[ms-0398.004.007.005]

CAMPAIGN 90
RE-ELECT SUPERVISOR
LEON WILLIAMS

Bruce M. Abrams
Sam L. Ackerman
Michel Anderson
Anthony Anewalt
Neal Arthur
Hon. George Bailey
Hon. Brian Bilbray
Paul Barkley
Siyura Barron
Hon. Jim Bates
Raquel Beltran
Bill Brown
Harold Brown
Malin Burnham
Dr. Robert & Jacquelyn Burns
R. A. Butler
Victor M. Calderon
Gladys Calvin
Howard Carey
Ken and Esther Carpi
Leah Goodwin-Carter
Rev. Ellis Casson
Irma Castro
Hon. Pete Chacon
George & Mavis Clute
Phyllis and Sanford Cohn
Raymond L. Conley
Bob Countryman
David O. Cruz
Larry Cushman
James R. Dawe
Hon. Wadie Deddeh
Jose R. De La Garza
Frank & Tillie DeVore
Peter Dual
Anne Evans
Kim Fletcher
John B. Fox
Joe Francis
Byron S. Georgiou
Frank J. A. Greco
Dan Guevara
Bud Harbin
J. T. Hawthorne
Bruce Hazard
Tom Hom
Evan V. Jones
Jo Jordan
Richard Juarez
Bea Kemp
Al Kercheval
Tawfiq Khoury
Phil Klauber
Pat Kruer
Theodore G. Lambron M.D.
William P. Lee
Anthony J. Lettieri
Pat Lettieri
Gordon Luce
Hon. John MacDonald
Mike Madigan
Bob Matthews
R. Barry McComic
James H. McCormack
Clarence McCoy
Patricia McQuater
Michelle Fort Merrill
Rebecca Michael
Jim Milch
Donna Morafcik
Curtis Moring
Bruce M. Moore
Willie Morrow
Ken Maemaji
Fred Norfleet, Jr.
Rachel Ortiz
Jorge H. Palacios
Robert H. Pankey
Andrew G. Peterson
Matthew A. Peterson
Paul A. Peterson
Hon. Wes Pratt
Sol Price
Bernie Rhinerson
Arthur Rivkin
Hon. Ron Roberts
Dennis L. Russell
Marshal A. Scarr
William J. Schwartz, Jr.
Salim D. Sesi
Norman T. Seltzer
Morris Silverman
Rev. George Walker Smith
John Starkey
Vernon Sukumu
Marc R. Tarasuck
Lee R. Taylor
John D. Thelan
Vic Villaplana
William R. Walker
Bruce H. Warren
Frank B. Weiss
Shirley D. Williams
Richard Ybarra
Alan Ziegaus
(Partial List of Supporters)

June 14, 1990

TO: STEERING COMMITTEE

FROM: DAN GREENBLAT

SUBJECT: POST-ELECTION ANALYSIS

Congratulations are in order to everyone on the Steering Committee! The election results confirmed our strategy was a successful one in the face of a phenomenon we could term the "Odd Man Out Syndrome," i.e., Mike Schaefer in any political campaign.

Here are the high points of the post election analysis:

1. Williams wins with strong support from the black community and the liberal white community.

   The black community did not support Willie Blair any more than the Fourth District as a whole supported him but the buried Mike Schaefer. The black community overwhelmingly rejected Mike Schaefer in favor of Leon Williams.

   While Leon Williams averaged 64.3%, Schaefer averaged only 15.4% in the black communities of South East San Diego and Encanto (West & East). The Schaefer phrase of "if you can't vote for me, vote for Blair" simply did not stick. Willie Blair was not the alternative choice for black voters because they coalesced behind Williams solidly.

   Similarly, the liberal white communities of Mission Hills and Hillcrest were strong in their support of Leon Williams. Williams averaged 62.1% there versus 20.76% for Schaefer. In contrast, the white conservative area of Loma Portal, while giving Williams 55.6% and burying Schaefer (15.4%) chose to swing toward Blair 29%.

   Another indicator of the solidification of support behind Williams in the black community was the extremely low roll-off in those areas. Roll-off is the percent of voters who made it to the polls but did not vote for any candidate in this race. The black communities had

Paid for by Friends of Leon Williams, 2505 Congress Street, Suite 230, San Diego, California 92110, Committee #890737

the lowest roll-off of any area in the district while giving Williams very large winning margins.

Although roll-off in the liberal white communities was slightly higher than the district average, the percentages for Schaefer dropped noticeably. The result was a "spike" for Williams as his vote margin went up sharply and a "dip" for Schaefer as these voters rejected him.

2. Threatened white communities gave Schaefer his support.

Portions of the district experiencing transition due to the influx of ethnic minorities appeared to give Schaefer his biggest vote. These communities included: Serra Mesa, North Park, Normal Heights, City Heights and Spring Valley.

Typically, Schaefer was limited to no more than 28% of the vote in these areas. Combined with Blair's 18% - 20% in these communities, the role of Schaefer as a "spoiler" could have been achieved had we not made enough voters aware of Schaefer's shortcomings.

3. Blair consistently polled only 20% across-the-board.

Willie Blair was consistent in his ability to garner only 20% - 21% of the vote across the district. Of particular importance, was his failure to exceed 22.89% within the black community while Williams garnered 63.05% in that same community.

The fact that his percentage in the absentees was nearly identical to his city-wide percentage illustrates that he had an ineffective campaign. Absentees vote prior to the high visibility efforts of the campaigns. Presumably, as the campaigns accelerated, his visibility would have risen among non-absentee voters. His threat was real in conjunction with Schaefer but by himself, Schaefer could not have unseated Williams.

4. Schaefer "Editorial Piece" should have had a larger audience.

The district has about 132,000 Households and about 60,000 were High Propensity for the Primary. While the Williams "Image" piece went to 52,000 Households, the "Editorial" piece went to only 30,000 Households in the targeted white communities.

We cannot check to see the correlation between targeted voters and those who actually did turn out until the Primary Election Canvass

Tape is made available. However, we know coverage of High Propensity Households with the Editorial piece in the white community was limited.

Therefore, broader distribution of this piece certainly would have boosted Williams' eventual margin. The question remains: "By how much?" And this could be academic because 55.01% for Williams was sufficient.

The issue, however, is: What will it take before the voters realize and remember that Mike Schaefer is simply not acceptable for elected office at any level? This was the first time in local election history that anyone has attacked Mike Schaefer. Given his showing, perhaps it should become the rule, not the exception, until he is no longer even a disrupting factor in any election.

5. Williams wins by piling up large margins in communities with highest contribution to the total vote.

   Another key to the Williams win was large margins in areas where the voters represented a large block of the district-wide turnout. Generally, the turnout in the black community was lower than the district-wide average but the aggregate vote of the black community was significant compared to the district as a whole.

   For example, in Encanto-West, Williams received 63% of the vote while this community generated 5% of all votes cast in the election. Similarly, he received 60% of the vote in Hillcrest, which contributed 4% of all votes cast. Other keys were: South Park (4.3% TVC), South East SD (3%), Chollas Park (3%), and Middletown (2.8%).

6. Absentee percentages were suppressed due to a campaign decision to ignore the opposition and attack late.

   Absentee results were disappointing. The strategy was to mail 30,000 pieces to probable absentees and pre-empt the opposition which had no resources to match us. Despite this, only 600 absentee applications were returned to us out of the 16,000 which were returned district-wide. Additionally, Williams won only 50.54% of the absentees.

   The campaign was overwhelmed by the flood of absentee requests. Although all Williams respondents received a brochure and follow up telephone call, the further outreach needed to reach other absentee applicants was beyond the resources of the campaign.

Additionally, these absentee voters had no recognition of the opposition. Schaefer was not jailed until six days before the election. Blair didn't begin touting his support until 10 days out from the election. The media talked about Schaefer's sorry background in the newspaper but this information must have been drowned out by the louder elections taking place elsewhere. Ironically, when Schaefer's jailing was reported, it appeared on B-4 of the San Diego Union, instead of B-1 with banner headlines.

Had we attacked Schaefer early to bolster our absentee count, he most assuredly would have attacked Williams. The result might have been a net loss of votes on election day. Given our lack of cash flow to engage in a full direct mail campaign against the opposition, we had to hold back until the final weekend. Consequently, we have to take to disappointing absentee count with the knowledge we could have done better.

7. The absentee voters were the most important single block of where we could have improved our percentages.

Without the absentees, the Williams percentage would have risen to 56.3% instead of 55.01%. This massive single block of 13,000 absentee voters was the largest available group of any "community."

Williams only polled 50.54% of the Requested Absentees. This is a remarkably low figure while Schaefer's 28.17% tally is entirely unrepresentative of his strength in the district. An early attack on Schaefer to all absentee applicants would have generated substantial windfall votes to Williams since Blair was completely out of the picture.

Tactically, this was out of the question. Therefore, in the future the campaign must plan for a significant outreach to the absentees. The election margin could have been demonstrably higher with that kind of voter contact.

8. Timely cashflow from the Steering Committee saved the day.

The campaign in early May presented itself with a potential deficit of $24,000. Worse, the cash flow did not permit even one piece to be mailed because the postage and printing lump sum requirements did not coincide with our fundraising plan.

The Steering Committee and the campaign staff dug in and turned the situation around completely. The Absentee mailer went out on time to 30,000 targeted households. In addition, sufficient funds were

generated to pay postage for the last two mailers and, two day later, the complete printing bill was paid from funds raised on the final weekend.

To everyone's credit, the Friends of Leon Williams Committee ends with a slight surplus and no bills outstanding. The 1994 Re-election Committee has $2,000 with which to prepare for the future.