



**EDGEWATER**  
**S T R A T E G I E S**

# Vote-Shifting During the 2018 November Election

*Analysis by  
Mason Herron  
President, Edgewater Strategies*

*[Mason@edgewater-strategies.com](mailto:Mason@edgewater-strategies.com)  
619-944-3834*

February 20, 2019

## Introduction

Each Election cycle, political watchers in San Diego are treated to the same process: As initial vote returns are posted shortly after 8pm on Election Night, conclusions are quickly arrived at, winners are declared, and narratives begin to form.

However, as subsequent days following the Election continue to show, the results on Election Night are far from final, and the political landscape looks vastly different when the results are certified.

Accordingly, this analysis of voter data in San Diego County for the November 2018 Election attempts to place a greater perspective on just how far vote totals can move throughout the vote-counting process. While many of us have tracked the daily movement of votes between candidates as they are posted by the Registrar of Voters, there have been few, if any, aggregate studies of vote tallies over the 30-day process.

This analysis seeks to rectify that issue by examining the aggregate movement of vote counts for the entire county, while also examining particular races, and types of races.

The report below includes an examination of the following:

- Aggregate examination of partisan races throughout the county
- Aggregate examination of Statewide, Congressional, Legislative, Supervisorial, and Municipal races
- A highlight of Republicans who gained in vote share, thus bucking the countywide trend
- An examination of those candidates who gained the most votes over time
- An analysis of the impact of the Democratic party endorsement in Dem vs. Dem races
- An analysis of Statewide Ballot Measures, Local Ballot Measures, and all ballot measures.

## Methodology

This study relies upon data provided by the Registrar of Voters. A copy of the results posted at 8:05pm on Election Night was retained, along with the final Election Day tabulation posted the following day, and the final certified results.

The races included in the aggregate data are included in Appendix A. While a significant portion of races were included, down ballot races for school boards, water boards, and other local offices were not included for a number of reasons, including a lack of partisan identity, the high number of candidates in each race, and the number of races where the top 2-3 candidates were declared as the winners (thus diluting the influence of partisanship on the race). Ultimately, all these factors make it exceedingly difficult to track trends in vote movement, especially as it correlates to the impact of partisanship or party endorsements.

In some cases, specific races were excluded from an analysis, typically due to the presence of only one party on the ballot. These exclusions are noted in the footnotes of each section.

### **Key Terms**

Initial Results % - The vote share as reflected on the very first report posted at 8:05pm on Election Night.

Election Day % - Vote share that includes all tabulated polls and valid provisional votes.

Vote-by-mail % - Vote share among individuals who mailed in absentee ballots, absentee ballots dropped off at poll locations, or early voters at ROV.

Final % - Final certified vote total from the ROV.


Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final – The difference in gain between the initial results posted on Election Night at 8:05pm and the final vote tally.

## Partisan Races Overall

Among the races that would traditionally be thought of as “partisan” – in this case, races for Statewide offices, State Legislature, Congress, and Board of Equalization<sup>1</sup> – Democratic candidates led the first wave of election results (posted at 8:05pm) by an aggregate margin of 53.61% to 46.39%. By the time the votes were certified, Democrats had an aggregate lead of 58.29% to 41.71%. Overall, this amounted to a total increase of 4.68% (and a commensurate decrease of 4.68% for Republican candidates).

Among those classified as “Election Day” voters, Democrats for partisan offices won 59.02% - 40.98%, while among vote-by-mail voters, that lead was a slightly lower 57.96%-42.04%.

In terms of method of voting, 68.71% of voters were Vote-By-Mail voters, while 31.29% voted on Election Day.



<sup>1</sup> Note: These numbers exclude the races for the 76<sup>th</sup> Assembly District, Lieutenant Governor, U.S. Senate, and Insurance Commissioner, which were all Democrat vs. Democrat. Also excluded was the race for Insurance Commissioner, which was a Democrat against a Decline-to-State (Steve Poizner).


## Statewide Races

Out of every category, races for statewide office were where Democrats were able to pick up the most ground between the initial results on Election Night and the ultimate totals. When the first results were posted on Election Night, for statewide offices (Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, and Board of Equalization – District 4)<sup>2</sup>, Democrats won the aggregate vote by a margin of 53.55% - 46.45%. By the time the results had been certified, that lead had grown to 58.20% to 41.80%. Ultimately, the Democrats gained 4.64%, while Republicans lost 4.64%.

Democrats won Election Day voters by a margin of 58.95% to 41.05% and Vote-By-Mail voters by a margin of 57.85% - 42.15%.

Among those who cast a ballot for a statewide candidate, 68.66% did so by mail, and 31.34% did so on Election Day.

Party	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	53.55%	58.95%	57.85%	58.20%	4.64%
REP	46.45%	41.05%	42.15%	41.80%	-4.64%



<sup>2</sup> Note: These numbers exclude the races for Lieutenant Governor, U.S. Senate, and Insurance Commissioner, which were all Democrat vs. Democrat. Also excluded was the race for Insurance Commissioner, which was a Democrat against a Decline-to-State (Steve Poizner).


## Congressional Races

Included among this sample are the San Diego County portions of races for the U.S. House of Representatives, which includes the 49<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 51<sup>st</sup>, 52<sup>nd</sup>, and 53<sup>rd</sup> Districts. All of these races included one Republican and one Democrat, with the 49<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> deemed as “competitive” races.

Based on the initial aggregated wave of Election results, Democrats initially led the Republicans 57.78% - 42.22%. Based on the aggregated certified results, Democrats eventually led 62.15% - 37.85% - an overall gain of 4.37% for Democrats and a loss of 4.37% for Republicans.

Among Election Day Voters, Democrats won 62.35% - 37.65%, and among Vote-by-Mail voters, that margin favored the Democrats 62.05% - 37.95%. Among those voting in Congressional elections, 68.93% were Vote-By-Mail voters, while 31.07% were Election Day voters.

Party	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	57.78%	62.35%	62.05%	62.15%	4.37%
REP	42.22%	37.65%	37.95%	37.85%	-4.37%




## State Legislative Races

Among the races for the State Legislature in San Diego County (71<sup>st</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, 77<sup>th</sup>, 78<sup>th</sup>, 79<sup>th</sup>, and 80<sup>th</sup> Assembly Districts & the 36<sup>th</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> Senate Districts) – excluding the 76<sup>th</sup> Assembly District, which had two candidates of the same party – Democrats won Election Night by a margin of 51.03% - 48.97%. They won the final vote tally 57.06% - 42.94%. Overall, the Democrats picked up 5.03% while the Republicans lost 5.03%.

Democrats won Election Day voters by a margin of 57.06% - 42.94%, while they won Vote-By-Mail voters by a margin of 55.61% - 44.39%.

Among those who voted, 68.76% voted by mail, while 31.24% were Election Day voters.

Party	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	51.03%	57.06%	55.61%	56.06%	5.03%
REP	48.97%	42.94%	44.39%	43.94%	-5.03%




## Board of Supervisors

While there were only two races for Board of Supervisors (Districts 4 & 5), approximately 40% of county voters weighed in on these Elections, warranting their inclusion here. Between the two districts, the Democratic candidate gained an aggregate of 4.92% between the initial wave of results and the final tally, while the Republicans lost an equal amount.

Among those who voted for Board of Supervisor, 29.49% did so on Election Day, while 70.51% did so by mail.

Party	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	50.96%	57.67%	55.14%	55.89%	4.92%
REP	49.04%	42.33%	44.86%	44.11%	-4.92%






## Municipal Races

In the races for municipal offices (Mayor and City Council)<sup>3</sup> we examined, Democratic candidates gained, in aggregate, 2.18% of the vote share between Election Night and the certified results, while Republicans lost 2.36%. A handful of DTS candidates lost .49% during the same time-span.

Party	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	38.69%	41.17%	40.75%	40.88%	2.18%
DTS	22.78%	21.98%	22.43%	22.29%	-0.49%
REP	40.88%	38.24%	38.65%	38.52%	-2.36%



<sup>3</sup> Not included are races in which only one party was represented on the ballot, such as the race for El Cajon Mayor and Poway Mayor.

## Republicans Who Gained

Out of all races analyzed, only a handful of Republicans were able to gain vote share between the initial wave of results and the final margin.

Contest Name	Candidate Name	Election Night %	Election Day %	VBM %	Total %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
CARLSBAD CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	DAVID MCGEE	10.63%	12.27%	10.18%	10.80%	0.17%
DEL MAR CITY COUNCIL	BRIAN FLETCHER	22.05%	28.86%	23.37%	24.78%	2.73%
ENCINITAS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4	TONY BRANDENBURG	47.03%	52.19%	47.45%	48.80%	1.77%
IMPERIAL BEACH MAYOR	VALERIE ACEVEZ	30.09%	36.40%	29.13%	31.74%	1.65%
OCEANSIDE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	CHRIS RODRIGUEZ	42.10%	44.01%	42.77%	43.13%	1.03%
POWAY MAYOR	STEVE VAUS	62.22%	64.42%	61.70%	62.52%	0.30%
POWAY MAYOR	YURI BOHLEN	3.03%	3.20%	3.02%	3.07%	0.04%
POWAY CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	JON RYAN	25.31%	26.69%	24.87%	25.43%	0.12%
POWAY CITY COUNCIL SHORT TERM	CAYLIN FRANK	50.22%	49.77%	50.85%	50.53%	0.31%
SANTEE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	ROB MCNELIS	56.07%	57.79%	55.25%	56.19%	0.12%

## Most Significant Gains

Listed below are the candidates who gained the most over time. Blue denotes a Democrat, while DTS denotes a Democrat. No Republicans appear on this list.

Contest Name	Candidate Name	Party	Election Night %	Total %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
CITY OF SAN MARCOS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MARIA NUNEZ	DTS	35.78%	49.80%	14.02%
CITY OF ESCONDIDO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	CONSUELO MARTINEZ	DEM	52.82%	65.18%	12.37%
CITY OF VISTA CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	CORINNA CONTRERAS	DEM	39.62%	50.80%	11.18%
CITY OF NATIONAL CITY MAYOR	A SOTELO-SOLIS	DEM	36.53%	46.14%	9.61%
STATE ASSEMBLY 80TH DIST	LORENA GONZALEZ	DEM	67.39%	74.98%	7.59%
STATE SENATE 40TH DIST	BEN HUESO	DEM	59.23%	66.19%	6.96%
CITY OF NATIONAL CITY COUNCIL	JOSE RODRIGUEZ	DEM	18.12%	24.34%	6.22%
US REPRESENTATIVE 51ST DIST	JUAN VARGAS	DEM	66.62%	72.55%	5.93%
STATE ASSEMBLY 79TH DIST	SHIRLEY N. WEBER	DEM	60.94%	66.76%	5.82%
CITY OF CHULA VISTA CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MARK BARTLETT	DEM	42.85%	48.34%	5.50%
CITY OF SAN MARCOS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	RANDY WALTON	DEM	46.38%	51.85%	5.47%
CITY OF VISTA MAYOR	JOE GREEN	DTS	35.01%	40.18%	5.17%
US REPRESENTATIVE 53RD DIST	SUSAN A. DAVIS	DEM	64.06%	69.07%	5.02%
ATTORNEY GENERAL	XAVIER BECERRA	DEM	53.68%	58.63%	4.95%
SECRETARY OF STATE	ALEX PADILLA	DEM	54.54%	59.45%	4.90%
TREASURER	FIONA MA	DEM	53.97%	58.87%	4.90%
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION 4TH DISTRICT	MIKE SCHAEFER	DEM	50.58%	55.32%	4.74%
CITY OF ESCONDIDO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	VANESSA VALENZUELA	DEM	33.94%	38.61%	4.68%
CITY OF OCEANSIDE TREASURER	VICTOR ROY	DEM	51.67%	56.10%	4.44%

## Party Endorsements in Dem vs. Dem races

Thanks to California’s unique Election rules that occasionally lead to intraparty matchups in the General Election, 2018 saw a number of high-profile contests featuring two Democrats facing off against each other.

In these cases, the key differentiator between the two candidates can often be the party endorsement, which should theoretically heighten the partisan attachment to the candidate that has received the endorsement.

According to the data from several intraparty races where a party endorsement was made, the candidate with the Democratic Party endorsement, on average, saw their lead grow between the initial wave of results and Election Day by .71%, while candidates without the party endorsement saw their lead shrink by .74%.<sup>4</sup> However, while aggregate results show one result, the endorsed Democrat ultimately ended up dropping their vote share over time in 4 of the 7 races examined below.

Contest Name	Candidate Name	Election Night %	Election Day %	VBM %	Total %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR	ED HERNANDEZ	36.59%	39.10%	36.69%	37.45%	0.87%
	ELENI KOUNALAKIS	63.41%	60.90%	63.31%	62.55%	-0.87%
UNITED STATES SENATOR	DIANNE FEINSTEIN	53.82%	52.38%	53.16%	52.92%	-0.90%
	KEVIN DE LEON	46.18%	47.62%	46.84%	47.08%	0.90%
STATE ASSEMBLY 76TH DIST	ELIZABETH WARREN	43.71%	47.84%	44.47%	45.44%	1.73%
	TASHA BOERNER H.	56.29%	52.16%	55.53%	54.56%	-1.73%
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION	MARSHALL TUCK	57.39%	55.63%	54.28%	54.69%	-2.70%
	TONY K. THURMOND	42.61%	44.37%	45.72%	45.31%	2.70%
San Diego Community College (District E)	SEAN ELO	50.32%	47.00%	52.31%	49.68%	-0.64%
	DAVID ALVAREZ	48.08%	53.00%	47.69%	48.53%	0.45%
SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4	MYRTLE COLE	47.95%	39.01%	44.06%	42.26%	-5.69%
	MONICA MONTGOMERY	52.05%	60.99%	55.94%	57.74%	5.69%
SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 8	VIVIAN MORENO	54.79%	48.78%	52.30%	50.94%	-3.86%
	ANTONIO MARTINEZ	45.21%	51.22%	47.70%	49.06%	3.86%

*(Names in blue indicate party-endorsed candidate)*


<sup>4</sup> While one would expect the % lost to match the % gained, the race for San Diego Community College (District E) between Sean Elo and David Alvarez included write-in votes, which created an imbalance in the final total.

## State & Local Ballot Measures (Combined)

Unlike candidates for office, ballot measures do not carry a party designation in any formal matter. However, we can still ascertain the importance of partisan identity when it comes to ballot measures by identifying whether those measures were endorsed by the Democratic Party, Republican Party, both, or neither.

Ultimately, those that were endorsed only by the Democratic Party gained 2.47% between the initial wave of results and the final results. Republican-endorsed measures lost 2.74%, those endorsed by both parties gained .4%, and those endorsed by neither gained only .13%.


Party Endorsement	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	46.07%	49.47%	48.11%	48.53%	2.47%
REP	54.33%	50.49%	52.10%	51.59%	-2.74%
BOTH	71.45%	70.47%	72.49%	71.85%	0.40%
NONE	37.48%	38.64%	37.14%	37.61%	0.13%



## Statewide Ballot Measures

Statewide ballot measures that were endorsed by the local Democratic Party grew their vote margin by 3.13% between the initial wave of results and the final results, while Republican-endorsed measures saw their vote share decrease by the same percentage (3.13%). Measures endorsed by both parties grew their percentage by .54%, while those endorsed by none shrank .27%.


Party Endorsement	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	46.35%	50.38%	49.07%	49.48%	3.13%
REP	53.65%	49.62%	50.93%	50.52%	-3.13%
BOTH	64.78%	64.44%	65.71%	65.31%	0.54%
NONE	42.49%	42.69%	42.01%	42.22%	-0.27%



## Local Ballot Measures

In terms of local ballot measures, initiatives that had the Democratic Party endorsement gained a total of 1.46% between the initial results and the final totals. Those endorsed by Republicans lost 2.08%. Measures endorsed by both parties typically fell by only .07%, while those endorsed by neither party gained .91% on average.

Party Endorsement	Initial Results %	Election Day %	Vote-by-Mail %	Final %	Gain/Loss - Election Night to Final
DEM	45.63%	48.10%	46.63%	47.10%	1.46%
REP	55.44%	51.92%	54.02%	53.36%	-2.08%
BOTH	78.20%	76.12%	79.07%	78.12%	-0.07%
NONE	31.29%	33.98%	31.35%	32.19%	0.91%



## Appendix A – List of Races Analyzed

GOVERNOR	CITY OF SOLANA BEACH CITY COUNCIL
SECRETARY OF STATE	CITY OF VISTA MAYOR
CONTROLLER	CITY OF VISTA CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1
TREASURER	CITY OF VISTA CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4
ATTORNEY GENERAL	PROP 1 AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND HOUSING PGMS
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION 4TH DISTRICT	PROP 2 AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXIST. HOUSING PGM
US REPRESENTATIVE 49TH DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	PROP 3 AUTHORIZES BONDS FUND PROJECTS WTR
US REPRESENTATIVE 50TH DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	PROP 4 AUTHORIZES BONDS FUNDING CONST. HOSP.
US REPRESENTATIVE 51ST DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	PROP 5 CHANGES REQ. CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS
US REPRESENTATIVE 52ND DIST	PROP 6 ELIMINATES ROAD REPAIR/TRANS. FUNDING
US REPRESENTATIVE 53RD DIST	PROP 7 DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME
STATE SENATE 36TH DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	PROP 8 REGULATES KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS
STATE SENATE 38TH DIST	PROP 10 ENACT RENT CONTROL
STATE SENATE 40TH DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	PROP 11 PRIVATE-SECTOR EMER. AMBULANCE
STATE ASSEMBLY 71ST DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	PROP 12 ESTABLISHES NEW STANDARDS FARM ANIMALS
STATE ASSEMBLY 75TH DIST (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)	MEASURE A- SAN DIEGO COUNTY CH. AMD. "CLEAN-UP"
STATE ASSEMBLY 77TH DIST	MEASURE B- SAN DIEGO COUNTY CH. AMD. REP. UNINC. AREAS
STATE ASSEMBLY 78TH DIST	MEASURE C- SAN DIEGO COUNTY CH. AMD. GOOD GOVT.
STATE ASSEMBLY 79TH DIST	MEASURE D- SAN DIEGO COUNTY CH. AMD. REQ. RUN-OFF ELECTS.
STATE ASSEMBLY 80TH DIST	MEASURE E- CITY OF SAN DIEGO SOCCER CITY
SUPERIOR COURT OFFICE NO. 37	MEASURE G- CITY OF SAN DIEGO SDSU WEST
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT NO. 4	MEASURE J- CITY OF SAN DIEGO CH. AMD. DISC. BUSINESS INTEREST
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT NO. 5	MEASURE K- CITY OF SAN DIEGO CH. AMD. LIMIT 2-FOUR YR TRMS
CITY OF CARLSBAD MAYOR	MEASURE L- CITY OF SAN DIEGO CH. AMD. ETHICS-COMP.
CITY OF CARLSBAD CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE M- CITY OF SAN DIEGO CH. AMD. APPT. AUDIT COM
CITY OF CARLSBAD CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3	MEASURE N- CITY OF SAN DIEGO REINSTATE DISABILITY RETIREMENT P.O.
CITY OF CHULA VISTA MAYOR	MEASURE Q- CITY OF CHULA VISTA CANNABIS BUS. TAX
CITY OF CHULA VISTA CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE P- CITY OF DEL MAR CH. AMD. CITY'S GENERAL PLAN
CITY OF CHULA VISTA CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	MEASURE R- CITY OF DEL MAR SHORELINE PROT. AREA
CITY OF CHULA VISTA CITY ATTORNEY	MEASURE T- CITY OF DEL MAR PROPOSING ORD. 939
CITY OF DEL MAR CITY COUNCIL	MEASURE U- CITY OF ENCINITAS HOUSING PLAN UPDATE 2018
CITY OF EL CAJON CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE V- CITY OF LA MESA CITY TAX CANNABIS
CITY OF ENCINITAS MAYOR	MEASURE W- CITY OF NATIONAL CITY RENT CONTROL
CITY OF ENCINITAS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3	MEASURE X- CITY OF OCEANSIDE ONE-HALF CENT SALES TAX
CITY OF ENCINITAS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4	MEASURE Y- CITY OF OCEANSIDE AMEND. LAND USE ELEMENT



CITY OF ESCONDIDO MAYOR	MEASURE Z- CITY OF VISTA CITIZEN'S MED. CANNABIS
CITY OF ESCONDIDO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE AA- CITY OF VISTA CANNABIS BUS. TAX
CITY OF ESCONDIDO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	MEASURE BB- CITY OF VISTA CANNABIS BUS. ORD.
CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH MAYOR	MEASURE CC- SOUTHWESTERN CC DIST - TERM LIMITS
CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH CITY COUNCIL	MEASURE DD- SWEETWATER UN HS DIST \$403M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF LA MESA CITY COUNCIL	MEASURE EE- BONSALL UN SCHL \$38M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF LEMON GROVE CITY COUNCIL	MEASURE GG- BORREGO SPGS UN SCHL \$8.6M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF NATIONAL CITY MAYOR	MEASURE HH- CARLSBAD UN SCHL \$265M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF NATIONAL CITY CITY COUNCIL	MEASURE JJ- MTN EMPIRE UN SCHL \$15M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF OCEANSIDE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE H- SD UN SCHL DIST TERM LIMITS
CITY OF OCEANSIDE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	MEASURE YY- SD UN SCHL DIST \$3.5B BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF OCEANSIDE TREASURER	MEASURE LL- VISTA UN SCHL \$247M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF POWAY MAYOR	MEASURE MM- DEL MAR UN SCHL \$186M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF POWAY CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE NN- SOUTH BAY UN SCHL \$18M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF POWAY CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3	MEASURE VV- CHULA VISTA ELEM \$150M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF POWAY CITY COUNCIL SHORT TERM	MEASURE S- SANTEE SCHL DIST \$15.37M BONDS (REQ 55%)
CITY OF SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	MEASURE O- OTAY MESA EIFD BOND ISSUANCE (REQ 55%)
CITY OF SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 6	MEASURE PP- BORREGO SPR FIRE SPECIAL PARCEL TAX (REQ 2/3)
CITY OF SAN MARCOS MAYOR	MEASURE QQ- JULIAN-CUY FIRE PROT DIST ANNUAL BENEFIT FEE
CITY OF SAN MARCOS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	MEASURE RR- RINCON RANCH CSD SPECIAL TAX (REQ 2/3)
CITY OF SAN MARCOS CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	MEASURE SS- VALLEY CENTER FIRE SPECIAL TAX (REQ 2/3)
CITY OF SANTEE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1	
CITY OF SANTEE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2	
CITY OF SANTEE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3 - SHORT TERM	