letter to 200 core pro-City folk. EPACT handed out a letter to 1,300 apartments.

Outside Endorsements. Went hard after Palo Alto Weekly, San Jose Mercury, San Mateo Times, Democratic Party, and Labor Council. Got all but Mercury who didn't endorse anyone (but did print a picture of my father). It's free ink,

but always hard to tell whether local voters care what outsiders think. The labor endorsement though was definitely valuable. Local unions walked two weekends, getting endorsement literature to 900 labor households.

Get Out The Vote Phone Calling. We built a list of 800 names. As it turned out the list was very useful for focusing calls on election day. However, the expectation of checking polls to see if the 800 had voted broke down due to lack of trained volunteers and polling places not posting names efficiently.

Word of Mouth. There is no substitute for the grapevine. Nothing is as effective. You can't measure it. You can't buy it. You can't win without it.

Money. We spent \$1.50 per voter. That's \$6,300: \$1,800 on the "Straight Answers to Hard Questions" name recognition postcard, \$1,600 on the "Strong Neighborhoods / Strong City" endorsement flyer with the map, \$700 on the "Vote for Continued Progress" slate mailer, \$800 on signs, \$400 on door-to-door handouts, \$450 on filing fees, and \$550 on everything else.

On the other hand, we've raised only \$3,800. So the \$6,300 is spread: 20% from organized labor; 10% from non-residents (including friends, family, and supporters who work in or with E.P.A. organizations); 10% from E.P.A. businesses; 20% from other E.P.A. voters; and 40% on the credit card.

So we're \$2,500 in the red. Under the new Proposition 208, we probably have only eight weeks to raise money. I'm including an envelope you can use to send a contribution or the name of a friend who might contribute, or a great fundraising idea.

No! You've been quite generous in your support.
B

Detailed Analysis. Non-resident readers may want to bail out at this point, we're about to dive into local detail and some statistics. Thanks again! Those of you reading on, please glance at the page of 12 scatter plot graphs. Each graph compares the precinct results for a pair of candidates. For example, the Jones versus Santiago plot (2nd row, last plot) shows pattern of dots sloping down to the right. Where Jones did best Santiago did worst, and vice versa. The little " $r = -.76$ " means there was a very high inverse correlation. A -1.00 means a perfectly opposite relationship between two candidates' patterns, a positive 1.00 means a perfect match, and a zero means no correlation.

How did we do overall? Our target was 40%. We got 1,818 votes from 4,241 voters for 43% overall, ranging from 38% in our worst precinct to 52% in our best. In 1994 we got 1,155 from 3,437 voters for 35%, ranging from 27% to 44%.

How did this compare to the 1992 and 1994 elections? There was a different candidate mix and turnout. There were 23% more voters in 1992, and 15% fewer in 1994. Here are the actual votes and votes adjusted for turnout for all candidates winning over 30% in those three races.

	<u>Actual</u>		<u>Adjusted</u>
Gibson '96	2,096	Gibson '96	2,096
Vines '92	1,855	Wilson '94	2,073
Bay '96	1,818	Bay '96	1,818
Gibson '92	1,761	Jones '96	1,727
Wilson '94	1,759	Vines '92	1,511
Jones '96	1,727	Walker '94	1,500
Jones '92	1,704	Gibson '92	1,435
Scherzer '92	1,601	Jones '92	1,388
Evans	1,485	Bay '94	1,361
Walker '94	1,273	Scherzer '92	1,304
Bay '94	1,155	Evans	1,203

Did voters vote the slate? Yes. As you can see from the wavy lines on the statistics sheet, the lines for Gibson, Jones and Bay rise and fall more or less in unison. The Bay line runs below the Jones line in Kavanaugh/ Flood, University Village, Gardens North and South (precincts 4,5,8,9), and above it in the rest, but they run together.

How much impact did the EPACT have? Strong impact. EPACT has the most influence in Gateway, Woodland, and Willows (7,10,11,12). They worked against us in 1994 and with us in 1996, probably accounting for a 10% difference. Also, Rasheed averaged only 18% in these precincts versus 30% in the others. Jones seems to have picked up most of the difference.

How much did the slate positioning hurt us with the anti-incumbent voters? Maybe not much. There is a strong correlation between Bay and Rasheed voting patterns, if you exclude the four EPACT precincts mentioned above and University Village which was the strongest Jones precinct. There is also a mild positive correlation between Bay, Santiago and Wallacee patterns. All of which says that we did well among the anti-incumbent voters too.

How much influence did Bill Vines and Myrtle Walker exert against the slate? Hard to tell about Vines from the numbers. Regarding Walker, there is a moderate correlation between the Walker 1994 pattern and Rasheed 1996. However, Walker 1994 vs. Jones 1996 shows an almost perfect correlation in spite of long-standing Walker/Jones friction. Puzzling. And Rasheed 1996 vs. Jones 1996 doesn't show the inverse correlation you'd expect. Go figure.

So that's how it looks from here. I look forward to working with you on someone's campaign in 1998. Maybe yours?

Thank you again.



*It's been great
getting to work w/ you
more of late.*

	Newbridge		Palo Alto Park		University Corridor		Flood Park / Nairobi		University Village		Weeks		Gateway		Gardens North		Gardens South		Woodland South		Woodland North		Willows		Early Absentee		Late Absentee		Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	AE	AL																
Gibson	133	120	138	191	172	149	142	157	180	142	90	103	198	181																
Bay	115	102	116	149	154	131	133	142	128	138	85	89	187	149																
Jones	101	79	112	161	168	112	105	155	161	107	67	79	157	163																
Santiago	81	97	55	86	73	118	105	70	69	89	39	54	124	97																
Rashied	83	73	79	108	74	94	56	111	95	52	28	36	144	104																
James	60	45	37	45	54	42	48	72	75	43	20	34	91	73																
Van Zant	21	30	27	39	36	33	45	49	37	32	10	25	76	55																
Wallace	19	28	27	24	32	25	32	24	39	28	16	18	44	42																
Total	613	574	591	803	763	704	666	780	784	631	355	438	1021	864	9,587															

Ballots Cast	285	252	258	354	344	300	283	362	335	303	162	216	423	364	4,241
Votes / Ballots	72%	76%	76%	76%	74%	78%	78%	72%	78%	69%	73%	68%	80%	79%	75%

	Gibson	Bay	Jones	Santiago	Rashied	James	Van Zant	Wallace
T	47%	48%	48%	53%	54%	50%	50%	50%
N	40%	40%	40%	45%	42%	45%	44%	47%
Z	35%	31%	31%	43%	45%	49%	37%	37%
T	28%	38%	21%	24%	21%	21%	39%	37%
C	29%	29%	31%	31%	31%	22%	31%	20%
E	21%	18%	14%	13%	13%	16%	14%	17%
E	7%	12%	10%	10%	7%	10%	11%	16%
A	7%	11%	10%	10%	7%	9%	8%	11%
E	49%	49%	49%	56%	47%	47%	48%	47%
T	43%	41%	44%	52%	41%	41%	41%	41%
N	41%	37%	37%	41%	48%	35%	41%	37%
Z	27%	27%	27%	24%	21%	29%	25%	29%
C	27%	29%	29%	17%	28%	17%	17%	34%
E	17%	12%	12%	12%	22%	14%	12%	22%
E	12%	12%	12%	8%	11%	11%	12%	18%
A	15%	10%	10%	10%	8%	10%	8%	12%
E	9%	9%	9%	7%	12%	7%	7%	9%

1996 City Council Results by Precinct



