

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

2009 ELECTIONS

City Offices and Ballot Measures



Institute for Social Research
Center For California Studies
California State University,
Sacramento



CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT
ELECTION OUTCOMES:
CANDIDATES AND BALLOT MEASURES, 2009 ELECTIONS

CITY OFFICES AND BALLOT MEASURES

Timothy A. Hodson, Ph.D.,
Director, Center for California Studies

Ernest Cowles, Ph.D.,
Director, Institute for Social Research

Valory Logsdon
Research Analyst, Institute for Social Research

Center for California Studies
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6081
(916) 278-6906 FAX: (916) 278-5199

Institute for Social Research
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6101
(916) 278-5737 FAX: (916) 278-5150

Institute for Social Research Project Staff:

Clint Swift
Kelly Nelson

Acknowledgements

The researchers would like to sincerely thank the county elections officials and staff throughout the State of California who took time to provide data to the project. Additionally, we are grateful to the Secretary of State's Office for its continuing support and interest in this project. Without their assistance, the completion of these yearly reviews and the California Elections Data Archive would not be possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|---|---|--------|
| INTRODUCTION..... | | i |
| 2009 County, City and School District Election Dates by County | | xix |
| Trend Table A | Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year | xxi |
| Trend Table B | Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction and Year..... | xxiv |
| Trend Table C | Community Service District and County Service Area Measures by County | xxvii |
| Trend Table D | Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Type and Year | xxviii |
| Trend Table E | Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures, 1998-2009 | xxix |
| Trend Table F | Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Ballot Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic and Year | xxix |
| Trend Table G | Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Year | xxx |
| Trend Table H | Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year..... | xxx |
| Trend Table I | Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Year | xxxi |
| | | |
| 2009 ELECTION SERIES SUMMARY: ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES AND CANDIDATES | | 1 |
| Table A | Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2009..... | 3 |
| Table B | Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2009 | 5 |
| Table C | Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 2009..... | 7 |

PART 1 VOTE TOTALS, ELECTION OUTCOMES AND TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES9

Table 1.1 Vote Totals for City Ballot Measures by County, 2009 11

Table 1.2 Text for City Ballot Measures by County, 2009 17

Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures
by Type of Measure and County, 200927

Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures
by Topic of Measure and County, 200928

PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES29

Table 2.1 Vote Totals for City Office Candidates
by County and Election Date, 2009.....31

Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Offices, 2009.....62

CALIFORNIA ELECTIONS DATA ARCHIVE

INTRODUCTION

The California Elections Data Archive (CEDA) is a joint project of the Center for California Studies and the Institute for Social Research, at the California State University, Sacramento and the office of the California Secretary of State. The purpose of CEDA is to provide researchers, citizens, public agencies and other interested parties with a single repository of local election data. With over 6,000 local jurisdictions in California, the task of monitoring local elections is nearly impossible for individuals. CEDA addresses this problem through the creation of a single, cost-effective and easily accessible source of local election data. CEDA includes candidate and ballot measure results for county, city, community college, and school district elections throughout the State. CEDA thus represents the only comprehensive repository of local election results in California and one of a very few such databases on local elections in the U.S.

How the CEDA Data is Collected and Reported

Election data are collected periodically throughout each calendar year. This enables CEDA to incorporate results from special elections as well as all regularly scheduled elections. Election results from counties, cities, and community college and school districts are entered in the CEDA database from which three standard CEDA reports are generated. These reports include:

- **County Elections:** Candidates, ballot designations, and vote totals for all elected county offices; vote totals and text for county ballot measures.
- **City Elections:** Candidates, ballot designations, and vote totals for all elected city offices; vote totals and text for all city ballot measures.
- **Community College and School District Elections:** Candidates, ballot designations, and vote totals for all elective community college and school district offices; vote totals and text for all district ballot measures.

Ballot measures for all jurisdictions are coded according to type (e.g., charter amendment, taxes, bond measure, initiative, etc.) and to topic (e.g., education, public safety, governance, etc.).

THE CEDA PARTNERSHIP

THE CENTER FOR CALIFORNIA STUDIES

Located at California State University, Sacramento, the Center for California Studies is a public policy, public service and curricular support unit of the California State University. The Center's location in the state Capital and its ability to draw upon the resources of the entire State University system give it a unique capacity for making contributions to public policy development and the public life of California. Center programs cover four broad areas: administration of the nationally known Assembly, Senate, Executive, and Judicial Administration Fellowship Programs; university-state government liaison and applied policy research; civic education and community service through forums, conferences and issue dialogues; and curricular support activity in the interdisciplinary field of California Studies.

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Established in 1989, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is a multidisciplinary institute that is committed to advancing the understanding of the social world through applied research. The Institute offers research expertise and technical assistance serving as a resource to agencies, organizations, the University and the broader community. Services provided by the Institute include research and sampling design, measurement, coding and data entry, computer assisted telephone and field interviewing, mailed and Internet surveys, focus groups, data base management, statistical analysis and report production. ISR has completed numerous projects with more than 50 federal, state and community agencies, several private firms and many administrative units of the university. Faculty affiliates of the Institute offer specific content expertise in a wide variety of disciplines, including the social sciences, health and human services, engineering and education.

CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE

The Secretary of State is, among other duties, California's chief elections officer with the responsibility of administering the provisions of the Elections Code. The Secretary must compile state election returns and issue certificates of election to winning candidates; compile the returns and certify the results of initiative and referendum elections; certify acts delayed by referendum, and prepare and file a statement of vote. Recent legislation permits but does not mandate that the Secretary of State compile local election results.

TRENDS IN LOCAL ELECTIONS: 1995-2009

CEDA now encompasses 15 years of election data, including three gubernatorial election years (1998, 2002 and 2006), four presidential elections (1996, 2000, 2004, and 2008) and eight odd-numbered years devoted to local races. The 2009 election contained both Assembly and Senate seat elections and 6 statewide propositions. As a year in which there were no statewide office elections, 2009 was characterized by smaller voter turnout typical of off-year election cycles. This report begins with an overview of some of the multi-year election trends then continues to a discussion of the 2009 contests.

BALLOT MEASURES

Each year, California voters are asked to consider a number of governance issues and to choose among candidates vying for public office. Within local elections, there appear to be consistent features at all local election levels across elections over the 15 years of CEDA data collection. Other election characteristics seem to vary considerably from year to year, however. This variation is particularly noticeable between on and off year election cycles. In the following section, the patterns and trends seen in local elections during the 15 years of CEDA data collection are summarized.

Trends in the Number, Types, and Topics of Local Election Measures


As noted in previous reports, the number of local ballot measures offered to voters clearly seems to “piggy-back” on state and national elections. From 1995 through 2009 there were, on average, 412 ballot measures per year. In even number years, the average was 603 measures, while odd years average 244. With the addition of the 2009 election year’s data, the average number of ballot measures that passed remained stable at 63 percent. Moreover, with the addition of the 2009 election, the percentage of measures passed remained constant across odd and even year elections, despite the fact that the number of measures was nearly two and one-half times larger in even as opposed to odd years (See Trend Table A).

- Among all the various types of ballots measures, *charter amendments* continued to have the largest percentage of measures passed, with more than three-quarters (77%) of *charter amendment* measures passing during the 15-year period. The second best success was among *recall measures* with slightly more than two-thirds (68%) passing. However, during the past 15 years, this type consistently had the second smallest number of actual measures (behind *initiatives*) compared with the other measure categories. In terms of passage rates, following *recalls* were *bonds* (67%), *ordinances* (60%), *taxes* (54%), and *initiatives* (49%), respectively (See Trend Table A).
- Across the three governments levels—county, city and school district—at which data is collected, the largest average yearly number of ballot measures were seen at the city level (204; 49%), followed by the school district (141; 34%) and county (67; 16%). However, following the trend of previous years, school districts had the largest percentage of measures passing (67%), followed by city (62%) and county (57%) (See Trend Table A).


During the 15 years of CEDA data collection, the number of ballot measures in even years peaked in 2004 with 715 measures. The current 2009 election saw 193 measures—the third smallest in the history of the CEDA data collection. The passage rate for the 2009 elections

cycle was 63 percent which is right at the average for odd year elections and for the passage rate of measures overall.

- Among the eight topic areas for local ballot measures, education issues continue to be the most common ballot measure, with slightly more than one-third (34%) of all measures between 1995 and 2009 focused on this topic. The number of education measures has exceeded the number of measures dealing with other specific topics. However, in 2009 there was a slightly larger percentage of measures devoted to revenue topics (29%) in comparison to education (24%). This again may illustrate the financial concerns in local election issues. (See Trend Table B).
- Prior to the 2008 election year, education measures appeared to have stabilized as a percentage of the total number of measures—slightly more than a third (35%)—despite the large variation in the actual number of measures between odd and even year elections. In 2007, there was a sharp decrease in the number of education ballot measures (only 42 out of 179) with the percentage of total measures focused on education dropping to 23 percent. However, with the 2008 results, education measures once again dominated the ballot topics comprising 246 out of 593 measures (41%) (See Trend Table B).
- Since CEDA starting tracking revenue as a separate topic area in 2000, this topic has represented 9 percent of the total ballot measures in local elections. However, in the 2009 election cycle revenue jumped to 29 percent of the local election ballot measures from the mid-teens seen in the previous two years. Again, this increase perhaps reinforces the notion of greater emphasis on revenue concerns in the down economy.
 - In 2009, among all county measures, revenue issues accounted for about 13 percent; but among city's measures, revenue accounted for about 42 percent of the issues.
 - Since the 2005 election year, no revenue issues have been seen at the school district level.
- Figure 1 displays the trends for ballot measures and the percent of measures passing in each of the 15 years of data. As can be seen in the green trend line in Figure 1, the actual number of ballot initiatives cyclically varies substantially between odd and even years, but also as seen in the orange trend line, the percentage of ballot measures passing remains fairly constant, although there was a notable downturn in the percentage passing in 2009 compared with the previous two years (See Figure 1).



- Figure 2 provides an overview of the average (mean) number of local ballot measures and the percent of those measures that passed in each of eight topic areas for the past 15 years (1995-2009). As discussed previously, ballot issues dealing with education and governance displayed the largest overall average number of measures, but also revealed the highest average passing rate among the eight topic areas (See Figure 2).



*Revenue data has only been collected as a separate topic since 2000.

- The level of ballot measures also appeared to have little overall impact on the passing rate for various governmental levels. County measures continue to show the lowest passing rate at 57 percent overall, with school district measures having the best passing rate about ten percent better than county measures at 67 percent (See Trend Table B).
- As reflected in previous reports, county measures showed the greatest disparity in passing rates between odd and even year elections, faring much better in odd year elections. For example, county elections witnessed a 15 percent better passing rate for *tax* propositions, a 29 percent better passing rate for *recall* measures, a 15 percent better passing rate for *bond* proposals. In fact, at the county level, only one type of measure, *charter amendments*, had a better passing rate for even as opposed to odd year elections (See Trend Table A).
- Among the six types of ballot measures identified in the CEDA data, *charter amendments* and *recalls* had the highest pass rates, 77 percent and 68 percent respectively, while *initiatives* and *taxes* had the lowest pass rates with 49 percent and 54 percent passing (Again, see Trend Table A).

Trends in Bond and Tax Measures

- *Bonds* and *tax* measures each continue to make up slightly more than one-quarter of all the measures at 27 and 28 percent respectively, a little more than one-half (55%) of all


ballot measures over the 15 years of election results tracked by CEDA. *Ordinances* and *charter amendments*, affecting policy shifts in local government, constituted another one-third (34%). *Initiatives* and *recalls* continue to account for only 6 percent of the total local ballot measures (See Trend Table A).

- While the overall percentage of measures devoted to taxes during the past 15 years has been gradually trending upward, this year saw a significant increase (about 20%) in tax issues, again possibly reflecting the struggles of local government entities in the harsh economic environment.
- School districts remain responsible for the vast majority of the *bonds* placed before voters—about 93 percent over 15 years of data collection. Bonds continue to make up three-quarters (approximately 73%) of the six types of measures in school district elections.
- *Tax* measures were more frequent at the city level than previously (57%) while counties and local school districts accounted for about one-fifth (22% and 20% respectively) (See Trend Table A).
- In the 15 years that CEDA has been collecting data, bond measures had much higher rates of passage than did tax measures. The average pass rate for bonds was 67 percent, while the pass rate for taxes during the period was 54 percent (See Trend Table A).
 - Another trend observed during the 15-year data collection is that pass rates for tax measures are consistently higher in odd-numbered years than in even-number years—an average of 60 percent in odd years compared with 51 percent for the even-numbered years. As noted above with regard to general pass rates, counties saw the biggest differences between pass rates for taxes in odd versus even years, with an average pass rate of 56 percent in odd years and 38 percent in even years. The discrepancy for odd and even years increased slightly for cities with the 2009 election—an average 61 percent pass rate in odd years and a 54 percent pass rate in even years. School Districts tax measures passed at the same rate, 61 percent, in odd and even years (See Trend Table A).
 - On the other hand, on average, pass rates for bond measures appear better in even-numbered years than in odd-numbered years (69% vs. 60% respectively). However, while bond measures are considerably more likely to pass in even years versus odd years for cities (71% versus 52%) and in school districts (70% vs. 60%); they are more likely to pass in odd numbered years rather than even years for counties (73% vs. 58% respectively) (See Trend Table A).

Trends in Community Services Districts and County Service Areas Measures


Community Service Districts (CSDs) and County Service Areas (CSAs) were introduced just before the turn of the new century as an accommodation to the tax restrictions posed by Proposition 13. Portions of a county could form a special district and agree to tax themselves to provide services that the population as a whole might not support. CEDA began tracking community service district ballot measures in 1998. Despite considerable fluctuation in the number of CSD/CSA measures during the subsequent 12-year period, speculation that the

number would increase over time is not supported by the trend data (see the dashed trendline in Figure 3 below). As seen in Figure 3, while the number of measures (represented by the solid line) increased dramatically from 1999 to 2000 and again in the 2003 through 2005 periods, the number experienced an equally sharp decline from 2000 to 2003 and again from 2005 through the 2007 election year. In 2008 there was an uptick in the number of measures; however, with this year's data (2009) the overall downward trend appears reestablished.



- As discussed in previous trend summaries, one important question is whether CSD/CSA measures lose effectiveness in terms of their passage rate as they become a larger percentage of all county measures. This year's data provides additional information to consider in this question. First, although the percentage of measures for CSDs/CSAs varied up and down through the 2005 election, the overall trend since 2006 has been downward—essentially these measures are accounting for a smaller and smaller percentage of all county measures. In 2009, they accounted for less than five percent of the measures. This is in marked contrast to 2005 when they comprised more than one-half of county ballot measures. Moreover, while the percentage of these measures and their passage rates seem to be synchronized in previous years (except for 2005), that pattern appears broken in the 2009 election cycle. While the percentage of county measures accounted for by CSDs/CSAs dropped to its lowest level since CEDA began tracking these data, their passage rate was at its second highest level ever. While this single year of data does not permit a trend conclusion, if this divergence continues, it may signal that the number of CSD/CSA issues (relative to all county measures) are independent of the passage of those measures (See Figure 4 below).

- In the 12 years of CEDA data on CSD/CSA elections (1998-2009), 229 ballot measures have presented CSD/CSA issues across the 58 counties. However, the use of CSD/CSA measures varied widely among these counties. Seven counties accounted for nearly two-thirds (65%) of CSD/CSA-related measures—Contra Costa (16), El Dorado (37), Kern (13), Marin (31), San Diego (19), San Luis Obispo (20) and Siskiyou (12). By contrast, 48 counties have had 5 or fewer CSD/CSA measures on their ballots over the 12-year period (See Trend Table C).



- In the years since their inception, the principal type of CSD/CSA measure has involved *taxes* (161; 70%). Interestingly, another funding mechanism, *bond measures*, has only appeared as CSD/CSA proposals four times (1% of the total measures). Behind taxes, *ordinances* (26; 11%) and *gann limit* issues (22; 10%) were a distant second and third in terms of prevalence on the ballot. *Recalls* (11), *bond measures* (4) and *advisory measures* (4) together only accounted for about 8 percent of the total number of measures during the 12-year period (See Trend Table D).
 - During the 12 years since their inception, CSD/CSA-related tax measures were passed slightly less than one-half (48%) of the time. As with other tax related ballot measures, CSD/CSA measures in this area were more apt to pass in the odd-year elections (63% pass) and more apt to fail in even years (61% fail). Including this most recent year (2009) of data CSDs/CSAs have slightly higher passage rates in terms of tax measures than counties, 48 and 42 percent respectively. On the other hand, cities do slightly better than CSDs/CSAs, passing 56 percent of their tax measures, while school districts enjoy the greatest success with these measures with a about a 61 percent passage rate (See Trend Tables A & D).

- With the addition of the 2009 election year data, when we separate out CSD/CSA measures from all county measures, we see that non-CSD/CSA and CSD/CSA measures passed at nearly identical rates, 58 and 59 percent respectively. However, CSDs/CSAs did much better than other county measures when the ballot measure involved taxes. County tax measures that are non-CSD/CSA measures had a 40 percent pass rate, while CSD/CSA tax measures enjoyed a 48 percent passage rate (See Trend Table E).
- Public safety remains the most common focus of CSD/CSA measures (75 of the 229 measures; 33%). Revenue (36) was the second most prevalent focus of CSD/CSA ballot measures, followed by *general services* (31), *transportation* (28), *public facilities* (28), *governance* (27) and *land use* (3) measures.
 - It is interesting to note that there were no *governance* measures in the first year that CSDs/CSAs tracking was initiated (1998), but *governance* has appeared as a CSD/CSA issue in every election since then. *Public facilities* measures had appeared in all but two years (2000 and 2003). By contrast, *land use*, which also did not appear as CSD/CSA measures in 1998, has only appeared in two elections, 2000 and 2005. Also interesting is the fact that *public safety* measures, the most common CSD/CSA measure, has not appeared on the ballot in the last two odd year elections (2007 and 2009), their only absences from the ballot since 1998 (See Trend Table F).

TRENDS REGARDING CANDIDATES


The addition of the 2009 data reinforces previous findings that stable patterns have emerged with regard to the number of candidates seeking offices, and distribution of candidates across the various local offices that are tracked.

- The total number of candidates for local offices (county boards of supervisors, other county offices, city councils, and local school boards) is consistently more than twice as high in even-numbered as opposed to odd-numbered years (See Trend Table G).
- In the 15 years of CEDA data collection, school district candidates have comprised just under one half (48%) of all candidates for local offices. Candidates for city offices make up about 37 percent of the local candidates, while the smallest percentage of local election candidates reflects those seeking county offices (about 15%).
- In the on-year elections, city candidates and school district candidates are fairly similar in terms of the number of candidates. However, with the exception of the 2007 election, school district candidates have the largest number of candidates in the off-year election cycles where they make up more than half of the candidates on the ballot (See Trend Table G).
 - In three of the prior even-year elections, 2000, 2004 and 2008, there were slightly greater percentages of city candidates than of school district candidates.

- The percentage of candidates running for county offices “pops” upward on on-cycle election years. In the 15 years of CEDA data collection, the county candidates averaged 19 percent of all local election candidates in the even years, but comprised only 6 percent of the candidates in the odd years (See Trend Table G).
- Over the 15 years of data collection, county candidates made up about 15 percent of all candidates in local elections (See Trend Table H).
 - Among candidates for county offices, 39 percent were running for County Supervisor positions, while 23 percent were seeking CSD/CSA seats.
- On average, during the 15 years of CEDA data collection, slightly less than one-third (31%) of all candidates for local offices were incumbents (See Trend Table I).
 - About 34 percent of those seeking school district seats were incumbents.
 - Approximately 26 percent of those seeking city council positions were incumbents.
 - About 27 percent of those seeking county supervisor seats were incumbents, however, with the exception of 1997 when there were 5 County Supervisor seat races open, there are typically no races for County Supervisor in odd-year elections.
- During the 15 year period, nearly four out of every five (79%) incumbents running for local reelection win their respective offices (See Figure 5 and Trend Table I).
 - 74 percent of those running for county supervisor¹ seats held the office.
 - About 79 percent of incumbent city council office holders win their elections.
 - Seventy-seven (77%) percent of incumbent school district candidates win their elections (See Trend Table I).
- In local elections, during the past 15 years, a little more than half (53%) of winning candidates are incumbents. This means that the local political area is seeing a fresh mixture of individuals comprising local elected offices and bodies with each election cycle. Conversely, this also suggests that fears of control of these institutions by a group of long-term political incumbents may be overstated.
 - 61 percent of winning candidates for county supervisor positions are incumbents.
 - About 49 percent of candidates for city council who win are incumbents.

¹ This percentage is calculated on those years in which county supervisors were normally up for election. In off years there were either no candidates or a very small number running for vacated seats.

- 53 percent of winning school district candidates are previous office holders (See Trend Table I).



2009 ELECTION DATA

BALLOT MEASURES

The number of ballot measures that faced local government voters in 2009 totaled 193, including 16 county measures, 130 city and 47 school district measures. Only three of these measures made it to the ballot through the initiative process. Of these measures, 121 were enacted for a pass rate of 63%. The number of measures in 2009 was below the odd-numbered year average since 1995 of 244. The pass rate, however, was exactly the average of 63%.

Perhaps the most interesting overall characteristic of local ballot measures in 2009 was the disappearance of bond measures. In 2007, local voters faced a total of 22 local bond measures worth \$1.8 billion, of which 12 were approved (55% approval rate). In 2009, there were only six bond measures totaling a comparatively paltry \$179.8 million, and only two were approved (33% approval rate). Moreover, the number and amount of bond measures in 2007 were down from 2005, when voters faced 57 separate bond measures totaling more than \$6 trillion, of which 75 percent were approved. In other words, since 2005 local voters have gone from approving trillions in bonds to billions to hundreds of millions. The average in odd-numbered years since 1995 has been 63 local bond measures with a pass rate of 60%. The 2009 totals are also in stark contrast to the data from 2008 (which, as an even-numbered year did see significantly more elections), when voters faced 201 separate local bond measures totaling \$35.6 trillion, of which 166 totaling \$33.6 trillion were approved.

The decline in bond measures is especially notable among school districts. In 2007, school districts placed 19 bond measures worth \$1.7 billion on the ballot, while in 2005, 52 school bond measures worth \$6 trillion were voted upon. The pass rate for bond measures in 2007 was 58%, while the rate in 2005 was 77%. In contrast, in 2009 school district voters passed judgment on only 5 bond measures worth a total of \$91.8 million, of which three failed and only two passed for a success rate of only 40%.

As noted in the 2007 CEDA Report, the continuing decline in bond measures is interesting, though CEDA is primarily a data collection, not data analysis, project. It is possible that the decline in the last three odd-numbered election cycles is in part a function of several factors. Since 2003, local voters have approved more than \$40 trillion dollars in bonds. It is possible that the need for bond funds, used for construction and other capital projects, has been met. School districts in particular are facing demographic trends that will result in declining enrollments, and thus the need for additional classrooms will slow. Similarly, voter appetite for approval of additional bonded indebtedness may now be satiated, especially given the widespread attention paid to federal and state debts. As the state's bond ratings have declined, so have the bond ratings of some local jurisdictions. Lower ratings translate to higher costs in marketing and selling bonds, and therefore can make bonds less attractive to local governments. Finally, of course, the affects of the national credit crunch cannot be discounted.

While bond measures declined, tax measures increased. Overall, there were 99 tax measures in 2009, of which 67% were approved. The average number of tax measures in odd-numbered years since 1995 is 73, with a pass rate of 58%. Thus 2009 had both an above average number of tax measures and an above average pass rate. The 2007 and 2008 CEDA Reports also noted the above average number and high success rates of local tax measures. Tax

measures in 2007 had the highest approval rate since 1995. In 2008 a total of 188 tax measures resulted in passage of 126 for a pass rate of 67%.

An interesting development in 2009 was an increase in the number of parcel tax measures. [Note: A parcel tax is a tax on real estate parcels, but not on the value of those parcels. Parcel taxes are permitted when levied as a “special tax,” the revenues from which are used for specific purposes which can include the general expenditures of a school district. Parcel taxes require approval by a two-thirds vote of the electorate.] There were two county parcel tax measures of which one passed; six city parcel tax measures of which three passed; and 30 school district parcel tax measures of which 19 or 63% passed. The prevalence of school district parcel taxes may indicate the need for general funds to keep open the doors built by previous bond measures.

Other tax measures included hotel/transient taxes (16, of which 13 or 81% passed); utilities taxes (22, of which 18 or 81% passed); sales taxes (9 of which only two or 22% passed); and miscellaneous tax measures (e.g., “special” fire tax, business license taxes, etc.).

The topics of local ballot measures in 2009 were consistent with past years. The most common topics were revenue (29% of all local measures), education (24%), and governance (22%).

Unlike past years, efforts to change elective positions to being appointive were popular in 2009. A total of six such measures faced city voters and four passed. (Burlingame, Millbrae, San Carlos and Willits made their city clerks appointed rather than elected. Voters in San Gabriel and Riverside opted to stay with elected clerks. On the other hand, efforts to shift from at-large to district-based elections were as unsuccessful in 2009 as in past years, with voters in Carmel Valley, West Covina and Wildomar rejecting such measures. Palmdale voters abolished term limits on city officials while Foster City voters rejected a proposed modification of their city’s term limits. Interestingly, voters in the New Hope Elementary School District in San Joaquin County voted to reduce their representatives by cutting the governing board from 5 to 3 members.)

The Golden State’s tradition of eclectic, entertaining and sometimes eccentric politics continued to be reflected in 2009 through local ballot measures, such as:

- A measure amending the Santa Barbara City Charter reducing the building heights in the El Pueblo Viejo area to 40 feet
- An unsuccessful initiative measure in the City of Ventura to create a View Resources Board
- A failed effort to ban fireworks in Compton
- A Walnut Creek measure permitting a store “such as a Neiman Marcus,” but only half the size of an existing Nordstrom store

County Measures. In 2009 there were only 16 county ballot measures, all of which were placed on the ballot by county governments. Of the 16, 11 or 69% were approved. Seven measures dealt with governance issues, three with land use, three with revenue issues and one with transportation. In addition there was a recall measure in the Mountain Gate Community Service Area in Shasta County (the director was recalled). El Dorado and Marin Counties had parcel tax measures; both would have imposed a tax of \$150 per year per parcel. The tax failed in El Dorado, but passed in Marin.

City Measures. Voters in 69 cities faced 130 city ballot measures and approved 79 or 61%. The number of measures is more than the average of 117 city measures in odd-numbered years since 1995, although the pass rate in 2009 was slightly lower than the average if 64%. The most common topics were revenue (54 measures or 42% of all city measures); governance issues (35 or 27%); and land use (14 or 11%). Revenue measures enjoyed a higher than average pass rate of 72%, whereas governance issues had a pass rate of 60% and land use measures of only 50%. Land use measures included micro zoning decisions by ballot box (e.g., the Walnut Creek “Neiman-Marcus” measure and an advisory vote in Los Angeles on locating a new high school), as well as larger land use decisions (e.g., redevelopment zones and parks).

Voters in the City of Los Angeles passed two charter amendments affecting retirement and other benefits for public safety employees. Both measures, however, liberalized the system. Measure C permitted the disabled children of deceased firefighters and police officers to continue to receive benefits even after the children are adopted or marry. Measure D permitted retired firefighters and police officers to purchase survivor benefits for a spouse or domestic partner.

There were only three recall elections affecting city officials in 2009. Voters in Oceanside and San Jose decided not to recall city council members (one in each city), but voters in Cotati did remove one of their city council members.

School District Measures. California’s school districts voted on 47 ballot measures, of which 32 were approved for a 68% pass rate. The total is significantly lower than the average of 97 school district measures in odd-numbered years, and appears to be a function of the lack of school bond measures noted above. Indeed, bonds represented only 11% of all school measures – the lowest proportion of any year since 1995. The second lowest was 33% in 2003 – well below the average of nearly 80%. The absence of bond measures was somewhat offset by an increased number of tax measures. School districts placed 32 parcel tax measures on the ballot, of which 21 or 66% passed (passage requires a two-thirds vote). The parcel taxes ranged from a low of \$36 per parcel (in a measure before the voters of the Gravenstein Union Elementary District, Sonoma County) to \$795 in (San Marino, Los Angeles County). Oddly, the Graevnstein measure failed, while San Marino’s passed. Of the 11 parcel tax measures that failed, nine actually received more than 50% of the vote, but failed to reach the 66.6% required by Proposition 13. The worst defeat was the rejection of Measure E in Rowland Unified School District: the measure lost 12.5% to 87.5%.

The number of recalls of school board trustees increased somewhat in 2009 over recent years. There were no school recall elections in 2007 and only three in 2008. In 2009, a total of nine school trustees faced recall elections. Of those, seven recalls passed (meaning, the trustees were recalled) and two failed. Voters in the Big Oak Flat-Groveland Unified School District in Tuolumne County recalled all five members of the school board, culminating several years of turmoil (the district had seven superintendents in eight years) and a controversy involving the firing of a popular teacher and coach at one of the district’s two high schools. In Monterey County, two of the five members of the San Ardo Union Elementary School District were recalled. Recall efforts failed in Chualar Union and Alisal Union School Districts (both in Monterey County).

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

The year 2009 may have seen the birth of the Tea Party movement and a general anti-

government and anti-incumbent sentiment in the United States, but it was still a good year for local government incumbents in California. Of the 712 incumbents seeking reelection in 2009, 554 (78%) were reelected. More than half of all winning candidates (55%) were incumbents. The 2009 incumbent reelection rates were comparable to 2008 (75% reelected), 2007 (76%) and to the average reelection rates in odd-numbered years since 1995 (77%). California county, city and school district voters may have been dissatisfied with government and office-holders in general, but they were demonstrably happy with their local incumbents.

Incumbent success did not equate a lack of turnover in local elected offices. Each year hundreds of incumbent office-holders opt not to seek reelection or are defeated. As a result the influx of new people into local elected office is substantial. In 2009, 45% of all victorious candidates were non-incumbents; thus there was a 45% turnover among the ranks of local elected officials. This is consistent with 44% turnover in 2008 and 50% in 2007.

A total of 2,074 Californians ran for local elective office in 2009. This is less than the odd-numbered year average since 1995 of 2,313 candidates, and reflects a long-term trend of fewer people running for office. To illustrate, in the first year of CEDA data (1995), the total of local candidates was 2,384. This was followed by 2,492 in 1997; 2,293 in 1999 and 2,525 in 2001. The numbers dipped slightly to 2,107 in 2003, but rebounded to an odd-numbered year high of 2,578 candidates in 2005. Since then, the numbers have fallen, with only 2,053 in 2007 and 2,074 in 2009. The drop is most notable among school district candidates. The odd-numbered year average since 1995 is 1,401, with a high of 1,632 occurring in 1995. There was a drop of nearly a third between 2005 (1,406) and 2007 (1,013), with a slight increase in 2009 to 1,060.

County Elections. Typically, counties in California elect their Boards of Supervisors, Sheriffs and other county officials in even-numbered years, leaving few, if any, county-wide offices to be contested in odd-numbered years. This was the case in 2009, when community service district (CSD) and community service area (CSA) governing board elections accounted for all but two of county candidate elections.

A total of 141 Californians ran for CSD/CSA governing board seats, of whom 31% (44) were incumbents and 69% (97) were non-incumbents. Incumbents were generally successful, with a reelection rate of 77%. However, turnover among CSD/CSA boards was high, with 49% of all winners being non-incumbents.

The two county elections that did not involve a CSD or CSA were both in the City and County of San Francisco that elected a City Attorney and a City Treasurer. In both cases the incumbent won.

City Elections. More than 100 California cities held elections in 2009 ranging from tiny Mount Shasta to Los Angeles. A total of 871 individuals ran for a variety of city offices, including city council (744 candidates), mayor (62), city attorney (8), city clerk (27), city controller (3) and treasurer (27). The total number of candidates was below the odd-numbered year average since 1995 of 777, and the high of 1,005 in 2005. However, it was an increase over the 2007 total of 833.

A total of 306 city council positions were elected in 2009. Of the winners, 51% were incumbents seeking reelection (155) and 49% were non-incumbents (151). This translates to an incumbent reelection rate of 79%, but an overall turnover rate of 49%. That is, although incumbent city council members who sought reelection were often successful, many races did not feature incumbents, and 21% of incumbents were defeated. Thus of the 306 people elected to city

councils, 155 were returning incumbents, while 151 were newcomers.

Mayoral elections showed a better advantage for incumbents. A total of 18 mayors were elected from a field of 62 candidates. Incumbent mayors had a reelection rate of 83% (15) with only three being defeated (the mayors of El Monte, Fairfield and Riverbank, respectively). The turnover rate for mayors was only 17%, with only three of the 18 being non-incumbents.

Other city positions were fewer in number and, with the exception of city attorneys, friendly for incumbents. All 16 city treasurers seeking reelection were successful, and the turnover rate was only 27%, with the successful candidates including 6 non-incumbents plus the 16 reelected incumbents. Of the 17 incumbent city clerks seeking reelection, all but two succeeded for a reelection rate of 88%. Overall 17 positions were filled, with only two or 12% being newcomers. On the other hand, of the three city attorney positions being selected by voters in 2009, only one was an incumbent (Redondo Beach).

School Districts. A total of 1,060 Californians ran for school district boards in 2009. Of these, 574 were elected, including 316 incumbents and 258 non-incumbents. Incumbents seeking reelection consequently enjoyed a reelection rate of 76%, while there was a turnover rate of 45% (i.e., the 258 newcomers elected to school boards represented a 45% turnover of trustees).

As noted above, the total number of school district candidates in 2009 was below the odd-numbered year average since 1995 of 1,401, though it was slightly more than in 2007 (1,060 versus 1,013).

2009 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

| | 1/27 | 2/24 | 3/3 | 3/10 | 3/11 | 3/17 | 4/7 | 4/14 | 4/21 | 4/24 | 5/5 | 5/19 | 6/2 | 6/9 | 6/16 | 6/23 | 6/30 | 7/21 | 8/25 | 9/22 | 11/3 | 11/17 | 12/8 | 12/29 | |
|-----------------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|---|
| Alameda | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | |
| Calaveras | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | |
| Contra Costa | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| El Dorado | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Fresno | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Glenn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Humboldt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Imperial | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Kern | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Los Angeles | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Madera | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Marin | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | |
| Mariposa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Mendocino | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Merced | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Monterey | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | |
| Napa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Orange | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Placer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Plumas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Riverside | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Sacramento | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| San Bernardino | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| San Diego | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | |
| San Francisco | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| San Joaquin | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| San Luis Obispo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| San Mateo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |

2009 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

| | 1/27 | 2/24 | 3/3 | 3/10 | 3/11 | 3/17 | 4/7 | 4/14 | 4/21 | 4/24 | 5/5 | 5/19 | 6/2 | 6/9 | 6/16 | 6/23 | 6/30 | 7/21 | 8/25 | 9/22 | 11/3 | 11/17 | 12/8 | 12/29 | |
|---------------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|--|
| Santa Barbara | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Santa Clara | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Shasta | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Siskiyou | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Solano | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sonoma | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Stanislaus | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Tehama | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Trinity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Tulare | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Tuolumne | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Ventura | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yolo | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | |

TREND TABLE A NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TYPE, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | ALL MEASURES | | | BONDS | | | TAXES | | | ORDINANCE | | | RECALLS | | | INITIATIVES | | | CHARTER AMENDMENT | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing |
| ALL MEASURES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 412 | 100 | 63 | 110 | 27 | 67 | 117 | 28 | 54 | 90 | 22 | 60 | 15 | 4 | 68 | 10 | 2 | 49 | 51 | 12 | 77 |
| EVEN YEARS | 603 | 100 | 63 | 165 | 27 | 69 | 167 | 28 | 51 | 139 | 23 | 60 | 16 | 3 | 66 | 15 | 2 | 50 | 74 | 12 | 76 |
| ODD YEARS | 244 | 100 | 63 | 63 | 26 | 60 | 73 | 30 | 60 | 47 | 19 | 61 | 15 | 6 | 69 | 5 | 2 | 48 | 31 | 13 | 77 |
| COUNTY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 67 | 16 | 57 | 2 | 3 | 65 | 26 | 39 | 42 | 22 | 32 | 64 | 2 | 3 | 73 | 2 | 3 | 50 | 7 | 11 | 67 |
| EVEN YEARS | 111 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 2 | 58 | 44 | 40 | 38 | 36 | 32 | 62 | 2 | 1 | 55 | 4 | 4 | 48 | 13 | 12 | 67 |
| ODD YEARS | 29 | 12 | 67 | 2 | 6 | 73 | 11 | 35 | 56 | 9 | 33 | 69 | 2 | 8 | 84 | 0 | 1 | 67 | 2 | 8 | 68 |
| CITY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 204 | 49 | 62 | 6 | 3 | 62 | 67 | 33 | 56 | 61 | 30 | 57 | 7 | 3 | 65 | 8 | 4 | 48 | 44 | 21 | 78 |
| EVEN YEARS | 302 | 50 | 62 | 8 | 3 | 71 | 101 | 34 | 54 | 95 | 31 | 58 | 9 | 3 | 62 | 11 | 4 | 50 | 61 | 20 | 78 |
| ODD YEARS | 118 | 48 | 63 | 3 | 3 | 52 | 38 | 32 | 61 | 31 | 26 | 54 | 5 | 4 | 70 | 5 | 4 | 45 | 29 | 24 | 78 |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 141 | 34 | 67 | 102 | 73 | 67 | 23 | 16 | 61 | 7 | 5 | 78 | 7 | 5 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 100 | | | |
| EVEN YEARS | 191 | 32 | 69 | 153 | 80 | 70 | 21 | 11 | 61 | 8 | 4 | 76 | 5 | 3 | 76 | | | | | | |
| ODD YEARS | 97 | 40 | 62 | 58 | 60 | 60 | 25 | 25 | 61 | 6 | 6 | 80 | 8 | 8 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 100 | | | |

TREND TABLE A NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TYPE, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | ALL MEASURES | | | BONDS | | | TAXES | | | ORDINANCE | | | RECALLS | | | INITIATIVES | | | CHARTER AMENDMENT | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----|
| | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Pass Rate | |
| ALL MEASURES | 1995 | 252 | 100 | 61 | 91 | 36 | 47 | 26 | 10 | 35 | 46 | 18 | 61 | 8 | 3 | 88 | 8 | 3 | 50 | 54 | 21 | 93 |
| | 1996 | 573 | 100 | 57 | 64 | 11 | 59 | 141 | 25 | 40 | 176 | 31 | 58 | 33 | 6 | 70 | 18 | 3 | 39 | 115 | 20 | 73 |
| | 1997 | 342 | 100 | 60 | 127 | 37 | 59 | 100 | 29 | 56 | 45 | 13 | 69 | 29 | 8 | 38 | 7 | 2 | 71 | 31 | 9 | 81 |
| | 1998 | 572 | 100 | 60 | 144 | 25 | 58 | 162 | 28 | 48 | 115 | 20 | 58 | 19 | 3 | 74 | 9 | 2 | 56 | 94 | 16 | 77 |
| | 1999 | 283 | 100 | 59 | 107 | 38 | 59 | 54 | 19 | 57 | 68 | 24 | 57 | 14 | 5 | 69 | 10 | 4 | 40 | 20 | 7 | 50 |
| | 2000 | 559 | 100 | 59 | 135 | 24 | 60 | 122 | 22 | 39 | 154 | 28 | 58 | 11 | 2 | 100 | 21 | 4 | 67 | 79 | 14 | 67 |
| | 2001 | 233 | 100 | 70 | 73 | 31 | 75 | 68 | 29 | 72 | 33 | 14 | 58 | 21 | 9 | 71 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 25 | 11 | 60 |
| | 2002 | 657 | 100 | 65 | 245 | 37 | 76 | 155 | 24 | 54 | 136 | 21 | 54 | 8 | 1 | 63 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 77 | 12 | 77 |
| | 2003 | 178 | 100 | 62 | 22 | 12 | 55 | 62 | 35 | 48 | 47 | 26 | 70 | 9 | 5 | 89 | 5 | 3 | 40 | 24 | 13 | 75 |
| | 2004 | 715 | 100 | 63 | 179 | 25 | 75 | 258 | 36 | 47 | 144 | 20 | 64 | 11 | 2 | 73 | 14 | 2 | 29 | 72 | 10 | 79 |
| | 2005 | 295 | 100 | 64 | 57 | 19 | 74 | 111 | 38 | 58 | 59 | 20 | 54 | 11 | 4 | 82 | 7 | 2 | 43 | 35 | 12 | 89 |
| | 2006 | 555 | 100 | 60 | 184 | 33 | 59 | 142 | 26 | 56 | 123 | 22 | 63 | 17 | 3 | 29 | 22 | 4 | 36 | 39 | 7 | 82 |
| | 2007 | 179 | 100 | 71 | 22 | 12 | 55 | 61 | 34 | 74 | 40 | 22 | 58 | 13 | 7 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 21 | 79 |
| | 2008 | 593 | 100 | 75 | 201 | 34 | 84 | 188 | 31 | 67 | 123 | 20 | 65 | 12 | 2 | 58 | 11 | 2 | 91 | 39 | 7 | 90 |
| 2009 | 193 | 100 | 63 | 6 | 3 | 50 | 99 | 51 | 67 | 35 | 18 | 63 | 13 | 7 | 70 | 3 | 2 | 33 | 20 | 10 | 60 | |
| COUNTY MEASURES | 1995 | 17 | 7 | 53 | | | | 6 | 35 | 33 | 2 | 12 | 0 | | | | | | 6 | 35 | 83 | |
| | 1996 | 115 | 20 | 49 | 4 | 3 | 50 | 35 | 30 | 29 | 35 | 30 | 54 | 4 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 23 | 20 | 65 |
| | 1997 | 24 | 7 | 63 | 7 | 29 | 57 | 7 | 29 | 71 | 4 | 17 | 100 | 2 | 8 | 50 | | | | 4 | 17 | 25 |
| | 1998 | 121 | 21 | 59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 41 | 38 | 31 | 26 | 72 | | | | 4 | 3 | 25 | 25 | 21 | 76 |
| | 1999 | 33 | 17 | 67 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 16 | 48 | 50 | 8 | 24 | 63 | | | | | | | 4 | 12 | 100 |
| | 2000 | 116 | 21 | 49 | 6 | 5 | 83 | 51 | 45 | 29 | 28 | 24 | 50 | | | | 8 | 7 | 88 | 8 | 7 | 38 |
| | 2001 | 36 | 15 | 75 | 3 | 8 | 100 | 13 | 36 | 77 | 11 | 31 | 64 | 4 | 11 | 75 | | | | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | 2002 | 98 | 15 | 56 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 38 | 39 | 45 | 39 | 40 | 67 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 7 | 7 | 71 |
| | 2003 | 28 | 16 | 64 | | | | 12 | 43 | 25 | 15 | 54 | 100 | 1 | 4 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | 2004 | 142 | 20 | 54 | | | | 59 | 42 | 44 | 47 | 33 | 62 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 25 | 18 | 13 | 56 |
| | 2005 | 57 | 19 | 63 | 3 | 5 | 67 | 24 | 42 | 65 | 16 | 28 | 56 | 3 | 5 | 100 | 3 | 5 | 67 | 2 | 4 | 50 |
| | 2006 | 93 | 17 | 52 | | | | 44 | 47 | 41 | 30 | 32 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 25 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 6 | 6 | 83 |
| | 2007 | 29 | 16 | 76 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 10 | 67 | 16 | 55 | 63 | 8 | 28 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | 2008 | 90 | 15 | 62 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 33 | 37 | 74 | 40 | 44 | 65 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| 2009 | 16 | 8 | 69 | | | | 4 | 25 | 50 | 6 | 38 | 66 | 1 | 6 | 100 | | | | 2 | 13 | 100 | |

TREND TABLE A NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TYPE, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | ALL MEASURES | | | BONDS | | | TAXES | | | ORDINANCE | | | RECALLS | | | INITIATIVES | | | CHARTER AMENDMENT | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----|----|
| | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | | |
| CITY MEASURES | 1995 | 118 | 47 | 71 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 7 | 6 | 29 | 38 | 32 | 58 | | | | | 7 | 6 | 43 | 48 | 41 | 94 |
| | 1996 | 371 | 65 | 58 | 10 | 3 | 30 | 98 | 26 | 43 | 120 | 32 | 58 | 25 | 7 | 76 | | 11 | 3 | 55 | 92 | 25 | 75 |
| | 1997 | 144 | 42 | 58 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 70 | 49 | 50 | 28 | 19 | 54 | 9 | 6 | 22 | | 7 | 5 | 71 | 27 | 19 | 89 |
| | 1998 | 287 | 50 | 60 | 9 | 3 | 78 | 102 | 36 | 48 | 79 | 28 | 53 | 7 | 2 | 43 | | 5 | 2 | 80 | 69 | 24 | 77 |
| | 1999 | 119 | 42 | 53 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 27 | 23 | 52 | 48 | 40 | 48 | 8 | 67 | 100 | | 10 | 8 | 40 | 16 | 13 | 38 |
| | 2000 | 297 | 53 | 60 | 11 | 4 | 82 | 65 | 22 | 45 | 113 | 38 | 56 | 6 | 2 | 100 | | 13 | 4 | 64 | 71 | 24 | 70 |
| | 2001 | 94 | 40 | 68 | 8 | 9 | 63 | 32 | 34 | 72 | 18 | 19 | 61 | 3 | 3 | 100 | | 1 | 1 | 100 | 24 | 26 | 63 |
| | 2002 | 309 | 47 | 60 | 12 | 4 | 83 | 102 | 33 | 58 | 94 | 30 | 48 | 5 | 2 | 60 | | 8 | 3 | 38 | 70 | 23 | 77 |
| | 2003 | 89 | 50 | 67 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 14 | 16 | 71 | 29 | 33 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 100 | | 5 | 6 | 40 | 24 | 27 | 75 |
| | 2004 | 338 | 47 | 59 | 7 | 2 | 43 | 148 | 44 | 46 | 92 | 27 | 63 | 6 | 2 | 67 | | 10 | 3 | 30 | 54 | 16 | 87 |
| | 2005 | 135 | 46 | 61 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 47 | 35 | 55 | 37 | 27 | 51 | 3 | 2 | 33 | | 4 | 3 | 25 | 33 | 24 | 91 |
| | 2006 | 255 | 46 | 64 | 10 | 4 | 50 | 83 | 33 | 69 | 85 | 33 | 61 | 6 | 2 | 17 | | 20 | 8 | 35 | 33 | 13 | 82 |
| | 2007 | 108 | 60 | 71 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 37 | 73 | 19 | 18 | 53 | 5 | 5 | 100 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 35 | 79 |
| | 2008 | 258 | 44 | 73 | 5 | 2 | 100 | 111 | 43 | 71 | 80 | 31 | 65 | 8 | 3 | 38 | | 9 | 3 | 89 | 35 | 14 | 89 |
| 2009 | 130 | 67 | 61 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 63 | 48 | 68 | 28 | 22 | 61 | 3 | 2 | 33 | | 3 | 2 | 33 | 18 | 14 | 56 | |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT MEASURES | 1995 | 117 | 46 | 51 | 87 | 74 | 45 | 13 | 11 | 38 | 6 | 5 | 100 | 8 | 7 | 88 | | 1 | 1 | 100 | | | |
| | 1996 | 87 | 15 | 61 | 50 | 57 | 66 | 8 | 9 | 63 | 21 | 24 | 62 | 4 | 5 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | 1997 | 174 | 51 | 62 | 118 | 68 | 59 | 23 | 13 | 70 | 13 | 7 | 92 | 18 | 10 | 44 | | | | | | | |
| | 1998 | 164 | 29 | 62 | 134 | 82 | 57 | 10 | 6 | 100 | 5 | 3 | 40 | 12 | 7 | 92 | | | | | | | |
| | 1999 | 131 | 46 | 62 | 102 | 78 | 58 | 11 | 8 | 82 | 12 | 9 | 92 | 6 | 5 | 33 | | | | | | | |
| | 2000 | 146 | 26 | 63 | 118 | 81 | 57 | 6 | 4 | 67 | 13 | 9 | 92 | 5 | 3 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| | 2001 | 103 | 44 | 71 | 62 | 60 | 76 | 23 | 22 | 70 | 4 | 4 | 25 | 14 | 14 | 64 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002 | 250 | 38 | 75 | 228 | 91 | 76 | 15 | 6 | 53 | 3 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 1 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| | 2003 | 61 | 34 | 52 | 20 | 33 | 55 | 36 | 59 | 47 | 3 | 5 | 67 | 2 | 3 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| | 2004 | 235 | 33 | 73 | 172 | 73 | 77 | 51 | 22 | 53 | 5 | 2 | 100 | 4 | 2 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 103 | 35 | 69 | 52 | 50 | 77 | 40 | 39 | 55 | 6 | 6 | 67 | 5 | 5 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| | 2006 | 207 | 37 | 58 | 174 | 84 | 60 | 15 | 7 | 27 | 8 | 4 | 88 | 7 | 3 | 43 | | | | | | | |
| | 2007 | 42 | 23 | 67 | 19 | 45 | 58 | 18 | 43 | 78 | 5 | 12 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 | 245 | 41 | 82 | 193 | 79 | 83 | 44 | 18 | 75 | 3 | 1 | 67 | 3 | 1 | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| 2009 | 47 | 24 | 68 | 5 | 11 | 60 | 32 | 68 | 66 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 9 | 19 | 78 | | | | | | | | |

TREND TABLE B NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TOPIC, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | ALL MEASURES | | | EDUCATION | | | GOVERNANCE | | | LAND USE | | | PUBLIC SAFETY | | | PUBLIC FACILITIES | | | GENERAL SERVICES | | | TRANSPORTATION | | | REVENUE | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Mean Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing |
| ALL MEASURES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 412 | 100 | 63 | 140 | 34 | 67 | 94 | 23 | 61 | 35 | 8 | 48 | 25 | 6 | 46 | 21 | 5 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 58 | 11 | 3 | 51 | 36 | 9 | 44 |
| EVEN YEARS | 603 | 100 | 63 | 190 | 31 | 70 | 126 | 21 | 66 | 47 | 8 | 56 | 34 | 6 | 53 | 29 | 5 | 49 | 24 | 4 | 60 | 15 | 3 | 58 | 39 | 6 | 57 |
| ODD YEARS | 245 | 100 | 63 | 97 | 39 | 62 | 54 | 22 | 72 | 19 | 8 | 50 | 12 | 5 | 55 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 62 | 6 | 2 | 49 | 21 | 9 | 71 |
| COUNTY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 68 | 16 | 57 | 1 | 1 | 78 | 19 | 28 | 70 | 7 | 10 | 46 | 8 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 12 | 49 | 5 | 7 | 63 | 7 | 11 | 64 | 5 | 7 | 50 |
| EVEN YEARS | 111 | 18 | 54 | 1 | 1 | 67 | 30 | 27 | 67 | 11 | 10 | 48 | 14 | 13 | 43 | 13 | 11 | 40 | 7 | 7 | 58 | 12 | 11 | 61 | 9 | 8 | 53 |
| ODD YEARS | 30 | 12 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 9 | 30 | 76 | 3 | 9 | 38 | 3 | 10 | 54 | 4 | 13 | 75 | 3 | 10 | 74 | 3 | 10 | 72 | 2 | 7 | 44 |
| CITY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 203 | 49 | 62 | 1 | 1 | 63 | 73 | 36 | 68 | 28 | 14 | 58 | 17 | 8 | 57 | 13 | 7 | 56 | 13 | 7 | 61 | 4 | 2 | 42 | 30 | 15 | 67 |
| EVEN YEARS | 302 | 50 | 62 | 2 | 1 | 69 | 107 | 36 | 67 | 41 | 14 | 61 | 26 | 9 | 58 | 21 | 7 | 57 | 18 | 6 | 62 | 6 | 2 | 51 | 42 | 14 | 63 |
| ODD YEARS | 117 | 48 | 63 | 1 | 1 | 50 | 43 | 37 | 71 | 16 | 13 | 52 | 9 | 8 | 56 | 7 | 6 | 54 | 9 | 8 | 59 | 3 | 2 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 76 |
| SCHOOL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995-2009 | 141 | 34 | 67 | 138 | 98 | 58 | 2 | 1 | 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| EVEN YEARS | 191 | 32 | 70 | 187 | 98 | 56 | 2 | 1 | 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 83 |
| ODD YEARS | 97 | 40 | 62 | 95 | 98 | 62 | 2 | 2 | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TREND TABLE B NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TOPIC, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | ALL MEASURES | | | EDUCATION | | | GOVERNANCE | | | LAND USE | | | PUBLIC SAFETY | | | PUBLIC FACILITIES | | | GENERAL SERVICES | | | TRANSPORTATION | | | REVENUE | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----|
| | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of All Measures | Percent Passing | |
| ALL MEASURES | 1995 | 252 | 100 | 61 | 120 | 48 | 53 | 63 | 25 | 84 | 14 | 6 | 57 | 12 | 5 | 50 | 14 | 6 | 57 | | | | 2 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| | 1996 | 573 | 100 | 57 | 84 | 15 | 70 | 210 | 37 | 65 | 54 | 9 | 56 | 39 | 7 | 51 | 38 | 7 | 37 | 71 | 12 | 51 | 6 | 1 | 50 | | | |
| | 1997 | 342 | 100 | 60 | 175 | 51 | 62 | 43 | 13 | 67 | 19 | 6 | 68 | 12 | 4 | 42 | 15 | 4 | 60 | 35 | 10 | 60 | 4 | 1 | 50 | | | |
| | 1998 | 572 | 100 | 60 | 158 | 28 | 63 | 130 | 23 | 64 | 46 | 8 | 70 | 37 | 6 | 43 | 33 | 6 | 58 | 25 | 4 | 80 | 23 | 4 | 70 | | | |
| | 1999 | 283 | 100 | 59 | 119 | 42 | 59 | 62 | 22 | 63 | 29 | 10 | 41 | 14 | 5 | 57 | 4 | 1 | 75 | 13 | 5 | 54 | 8 | 3 | 88 | | | |
| | 2000 | 559 | 100 | 59 | 151 | 27 | 63 | 141 | 25 | 63 | 73 | 13 | 55 | 31 | 6 | 48 | 39 | 7 | 67 | 20 | 4 | 55 | 21 | 4 | 43 | 15 | 3 | 73 |
| | 2001 | 233 | 100 | 70 | 105 | 45 | 72 | 46 | 19 | 67 | 7 | 3 | 71 | 11 | 5 | 73 | 19 | 8 | 58 | 7 | 3 | 71 | 4 | 2 | 25 | 31 | 13 | 87 |
| | 2002 | 657 | 100 | 65 | 250 | 38 | 75 | 144 | 22 | 66 | 44 | 7 | 43 | 42 | 6 | 57 | 35 | 5 | 49 | 20 | 3 | 60 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 85 | 13 | 62 |
| | 2003 | 178 | 100 | 62 | 61 | 34 | 52 | 52 | 29 | 73 | 15 | 8 | 60 | 12 | 7 | 50 | 5 | 3 | 60 | 6 | 3 | 100 | 8 | 4 | 38 | 13 | 7 | 62 |
| | 2004 | 715 | 100 | 63 | 234 | 33 | 72 | 146 | 21 | 74 | 58 | 8 | 52 | 55 | 8 | 47 | 37 | 5 | 38 | 23 | 3 | 70 | 25 | 3 | 76 | 110 | 15 | 47 |
| | 2005 | 295 | 100 | 64 | 103 | 35 | 69 | 60 | 20 | 72 | 28 | 9 | 39 | 18 | 6 | 44 | 14 | 5 | 64 | 18 | 6 | 67 | 13 | 4 | 62 | 33 | 11 | 70 |
| | 2006 | 555 | 100 | 60 | 207 | 37 | 58 | 109 | 20 | 60 | 51 | 9 | 61 | 37 | 7 | 73 | 22 | 4 | 41 | 12 | 2 | 58 | 22 | 4 | 50 | 61 | 11 | 62 |
| | 2007 | 179 | 100 | 71 | 42 | 23 | 67 | 63 | 35 | 81 | 18 | 10 | 39 | 5 | 3 | 100 | 8 | 4 | 88 | 7 | 4 | 86 | 4 | 2 | 25 | 31 | 17 | 68 |
| 2008 | 593 | 100 | 75 | 246 | 41 | 82 | 99 | 17 | 74 | 43 | 7 | 72 | 39 | 7 | 49 | 32 | 5 | 66 | 10 | 2 | 80 | 14 | 2 | 50 | 92 | 16 | 77 | |
| 2009 | 193 | 100 | 63 | 47 | 24 | 68 | 42 | 22 | 64 | 17 | 9 | 47 | 10 | 5 | 60 | 7 | 4 | 86 | 8 | 4 | 25 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 56 | 29 | 71 | |
| COUNTY MEASURES | 1995 | 17 | 7 | 53 | | | | 7 | 41 | 71 | 3 | 18 | 33 | | | | 3 | 18 | 67 | | | | 1 | 6 | 0 | | | |
| | 1996 | 115 | 20 | 49 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 45 | 39 | 64 | 11 | 10 | 38 | 8 | 7 | 50 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 42 | 3 | 3 | 100 | | | |
| | 1997 | 24 | 7 | 63 | 1 | 4 | 100 | 5 | 21 | 60 | 3 | 13 | 100 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 40 | 3 | 13 | 100 | 1 | 4 | 100 | | | |
| | 1998 | 121 | 21 | 59 | | | | 24 | 20 | 75 | 13 | 11 | 62 | 14 | 12 | 36 | 12 | 10 | 42 | 15 | 12 | 67 | 16 | 13 | 75 | | | |
| | 1999 | 33 | 17 | 67 | | | | 5 | 15 | 80 | | | | 3 | 9 | 50 | 3 | 9 | 67 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 88 | | | |
| | 2000 | 116 | 21 | 49 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 22 | 19 | 64 | 17 | 15 | 35 | 14 | 12 | 36 | 16 | 14 | 44 | 8 | 7 | 63 | 16 | 14 | 50 | 9 | 8 | 78 |
| | 2001 | 36 | 15 | 75 | 2 | 6 | 100 | 12 | 33 | 58 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 19 | 100 | 5 | 14 | 80 | 4 | 11 | 75 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 75 |
| | 2002 | 98 | 15 | 56 | | | | 34 | 35 | 71 | 7 | 7 | 71 | 15 | 15 | 33 | 11 | 11 | 36 | 7 | 7 | 57 | 5 | 5 | 40 | 12 | 12 | 67 |
| | 2003 | 28 | 16 | 64 | | | | 10 | 36 | 90 | | | | 5 | 18 | 40 | | | | 2 | 7 | 100 | 2 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 21 | 17 |
| | 2004 | 142 | 20 | 54 | 3 | 2 | 33 | 35 | 25 | 69 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 22 | 15 | 50 | 13 | 9 | 54 | 4 | 3 | 50 | 20 | 14 | 75 | 17 | 12 | 41 |
| | 2005 | 57 | 19 | 63 | | | | 12 | 21 | 67 | 6 | 11 | 33 | 6 | 11 | 33 | 8 | 14 | 75 | 9 | 16 | 78 | 9 | 16 | 78 | 4 | 7 | 50 |
| | 2006 | 93 | 17 | 52 | | | | 28 | 30 | 54 | 10 | 11 | 70 | 11 | 12 | 55 | 7 | 8 | 43 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 15 | 16 | 40 | 11 | 12 | 27 |
| | 2007 | 29 | 16 | 76 | | | | 14 | 48 | 93 | 5 | 17 | 0 | | | | 5 | 17 | 100 | 2 | 7 | 100 | 2 | 7 | 50 | | | |
| 2008 | 90 | 15 | 62 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 25 | 28 | 76 | 7 | 8 | 86 | 14 | 16 | 43 | 14 | 16 | 50 | 4 | 4 | 75 | 7 | 8 | 57 | 11 | 12 | 64 | |
| 2009 | 16 | 8 | 69 | | | | 7 | 44 | 86 | 3 | 19 | 33 | | | | 3 | 19 | 100 | | | | 1 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 50 | |

TREND TABLE C COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES BY COUNTY

| | 1998 | | | 1999 | | | 2000 | | | 2001 | | | 2002 | | | 2003 | | | 2004 | | | 2005 | | | 2006 | | | 2007 | | | 2008 | | | 2009 | | | 1998-2009 | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | | | | | | |
| Butte | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 13 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Calaveras | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 57 | 75 | | | | | |
| Contra Costa | 1 | 33 | 100 | | | | 3 | 60 | 33 | 1 | 100 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 50 | | | | 2 | 40 | 100 | 2 | 67 | 100 | | | 2 | 100 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 67 | | | | 16 | 64 | 75 | | | | |
| El Dorado | 2 | 12 | 50 | | | | 5 | 56 | 20 | | | | 1 | 50 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 14 | 88 | 64 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 3 | 100 | 100 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 37 | 54 | 49 | | | |
| Fresno | 1 | 50 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 8 | 100 | | | | |
| Humboldt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 36 | 25 | | | | |
| Imperial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 13 | 100 | | | |
| Inyo | | | | | | | 1 | 50 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 13 | 100 | | | |
| Kern | 6 | 100 | 50 | | | | 2 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13 | 65 | 38 | | | |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 33 | 50 | | | |
| Lassen | | | | | | | 1 | 33 | 0 | | | | 4 | 80 | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | 73 | 25 | | | |
| Marin | | | | 2 | 50 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 80 | 9 | 82 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 31 | 72 | 97 | | |
| Mendocino | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 38 | 33 | | |
| Monterey | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 9 | 0 | | |
| Nevada | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 25 | 100 | | |
| Orange | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 100 | | |
| Placer | 1 | 33 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 18 | 50 | | |
| Plumas | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 67 | 100 | |
| Riverside | | | | 3 | 100 | 33 | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 50 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9 | 69 | 33 | |
| Sacramento | 2 | 40 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 19 | 100 | |
| San Bernardino | 2 | 100 | 50 | | | | 3 | 100 | 67 | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 0 | | | | 1 | 33 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | 11 | 73 | 45 | |
| San Diego | 9 | 75 | 33 | | | | 3 | 60 | 33 | 1 | 100 | 100 | 2 | 40 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 19 | 43 | 32 | |
| San Joaquin | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 25 | 100 |
| San Luis Obispo | | | | 5 | 100 | 100 | 1 | 33 | 0 | | | | 1 | 50 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 20 | 74 | 70 |
| San Mateo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 100 |
| Santa Barbara | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 18 | 50 |
| Santa Cruz | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Shasta | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 100 | 50 |

TREND TABLE C COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES BY COUNTY

| | 1998 | | | 1999 | | | 2000 | | | 2001 | | | 2002 | | | 2003 | | | 2004 | | | 2005 | | | 2006 | | | 2007 | | | 2008 | | | 2009 | | | 1998-2009 | | |
|--|------|----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|----|-----------|------|---|-----------|-----------|----|----|
| | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | N | % | % Passing | | | |
| Siskiyou | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | 83 | 0 | | | | | | | 2 | 100 | 0 | | | | 3 | 75 | 33 | | | | 12 | 86 | 25 | |
| Sonoma | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | 1 | 50 | 0 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 13 | 50 | | |
| Stanislaus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 50 | 0 | | 1 | 25 | 0 | | | | | | 2 | 25 | 0 | | |
| Sutter | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 29 | 0 | | |
| Trinity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 50 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 20 | 100 | | |
| Tulare | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 50 | 100 | | |
| Tuolumne | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | 2 | 25 | 50 | | |
| Yolo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 50 | 100 | 1 | 33 | 100 | | |
| Yuba | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 25 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 27 | 33 | | |
| Total for CSD/CSA Measures Over All Counties | 25 | 21 | 56 | 13 | 39 | 62 | 32 | 28 | 50 | 16 | 44 | 81 | 18 | 18 | 44 | 13 | 46 | 38 | 27 | 19 | 48 | 31 | 53 | 73 | 21 | 22 | 48 | 8 | 28 | 88 | 19 | 21 | 58 | 6 | 3 | 83 | 229 | 44 | 57 |

TREND TABLE D NUMBER OF COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL COUNTY MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TYPE AND YEAR

| Year | ALL CSD/CSA | | | TAXES | | | BONDS | | | ADVISORY | | | RECALLS | | | GANN LIMIT | | | ORDINANCE | | |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Pass Rate |
| 1998 | 25 | 21 | 56 | 18 | 15 | 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | 6 | 86 |
| 1999 | 13 | 39 | 62 | 10 | 30 | 70 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | 100 | | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 2000 | 32 | 28 | 50 | 22 | 19 | 27 | | | | 2 | 2 | 100 | | | 6 | 5 | 100 | | 2 | 2 | 50 |
| 2001 | 16 | 44 | 81 | 10 | 28 | 90 | 2 | 6 | 100 | | | | | | 2 | 6 | 100 | | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| 2002 | 18 | 18 | 44 | 14 | 14 | 36 | | | | | | | | | 4 | 4 | 75 | | | | |
| 2003 | 13 | 46 | 38 | 11 | 39 | 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 7 | 100 |
| 2004 | 27 | 19 | 48 | 21 | 15 | 38 | | | | 1 | 1 | 100 | | | 2 | 1 | 100 | | 3 | 2 | 67 |
| 2005 | 31 | 54 | 73 | 23 | 40 | 65 | 2 | 4 | 50 | | | | 3 | 5 | 100 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 4 | 100 |
| 2006 | 21 | 23 | 48 | 14 | 15 | 50 | | | | | | | 4 | 4 | 25 | | | | 3 | 3 | 67 |
| 2007 | 8 | 28 | 88 | 3 | 10 | 67 | | | | | | | 3 | 10 | 100 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 1 | 3 | 100 |
| 2008 | 19 | 21 | 58 | 12 | 13 | 42 | | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | 4 | 4 | 100 | | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| 2009 | 6 | 38 | 83 | 3 | 19 | 67 | | | | | | | 1 | 6 | 100 | 1 | 6 | 100 | 1 | 6 | 100 |
| 1998-2009 | 229 | 27 | 58 | 161 | 19 | 48 | 4 | 0 | 75 | 4 | 0 | 75 | 11 | 1 | 73 | 22 | 3 | 95 | 26 | 3 | 73 |

TREND TABLE E COMPARISON OF PASS RATES FOR COUNTY-WIDE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT/ COUNTY SERVICE AREA TAX MEASURES, 1998-2009

| | NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE MEASURES | | | CSD/CSA MEASURES | | NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE TAX MEASURES | | CSD/CSA COUNTY TAX MEASURES | |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| | Total Number of County Measures | Number of Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | Percent Passing |
| 1998 | 121 | 96 | 59 | 25 | 56 | 32 | 34 | 18 | 44 |
| 1999 | 33 | 20 | 70 | 13 | 62 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 70 |
| 2000 | 115 | 83 | 51 | 32 | 50 | 28 | 29 | 22 | 27 |
| 2001 | 36 | 20 | 70 | 16 | 81 | 3 | 33 | 10 | 90 |
| 2002 | 98 | 80 | 60 | 18 | 44 | 24 | 50 | 14 | 36 |
| 2003 | 28 | 15 | 87 | 13 | 38 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 27 |
| 2004 | 139 | 112 | 54 | 27 | 48 | 39 | 49 | 21 | 38 |
| 2005 | 57 | 26 | 54 | 31 | 71 | 1 | 100 | 23 | 65 |
| 2006 | 93 | 72 | 54 | 21 | 48 | 30 | 37 | 14 | 50 |
| 2007 | 29 | 21 | 71 | 8 | 88 | 1 | 100 | 3 | 67 |
| 2008 | 90 | 71 | 63 | 19 | 58 | 21 | 43 | 12 | 42 |
| 2009 | 16 | 10 | 60 | 6 | 83 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 67 |
| 1998-2009 | 855 | 626 | 59 | 229 | 58 | 187 | 40 | 161 | 48 |

TREND TABLE F NUMBER OF COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL COUNTY MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TOPIC AND YEAR

| | ALL CSD/CSA | | | LAND USE | | | PUBLIC SAFETY | | | GOVERNANCE | | | ENVIRONMENT | | | TRANSPORTATION | | | PUBLIC FACILITIES | | | GENERAL SERVICES | | | REVENUE | | |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing | Number of Measures | % of County Measures | Percent Passing |
| 1998 | 25 | 21 | 56 | | | | 11 | 9 | 46 | | | | 2 | 2 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 67 | 6 | 5 | 83 | 3 | 2 | 33 | 25 | 21 | 56 |
| 1999 | 13 | 39 | 62 | | | | 3 | 9 | 67 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 13 | 39 | 62 |
| 2000 | 32 | 28 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 5 | 4 | 20 | | | | 5 | 4 | 60 | 10 | 9 | 80 | 32 | 28 | 50 |
| 2001 | 16 | 44 | 81 | | | | 5 | 14 | 100 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 75 | 3 | 8 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 100 | 16 | 44 | 81 |
| 2002 | 18 | 18 | 44 | | | | 11 | 11 | 45 | 3 | 3 | 67 | | | | 3 | 3 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | 18 | 18 | 44 |
| 2003 | 13 | 46 | 38 | | | | 5 | 18 | 40 | 2 | 7 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | 6 | 21 | 17 | 13 | 46 | 38 |
| 2004 | 27 | 19 | 48 | | | | 15 | 11 | 47 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 33 | 4 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 27 | 19 | 48 |
| 2005 | 31 | 54 | 71 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 5 | 100 | 6 | 11 | 100 | 6 | 11 | 100 | 9 | 16 | 78 | 4 | 7 | 50 | 31 | 54 | 71 |
| 2006 | 21 | 23 | 48 | | | | 7 | 8 | 71 | 6 | 6 | 33 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 21 | 23 | 48 |
| 2007 | 8 | 28 | 88 | | | | | | | 4 | 14 | 100 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 7 | 100 | | | | 8 | 28 | 88 |
| 2008 | 19 | 21 | 58 | | | | 8 | 9 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 80 | 19 | 21 | 58 |
| 2009 | 6 | 38 | 83 | | | | | | | 2 | 13 | 100 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 100 | | | | 1 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 38 | 83 |
| 1998-2009 | 229 | 27 | 58 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 9 | 51 | 27 | 3 | 70 | 28 | 3 | 57 | 28 | 3 | 61 | 31 | 4 | 68 | 36 | 4 | 64 | 229 | 27 | 58 |

TREND TABLE G NUMBER OF CANDIDATES BY JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | NUMBER OF CANDIDATES | | | |
|-------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| | ALL CANDIDATES | COUNTY CANDIDATES | CITY CANDIDATES | SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES |
| 1995 | 2,384 | 0 | 752 | 1,632 |
| 1996 | 5,524 | 805 | 2,169 | 2,550 |
| 1997 | 2,492 | 25 | 744 | 1,723 |
| 1998 | 5,502 | 1,167 | 1,903 | 2,432 |
| 1999 | 2,293 | 138 | 738 | 1,417 |
| 2000 | 5,154 | 894 | 2,200 | 2,060 |
| 2001 | 2,525 | 189 | 702 | 1,634 |
| 2002 | 6,072 | 1,412 | 2,210 | 2,450 |
| 2003 | 2,107 | 209 | 575 | 1,323 |
| 2004 | 5,155 | 878 | 2,232 | 2,045 |
| 2005 | 2,578 | 167 | 1,005 | 1,406 |
| 2006 | 5,645 | 1,247 | 2,162 | 2,236 |
| 2007 | 2,053 | 207 | 833 | 1,013 |
| 2008 | 5,389 | 888 | 2,320 | 2,181 |
| 2009 | 2,074 | 143 | 871 | 1,060 |
| Total | 56,947 | 8,369 | 21,416 | 27,162 |

TREND TABLE H NUMBER OF CANDIDATES FOR MAJOR COUNTY OFFICES BY YEAR

| | TOTAL NUMBER OF CANDIDATES | NUMBER OF COUNTY CANDIDATES | COUNTY SUPERVISOR CANDIDATES | | CSD/CSA CANDIDATES | |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| | | | NUMBER OF CANDIDATES | % OF COUNTY CANDIDATES | NUMBER OF CANDIDATES | % OF COUNTY CANDIDATES |
| 1995 | 2,384 | 0 | 0 | 0 | * | * |
| 1996 | 5,524 | 805 | 566 | 70 | * | * |
| 1997 | 2,492 | 25 | 21 | 84 | * | * |
| 1998 | 5,502 | 1,167 | 362 | 31 | 22 | 0 |
| 1999 | 2,293 | 138 | 5 | 4 | 109 | 79 |
| 2000 | 5,154 | 894 | 511 | 57 | 174 | 20 |
| 2001 | 2,525 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 98 |
| 2002 | 6,072 | 1,412 | 363 | 26 | 127 | 9 |
| 2003 | 2,107 | 209 | 10 | 5 | 175 | 84 |
| 2004 | 5,155 | 878 | 523 | 60 | 125 | 14 |
| 2005 | 2,578 | 167 | 4 | 2 | 155 | 93 |
| 2006 | 5,645 | 1,247 | 366 | 29 | 162 | 13 |
| 2007 | 2,053 | 207 | 10 | 5 | 161 | 78 |
| 2008 | 5,389 | 888 | 521 | 59 | 174 | 20 |
| 2009 | 2,074 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 99 |
| TOTAL | 56,947 | 8,369 | 3,262 | 39 | 1,711 | 23 |

*The California Elections Data Archive did not collect information on CSD/CSA candidates until 1998.

TREND TABLE I PERCENT OF INCUMBENT CANDIDATES AND PERCENT OF PREVAILING INCUMBENTS BY MAJOR OFFICE, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

| | | % OF ALL CANDIDATES | % OF COUNTY SUPERVISOR CANDIDATES | % OF CITY COUNCIL CANDIDATES | % OF SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES |
|---|------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| PERCENT OF CANDIDATES WHO ARE INCUMBENTS | 1995 | 27 | 0 | 18 | 30 |
| | 1996 | 26 | 24 | 22 | 28 |
| | 1997 | 30 | 5 | 23 | 33 |
| | 1998 | 32 | 27 | 26 | 32 |
| | 1999 | 30 | 0 | 23 | 32 |
| | 2000 | 30 | 29 | 27 | 32 |
| | 2001 | 30 | 0 | 24 | 32 |
| | 2002 | 34 | 32 | 26 | 36 |
| | 2003 | 31 | 0 | 22 | 35 |
| | 2004 | 33 | 28 | 28 | 37 |
| | 2005 | 31 | 0 | 23 | 36 |
| | 2006 | 34 | 28 | 29 | 36 |
| | 2007 | 31 | 0 | 27 | 33 |
| | 2008 | 34 | 28 | 30 | 38 |
| | 2009 | 34 | 0 | 26 | 39 |
| PERCENTAGE OF INCUMBENTS WHO WIN | 1995 | 79 | 0 | 78 | 78 |
| | 1996 | 77 | 64 | 74 | 78 |
| | 1997 | 76 | 0 | 79 | 74 |
| | 1998 | 85 | 82 | 82 | 83 |
| | 1999 | 77 | 0 | 79 | 76 |
| | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 79 | 74 |
| | 2001 | 77 | 0 | 78 | 77 |
| | 2002 | 81 | 72 | 79 | 79 |
| | 2003 | 77 | 0 | 72 | 78 |
| | 2004 | 79 | 68 | 81 | 76 |
| | 2005 | 79 | 0 | 80 | 78 |
| | 2006 | 81 | 81 | 78 | 78 |
| | 2007 | 76 | 0 | 77 | 74 |
| | 2008 | 75 | 78 | 79 | 70 |
| | 2009 | 78 | 0 | 79 | 76 |
| PERCENTAGE OF WINNING CANDIDATES WHO ARE INCUMBENTS | 1995 | 50 | 0 | 40 | 51 |
| | 1996 | 48 | 50 | 41 | 47 |
| | 1997 | 49 | 0 | 45 | 49 |
| | 1998 | 57 | 64 | 48 | 53 |
| | 1999 | 51 | 0 | 45 | 52 |
| | 2000 | 52 | 71 | 52 | 49 |
| | 2001 | 50 | 0 | 51 | 50 |
| | 2002 | 57 | 62 | 49 | 56 |
| | 2003 | 51 | 0 | 39 | 55 |
| | 2004 | 55 | 58 | 51 | 57 |
| | 2005 | 52 | 0 | 50 | 52 |
| | 2006 | 56 | 68 | 51 | 55 |
| | 2007 | 50 | 0 | 53 | 48 |
| | 2008 | 56 | 60 | 55 | 55 |
| | 2009 | 55 | 0 | 52 | 56 |

2009 ELECTION SERIES SUMMARY:
ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR
COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT
BALLOT MEASURES AND CANDIDATES

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2009

| | TAXES | | BONDS | | CHARTER AMENDMENT | | ADVISORY | | INITIATIVE | | RECALL | | GANN LIMIT | | ORDINANCE | | ALL MEASURES | | |
|-----------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------------------|------|----------|------|------------|------|--------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------|
| | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | TOTAL |
| Alameda | 10 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| Contra Costa | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| El Dorado | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Fresno | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Imperial | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Los Angeles | 21 | 6 | | | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | | | | 5 | 3 | | 36 | 17 | 53 |
| Madera | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Marin | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | 9 | 2 | 11 |
| Mendocino | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Merced | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Monterey | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Orange | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Placer | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Riverside | 4 | 3 | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | 1 | 3 | | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Sacramento | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| San Bernardino | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| San Diego | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| San Francisco | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| San Joaquin | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 12 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 6 | 25 |
| Santa Barbara | | | | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Santa Clara | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Shasta | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Solano | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Sonoma | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Stanislaus | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 5 |

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2009

| | TAXES | | BONDS | | CHARTER AMENDMENT | | ADVISORY | | INITIATIVE | | RECALL | | GANN LIMIT | | ORDINANCE | | ALL MEASURES | | |
|--------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------------------|------|----------|------|------------|------|--------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------|
| | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | TOTAL |
| Tulare | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Tuolumne | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | 0 | | | | | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Ventura | 0 | 2 | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Yolo | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| All Counties | 66 | 33 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 13 | 121 | 72 | 193 |

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2009

| | EDUCATION | | LAND USE | | SAFETY | | GOVERNANCE | | ENVIRONMENT | | TRANSPORT | | FACILITIES | | HOUSING | | GENERAL SERVICES | | REVENUE | | OTHER | | ALL MEASURES | | |
|-----------------|-----------|------|----------|------|--------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|---------|------|------------------|------|---------|------|-------|------|--------------|------|-------|
| | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | TOTAL |
| Alameda | 4 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| Contra Costa | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| El Dorado | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Fresno | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Imperial | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Los Angeles | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 11 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | 15 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 17 | 53 |
| Madera | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Marin | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 9 | 2 | 11 | |
| Mendocino | | | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Merced | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Monterey | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Orange | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Placer | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Riverside | | | | | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Sacramento | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| San Bernardino | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| San Diego | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| San Francisco | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| San Joaquin | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| San Luis Obispo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 11 | 3 | | | 19 | 6 | 25 |
| Santa Barbara | | | 0 | 1 | | | 4 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Santa Clara | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Shasta | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Solano | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2009

| | EDUCATION | | LAND USE | | SAFETY | | GOVERNANCE | | ENVIRONMENT | | TRANSPORT | | FACILITIES | | HOUSING | | GENERAL SERVICES | | REVENUE | | OTHER | | ALL MEASURES | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------|----------|------|--------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|---------|------|------------------|------|---------|------|-------|------|--------------|------|-------|---|
| | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | TOTAL | |
| Sonoma | 0 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Stanislaus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Tulare | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| Tuolumne | 5 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | 0 | 5 | |
| Ventura | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 5 | 5 | |
| Yolo | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| All Counties | 31 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 40 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 121 | 72 | 193 | |

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2009

| | | Director, CSD* | | Other County Offices | | City Council | | Other City Offices | | School Board Member | | Total | |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|----------------------|---|--------------|-----|--------------------|-----|---------------------|------|---------|-------|
| | | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N |
| Incumbent Candidates | Win | 77.3 | 34 | 100.0 | 2 | 79.5 | 155 | 88.7 | 47 | 75.8 | 316 | 77.8 | 554 |
| | Lose | 22.7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 20.5 | 40 | 11.3 | 6 | 24.2 | 101 | 22.2 | 158 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 195 | 100.0 | 53 | 100.0 | 417 | 100.0 | 712 |
| Non-Incumbent Candidates | Win | 50.5 | 49 | 0.0 | 0 | 28.0 | 149 | 28.4 | 21 | 40.1 | 258 | 35.0 | 479 |
| | Lose | 49.5 | 48 | 0.0 | 0 | 72.0 | 384 | 71.6 | 53 | 59.1 | 385 | 64.5 | 883 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 97 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 533 | 100.0 | 74 | 100.0 | 649 | 100.0 | 1,368 |
| Winning Candidates | Incumbent | 41 | 34 | 100.0 | 2 | 51.0 | 155 | 69.1 | 47 | 55.1 | 316 | 53.6 | 554 |
| | Non-Incumbent | 59 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 49.0 | 149 | 30.9 | 21 | 44.9 | 258 | 46.4 | 479 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 83 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 304 | 100.0 | 68 | 100.0 | 574 | 100.0 | 1,033 |
| Losing Candidates | Incumbent | 17.2 | 10 | 0.0 | 0 | 9.4 | 40 | 10.2 | 6 | 20.8 | 101 | 15.2 | 158 |
| | Non-Incumbent | 82.8 | 48 | 0.0 | 0 | 90.6 | 384 | 89.8 | 53 | 79.2 | 385 | 84.8 | 883 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 58 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 424 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 486 | 100.0 | 1,041 |
| All Candidates | Incumbent | 31.2 | 44 | 100.0 | 2 | 26.8 | 195 | 41.9 | 53 | 39.3 | 417 | 34.3 | 712 |
| | Non-Incumbent | 68.8 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 73.2 | 533 | 58.1 | 74 | 60.7 | 643 | 65.7 | 1,362 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 141 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 728 | 100.0 | 127 | 100.0 | 1060 | 100.0 | 2,074 |

*Directors of Community Service Districts, and Community Service Areas

PART 1
VOTE TOTALS, ELECTION OUTCOMES
AND TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | MEASURE TITLE | TYPE OF MEASURE | TOPIC OF MEASURE | VOTE IN FAVOR | TOTAL VOTE | PERCENT OF VOTE | PASS OR FAIL |
|--------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| ALAMEDA | 5/19/2009 | Hayward | Measure A | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 7,999 | 14,813 | 54.0% | Pass |
| | 7/21/2009 | Oakland | Measure D | Charter Amendment | General Services: Social/Welfare | 36,097 | 50,242 | 71.8% | Pass |
| | | | Measure H | Property Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 37,192 | 49,708 | 74.8% | Pass |
| | | | Measure C | Transient Occupancy Tax | Facilities: Museum/Cultural/Community Centers | 38,907 | 50,664 | 76.8% | Pass ^T |
| | | | Measure F | Business Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 40,439 | 50,546 | 80.0% | Pass |
| ALPINE | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| AMADOR | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| BUTTE | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| CALAVERAS | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| COLUSA | 3/3/2009 | Alamo ^P | Measure A | Ordinance | Governance: Formation/Annexation/Consolidation | 2,468 | 6,924 | 35.6% | Fail |
| CONTRA COSTA | 11/3/2009 | Walnut Creek | Measure I | Ordinance | Land Use: Zoning | 16,446 | 23,042 | 71.4% | Pass |
| DEL NORTE | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| EL DORADO | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| FRESNO | 3/11/2009 | Clovis | Measure A | Sales Tax | Safety | 5,221 | 16,319 | 32.0% | Fail |
| GLENN | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| HUMBOLDT | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| IMPERIAL | 5/19/2009 | Calexico | Measure E | Sales Tax | Safety: Multiple Emergency Services | 807 | 1,785 | 45.2% | Fail ^T |
| | 11/3/2009 | El Centro | Measure G | Ordinance | Governance | 1,737 | 2,908 | 59.7% | Pass |
| INYO | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| KERN | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| KINGS | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| LAKE | 11/3/2009 | Lakeport | Measure C | Ordinance | Other: Fireworks | 594 | 981 | 60.6% | Pass |
| LASSEN | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Bellflower | Measure A | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 2,592 | 3,170 | 81.8% | Pass |
| | | Beverly Hills | Measure P | Business Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,163 | 5,722 | 20.3% | Fail |
| | | Carson | Measure C | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 7,463 | 10,750 | 69.4% | Pass |
| | | Cudahy | Measure R | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/ Limit | 972 | 1,083 | 89.8% | Pass |
| | | Gardena | Measure A | Utility Tax | Safety: Multiple Emergency Services | 2,203 | 2,563 | 86.0% | Pass |
| | | Glendora | Measure C | Initiative | Land Use: Zoning | 3,362 | 4,827 | 69.6% | Pass |
| | | La Habra Heights | Measure G | Ordinance | Safety: Fire | 893 | 1,094 | 81.6% | Pass |
| | | La Mirada | Measure A | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,947 | 3,078 | 63.3% | Pass |

^TIndicates measure required two-thirds vote to pass. ^FIndicates measure required a 55% vote to pass. All other city measures required a majority vote.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | MEASURE TITLE | TYPE OF MEASURE | TOPIC OF MEASURE | VOTE IN FAVOR | TOTAL VOTE | PERCENT OF VOTE | PASS OR FAIL |
|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| *Proposed city. | | | | | | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | Measure A | Charter Amendment | Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations | 132,037 | 248,079 | 53.2% | Pass |
| (continued) | | | Measure B | Charter Amendment | Environment: Agency Creation | 129,925 | 262,494 | 49.5% | Fail |
| | | | Measure C | Charter Amendment | Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations | 168,786 | 251,920 | 67.0% | Pass |
| | | | Measure D | Charter Amendment | Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations | 176,950 | 250,162 | 70.7% | Pass |
| | | | Measure E | Charter Amendment | Land Use: Redevelopment | 119,943 | 251,215 | 47.7% | Fail |
| | | Redondo Beach | Measure A | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 4,837 | 6,472 | 74.7% | Pass |
| | | San Gabriel | Measure A | Ordinance | Governance : Organization | 1,049 | 2,229 | 47.1% | Fail |
| | | San Marino | Measure C | Advisory | Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits | 2,612 | 3,229 | 80.9% | Pass |
| | 4/7/2009 | Glendale | Measure UUT | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/ Limit | 11,867 | 17,823 | 66.6% | Pass |
| | 4/24/2009 | Compton | Measure F | Charter Amendment | Other: Fireworks | 1,582 | 3,625 | 43.6% | Fail |
| | | | Measure L | Charter Amendment | Governance | 2,357 | 3,509 | 67.2% | Pass |
| | 5/19/2009 | Palmdale | Measure A | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 6,287 | 9,816 | 64.0% | Pass |
| | | | Measure B | Ordinance | Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits | 5,007 | 9,824 | 51.0% | Pass |
| | 6/2/2009 | Compton | Measure E | Charter Amendment | Governance: Elections | 1,051 | 2,274 | 46.2% | Fail |
| | | | Measure P | Charter Amendment | Governance: Elections | 932 | 2,274 | 41.0% | Fail |
| | | Vernon | Measure A | Charter Amendment | Governance: Elections | 40 | 42 | 95.2% | Pass |
| | 6/9/2009 | Arcadia | Measure A | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 2,091 | 2,734 | 76.5% | Pass |
| | 11/3/2009 | Artesia | Measure S | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 489 | 966 | 50.6% | Pass |
| | | | Measure Y | Business Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 484 | 978 | 49.5% | Fail |
| | | El Monte | Measure RR | Advisory | Transport: Traffic Regulation/Reduction | 2,230 | 5,733 | 38.9% | Fail |
| | | | Measure P | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 2,382 | 5,710 | 41.7% | Fail |
| | | Huntington Park | Measure E | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 590 | 1,130 | 52.2% | Pass |
| | | Irwindale | Measure T | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 317 | 375 | 84.5% | Pass |
| | | | Measure U | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 305 | 372 | 82.0% | Pass |
| | | Maywood | Measure MS | Advisory | Land Use: Zoning | 498 | 1,868 | 26.7% | Fail |
| | | | Measure SC | Advisory | Land Use: Zoning | 1,320 | 1,832 | 72.1% | Pass |
| | | Montebello | Measure M | Ordinance | Revenue: Voter Approval | 4,101 | 5,029 | 81.5% | Pass ^F |
| | | Palmdale | Measure CH | Ordinance | Governance | 6,577 | 8,031 | 81.9% | Pass |
| | | Pico Rivera | Measure TR | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/ Limit | 3,119 | 4,613 | 67.6% | Pass |
| | | Pomona | Measure PC | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,019 | 5,025 | 60.1% | Pass |
| | | Rancho Palos Verdes | Measure TOT | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,062 | 6,262 | 48.9% | Fail |
| | | Redondo Beach | Measure UU | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,601 | 7,694 | 46.8% | Fail |

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | MEASURE TITLE | TYPE OF MEASURE | TOPIC OF MEASURE | VOTE IN FAVOR | TOTAL VOTE | PERCENT OF VOTE | PASS OR FAIL |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Santa Clarita | Measure C | Advisory | Governance: Formation/Annex./Consol. | 1,761 | 3,300 | 53.4% | Pass |
| | | South El Monte | Measure SE | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 693 | 1,196 | 57.9% | Pass |
| | | South Pasadena | Measure L | Miscellaneous Tax | Facilities: Libraries | 3,031 | 3,789 | 80.0% | Pass ^T |
| | | West Covina | Measure D | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 3,359 | 9,113 | 36.9% | Fail |
| MADERA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| MARIN | 11/3/2009 | Fairfax | Measure I | Property Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,796 | 2,444 | 73.5% | Pass ^T |
| | | San Anselmo | Measure E | Ordinance | Land Use: Zoning | 1,980 | 3,755 | 52.7% | Pass |
| | | | Measure F | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,485 | 3,743 | 39.7% | Fail |
| | | San Rafael | Measure G | GO Bond | Safety: Multiple Emergency Services | 6,645 | 10,891 | 61.0% | Fail ^T |
| MARIPOSA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| MENDOCINO | 11/3/2009 | Willits | Measure B | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 548 | 979 | 56.0% | Pass |
| MERCED | 11/3/2009 | Gustine | Measure B | Sales Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 347 | 669 | 51.9% | Pass |
| | | Los Banos | Measure A | Ordinance | Safety: Multiple Emergency Services | 2,387 | 2,895 | 82.5% | Pass |
| MODOC | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| MONO | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| MONTEREY | 11/3/2009 | Carmel Valley ^P | Measure G | Ordinance | Governance: Formation/Annexation/Consolidation | 2,592 | 5,459 | 47.5% | Fail |
| | | | Measure H | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 2,170 | 4,651 | 46.7% | Fail |
| | | Carmel-By-the-Sea | Measure I | Ordinance | Land Use: Zoning | 913 | 1,465 | 62.3% | Pass |
| | | Pacific Grove | Measure J | Property Tax | Facilities: Libraries | 2,747 | 4,168 | 65.9% | Fail ^T |
| | | Salinas | Measure K | Sales Tax | Safety | 5,625 | 14,317 | 39.3% | Fail |
| NAPA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| NEVADA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| ORANGE | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| PLACER | 8/25/2009 | Rocklin | Measure A | Miscellaneous Tax | Facilities: Parks & Recreation | 11,064 | 13,381 | 82.7% | Pass ^T |
| PLUMAS | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 5/19/2009 | Desert Hot Springs | Measure A | Utility Tax | Safety | 1,506 | 2,013 | 74.8% | Pass ^T |
| | 11/3/2009 | Banning | Measure L | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,337 | 4,441 | 75.1% | Pass |
| | | Blythe | Measure H | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 871 | 1,851 | 47.1% | Fail |
| | | Coachella | Measure M | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 457 | 1,008 | 45.3% | Fail |
| | | Norco | Measure B | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,487 | 2,727 | 54.5% | Pass |
| | | Palm Springs | Measure G | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/ Limit | 5,713 | 8,139 | 70.2% | Pass |

^PProposed City

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | MEASURE TITLE | TYPE OF MEASURE | TOPIC OF MEASURE | VOTE IN FAVOR | TOTAL VOTE | PERCENT OF VOTE | PASS OR FAIL |
|--------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| RIVERSIDE (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Perris | Measure D | Advisory | Safety: Multiple Emergency Services | 1,084 | 1,868 | 58.0% | Pass |
| | | | Measure C | Property Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 803 | 1,873 | 42.9% | Fail |
| | | | Measure E | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 842 | 1,873 | 45.0% | Fail |
| | | Wildomar | Measure I | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 1,397 | 2,311 | 60.5% | Pass |
| | | | Measure J | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 466 | 2,268 | 20.5% | Fail |
| | | | Measure K | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 366 | 2,262 | 16.2% | Fail |
| SACRAMENTO | 5/19/2009 | Rancho Cordova | Measure B | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 4,591 | 8,130 | 56.5% | Fail ^T |
| SAN BENITO | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| SAN BERNARDINO | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| SAN DIEGO | 5/5/2009 | Chula Vista | Measure A | Sales Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 9,645 | 29,675 | 32.5% | Fail |
| | 12/8/2009 | Oceanside | Recall 1 | Recall | Governance: Recall | 9,315 | 25,100 | 37.1% | Fail |
| SAN FRANCISCO | County and City Measures included in County Report | | | | | | | | |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 3/3/2009 | Lodi | Measure W | Ordinance | Land Use: Redevelopment | 3,969 | 8,648 | 45.9% | Fail ^F |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 11/3/2009 | Paso Robles | Measure A-09 | Utility Tax | General Services: Water | 2,659 | 5,827 | 45.6% | Fail |
| SAN MATEO | 5/5/2009 | Burlingame | Measure SD | Property Tax | General Services: Water | 2,706 | 4,267 | 63.4% | Pass |
| | 5/19/2009 | Pacifica | Measure D | Sales Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,319 | 8,571 | 38.7% | Fail ^F |
| | 11/3/2009 | Atherton | Measure S | Property Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,426 | 1,829 | 78.0% | Pass ^T |
| | | | Measure T | Gann Limit | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,252 | 1,799 | 69.6% | Pass |
| | | Brisbane | Measure G | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 536 | 828 | 64.7% | Pass |
| | Burlingame | Measure H | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,977 | 4,979 | 79.9% | Pass | |
| | | Measure I | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 2,570 | 4,784 | 53.7% | Pass | |
| | Foster City | Measure W | Ordinance | Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits | 1,406 | 4,098 | 34.3% | Fail | |
| | Millbrae | Measure J | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 2,295 | 3,351 | 68.5% | Pass | |
| | | Measure K | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 1,693 | 3,319 | 51.0% | Pass | |
| | Portola Valley | Measure P | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,229 | 1,488 | 82.6% | Pass | |
| | | Measure Q | Gann Limit | Revenues | 891 | 1,489 | 59.8% | Pass | |
| | | Measure R | Gann Limit | Land Use: Open Space | 967 | 1,467 | 65.9% | Pass | |
| | Redwood City | Measure X | Charter Amendment | Governance: Organization | 4,353 | 7,319 | 59.5% | Pass | |
| | | Measure Y | Business Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,415 | 7,464 | 45.8% | Fail | |
| | San Bruno | Measure F | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,093 | 4,429 | 69.8% | Pass | |
| San Carlos | Measure U | Sales Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 3,022 | 6,989 | 43.2% | Fail | | |
| | Measure V | Ordinance | Governance: Organization | 3,972 | 6,462 | 61.5% | Pass | | |

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | MEASURE TITLE | TYPE OF MEASURE | TOPIC OF MEASURE | VOTE IN FAVOR | TOTAL VOTE | PERCENT OF VOTE | PASS OR FAIL |
|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| SAN MATEO (continued) | 11/3/2009 | San Mateo | Measure L | Sales Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 8,258 | 13,485 | 61.2% | Pass |
| | | | Measure M | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 10,068 | 13,492 | 74.6% | Pass |
| | | South San Francisco | Measure O | Transient Occupancy Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 4,326 | 5,572 | 77.6% | Pass |
| SANTA BARBARA | 11/3/2009 | Santa Barbara | Measure B | Charter Amendment | Land Use: Zoning | 10,444 | 22,681 | 46.0% | Fail |
| | | | Measure C | Charter Amendment | Governance: Organization | 16,969 | 21,602 | 78.6% | Pass |
| | | | Measure D | Charter Amendment | Governance: Organization | 12,101 | 21,205 | 57.1% | Pass |
| | | | Measure E | Charter Amendment | Governance: Organization | 14,026 | 21,347 | 65.7% | Pass |
| SANTA CLARA | 3/3/2009 | San Jose | Recall 7 | Recall | Governance: Recall | 5,897 | 13,167 | 44.8% | Fail |
| | 5/19/2009 | Morgan Hill | Measure A | Ordinance | Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary | 4,094 | 6,976 | 58.7% | Pass |
| | 11/3/2009 | Cupertino | Measure B | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 7,978 | 10,501 | 76.0% | Pass |
| | | Palo Alto | Measure A | Business Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 6,113 | 14,308 | 42.7% | Fail |
| SANTA CRUZ | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| SHASTA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| SIERRA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| SISKIYOU | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| SOLANO | 11/3/2009 | Vallejo | Measure U | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/ Limit | 10,065 | 14,537 | 69.2% | Pass |
| SONOMA | 11/17/2009 | Cotati | Recall 1 | Recall | Governance: Recall | 1,119 | 1,690 | 66.2% | Pass |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | Measure A | Advisory | General Services: Wastewater/Sewage | 8,294 | 20,761 | 39.9% | Fail |
| | | | Measure B | Advisory | General Services: Wastewater/Sewage | 7,288 | 20,646 | 35.3% | Fail |
| | | | Measure C | Advisory | General Services: Wastewater/Sewage | 7,883 | 20,563 | 38.3% | Fail |
| | | | Measure D | Advisory | General Services: Wastewater/Sewage | 7,490 | 20,610 | 36.3% | Fail |
| | | | Measure E | Advisory | General Services: Wastewater/Sewage | 6,213 | 20,562 | 30.2% | Fail |
| SUTTER | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| TEHAMA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| TRINITY | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| TULARE | 11/3/2009 | Dinuba | Measure M | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 1,204 | 1,864 | 64.6% | Pass |
| | | Tulare | Measure N | Utility Tax | Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/ Limit | 2,344 | 2,823 | 83.0% | Pass |
| TUOLUMNE | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |
| VENTURA | 11/3/2009 | Fillmore | Measure F | Charter Amendment | Housing: Affordable | 181 | 1,300 | 13.9% | Fail |
| | | | Measure A | Sales Tax | Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation | 10,256 | 22,975 | 44.6% | Fail |
| | | San Buenaventura | Measure B | Initiative | Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary | 5,751 | 22,651 | 25.4% | Fail |
| | | | Measure C | Initiative | Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary | 10,604 | 22,905 | 46.3% | Fail |

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | MEASURE TITLE | TYPE OF MEASURE | TOPIC OF MEASURE | VOTE IN FAVOR | TOTAL VOTE | PERCENT OF VOTE | PASS OR FAIL |
|--------|------------------|-------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| YOLO | 11/3/2009 | Davis | Measure P | Charter Amendment | Land Use: Zoning | 3,201 | 12,666 | 25.3% | Fail |
| YUBA | No City Measures | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|
| ALAMEDA | 5/19/2009 | Hayward | Measure A | Pass |
| To prevent severe cuts to Hayward city services including: maintaining firefighters, paramedics, fire stations, and neighborhood police patrols; protecting emergency response times; preserving youth/anti-gang programs, disaster preparedness, and job/economic development services; shall the City of Hayward adopt an Ordinance enacting a Utility Users Tax of 5.5% on gas, electricity, video and telecommunications services, for 10 years only, with exemptions available for low-income/lifeline users; and all money dedicated to preserving Hayward city services? | | | | |
| ALAMEDA | 7/21/2009 | Oakland | Measure C | Pass (2/3 required) |
| To provide additional funding to the Oakland Zoo, the Oakland Museum of California, the Chabot Space and Science Center, cultural arts programs and festivals and the Oakland Convention and Visitor Bureau, shall the City of Oakland add a three percent (3%) surcharge to the current eleven percent (11 %) Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax) that persons who stay in Oakland hotels pay? | | | | |
| ALAMEDA | 7/21/2009 | Oakland | Measure D | Pass |
| Shall the City Charter be amended to require that the City (1) set aside 3.0% of its annual unrestricted General Purpose Fund revenues for grants to children's and youth services, (2) in addition to the set aside, continue to spend the amount that the City already spends on children and youth, and (3) every twelve years extend these requirements for twelve more years or seek voter approval of the extension? | | | | |
| ALAMEDA | 7/21/2009 | Oakland | Measure F | Pass |
| Shall City of Oakland's business tax, which currently imposes a tax rate of \$1.20 per \$1,000 on "cannabis business" gross receipts, be amended to establish a new tax rate of \$18 per \$1,000 of gross receipts? | | | | |
| ALAMEDA | 7/21/2009 | Oakland | Measure H | Pass |
| Shall City of Oakland's Real Property Transfer Tax be amended to clarify that the tax applies to transfers of real property caused by changes in the ownership or control of corporations and other legal entities, such as mergers and acquisitions? | | | | |
| ALAMEDA | 11/3/2009 | Emeryville | Measure K | Pass |
| To maintain the high quality of life and unique character of Emeryville, continue to fund emergency services, and fund other vital City services, shall the City of Emeryville increase the business license tax imposed on the business of operating, conducting, or managing a card room, from 9% of gross receipts per month or \$1,000.00 per table per month, whichever is greater, to 10% of gross receipts per month or \$1,000.00 per table per month, whichever is greater? | | | | |
| ALAMEDA | 11/3/2009 | Newark | Measure L | Pass |
| To prevent severe cuts to critical Newark city services, including police officers and patrols, crime prevention, anti gang/drug prevention, fire protection and 911 emergency services, senior services and health programs, programs for children and teens, street maintenance and pothole repair, and general city services, shall the City of Newark establish a 3.9 percent Utility Users Tax for six years exempting low income seniors and requiring independent audits with all funds staying local? | | | | |
| CONTRA COSTA | 3/3/2009 | Alamo-Proposed | Measure A | Fail |
| Shall the order of the Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission, adopted on September 18, 2008, as Resolution No. 07- 27, ordering the incorporation of the territory described and designated in Resolution No. 07-27 as the "Incorporation of the Town of Alamo", be confirmed, subject to the terms and conditions specified in Resolution No. 07-27? | | | | |
| CONTRA COSTA | 11/3/2009 | Walnut Creek | Measure I | Pass |
| Shall the ordinance allowing a new two-story retail anchor building, such as a Neiman Marcus store, of approximately half the square footage of the Nordstrom building, in Broadway Plaza at South Main St. and Mt. Diablo Blvd.; increasing the site's floor-to-area ratio limit; and addressing parking and transportation issues by amending the Walnut Creek General Plan and Zoning Ordinance; and approving a Development Agreement, be adopted? | | | | |
| FRESNO | 3/11/2009 | Clovis | Measure A | Fail |
| To restore, maintain and improve essential city services and preserve the safety and character of Clovis, prioritizing police services, fire protection; street/pothole repairs; senior services, parks, youth anti-gang/ drug prevention and recreation programs; expanded neighborhood patrols; graffiti removal, and other general city services/facilities, shall the city sales tax be increased by one cent for ten years, then reduced to three-quarters cent with independent citizen's oversight, annual audits, and all funds under local control? | | | | |
| IMPERIAL | 5/19/2009 | Calexico | Measure E | Fail (2/3 required) |
| Shall the ordinance to fund police and fire services for the citizens of Calexico by implementing a dedicated half cent sales tax for twenty years be adopted? | | | | |
| IMPERIAL | 11/3/2009 | El Centro | Measure G | Pass |
| Shall the proposed City Charter of the City of El Centro be ratified? | | | | |
| LAKE | 11/3/2009 | Lakeport | Measure C | Pass |
| Shall the Municipal Code of the City of Lakeport be amended to allow for the sale and use of California State Fire Marshal Approved Safe and sane Fireworks within the City of Lakeport? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|---|----------|------------------|-----------|------|
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Bellflower | Measure A | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted, without raising tax rates, to continue and modernize Bellflower's utility users' tax on telecommunications services to fund vital services, including Sheriff's services/neighborhood patrols; school safety programs; graffiti removal; gang/drug prevention/enforcement programs; afterschool activities; senior/disabled residents' services; library services; and other general fund services; exempting low-income residents, requiring equal treatment of taxpayers regardless of technology used, audits, citizen oversight committee, public expenditure review/local control of revenues? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Beverly Hills | Measure P | Fail |
| Shall the ordinance that amends the method for calculating certain business taxes in the City of Beverly Hills to increase locally controlled revenue for city services and operations—such as, police, fire, paramedics, parks, and street repair—by converting the per barrel flat tax on oil companies, and the per employee flat tax on certain other businesses—including, professionals and commercial parking operations—to taxes based on gross receipts or gross payroll, be adopted? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Carson | Measure C | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to protect residents' health, maintain current levels of city services including deputy sheriff's patrols, 9-1-1 emergency response, youth recreation programs, Meals on Wheels for homebound seniors, Stroke Recovery Center, gang prevention/ intervention programs, graffiti removal, pothole repair, park maintenance, and other general City services, by establishing a 2% utility users' tax, exempting seniors and low-income households, with citizens' oversight and independent annual audits, requiring the ordinance end after 7 years? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Cudahy | Measure R | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to reduce the tax rate from 4% to 3.75% on residential Telecommunications Utility Users' Tax; to modernize the code to reflect changes in federal law; and to treat all taxpayers equally regardless of technology used? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Gardena | Measure A | Pass |
| Without raising current tax rates and maintaining the exemptions for low income residents, shall an ordinance be adopted to help preserve funding for critical City services, including police and fire protection, 911 emergency response, senior support services and pothole repairs by updating the utility users tax to include new technologies; treating all taxpayers equally regardless of technology used and requiring public review of expenditures, annual independent audits and no tax increase without voter approval? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Glendora | Measure C | Pass |
| (INITIATIVE) Shall an initiative entitled "An initiative to amend the Glendora Commercial Specific Plan (Glendora Municipal Code Chapter 21.08) to allow additional retail uses in planning area B and to increase the building area that could be used for the additional retail uses in planning area B."? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | La Habra Heights | Measure G | Pass |
| Shall an Ordinance be adopted to renew the City's authority to spend existing revenues from the special fire tax approved by two-thirds of the City's voters in 1997 to provide essential fire and life-safety services by renewing the voter-approved amendment to the City's appropriations limits? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | La Mirada | Measure A | Pass |
| Shall the Transient Occupancy Tax levied upon hotel/motel stays and certain other temporary lodging in the City of La Mirada be adjusted from 7 percent to 9 percent effective January 1, 2010, and to 10 percent effective January 1, 2013? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | Measure A | Pass |
| Shall the Charter be amended to empower the Board of Fire Commissioners to appoint and remove an Independent Assessor, exempt from Civil Service, who shall be responsible for auditing, assessing and reviewing the Fire Department's handling of complaints against sworn and civilian employees? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | Measure B | Fail |
| Shall the Charter and Administrative Code be amended to authorize creation of a Los Angeles Department of Water and Power program to require production of at least 400 megawatts of solar power energy by 2014; provide for voluntary participation in the program by commercial, industrial, and institutional customers to allow installation of solar power systems on their property which would be operated and maintained by the Department in exchange for potential incentives; establish a jobs program and training academy to meet program participation demand; provide contract bid preferences for local solar power equipment manufacturers; require quarterly oversight committee reports and annual City Controller audit; and utilize a variety of funding mechanisms? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | Measure C | Pass |
| Shall the Charter be amended to allow disabled children of deceased members of the Fire and Police Pension Plan to marry or be adopted without losing their Dependent Child benefits and to provide additional options for the payment of benefits belonging to disabled children of deceased members that do not increase the amount of the benefits being paid? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | Measure D | Pass |
| Shall the Charter be amended to allow retired members of the Fire and Police Pension Plan to purchase, at their own expense, a survivor benefit for a spouse or domestic partner? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|-------------|------|
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | Measure E | Fail |
| Should the Los Angeles City Charter be amended to clearly express the authority of the City of Los Angeles to provide incentives to businesses that will encourage economic development and provide public benefits to the City of Los Angeles and its residents? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | Redondo Beach | Measure A | Pass |
| Without increasing the current tax rate, shall an ordinance be adopted to ratifying/continuing Redondo Beach's existing utility users tax funding general city services, including: 9-1 1 response, police, fire, paramedics, street/pothole repairs, parks, libraries, local ocean/beach pollution prevention and youth/ senior services, maintaining low-income seniors/disabled resident exemptions, requiring equal treatment of taxpayers regardless of technology used, retaining local control, annual audits and public expenditure reviews? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 3/3/2009 | San Gabriel | Measure A | Fail |
| Shall the offices of City Clerk and City Treasurer be appointive? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 4/7/2009 | Glendale | Measure UUT | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to amend the Utility Users Tax to reduce the tax rate on communications users from 7% to 6.5%; assure that users of current and future communications technologies be treated fairly; preserve funding for essential municipal services like police, fire protection, parks and libraries; continue providing tax exemption for low-income and disabled residents; and prohibit any utility users tax rate increase without voter approval? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 4/24/2009 | Compton | Measure F | Fail |
| Shall the City Charter be amended to add a new Section 1704 to ban the possession, storage, sale and/or use of all fireworks within the City of Compton? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 4/24/2009 | Compton | Measure L | Pass |
| Shall the City Charter be amended at various sections to delete obsolete and unclear language and to conform to current law and existing City policies? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 5/19/2009 | Palmdale | Measure A | Pass |
| To maintain and improve essential general city services including: public safety; Sheriff's deputies; gang/ crime prevention; senior services; job creation; business development; shall the City of Palmdale increase the existing Transient Occupancy Tax, ("hotel room tax"), charged only to persons who occupy hotel/motel rooms in Palmdale, transmitted to the City of Palmdale by those who collect room charges, from 7% to 10%, with expenditures approved through general fund budgets adopted in open public hearings, subject to annual audits? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 5/19/2009 | Palmdale | Measure B | Pass |
| Shall the voters be allowed to choose, without limitation, those persons whom the voters desire to serve on the City Council, by repealing Ordinance No. 1184 (Palmdale Municipal Code Chapter 4.16) which established term limits for the Mayor and City Council Members? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 6/2/2009 | Compton | Measure E | Fail |
| Shall the City Charter be amended to change the date of the Primary Nominating Election to the first Tuesday in April in odd-numbered years, to be known as the "General Municipal election"; and change the date of the General Municipal election to the third Tuesday in June in odd-numbered years, to be known as the "Municipal Run-off Election", commencing in 2011? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 6/2/2009 | Compton | Measure P | Fail |
| Shall Section 500 of the City Charter be amended to divide the City into six (6) Districts for the purpose of electing members of the Council when the City's population exceeds 150,000 residents rather than 100,000 residents, as currently provided? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 6/2/2009 | Vernon | Measure A | Pass |
| Shall the City Charter be amended to provide for regular municipal Elections each April and for staggered terms of office for members of the City Council, one of whom shall be elected each year to five year terms; with the extension of terms for one council office currently to be elected in 2010 and one council office currently to be elected in 2012 to fully effect the staggered elections? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 6/9/2009 | Arcadia | Measure A | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to update, with no increase in rates, Arcadia's existing Utility Users' Tax Ordinance on telephone/telecommunications services to address current and future technologies in order to preserve funding for critical City services, including police and fire protection, paramedic services, library and recreational programs, so that all taxpayers are treated equally regardless of technology used, while maintaining current low income and disabled exemptions? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Artesia | Measure S | Pass |
| Shall Ordinance No. 09-749, which increases the transient occupancy tax from 6% to 12.5%, be adopted? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Artesia | Measure Y | Fail |
| Shall Ordinance No. 09-750, which increases business license taxes, be adopted? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | El Monte | Measure P | Fail |
| Shall the City of El Monte reorganize the City Council by replacing the current structure of one elected Mayor and four elected City Council members with a new structure composed of five elected City Council members who will share the title of Mayor on a rotating basis? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | El Monte | Measure RR | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Shall the City of El Monte institute an overnight parking regulatory program that would prohibit overnight street parking on most City streets between the hours of 3:00 A.M. and 5:00 A.M., subject to limited exceptions, including instances where residents and nonresidents alike have purchased special, street parking permits issued by the City. | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Huntington Park | Measure E | Pass |
| Shall Ordinance No. 840-NS be adopted to increase the existing Utility Users' and Communication Users' Tax rates by 2.75% in order to maintain a flow of revenues necessary to fund essential city services? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Irwindale | Measure T | Pass |
| To help preserve the safety and character in all neighborhoods in the City of Irwindale through general City services, which may include funding for police, fire protection, street repair, park maintenance, and recreational services, shall an ordinance be adopted imposing a ten percent charge on the room rate paid by persons who occupy hotel or motel rooms within the City? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Irwindale | Measure U | Pass |
| To help preserve the safety and character of the City of Irwindale through general City services such as law enforcement, fire protection, street repair, park maintenance, and recreational services, shall the City's existing utility users' tax be ratified and broadened to apply to changes in technology and laws since it was instituted in 1977, while maintaining an exemption for low-volume utility users? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Maywood | Measure MS | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Los Angeles Unified School District acquire, by negotiated sale or eminent domain, 10 single family parcels, 29 multi-family parcels, 7 commercial parcels and 1 vacant parcel within a site bounded by Slauson Avenue to the south, 57th Avenue to the north, King Avenue to the west and Mayflower Avenue to the east for the construction of the new South Region No. 8 High School? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Maywood | Measure SC | Pass |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Los Angeles Unified School District fully and adequately investigate the selection of other sites for the construction of the new South Region No. 8 High School, including alternative sites that were previously recommended by the City of Maywood and the community? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Montebello | Measure M | Pass (55% required) |
| Shall an Ordinance be adopted to protect and preserve legal control over the City's by requiring an approval of the voters of not less than fifty-five percent (55%) before the services may be performed by any public entity other than the City of Montebello? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Palmdale | Measure CH | Pass |
| Shall the citizens of Palmdale restore home-rule and local control by adopting a city charter to allow the City of Palmdale, rather than the State, the flexibility, discretion, and accountability to control local municipal affairs? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Pico Rivera | Measure TR | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to decrease the existing Utility Users Tax by one half of one percent (0.5%) and to revise the method for calculating and collecting the Utility Users Tax to reflect technological advances and changes? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Pomona | Measure PC | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to ratify and continue Pomona's existing Utility Users Tax to fund general city services, including essential municipal services such as, police, fire, street repair, parks and libraries, provided that current exemptions remain, and the ordinance is updated to treat taxpayers equally regardless of telecommunication technology used? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Rancho Palos Verdes | Measure TOT | Fail |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to increase the rate of the City's existing transient occupancy tax from ten percent (10%) to twelve percent (12%)? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Redondo Beach | Measure UU | Fail |
| To maintain essential City services shall an ordinance be adopted amending the City's utility users' tax to remove an exclusion that currently allows an electrical plant owned by a corporation to pay no utility users' tax on natural gas, with annual audits, public review of all expenditures and without raising individual taxpayers' taxes? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | Santa Clarita | Measure C | Pass |
| (ADVISORY) Do you support having areas in the Santa Clarita Valley including Sunset Pointe, Stevenson Ranch, Southern Oaks, Westridge, Tesoro, Castaic and Val Verde negotiate an annexation into the City of Santa Clarita? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | South El Monte | Measure SE | Pass |
| Shall the term of office of mayor be four years? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | South Pasadena | Measure L | Pass (2/3 required) |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted extending the Library Special Tax, which is due to expire on June 30, 2011, for an additional 5 years until June 30, 2016, to provide funding for the maintenance and operations of the South Pasadena Public Library at the current level of library services? | | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 11/3/2009 | West Covina | Measure D | Fail |
| Shall members of the City Council of the City of West Covina be elected by districts as described in the proposed ordinance? | | | | |
| MARIN | 11/3/2009 | Fairfax | Measure I | Pass (2/3 required) |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted approving the renewal of a special Fairfax municipal services tax of \$125 per year for each business occupancy and dwelling unit, for a period of five years to: Maintain 24-hour, 7 days per week staffing of Police and Fire Services - Perform Public Works safety improvements -Provide matching funds for state and federal grants -Revitalize Youth Programs and continue citizens' oversight committee that monitors the use of revenues from this tax? | | | | |
| MARIN | 11/3/2009 | San Anselmo | Measure E | Pass |
| Shall the ordinance of the San Anselmo Town Council establishing maximum floor area and maximum lot coverage for single family properties located below 150 feet mean sea level elevation be adopted? | | | | |
| MARIN | 11/3/2009 | San Anselmo | Measure F | Fail |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted establishing a uniform hotel users tax of 10% on hotel rooms in San Anselmo to be paid by hotel guests with the revenue to be used for Town general purposes, which if approved, shall be effective July 1, 2010? | | | | |
| MARIN | 11/3/2009 | San Rafael | Measure G | Fail (2/3 required) |
| To protect the safety of San Rafael residents and maintain rapid emergency response by upgrading/replacing aging police/fire stations and related city facilities to accommodate modern firefighting/lifesaving emergency medical equipment and provide an earthquake-safe dispatch center and police/fire stations so emergency communications and police/fire/paramedic units remain operational in disasters, shall the City of San Rafael issue \$88 million in bonds with independent oversight, no money for administrators and all funds staying local? | | | | |
| MENDOCINO | 11/3/2009 | Willits | Measure B | Pass |
| Shall the offices of city clerk and city treasurer be appointive? | | | | |
| MERCED | 11/3/2009 | Gustine | Measure B | Pass |
| To maintain public safety and community services including, but not limited to, maintaining an adequate number of police and fire personnel, and providing and maintaining recreation facilities and services throughout the community such as Y-Lead, swimming pool, and city parks, shall the ordinance be adopted increasing the City general sales tax by half cent, with guaranteed independent financial audits? | | | | |
| MERCED | 11/3/2009 | Los Banos | Measure A | Pass |
| To help prevent further cuts to neighborhood police officers/anti-gang units, firefighters/EMTs, maintain 9-1-1 emergency response times, shall Los Banos voters temporarily modify the Measure P Expenditure Plan for no more than 5 years, to officer and firefighter positions while maintaining citizens oversight, independent annual audits, keeping all funds exclusively for Los Banos without raising taxes? | | | | |
| MONTEREY | 11/3/2009 | Carmel Valley-Proposed | Measure G | Fail |
| Shall the order adopted on December 1, 2008, by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County ordering the incorporation of the territory described in the order and designated in the order as the "Proposal to Incorporate the Town of Carmel Valley" (LAFCO File No. 03-10) be confirmed subject to the terms and conditions specified in the order? | | | | |
| MONTEREY | 11/3/2009 | Carmel Valley-Proposed | Measure H | Fail |
| Shall members of the Town Council of the Town of Carmel Valley in future elections be elected by district rather than at-large? | | | | |
| MONTEREY | 11/3/2009 | Carmel by the Sea | Measure I | Pass |
| Approve discontinuance and abandonment of, and authorization to sell, Flanders mansion property public parkland. Shall discontinuance and abandonment of the Flanders Mansion Property (APN 010-061-005) as public parkland, and authorization to sell the Flanders Mansion Property "with Conservation Easements and Mitigation" as passed on May 12, 2009 by the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea City Council by Resolutions No. 2009-30 through 2009-33, be approved? | | | | |
| MONTEREY | 11/3/2009 | Pacific Grove | Measure J | Fail (2/3 required) |
| Shall the City of Pacific Grove Library Funding Measure be approved to enact an ordinance to create a Special Parcel Tax and limit that revenue to the sole purpose of maintaining and improving services at the Pacific Grove Public Library? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| MONTEREY | 11/3/2009 | Salinas | Measure K | Fail |
| To protect residents by increasing youth gang/violence prevention; after-school recreation/mentoring; expanding job training; hiring more police to patrol neighborhoods/schools; retaining firefighters/paramedics; establishing community policing; prostitution prevention; crime fighting technology; and protecting essential services, shall Salinas's transactions and use (otherwise known as sales) tax be increased one cent, requiring independent audits, citizens oversight, public expenditure reports, with all funds only for Salinas, not for Sacramento? | | | | |
| PLACER | 8/25/2009 | Rocklin | Measure A | Pass (2/3 required) |
| To keep park and recreation facilities safe, clean and well maintained, shall Rocklin City Ordinance No. 949, reenacting the Park Maintenance and Development Act of 1998, be approved which would allow the City to continue to collect a \$10.00 to \$30.00 per year special tax to be used only for park maintenance and development? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 5/19/2009 | Desert Hot Springs | Measure A | Pass (2/3 required) |
| To maintain a balanced budget, reduce debt and protect public safety services, including maintaining experienced police, 9-1-1 response, anti-gang/thug programs, natural disaster preparedness, and graffiti removal, shall the City of Desert Hot Springs modernize/increase the existing utility users tax rate by 2%, to sunset after 11 years, requiring independent annual audits and public expenditure reports, with all revenue staying in Desert Hot Springs? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Banning | Measure L | Pass |
| To minimize future cuts and provide funding for essential city services including police, fire, 9-1-1 emergency response, graffiti removal, and maintaining streets and public areas, shall the City of Banning adopt an ordinance increasing its existing Transient Occupancy Tax (which is a hotel bed tax paid when overnight visitors rent a room) from 6% to 12%, with annual independent audits provided by code, and all funds used to maintain city services in Banning? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Blythe | Measure H | Fail |
| In order to make up lost funding and to provide adequate funding for public safety, street and park maintenance, tourist promotion and other services/projects for the residents of the City of Blythe, shall the City's tax on transient occupancies ("Hotel Bed Tax" and "TOT"), collected by hotels from tourists, visitors to the City and all hotel guests, be increased by 3% from 10% to 13% of the daily room charge. | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Coachella | Measure M | Fail |
| To preserve/maintain essential Coachella services such as police officers, firefighters; 911 response times; crime, gang and drug prevention programs; fixing potholes and streets; removing graffiti; sweeping streets; maintaining parks, soccer and sports fields; funding youth and senior services, shall Coachella establish a 5% utility users tax, exempting low-income seniors, with independent citizens oversight and annual financial audits, with all funds solely for Coachella? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Norco | Measure B | Pass |
| Shall the Transient Occupancy Tax assessed by the City for persons occupying hotel/motel rooms in the City of Norco be increased from eight percent (8%) to eleven percent (11%)? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Palm Springs | Measure G | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to: reduce the City's telephone users' tax from 5% to 4.5%; revise the method for calculating and collecting the telephone users' tax to reflect technological advances and changes in state and federal law; eliminate the emergency response fee and adopt an access line tax in an amount equal to the current emergency past collection of the telephone users' tax and emergency response fee? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Perris | Measure C | Fail |
| Shall the 2001-3 Community Facilities District (CFD) tax be eliminated; and in order to preserve the safety and character in all neighborhoods in the City of Perris through general City services which may include fire protection, paramedic services, law enforcement, gang suppression, crime and drug intervention, local job creation and retention, and graffiti removal, shall a citywide parcel tax be established? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Perris | Measure D | Pass |
| (ADVISORY) Shall the Perris City Council make its top priority for use of parcel tax revenue fire protection, paramedic services, law enforcement, gang suppression, crime and drug intervention, local job creation and retention, and graffiti removal? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Perris | Measure E | Fail |
| Shall the position of City Clerk be appointive? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Wildomar | Measure I | Pass |
| Shall Ordinance 09-E01 be enacted, repealing Measure D which was enacted in 2008 and Ordinance No.31, and providing that members of the legislative body of the City of Wildomar shall be elected AT LARGE as set forth in the terms and conditions of approval of the incorporation of the City of Wildomar imposed by the Riverside County Local Formation Commission and approved by a vote of the people? | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Wildomar | Measure J | Fail |
| Shall Ordinance No. 09-E02 be enacted affirming the enactment of Measure D and Ordinance No. 31 providing that members of the legislative body of the City of Wildomar shall be elected BY districts as set forth in Ordinance No. 09-E02? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|
| RIVERSIDE | 11/3/2009 | Wildomar | Measure K | Fail |
| Shall Ordinance 09-E03 be enacted, repealing Measure D which was enacted in 2008 and Ordinance No 31, and providing that members of the legislative body of the City of Wildomar shall be elected FROM districts are set forth in Ordinance 09-E03? | | | | |
| SACRAMENTO | 5/19/2009 | Rancho Cordova | Measure B | Fail (2/3 required) |
| In order to provide funding for police services, maintenance of and improvements to city streets, sidewalks, and landscaping, graffiti removal, and code enforcement, shall an ordinance be adopted to continue the City of Rancho Cordova's existing 2.5% utility users' tax on telecommunication and video services, and to modernize the ordinance to treat taxpayers equally regardless of technology used? | | | | |
| SAN DIEGO | 5/5/2009 | Chula Vista | Measure A | Fail |
| To prevent further cuts and preserve general city services, including public safety staffing for emergency response, reducing crime and criminal gang/drug activity, maintaining city streets/parks, and preserving library services and youth/after-school programs; shall the City of Chula Vista adopt an ordinance enacting a one cent transactions and use (sales) tax, expiring in ten years, with mandatory audits, quarterly reports to Mayor and City Council, and a citizens' review committee? | | | | |
| SAN DIEGO | 12/8/2009 | Oceanside | Recall 1 | Fail |
| Shall Jerome M. Kern be recalled (removed) from the office of Member of the City Council? | | | | |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 3/3/2009 | Lodi | Measure W | Fail (55% required) |
| Shall Ordinance No. 1812 entitled, "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Lodi Approving and Adopting the Redevelopment Plan for the Lodi Community Improvement Project," be adopted? | | | | |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 11/3/2009 | Paso Robles | Measure A-09 | Fail |
| Shall the City Council's approval of Ordinance No. 953 N.S., increasing monthly water user rates effective January 1, 2010, where the rate for water users shall be a combination of a fixed rate plus a variable rate based on consumption, and where the variable rate component shall be further adjusted every January 1, up to, and including, January 1, 2014, be ratified? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 5/5/2009 | Burlingame | Measure SD | Pass |
| To improve, upgrade and maintain the deteriorated storm drain system, protect water quality, further reduce pollutants flowing into our creeks and San Francisco Bay, prevent street flooding that impedes residents and, police/fire, emergency access, improve local drainage, shall the City of Burlingame enact a storm drainage fee at the rate of 4.192 cents per impervious square foot, adjusted for inflation not exceeding 2% annually, with independent audits, citizens' oversight, and requiring all funds expended only on storm drains? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 5/19/2009 | Pacifica | Measure D | Fail (55% required) |
| To preserve public safety; prevent cuts to essential City services, including police, fire, 9-1-1 emergency response, street and pothole repair, and youth recreation programs; improve traffic flow and safety; protect local coastal areas and beaches from polluted runoff and trash; and provide other general fund services, shall Pacifica adopt a one-cent sales tax expiring in 2016, subject to financial audits, public expenditure reports, and a Citizen's Oversight Committee? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Atherton | Measure S | Pass (2/3 required) |
| To continue providing funding to maintain neighborhood police patrols and the Town's ability to respond to emergencies, repair and maintain streets, and repair and construct storm drains, shall an ordinance be adopted to continue the existing Town of Atherton Special Parcel Tax for four years? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Atherton | Measure T | Pass |
| In accordance with past practice, shall the Town's appropriations limit be increased by one and a half times the amount of the any voter approved parcel tax for four years? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Brisbane | Measure G | Pass |
| Shall the existing transient occupancy tax on the rent charged for use of hotel rooms in the city be increased from 10% to 12%? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Burlingame | Measure H | Pass |
| To preserve funding for general city services, including maintaining public safety, recreation, planning and library services, and repairing and improving city streets and infrastructure, such as the Broadway/Highway 101 interchange, shall the City of Burlingame approve an ordinance amending the Burlingame Municipal Code to increase the transient occupancy tax rate from ten (10%) per cent to twelve (12%) per cent on the rent charged to hotel guests within the City? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Burlingame | Measure I | Pass |
| Shall the Office of the City Clerk of the City of Burlingame be appointed? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Foster City | Measure W | Fail |
| Shall an ordinance of the People increasing the number of terms a Member of the City Council may serve from two full terms (8 years) in succession to three full terms (12 years) in succession be approved? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------|-----------|------|
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Millbrae | Measure J | Pass |
| Shall the ordinance adopted by the City Council increasing the uniform transient occupancy tax from ten percent (10%) to twelve percent (12%) be approved? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Millbrae | Measure K | Pass |
| Shall the office of city treasurer be appointive? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Portola Valley | Measure P | Pass |
| Do the people of the Town of Portola Valley adopt an ordinance that continues the reduced four and one-half percent (4.5%) Utility Users Tax levied on telephone, gas, water, and electricity, set forth in Chapter 3.32 of the Portola Valley Municipal Code, for a period of four (4) years from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2014? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Portola Valley | Measure Q | Pass |
| Shall the Town of Portola Valley adjust the appropriations limit of the Town each fiscal year commencing July 1, 2010 by the amount of money collected from the Utility Users Tax during the time of its levy and collection, provided that authorization to adjust the appropriations limit shall not exceed four (4) years from the end of Fiscal Year 2009-2010? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Redwood City | Measure X | Pass |
| Shall Section 18(a) of the City Charter be amended to create a seven member Library Board, all to be appointed by the City Council; Section 18(f) be added to provide that the Library Board would establish rules for its proceedings and the City Council would set forth the authority and duties of the Library Board; and deleting Section 19, 19 1/2, and 20 in their entirety? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Redwood City | Measure Y | Fail |
| Shall Ordinance No. 2346 be adopted to increase the rates of Redwood City's Business License Tax by 16.67% per year (rounded to the nearest whole dollar amount) for each of the three successive fiscal years commencing on July 1, 2010 and then, commencing on July 1, 2013 and annually thereafter, be increased based upon the annual change in the Consumer Price Index? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | San Bruno | Measure F | Pass |
| To preserve funding for general city services, shall the City of San Bruno approve an ordinance amending the San Bruno Municipal Code to increase the transient occupancy tax rate from ten (10%) to twelve (12%) per cent on the rate charged to hotel guests within the City? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | San Carlos | Measure U | Fail |
| City of San Carlos Vital Services Measure: To prevent further cuts and preserve funding for general city services, including fire protection, paramedic and 9-1-1- emergency response, police protection, and crime prevention; street repair and maintenance; and avoiding closure of parks and sports fields, shall the City of San Carlos adopt an ordinance enacting a one-half cent transactions and use tax (sales tax) for six years with independent annual audits and all funds staying local? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | San Carlos | Measure V | Pass |
| Shall the office of City Clerk be appointive? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | San Mateo | Measure L | Pass |
| To maintain and protect City services and facilities, such as street and sidewalk maintenance and repair, fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, neighborhood watch and crime prevention programs, libraries, community centers, recreation programs, and parks, shall the City of San Mateo be authorized to enact a one-quarter cent tax on sales for eight years with all proceeds placed in the City's General Fund with independent annual financial audits? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | San Mateo | Measure M | Pass |
| To maintain and protect City services and facilities, such as street and sidewalk maintenance and repair, fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, neighborhood watch and crime prevention programs, libraries, community centers, recreation programs, and parks, shall the City of San Mateo be authorized to increase the Hotel Transient Occupancy Tax (the "hotel tax") by 2% with all proceeds placed in the City's General Fund? | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | South San Francisco | Measure O | Pass |
| To provide funding for essential public services in South San Francisco, including parks, recreation, police, fire, streets, and libraries, shall the existing transient occupancy tax ("hotel") tax, paid by hotel guests and collected by hotel operators, be increased by 1% and modernized by amending the administrative provisions of the tax to ensure full collection for online reservations and to apply the tax to separate charges for vehicle parking for hotels? | | | | |
| SANTA BARBARA | 11/3/2009 | Santa Barbara | Measure B | Fail |
| Shall the City Charter be revised by amending Charter Section 1506 to reduce the maximum allowed building height within the City to forty-five (45) feet generally and forty (40) feet within the El Pueblo Viejo district except for those areas of the City zoned for single-family and two-family homes where the maximum building height will remain at thirty (30) feet? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----------|------|
| SANTA BARBARA | 11/3/2009 | Santa Barbara | Measure C | Pass |
| Shall the City Charter be revised by amending Charter Section 809 and Charter Section 810 to combine the Board of Park Commissioners with the Recreation Commission to form a new commission called the "Parks and Recreation Commission" and to allow the City Council to appoint a youth member of the new Parks and Recreation Commission? | | | | |
| SANTA BARBARA | 11/3/2009 | Santa Barbara | Measure D | Pass |
| Shall the City Charter be revised by amending Charter Section 811 to increase the number of Harbor Commissioners from five (5) to seven (7) members and to allow one member of the Commission to be a registered voter within Santa Barbara County and not necessarily just within the City of Santa Barbara as currently required? | | | | |
| SANTA BARBARA | 11/3/2009 | Santa Barbara | Measure E | Pass |
| Shall the City Charter be revised by amending Charter Section 814 to reduce the number of Members on the Architectural Board of Review (the "ABR") from nine (9) to seven (7) members and to allow the City Council to appoint up to three (3) ABR members from persons registered to vote within Santa Barbara County and not necessarily just within the City of Santa Barbara as currently required? | | | | |
| SANTA CLARA | 3/3/2009 | San Jose | Recall 7 | Fail |
| Shall Madison Nguyen be recalled (removed) from the office of Councilmember, District 7, of the City of San Jose? | | | | |
| SANTA CLARA | 5/19/2009 | Morgan Hill | Measure A | Pass |
| To increase opportunities for economic growth in the city while preserving the citywide population cap of 48,000 residents by 2020, shall an ordinance be adopted to exempt a total of 500 residential units in a 20 block area of downtown from the City of Morgan Hill's Residential Development Control System and to authorize the City Council to adopt policies and procedures implementing the exemptions? | | | | |
| SANTA CLARA | 11/3/2009 | Cupertino | Measure B | Pass |
| Without increasing the tax rate, shall an ordinance be adopted to update Cupertino's existing telephone utility users tax, to fund general city services, including neighborhood police patrols, library services, city streets, parks and open spaces, senior programs, and school crossing guards, while maintaining senior citizens' tax exemptions, retaining local control of revenues, requiring annual audits and public expenditure reviews, by amending language for consistency with current practice? | | | | |
| SANTA CLARA | 11/3/2009 | Palo Alto | Measure A | Fail |
| Shall the Palo Alto Municipal Code be amended to establish a business license tax in order to help maintain the City's ability to fund basic City services? | | | | |
| SOLANO | 11/3/2009 | Vallejo | Measure U | Pass |
| Shall an ordinance be adopted to reduce the tax rate and modernize the existing Utility Users' Tax only on telecommunication and video services, to preserve funding for essential City services including police, fire, emergency medical response, street repair and other City services, treating all taxpayers equally regardless of technology used, with all revenue and expenditures subject to the City's annual independent audit and keeping locally generated revenues in Vallejo? | | | | |
| SOLANO | 11/3/2009 | Cotati | Recall 1 | Pass |
| Shall GEORGE BARICH be recalled (removed) from the office of Member, City Council of the City of Cotati? | | | | |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | Measure A | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Modesto City Council provide sewer service, after annexation, to that area of the Modesto Urban Area General Plan known as the "Kiernan Avenue Corridor Comprehensive Planning Districts, including the Kiernan/Carver North Comprehensive Planning District, a portion of the Kiernan/Carver Comprehensive Planning District and a portion of the Salida Comprehensive Planning District" (all areas combined consisting of approximately 1,310 gross acres)? | | | | |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | Measure B | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Modesto City Council provide sewer service, after annexation, to that area of the Modesto Urban Area General Plan known as the "College West Comprehensive Planning District" (consisting of approximately 230 gross acres)? | | | | |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | Measure C | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Modesto City Council provide sewer service, after annexation, to that area of the Modesto Urban Area General Plan known as the "130-Acre Regional Commercial Portion of the Hetch-Hetchy Comprehensive Planning District"(approximate gross acreage)? | | | | |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | Measure D | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Modesto City Council provide sewer service, after annexation, to that area of the Modesto Urban Area General Plan known as the "Northwest Portion of the Roselle/Claribel Comprehensive Planning District" (consisting of approximately 480 gross acres)? | | | | |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | Measure E | Fail |
| (ADVISORY) Should the Modesto City Council provide sewer service, after annexation, to that area of the Modesto Urban Area General Plan known as the "830-acre Village Residential Portion of the Hetch-Hetchy Comprehensive Planning District"(approximate gross acreage)? | | | | |

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2009

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------|-----------|------|
| TULARE | 11/3/2009 | Dinuba | Measure M | Pass |
| Dinuba's UUT Modernization/Protect Vital City Services Measure To maintain Dinuba services bt protecting local funds to retain police officers, firefighters/paramedics, gang/drug prevention programs, maintain parks, after-school programs, graffiti removal, senior programs, and other services, shall Dinuba modernize and continue collecting its existing utility users' tax, ensuring equal treatment of taxpayers, independent audits, budget reviews, low-income senior exemptions, with all funds staying locally in Dinuba and no increase in tax rate? | | | | |
| TULARE | 11/3/2009 | Tulare | Measure N | Pass |
| Shall Ordinance 09-04 be adopted amending sections of the Utility Users Tax Ordinance to reduce the maximum tax rate from 7% to 6%, and remove the maximum tax cap and provide authority for an annual review by the City Council? | | | | |
| VENTURA | 11/3/2009 | Fillmore | Measure F | Fail |
| Shall the City of Fillmore's General Plan be amended to create a "Mobile Home Exclusive" zone, and the City's Municipal Code be amended to adopt mobile home rent control for qualifying low income residents, and to amend the City's condominium conversion ordinance to more readily permit the conversation of rental mobile home parks to resident ownership? | | | | |
| VENTURA | 11/3/2009 | San Buenaventura | Measure A | Fail |
| Shall Ventura adopt a one-half percent (0.5%) Sales Tax Ordinance to expire automatically in four years, with all money staying local in Ventura, to preserve essential general fund services such as police, fire and emergency response and provide additional funding for other priorities, including street repair, keeping Wright Library open and protecting local beaches from pollution, with a citizen's oversight committee, mandatory audits and quarterly reports to the council on how the money is spent? | | | | |
| VENTURA | 11/3/2009 | San Buenaventura | Measure B | Fail |
| (INITIATIVE) Shall an initiative ordinance be adopted to implement general plan objectives, to preserve viewsheds by establishing a 23-member View Resources Board appointed predominantly by VCORD to prepare a View Protection Ordinance (VPO); enact a temporary moratorium on new development approvals exceeding 26 feet in height in specified areas until VPO approval or two-year limit expires, and; require City Council to approve the VPO or allow View Resources Board member(s) to submit VPO initiative to voters? | | | | |
| VENTURA | 11/3/2009 | San Buenaventura | Measure C | Fail |
| (INITIATIVE) Shall an initiative ordinance be adopted to preserve Ventura's unique character, protect local businesses, and limit traffic by prohibiting new superstores larger than ninety thousand (90,000) square feet when more than three percent (3%) of the sales floor area offers non-taxable merchandise? Wholesale clubs and establishments selling primarily bulk merchandise and charging membership dues are exempt. Superstores open and operating as of January 1, 2008 would be permitted to continue in operation. | | | | |
| YOLO | 11/3/2009 | Davis | Measure P | Fail |
| Shall resolution No. 09-132, amending the Davis General Plan to change the land use designations for the Wildhorse Ranch Property from agriculture to residential uses, as set forth in the Resolution and establishing the Base Line Project Features for development of the Wildhorse Ranch Project to be approved? | | | | |

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2009

| | TAXES | | BONDS | | CHARTER AMENDMENT | | ADVISORY | | INITIATIVE | | RECALL | | GANN LIMIT | | ORDINANCE | | ALL CITY MEASURES | | |
|-----------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------------------|------|----------|------|------------|------|--------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|-------------------|------|-------|
| | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | TOTAL |
| Alameda | 6 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Contra Costa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Fresno | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Imperial | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Los Angeles | 16 | 4 | | | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | | | | 5 | 3 | 30 | 14 | 44 |
| Marin | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Mendocino | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Merced | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Monterey | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Placer | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Riverside | 4 | 3 | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Sacramento | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Diego | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| San Joaquin | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Luis Obispo | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 10 | 3 | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 17 | 4 | 21 |
| Santa Barbara | | | | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Santa Clara | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Solano | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Sonoma | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Stanislaus | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Tulare | 2 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Ventura | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Yolo | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| All Counties | 43 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 79 | 51 | 130 |

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2009

| | LAND USE | | SAFETY | | GOVERNANCE | | ENVIRONMENT | | TRANSPORT | | FACILITIES | | HOUSING | | GENERAL SERVICES | | REVENUE | | OTHER | | ALL CITY MEASURES | | |
|-----------------|----------|------|--------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|---------|------|------------------|------|---------|------|-------|------|-------------------|------|-------|
| | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | PASS | FAIL | TOTAL |
| Alameda | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Contra Costa | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Fresno | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Imperial | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Los Angeles | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | 15 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 14 | 44 |
| Marin | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Mendocino | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Merced | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Monterey | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Placer | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Riverside | | | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Sacramento | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Diego | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| San Joaquin | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Luis Obispo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 1 | 0 | | | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 11 | 3 | | | | 17 | 4 | 21 |
| Santa Barbara | 0 | 1 | | | 3 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Santa Clara | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Solano | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Sonoma | | | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Stanislaus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Tulare | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 | | | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Ventura | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Yolo | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| All Counties | 7 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 39 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 79 | 51 | 130 |

PART 2
VOTE TOTALS FOR
CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|--------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| ALAMEDA | 11/3/2009 | Emeryville | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | West | Jennifer | Teacher | No | 3 | 855 | 2,346 | 36.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Brinkman | Kurt | Businessman | No | 3 | 746 | 2,346 | 31.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Flores | Frank Emery | Businessman | No | 3 | 739 | 2,346 | 31.5% | No |
| | | Newark | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Apodaca | Ana M. | Newark City Councilmember | Yes | 3 | 3,414 | 7,993 | 42.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Nagy | Alan L. "Al" | Newark City Councilmember | Yes | 3 | 3,363 | 7,993 | 42.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Adolf | Nadja | Housewife | No | 3 | 1,137 | 7,993 | 14.2% | No |
| | | | | | | MAYOR | Smith | David W. | Mayor | Yes | 1 | 4,021 | 4,230 | 95.1% |
| ALPINE | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMADOR | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BUTTE | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CALAVERAS | 11/3/2009 | City of Angels | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Downey | Rick | Retired Local Businessman | No | 3 | 533 | 1,123 | 47.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Raggio | Betty A. | Retired | No | 3 | 456 | 1,123 | 40.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Fry, Jr. | George C. | Community Volunteer | No | 3 | 129 | 1,123 | 11.5% | No |
| COLUSA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CONTRA COSTA | 3/3/2009 | Alamo ^P | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Schmidt | Grace | Retired Administrator | No | 16 | 2,076 | 20,008 | 10.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Koc | Vicki | Community Volunteer | No | 16 | 1,978 | 20,008 | 9.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Mick | Steve | Retired University Administrator | No | 16 | 1,935 | 20,008 | 9.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Nahas | Randy | Engineer/Property Manager | No | 16 | 1,875 | 20,008 | 9.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Connelly | Bob | Retired Commercial Banker | No | 16 | 1,842 | 20,008 | 9.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | McPherson | Karen | Manager Telecommunications | No | 16 | 1,189 | 20,008 | 5.9% | No |
| | | | | | | More | Vishwas "Vish" | Retired Chief Engineer | No | 16 | 1,142 | 20,008 | 5.7% | No |
| | | | | | | Smith | Roger | Business/Property Owner | No | 16 | 1,115 | 20,008 | 5.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Waite | Brad | CEO Mortgage Banker | No | 16 | 1,086 | 20,008 | 5.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Barley | Diane M. | Banker | No | 16 | 1,070 | 20,008 | 5.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Johnson | Dennis | Business Owner | No | 16 | 934 | 20,008 | 4.7% | No |
| | | | | | | Rubay | Joseph A. "Joe" | Businessman | No | 16 | 899 | 20,008 | 4.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Morrow | John W. | Retired/Engineer/Manager | No | 16 | 789 | 20,008 | 3.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Morrow | Kevin G. | Insurance Professional | No | 16 | 692 | 20,008 | 3.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Stribling | Brad | Retired Electronics Executive | No | 16 | 584 | 20,008 | 2.9% | No |
| Niyati | Karl K. | Retired Hospital Administrator | No | 16 | 534 | 20,008 | 2.7% | No | | | | | | |

¹Write-in candidate votes, when reported by the county, have been included in the total votes cast. For these contests, the sum of the candidate votes is less than the total votes cast.

^P Proposed City

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| CONTRA COSTA (continued) | 11/3/2009 | San Ramon | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Hudson | Dave E. "Dave" | Vice Mayor, City of San Ramon | No | 4 | 5,300 | 14,049 | 37.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Livingstone | Jim | San Ramon City Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 4,497 | 14,049 | 32.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Brady | Jim | Engineering Manager | No | 4 | 2,563 | 14,049 | 18.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Burr | Doug | Management Consultant | No | 4 | 1,625 | 14,049 | 11.6% | No |
| | | | MAYOR | Full | Wilson | H. Abram | San Ramon Mayor | Yes | 1 | 6,790 | 7,084 | 95.8% | Yes | |
| DEL NORTE | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EL DORADO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRESNO | 3/3/2009 | Clovis | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Masig | Nathan | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 9,668 | 25,467 | 38.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Ashbek | Lynne | Councilmember/Health Executive | Yes | 3 | 9,402 | 25,467 | 36.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Foster | Douglas | Attorney | No | 3 | 6,190 | 25,467 | 24.3% | No |
| GLENN | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HUMBOLDT | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IMPERIAL | 11/3/2009 | Brawley | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Couchman | Sam | Workforce Program Director | No | 3 | 1,503 | 3,521 | 42.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Miranda | Miguel C. | Case Manager | No | 3 | 1,193 | 3,521 | 33.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Carrillo | Toni C. | No Ballot Designation | No | 3 | 801 | 3,521 | 22.7% | No |
| | | Calipatria | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Beltran | Fred B. | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 198 | 748 | 26.5% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Fuentes | Peter | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 172 | 748 | 23.0% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Green | Trevor C. | U.S.N. Veteran | No | 5 | 156 | 748 | 20.9% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Nelson | Patricia | No Ballot Designation | No | 5 | 114 | 748 | 15.2% | No | |
| | | | | | Ours | Kay A. | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 107 | 748 | 14.3% | No | |
| | | El Centro | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Solomon | Ben | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 1,711 | 4,820 | 35.5% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Viegas-Walker | Cheryl | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 1,591 | 4,820 | 33.0% | Yes | |
| Jackson | Jason | | | | Business Administrator Instructor | No | 3 | 1,493 | 4,820 | 31.0% | No | | | |
| INYO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KERN | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KINGS | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LAKE | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LASSEN | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| LOS ANGELES | 2/24/2009 | Burbank | CITY CLERK | | Full | Campos | Margarita | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 8,045 | 8,045 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Golonski | Dave | Burbank City Council Member | Yes | 13 | 4,895 | 27,685 | 17.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Gordon | David | Councilmember/Optometrlist | Yes | 13 | 4,569 | 27,685 | 16.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Talamantes | Jess | Human Relations Manager | No | 13 | 3,988 | 27,685 | 14.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Jo | Kimberly | Associate CIO | No | 13 | 2,489 | 27,685 | 9.0% | No |
| | | | | | | Stearns-Niesen | Elise M. | Educator | No | 13 | 2,043 | 27,685 | 7.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Yegparian | Garen | Technical Research Analyst | No | 13 | 2,010 | 27,685 | 7.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Dunayer | Lee | Financial Advisor | No | 13 | 1,755 | 27,685 | 6.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Jackson | Greg | Planning Consultant | No | 13 | 1,481 | 27,685 | 5.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Sharp | Barbara | Litigation Consultant | No | 13 | 1,337 | 27,685 | 4.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Ferguson | Steven L. | Student Trustee GCCD | No | 13 | 1,030 | 27,685 | 3.7% | No |
| | | | | | Humfreville | Dan | Advertising Executive | No | 13 | 985 | 27,685 | 3.6% | No | |
| | | | | | Nakashyan | Angela | Businesswoman | No | 13 | 731 | 27,685 | 2.6% | No | |
| | | | | | Prutz | Jeffrey W. | Private, USMC | No | 13 | 372 | 27,685 | 1.3% | No | |
| | | | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Anderson | Donna E. | City Treasurer | Yes | 1 | 7,783 | 7,783 |
| | 3/3/2009 | Azusa | CITY CLERK | | Full | Mendoza | Vera | Incumbent | Yes | 2 | 1,972 | 2,701 | 73.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Morales | Art | Military Veteran | No | 2 | 729 | 2,701 | 27.0% | No |
| | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Gonzales | Robert | Appointed Councilman | No | 5 | 1,403 | 4,966 | 28.3% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Hanks | Keith | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 1,183 | 4,966 | 23.8% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Alvarez | Edward J. | Excise Tax Auditor | No | 5 | 1,070 | 4,966 | 21.5% | No | |
| | | | | | Naccachian | Paul | Businessman/Mediator | No | 5 | 865 | 4,966 | 17.4% | No | |
| | | | | | Rosales | Nick | Corporate Officer | No | 5 | 445 | 4,966 | 9.0% | No | |
| | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Hamilton | Marcene | Certified Public Accountant | No | 2 | 1,554 | 2,721 | 57.1% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Vasquez, Jr. | Arthur M. | Accountant | No | 2 | 1,167 | 2,721 | 42.9% | No | |
| | | MAYOR | | Short | Rocha | Joseph Romero | Mayor/Educator | Yes | 1 | 2,385 | 2,385 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | Bell | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Jacobo | Teresa | Councilwoman | Yes | 6 | 1,332 | 4,316 | 30.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Artiga | Luis | Appointed Councilman | No | 6 | 1,201 | 4,316 | 27.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Rivas | Mario S. | Environmental Programs Coordinator | No | 6 | 472 | 4,316 | 10.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Valencia | Nestor E. | Health Care Administrator | No | 6 | 464 | 4,316 | 10.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Saleh | Ali | CEO | No | 6 | 443 | 4,316 | 10.3% | No |
| | | | | Chahine | Hussein | Attorney | No | 6 | 404 | 4,316 | 9.4% | No | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | Bellflower | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Larsen | Scott A. | CPA/Council Member | Yes | 6 | 1,755 | 6,182 | 28.4% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Koops | Dan L. | Business Owner | No | 6 | 1,599 | 6,182 | 25.9% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Ines | C. "Sonny" Santa | Chief Financial Officer | No | 6 | 1,541 | 6,182 | 24.9% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Helzer | Paul L. | Chiropractor/Businessman | No | 6 | 612 | 6,182 | 9.9% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Thibodeaux | Pat | Computer Systems Manager | No | 6 | 484 | 6,182 | 7.8% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Laskowski | John | Retired Water Worker | No | 6 | 191 | 6,182 | 3.1% | No | | | | |
| | | Beverly Hills | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Brucker | Barry | City Councilmember/Businessowner | Yes | 11 | 2,983 | 16,097 | 18.5% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Brien | William Warren | Physician/State Commissioner | No | 11 | 2,846 | 16,097 | 17.7% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Mirisch | John A. | Film Executive | No | 11 | 2,272 | 16,097 | 14.1% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Briskman | Linda J. | Beverly Hills City Councilmember | Yes | 11 | 2,169 | 16,097 | 13.5% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Maas | Virginia A. | Community Volunteer | No | 11 | 1,578 | 16,097 | 9.8% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Stone | Richard A. | Attorney/CPA | No | 11 | 1,483 | 16,097 | 9.2% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Cohen | Fran | Businesswoman/Architectural Commsr. | No | 11 | 1,245 | 16,097 | 7.7% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Hakim | Michael | Property Manager | No | 11 | 701 | 16,097 | 4.4% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Nathan | Nili | Banker/Businesswoman | No | 11 | 316 | 16,097 | 2.0% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Lilley | Brent C. | Entertainment Management | No | 11 | 274 | 16,097 | 1.7% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | Ross | Abraham C. | Attorney | No | 11 | 230 | 16,097 | 1.4% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Finkel | Eliot | Investment Advisor | No | 1 | 3,101 | 3,101 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Calabasas | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Bozajian | James R. | Calabasas City Council Member | Yes | 5 | 2,001 | 6,644 | 30.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | | Maurer | Mary Sue | Councilmember/Teacher | Yes | 5 | 1,726 | 6,644 | 26.0% | Yes |
| Wolfson | Jonathon | Calabasas City Council Member | Yes | 5 | 1,505 | | | | | 6,644 | 22.7% | Yes | | | | | | |
| Sibilia | Bob | Consumer Attorney | No | 5 | 1,002 | | | | | 6,644 | 15.1% | No | | | | | | |
| Reicheneder | Dale | Lawyer | No | 5 | 410 | | | | | 6,644 | 6.2% | No | | | | | | |
| Carson | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Gipson | Mike A. | Councilmember/Union Representative | Yes | 5 | 5,608 | 21,403 | 26.2% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | Ruiz-Raber | Julie | Community Services Teacher | No | 5 | 4,782 | 21,403 | 22.3% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | Williams | Harold C. | Councilmember/Civil Engineer | Yes | 5 | 4,598 | 21,403 | 21.5% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | Wilson | Wilma | Registered Nurse/Public Safety Commsr. | No | 5 | 3,323 | 21,403 | 15.5% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | Boggs | Rita R. | Entrepreneur/Part-time Professor | No | 5 | 3,092 | 21,403 | 14.4% | No | | | | | | |
| | | MAYOR | | Full | Dear | Jim | Mayor, City of Carson | Yes | 2 | 7,511 | 12,212 | 61.5% | Yes | | | | | |
| | | | | | Santarina | Elito M. | Councilman | No | 2 | 4,656 | 12,212 | 38.1% | No | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | Cerritos | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Edwards | Jim | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 4,166 | 14,917 | 27.9% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Chen | Carol | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 3,540 | 14,917 | 23.7% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Pulido | Mark | Governing Board Member | Yes | 6 | 3,399 | 14,917 | 22.8% | No | |
| | | | | | | Chen | Cindy Yen | Owner International Freight Company | No | 6 | 2,288 | 14,917 | 15.3% | No | |
| | | | | | | Fuentes | Chris | Businessman/Film Location manager | No | 6 | 1,277 | 14,917 | 8.6% | No | |
| | | | | | | Udomratsak | Michael R. | Student | No | 6 | 247 | 14,917 | 1.7% | No | |
| | | Claremont | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Calaycay | Corey | City Councilmember | Yes | 3 | 3,195 | 7,948 | 40.2% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Schroeder | Larry | Retired Finance Director | No | 3 | 2,853 | 7,948 | 35.9% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Healy | Bridget | Retired Public Administrator | No | 3 | 1,900 | 7,948 | 23.9% | No | |
| | | Commerce | CITY COUNCIL | | | Del Rio | Tina M. Baca | Councilmember | Yes | 10 | 783 | 4,621 | 16.9% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Leon | Lilia R. | Councilmember-Elect/Commissioner | No | 10 | 757 | 4,621 | 16.4% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Fierro | Robert C. | Councilmember/Teacher | Yes | 10 | 740 | 4,621 | 16.0% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Romero | Randy "Sax" | Commercial Transport | No | 10 | 725 | 4,621 | 15.7% | No | |
| | | | | | | Valencia | Jaime | Senior Accounting Associate | No | 10 | 692 | 4,621 | 15.0% | No | |
| | | | | | | Acero | Jose S. | Deputy Sherriff | No | 10 | 269 | 4,621 | 5.8% | No | |
| | | | | | | Zambrano | Rosa M. | Office Administrator | No | 10 | 253 | 4,621 | 5.5% | No | |
| | | | | | | Cervantes | Jesus M. | Food Track Clerk | No | 10 | 196 | 4,621 | 4.2% | No | |
| | | | | | | Gonzalez | Art A. | Business Owner | No | 10 | 94 | 4,621 | 2.0% | No | |
| | | Covina | CITY CLERK | | Full | Taber | Toni J. | Chief Deputy Clerk | Yes | 1 | 2,067 | 2,067 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Stapelton | Kevin G. | Businessman/Parent/Councilmember | Yes | 8 | 1,586 | 8,213 | 19.3% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | King | John C. | Councilmember/Business Manager | Yes | 8 | 1,509 | 8,213 | 18.4% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Low | Bob | Retired Teacher | No | 8 | 1,245 | 8,213 | 15.2% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Bowers | Kevin | Technology Account Executive | No | 8 | 1,151 | 8,213 | 14.0% | No | |
| | | | | | | Manning | Kay | High School Registrar | No | 8 | 1,056 | 8,213 | 12.9% | No | |
| | | | | | | Palmeri | Thomas F. | CPA/College Professor | No | 8 | 902 | 8,213 | 11.0% | No | |
| | | | | | | Fabian | Rosie | City Clerk/Senior Analyst/CEO | No | 8 | 605 | 8,213 | 7.4% | No | |
| Dahlen | Steven "Woody" | Realtor | No | 8 | 159 | 8,213 | 1.9% | No | | | | | | | |
| | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Fielding | John "Jack" | City Treasurer | Yes | 1 | 2,089 | 2,089 | 100.0% | Yes | | | |
| Cudahy | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Silva | David | Councilmember | Yes | 5 | 750 | 2,457 | 30.5% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | Barrios | Jose | Businessman/Commissioner | No | 5 | 682 | 2,457 | 27.8% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | Garcia | Luis | Public Works Inspector | No | 5 | 439 | 2,457 | 17.9% | No | | | |
| | | | | Cota | Daniel | Teacher | No | 5 | 434 | 2,457 | 17.7% | No | | | |
| | | | | Diaz | Rosa M. | Councilmember | Yes | 5 | 152 | 2,457 | 6.2% | No | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS- TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | Gardena | CITY CLERK | | Full | Cerda | Tasha | Businesswoman/Community Volunteer | No | 3 | 1,587 | 3,637 | 43.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Gause | Donesia | Deputy City Clerk | Yes | 3 | 1,074 | 3,637 | 29.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Velasco | Cynthia | Businesswoman | No | 3 | 976 | 3,637 | 26.8% | No |
| | | Glendora | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Davis | Karen K. | Pastor | No | 5 | 3,441 | 9,772 | 35.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Murabito | Gene | Businessman/Planning Commissioner | No | 5 | 3,372 | 9,772 | 34.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Parisi | Kristin | Children's Social Worker | No | 5 | 1,651 | 9,772 | 16.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Tweini | Yousef "Joseph" | Engineer/Manager | No | 5 | 886 | 9,772 | 9.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Pagac | Brian V. | Engineering Services | No | 5 | 422 | 9,772 | 4.3% | No |
| | | La Canada Flintridge | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Del Guercio | Steve | Councilman/Business Attorney | Yes | 4 | 1,771 | 6,252 | 28.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Spence | David | Councilman/Businessman | Yes | 4 | 1,695 | 6,252 | 27.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Ritcher | Robert | Retired Engineer | No | 4 | 1,402 | 6,252 | 22.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Haemmerle | Vance Richerd | Spacecraft Software Engineer | No | 4 | 1,384 | 6,252 | 22.1% | No |
| | | La Habra Heights | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Carroll | A. "Stan" | Councilmember/Retired Professor | Yes | 6 | 871 | 3,441 | 25.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Bergman | Brain | Councilmember/Retired Manager | Yes | 6 | 735 | 3,441 | 21.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Westerhoff | Carl | Businessman/Planning Commissioner | No | 6 | 670 | 3,441 | 19.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Edwards | George L. | Executive Vice President | No | 6 | 512 | 3,441 | 14.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Grimm | Faith | Community Volunteer | No | 6 | 383 | 3,441 | 11.1% | No |
| | | La Mirada | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Gomez | Vincent P. | Electrician | No | 6 | 270 | 3,441 | 7.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Tripp | Susan L. | Councilmember/Business Owner | Yes | 4 | 2,469 | 5,938 | 41.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Garcia | Gabriel | Administrator/Planning Commissioner | No | 4 | 1,919 | 5,938 | 32.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Dawson | Thomas | Police Field Supervisor | No | 4 | 821 | 5,938 | 13.8% | No |
| La Verne | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Taylor | Ken | Insurance Agent | No | 4 | 729 | 5,938 | 12.3% | No | | |
| | | | | Nasmyth | Donna | Appointed Incumbent | No | 4 | 2,174 | 6,150 | 35.3% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Carder | Robin | University Business Manager | No | 4 | 1,520 | 6,150 | 24.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Rosales | Charles | Planning Commissioner | No | 4 | 1,461 | 6,150 | 23.8% | No | | |
| | | | | Faustini | Norm | Retired Businessman | No | 4 | 995 | 6,150 | 16.2% | No | | |
| | MAYOR | | Short | Kendrick | Don | Councilmember/Business Owner | Yes | 1 | 2,939 | 2,939 | 100.0% | Yes | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | |
|----------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | CITY ATTORNEY | | Full | Weiss | Jack | Attorney/City Councilmember | No | 5 | 95,905 | 264,604 | 36.2% | Runoff | | |
| | | | | | | Trutanich | Carmen "Nuch" | Environmental Attorney | No | 5 | 72,612 | 264,604 | 27.4% | Runoff | | |
| | | | | | | Amerian | Michael Richard | Deputy City Attorney | No | 5 | 45,737 | 264,604 | 17.3% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Berger | David | Criminal Prosecutor | No | 5 | 36,905 | 264,604 | 13.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Weiss | Noel | Attorney/Policy Advocate | No | 5 | 13,445 | 264,604 | 5.1% | No | | |
| | | | CITY CONTROLLER | | Full | Greuel | Wendy | Councilwoman, City of Los Angeles | No | 3 | 168,680 | 257,902 | 65.4% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Evans | Kathleen "Suzy" | Business Owner | No | 3 | 47,758 | 257,902 | 18.5% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Patsaouras | Nick | Electrical Engineer/Businesswoman | No | 3 | 41,464 | 257,902 | 16.1% | No | | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | 1 | Full | Reyes | Ed P. | City Council Member | Yes | 2 | 7,608 | 10,003 | 76.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | Rosas | Jesse | Businessman/Community Activist | No | 2 | 2,395 | 10,003 | 23.9% | No |
| | | | | | | 3 | Full | Zine | Dennis P. | Councilmember/Police Reserve | Yes | 2 | 17,370 | 24,397 | 71.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | Bornstein | Jeffrey W. | Small Business Owner | Yes | 2 | 7,027 | 24,397 | 28.8% | No |
| | | | | | | 5 | Full | Vahedi | David T. | Board member/Neighborhood Council | Yes | 6 | 6,945 | 31,985 | 21.7% | Runoff |
| | | | | | | | | Koretz | Paul | Nonprofit Organization Director | No | 6 | 6,881 | 31,985 | 21.5% | Runoff |
| | | | | | | | | Bleich | Adeena N. | Director, Nonprofit Organization | No | 6 | 5,065 | 31,985 | 15.8% | No |
| | | | | | | | | Galperin | Ron | Neighborhood Advocate/Attorney | No | 6 | 4,874 | 31,985 | 15.2% | No |
| | | | | | | | | Simon | Robyn Ritter | Community Leader/Businesswoman | No | 6 | 4,458 | 31,985 | 13.9% | No |
| | | | | | | | | Schwartz | Robert | Attorney | No | 6 | 3,762 | 31,985 | 11.8% | No |
| | | | | | | 7 | Full | Alarcon | Richard | City Councilmember | Yes | 1 | 8,450 | 8,450 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | 9 | Full | Perry | Jan C. | Los Angeles City Councilwoman | Yes | 1 | 7,158 | 7,158 | 100.0% | Yes |
| 11 | Full | Rosendahl | | | | Bill | Council Member | Yes | 2 | 20,539 | 27,361 | 75.1% | Yes | | | |
| | | Wilson | | | | Harry "Craig" | Hydrographer | No | 2 | 6,822 | 27,361 | 24.9% | No | | | |
| 13 | Full | Garcetti | | | | Eric | Los Angeles City Council Member | Yes | 2 | 8,605 | 11,931 | 72.1% | Yes | | | |
| | | Slossberg | Gary | Public Interest Attorney | No | 2 | 3,326 | 11,931 | 27.9% | No | | | | | | |
| 15 | Full | Hahn | Janice | Los Angeles City Councilwoman | Yes | 2 | 10,869 | 14,289 | 76.1% | Yes | | | | | | |
| 15 | Full | Salabaj | Chris | Educator | No | 2 | 3,420 | 14,289 | 23.9% | No | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|----------------------------|----------|----------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | Los Angeles | MAYOR | | Full | Villaraigosa | Antonio R. | Incumbent | Yes | 10 | 152,613 | 274,254 | 55.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Moore | Walter | Lawyer | No | 10 | 71,937 | 274,254 | 26.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Turner | Gordon | Deputy City Attorney | No | 10 | 17,554 | 274,254 | 6.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Saltsburg | David "Zuma Dog" | Community Advocate/Economist | No | 10 | 9,115 | 274,254 | 3.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Darian | Bruce | General Contractor/Whistleblower | No | 10 | 5,691 | 274,254 | 2.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Hernandez | David R. | Civic Community Leader | No | 10 | 5,225 | 274,254 | 1.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Rubin | Craig X. | Pastor | No | 10 | 4,158 | 274,254 | 1.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Alvarez | Carlos C. | Legal Assistant | No | 10 | 3,047 | 274,254 | 1.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Harris | James | Union Meat Packer | No | 10 | 2,461 | 274,254 | 0.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Jennerjahn | Phil | Entertainer | No | 10 | 2,432 | 274,254 | 0.9% | No |
| Manhattan Beach | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Montgomery | Richard P. | Councilmember/Business Owner | Yes | 5 | 3,858 | 14,455 | 26.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Tell | Nick | Councilmember/Business Owner | Yes | 5 | 3,370 | 14,455 | 23.3% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Powell | Wayne | Chief Financial Officer | No | 5 | 3,230 | 14,455 | 22.3% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Paralusz | Kathleen M. | Attorney | No | 5 | 3,183 | 14,455 | 22.0% | No | | |
| | | | | Gallagher | Peter | Talent Management | No | 5 | 814 | 14,455 | 5.6% | No | | |
| | | CITY TREASURER | Full | Lilligren | Tim | City Treasurer/CPA | Yes | 1 | 3,964 | 3,964 | 100.0% | Yes | | |
| Monterey Park | | CITY CLERK | Full | Barron | David M. | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 4,290 | 4,290 | 100.0% | Yes | | |
| | | | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Chu | Betty Tom | Real Estate Management | No | 6 | 3,495 | 12,306 | 28.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lau | David T. | City Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 3,069 | 12,306 | 24.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Estrada | Luis E. | County Health Supervisor | No | 6 | 2,872 | 12,306 | 23.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Martinez | Sharon | Councilwoman/Business Owner | Yes | 6 | 2,430 | 12,306 | 19.7% | No |
| | | | | | | Abajian | John Bedros "J.B." | Screen Actor | No | 6 | 234 | 12,306 | 1.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Avila | Joe Ray | Businessman/Handyman | No | 6 | 200 | 12,306 | 1.6% | No |
| | | CITY TREASURER | Full | Leon | Joseph | Appointed Treasurer/Attorney | No | 1 | 3,965 | 3,965 | 100.0% | Yes | | |
| Norwalk | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Kelley | Cheri | Councilmember/Businesswomen | Yes | 6 | 2,078 | 9,211 | 22.6% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Mendez | Mike | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 1,937 | 9,211 | 21.0% | No | | |
| | | | | Rodarte | Marcel | Quality Specialist/Veteran | No | 6 | 1,919 | 9,211 | 20.8% | No | | |
| | | | | Martinez | Candy | Businesswoman/Commissioner | No | 6 | 1,721 | 9,211 | 18.7% | No | | |
| | | | | Garcia | Anthony | Community Worker | No | 6 | 1,381 | 9,211 | 15.0% | No | | |
| | | | | Mejia | Raul | Nonprofit Organization Director | No | 6 | 175 | 9,211 | 1.9% | No | | |
| Palos Verdes Estates | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Goodhardt | James F. | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 2,025 | 4,953 | 40.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | Bird | George | Attorney | No | 3 | 1,973 | 4,953 | 39.8% | No | | |
| | | | | Iannitti | Sheryl | Small Business Owner | No | 3 | 955 | 4,953 | 19.3% | No | | |
| | | | | | | CITY TREASURER | Full | Sherwood, Jr. | Joseph C. | Retired Business Executive | No | 1 | 2,184 | 2,184 |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | |
|----------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | Paramount | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Daniels | Gene | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 1,110 | 3,067 | 36.2% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Lemons | Peggy | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 1,007 | 3,067 | 32.8% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Guerrero | Jaime | Public Safety | No | 4 | 576 | 3,067 | 18.8% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Pena | Hector G. | Student Intervention Assistant | No | 4 | 374 | 3,067 | 12.2% | No | | |
| | | Redondo Beach | CITY ATTORNEY | | Full | Webb | Michael W. "Mike" | Redondo Beach City Attorney | Yes | 2 | 5,247 | 6,732 | 77.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Erickson | Tory | Business Attorney | No | 2 | 1,485 | 6,732 | 22.1% | No | | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | 1 | Full | Aspel | Steve | Incumbent | Yes | 2 | 1,401 | 1,935 | 72.4% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Tortorelli | Jim | Businessman | No | 2 | 534 | 1,935 | 27.6% | No | | |
| | | | | | | 2 | Brand | Bill "Brand" | Crew Chief-American Airlines | No | 4 | 827 | 1,572 | 52.6% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Cagle | Diane | Speech and Language Pathologist | No | 4 | 284 | 1,572 | 18.1% | No | |
| | | | | | | 4 | Michael | Shane D. | Civil Engineer | No | 4 | 276 | 1,572 | 17.6% | No | |
| | | | | | | | Beck | Jack | Small Business Owner | No | 4 | 185 | 1,572 | 11.8% | No | |
| | | | | | | MAYOR | Full | Gin | Mike | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 6,086 | 6,086 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Rosemead | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Clark | Margaret "Maggie" | Councilmember/Educator | Yes | 6 | 2,247 | 12,016 | 18.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Ly | Steven | Businessman | No | 6 | 2,123 | 12,016 | 17.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Armenta | Sandra | Educator | No | 6 | 2,099 | 12,016 | 17.5% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Tran | John | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 2,094 | 12,016 | 17.4% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Lo | Henry | School Board member | No | 6 | 1,874 | 12,016 | 15.6% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Nunez | John | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 1,579 | 12,016 | 13.1% | No | | |
| | | San Dimas | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Templeman | Jeff | Councilman/Retired Chief | Yes | 5 | 1,997 | 4,945 | 40.4% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Bertone | Denis | Councilmember/Retired Educator | Yes | 5 | 1,973 | 4,945 | 39.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Kenney | Kevin J. | Finances/Investments | No | 5 | 394 | 4,945 | 8.0% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Maksoudian | Sid | Business Owner/Chalet Gourmet | No | 5 | 387 | 4,945 | 7.8% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Kahn | Jeremy L. | Entrepreneur | No | 5 | 194 | 4,945 | 3.9% | No | | |
| | | MAYOR | Short | Morris | Curtis W. | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 2,269 | 2,269 | 100.0% | Yes | | | | |
| | | San Fernando | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | De La Torre | Maribel | Member of the City Council | Yes | 5 | 574 | 1,934 | 29.7% | Yes | | |
| Hernandez | Mario F. | | | | | Business Owner | No | 5 | 481 | 1,934 | 24.9% | Yes | | | | |
| Aisenman | Sharron | | | | | Owner of Manufacturing Company | No | 5 | 346 | 1,934 | 17.9% | No | | | | |
| Romero | Henry | | | | | Certified Appraiser | No | 5 | 308 | 1,934 | 15.9% | No | | | | |
| Granados | Angel | | | | | Commissioner/Contractor | No | 5 | 225 | 1,934 | 11.6% | No | | | | |
| CITY TREASURER | Full | Solis | Margarita | City Treasurer | Yes | 1 | 857 | 857 | 100.0% | Yes | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS- TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | |
|----------------------------|----------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/3/2009 | San Gabriel | CITY CLERK | | Full | Andrews | Eleanor K. | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 1,858 | 1,858 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Sawkins | Kevin | Attorney/San Gabriel Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 1,590 | 6,204 | 25.6% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Gutierrez | David "Dave" | Owner/Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 1,565 | 6,204 | 25.2% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | De La Torre | Mario J. | Lic. Real Estate Broker/Business Owner | No | 4 | 1,557 | 6,204 | 25.1% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Baldwin | Harry L. | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 1,492 | 6,204 | 24.0% | No | |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Janosik | John T. | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 1,836 | 1,836 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | San Marino | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Yung | Allan K. | Physician | No | 6 | 2,199 | 9,370 | 23.5% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Sun | Richard | Businessman/Retired Dentist | No | 6 | 2,184 | 9,370 | 23.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Ward | Richard J. "Dick" | Attorney | No | 6 | 1,872 | 9,370 | 20.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Morris | John T. | Water Resources Engineer | No | 6 | 1,510 | 9,370 | 16.1% | No |
| | | | | | | | Groseth | Jeff E. | Electronics Engineer | No | 6 | 925 | 9,370 | 9.9% | No |
| | | | | | | | Johnson | Stephanie | Programmer/Analyst | No | 6 | 680 | 9,370 | 7.3% | No |
| | | Signal Hill | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Noll | Mike | Incumbent/Businessman | Yes | 4 | 563 | 1,966 | 28.6% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Ward | Ellen | Past Mayor Signal Hill | Yes | 4 | 514 | 1,966 | 26.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Wilson | Edward | Councilman/Accountant | Yes | 4 | 478 | 1,966 | 24.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Villanueva | Edward J. | Capital Projects Operator | No | 4 | 411 | 1,966 | 20.9% | No |
| | | South Gate | CITY CLERK | | Full | Avalos | Carmen | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 1,647 | 1,647 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | DeWitt | William | City Councilman/Businessman | Yes | 2 | 1,194 | 2,332 | 51.2% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Hurtado | Gil | Customer Service Supervisor/Incumbent | Yes | 2 | 1,138 | 2,332 | 48.8% | Yes | |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Bernal | Maria Belen | Legal Services Manger | No | 3 | 1,014 | 1,817 | 55.8% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Robinson | Christopher | Project Manager | No | 3 | 485 | 1,817 | 26.7% | No | |
| | | | | | | Fernandez | Leticia | Business Owner | No | 3 | 318 | 1,817 | 17.5% | No | |
| | | Temple City | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Yu | Vincent P. | Architect/Planning Commissioner | No | 6 | 1,944 | 6,409 | 30.3% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Chavez | Edward "Tom" | Attorney/City Commissioner | No | 6 | 1,474 | 6,409 | 23.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Souder | Charles "Chuck" | Retired Businessman | No | 6 | 1,135 | 6,409 | 17.7% | No |
| | | | | | | | Gillanders | Kenneth G. "Ken" | Businessman/Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 729 | 6,409 | 11.4% | No |
| | | | | | | | Wilson | Cathe | retired Businesswoman/Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 705 | 6,409 | 11.0% | No |
| | | | | | | | Ong | Silenus | Appraiser/Redevelopment Consultant | No | 6 | 422 | 6,409 | 6.6% | No |
| | | West Hollywood | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Prang | Jeffrey W. | Mayor/City Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 2,751 | 7,144 | 38.5% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Duran | John J. | City Councilmember/Attorney | Yes | 4 | 2,542 | 7,144 | 35.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Meister | Lauren | Market Research Professional | No | 4 | 1,530 | 7,144 | 21.4% | No |
| | | | | | | | Stoyanov | Bisser | Social Services Provider | No | 4 | 321 | 7,144 | 4.5% | No |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------|-------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 3/10/2009 | Pasadena | CITY COUNCIL | 3 | Full | Holden | Chris | Pasadena City Councilmember | Yes | 1 | 504 | 504 | 100.0% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | 5 | Full | Gordon | Victor M. | Councilmember/Attorney | Yes | 2 | 816 | 895 | 91.2% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Tyler | Tarince | Library Assistant | No | 2 | 79 | 895 | 8.8% | No | | | |
| | | | | 7 | Full | Tornek | Terry E. | Business Executive | No | 5 | 936 | 1,985 | 47.2% | Runoff | | | |
| | | | | | | York | Margaret | County Police Chief | No | 5 | 540 | 1,985 | 27.2% | Runoff | | | |
| | | | | | | Hadjian | Ciran Marie | City Planner | No | 5 | 368 | 1,985 | 18.5% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Walsh | John | Retired Administrator/Editor/Lawyer | No | 5 | 112 | 1,985 | 5.6% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Etti | Gary L. | Community Volunteer | No | 5 | 29 | 1,985 | 1.5% | No | | | |
| | | | | 4/7/2009 | Glendale | CITY CLERK | Full | Kassakhian | Ardashes "Ardy" | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 13,822 | 13,822 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Najarian | Ara | Glendale City Council | Yes | 12 | 9,473 | 61,213 | 15.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | Friedman | Laura | Small Business Owner | No | 12 | 9,237 | 61,213 | 15.1% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | | Quintero | Frank | Councilmember/Retired Businessman | Yes | 12 | 8,857 | 61,213 | 14.5% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | | Yousefian | Bob | Councilmember | Yes | 12 | 7,427 | 61,213 | 12.1% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | | Philpott | Bruce | Retired Police Chief | No | 12 | 6,996 | 61,213 | 11.4% | No | |
| | | | | | | | | Keuroghelian | Chahe | Small Business Owner | No | 12 | 6,836 | 61,213 | 11.2% | No | |
| | Ghaepetian | Vartan | Small Business Owner | No | | | | 12 | 3,603 | 61,213 | 5.9% | No | | | | | |
| | Solis | Lenore | Small Business Owner | No | | | | 12 | 3,091 | 61,213 | 5.0% | No | | | | | |
| | Kazazian | Aram | Architect | No | | | | 12 | 2,795 | 61,213 | 4.6% | No | | | | | |
| | Teahan | Michael | Business Owner | No | | | | 12 | 1,562 | 61,213 | 2.6% | No | | | | | |
| | Lafian | Edward | Financial Representative | No | | | | 12 | 780 | 61,213 | 1.3% | No | | | | | |
| | Stepanian | Aramazd | Disabled Housing Manager | No | | | | 12 | 556 | 61,213 | 0.9% | No | | | | | |
| | CITY TREASURER | Full | Borucki | Ron | | | | City Treasurer | Yes | 2 | 10,895 | 21,344 | 51.0% | Yes | | | |
| | | Manoukian | Rafi | CEO | | | | No | 2 | 10,449 | 21,344 | 49.0% | No | | | | |
| Inglewood | | CITY COUNCIL | 1 | Full | Tabor | Daniel | | 1st District Councilman | Yes | 4 | 1,147 | 2,323 | 49.4% | Runoff | | | |
| | | | | | Dotson | George | Inglewood Business Owner | No | 4 | 761 | 2,323 | 32.8% | Runoff | | | | |
| | | | | | Stevens | Mike | Longshoreman/Advocate | Yes | 4 | 280 | 2,323 | 12.1% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | Hamlin | Stafford V. | Director Afterschool Programs | No | 4 | 135 | 2,323 | 5.8% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | 2 | Full | Dunlap | Judy | City Councilwoman/Teacher | Yes | 4 | 710 | 1,313 | 54.1% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Williams | Austin F. | No Ballot Designation | No | 4 | 441 | 1,313 | 33.6% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | Soto | Joseph A. | No Ballot Designation | No | 4 | 125 | 1,313 | 9.5% | No | | | | |
| | | | | | Clytus | Donald A. | No Ballot Designation | No | 4 | 37 | 1,313 | 2.8% | No | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 4/7/2009 | Long Beach | CITY COUNCIL | 1 | Short | Garcia | Robert | College Educator | No | 7 | 966 | 2,327 | 41.5% | Runoff | |
| | | | | | | Braude | Evan Anderson | Consumer Attorney | No | 7 | 743 | 2,327 | 31.9% | Runoff | |
| | | | | | | Tagaloa | Misi | Pastor/Teacher/Realtor | No | 7 | 282 | 2,327 | 12.1% | No | |
| | | | | | | Berry | Richard "Rick" | Product Management Consultant | No | 7 | 203 | 2,327 | 8.7% | No | |
| | | | | | | Shields | Jana K. | Linguist | No | 7 | 85 | 2,327 | 3.7% | No | |
| | | | | | | Grisolia | William Francisco | Senior Legal Specialist | No | 7 | 29 | 2,327 | 1.2% | No | |
| | | | | | | Lara | Eduardo | Educator | No | 7 | 19 | 2,327 | 0.8% | No | |
| | 4/14/2009 | Burbank | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Golonski | Dave | Burbank City Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 5,711 | 28,355 | 20.1% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Talamantes | Jess | Human Relations Manager | No | 6 | 5,366 | 28,355 | 18.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Gordon | David | Councilmember/Optometrlist | Yes | 6 | 5,251 | 28,355 | 18.5% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Jo | Kimberly | Associate CIO | No | 6 | 5,039 | 28,355 | 17.8% | No | | |
| | | | | | Stearns-Niesen | Elise M. | Educator | No | 6 | 3,849 | 28,355 | 13.6% | No | | |
| | | | | | Yegparian | Garen | Technical Research Analyst | No | 6 | 3,139 | 28,355 | 11.1% | No | | |
| | | Monrovia | CITY CLERK | Full | Proctor | Linda B. | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 2,997 | 3,027 | 99.0% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Garcia | Joe | Incumbent | Yes | 8 | 1,499 | 6,572 | 22.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Shaw | Clarence R. | Human Services Administrator | No | 8 | 1,259 | 6,572 | 19.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Shevlin | Beck A. | Legal Assistant | No | 8 | 1,234 | 6,572 | 18.8% | No |
| Kirby | Dan | Incumbent | Yes | 8 | | | 1,127 | 6,572 | 17.1% | No | | | | | |
| | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Larsen | Paul | Business Lawyer | No | 8 | 649 | 6,572 | 9.9% | No | | | | |
| | | | Carlson | John Wayne | Business Executive | No | 8 | 332 | 6,572 | 5.1% | No | | | | |
| | | | Bray | Stephen R. | Businessman | No | 8 | 237 | 6,572 | 3.6% | No | | | | |
| | | | Costello | Sandra J. | Educator/Businesswoman/Scientist | No | 8 | 235 | 6,572 | 3.6% | No | | | | |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | Full | Baker | Stephen R. | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 2,862 | 2,899 | 98.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | MAYOR | Full | Lutz | Mary Ann | Monrovia City Councilmember | No | 3 | 2,527 | 3,357 | 75.3% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Grollnek | Stephen H. | Consultant | No | 3 | 605 | 3,357 | 18.0% | No | | |
| Duron | Mario | Businessman | | | No | 3 | 225 | 3,357 | 6.7% | No | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | |
|----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 4/21/2009 | Compton | CITY ATTORNEY | | Full | Cornwell | Craig J. | Appointed City Attorney | No | 1 | 3,246 | 3,360 | 96.6% | Yes | |
| | | | CITY CLERK | | Full | Godwin | Alita L. | Compton City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 3,267 | 3,369 | 97.0% | Yes | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | 2 | Full | Dobson | Lillie | Councilwoman/Businesswoman | Yes | 3 | 2,738 | 3,873 | 70.7% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Patrick | Gwen | Businesswoman | No | 3 | 704 | 3,873 | 18.2% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Acevedo | Elias "Elijah" | Small Business Owner | No | 3 | 421 | 3,873 | 10.9% | No | |
| | | | 3 | Full | Arceneaux | Yvonne | Councilmember | Yes | 2 | 2,799 | 3,893 | 71.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | Sanchez | Diana | Business Administrator | No | 2 | 1,046 | 3,893 | 26.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | 4 | Full | Clay | Amos | Appointed Incumbent | No | 4 | 1,226 | 3,850 | 31.8% | No | | |
| | | | | | Jones | Willie O. | College Educator | No | 4 | 939 | 3,850 | 24.4% | No | | |
| | | | | | Darden | Lillie P. | Compton Planning Commissioner | No | 4 | 916 | 3,850 | 23.8% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Kemp | William | Businessman | No | 4 | 741 | 3,850 | 19.2% | No | | |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Sanders | Douglas | City Treasurer | Yes | 1 | 3,251 | 3,338 | 97.4% | Runoff | |
| | | | MAYOR | Full | Perrodin | Eric J. | Mayor, Deputy D.A. | Yes | 3 | 3,041 | 3,935 | 77.3% | Runoff | | |
| | | | | | Boone | Lynn | City employee | No | 3 | 478 | 3,935 | 12.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | Kelly | Joyce Harvey | Community Advocate | No | 3 | 361 | 3,935 | 9.2% | No | | |
| | | | Pasadena | CITY COUNCIL | 7 | Full | Tornek | Terry E. | Business Executive | No | 2 | 1,115 | 2,117 | 52.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | York | Margaret | County Police Chief | No | 2 | 1,002 | 2,117 | 47.3% | No |
| | | | 5/19/2009 | Los Angeles | CITY ATTORNEY | Full | Trutanich | Carmen "Nuch" | Environmental Attorney | No | 2 | 150,726 | 271,717 | 55.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Weiss | Jack | Attorney/City Councilmember | No | 2 | 120,991 | 271,717 | 44.5% | No |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | 5 | Full | Koretz | Paul | Nonprofit Organization Director | No | 2 | 18,547 | 36,372 | 51.0% | Yes | |
| Vahedi | David T. | Board member, Neighborhood Council | | | | No | 2 | 17,825 | 36,372 | 49.0% | No | | | | |
| Palmdale | CITY COUNCIL | Short | | | | Bettencourt | Laura | Crime Analyst/Educator | No | 3 | 4,924 | 9,343 | 52.7% | Yes | |
| | | | Fox | Steve | Educator/Attorney/Trustee | No | 3 | 3,389 | 9,343 | 36.3% | No | | | | |
| | | | Ennix | Constance S. | Retired Educator | No | 3 | 1,030 | 9,343 | 11.0% | No | | | | |
| 6/2/2009 | Compton | CITY COUNCIL | 4 | Short | Jones | Willie O. | College Educator | No | 2 | 1,438 | 2,385 | 60.3% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Clay | Amos | Appointed Incumbent | No | 2 | 947 | 2,385 | 39.7% | No | | |
| 6/16/2009 | Inglewood | CITY COUNCIL | 1 | Full | Dotson | George | Businessman | No | 2 | 1,243 | 2,271 | 54.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | Tabor | Daniel | Inglewood City Councilmember | Yes | 2 | 1,028 | 2,271 | 45.3% | No | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--------|--------|-------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 9/22/2009 | Los Angeles | CITY COUNCIL | 2 | Short | Krekorian | Paul | San Fernando Valley Assembly member | No | 10 | 5,615 | 16,294 | 34.5% | Runoff | | | |
| | | | | | | Essel | Christine | Businesswoman/Neighborhood Advocate | No | 10 | 4,577 | 16,294 | 28.1% | Runoff | | | |
| | | | | | | Galatzan | Tamar | Criminal Prosecutor | No | 10 | 2,128 | 16,294 | 13.1% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Benson | Mary | Board member, Neighborhood Council | No | 10 | 1,392 | 16,294 | 8.5% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Sanchez | Pat | Community Organizer | No | 10 | 796 | 16,294 | 4.9% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Sheftel | Frank | Candy Factory Owner | No | 10 | 497 | 16,294 | 3.1% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Saltzburg | David "Zuma Dog" | Zuma Dogg, Public Advocate | No | 10 | 475 | 16,294 | 2.9% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | McCue | Michael | Board member, Neighborhood Council | No | 10 | 380 | 16,294 | 2.3% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Essavi | Josef "Joe" | Los Angeles County Commissioner | No | 10 | 350 | 16,294 | 2.1% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Bisani | Augusto | Businessman/Business Owner | No | 10 | 84 | 16,294 | 0.5% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Baldwin Park | 11/3/2009 | Artesia | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Manalo | Victor | Artesia City Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 734 | 2,243 |
| Flowers | Sally A. | Artesia Councilmember/Businesswoman | Yes | 4 | 699 | | | | | | 2,243 | 31.2% | Yes | | | | |
| Lyon | John P. | No Ballot Designation | No | 4 | 611 | | | | | | 2,243 | 27.2% | Yes | | | | |
| Patel | Indravadan "Indu" | Businessman/Mechanical Engineer | No | 4 | 199 | | | | | | 2,243 | 8.9% | No | | | | |
| Baldwin Park | 11/3/2009 | Baldwin Park | CITY CLERK | Full | Avila | | | Alejandra | School Community Liaison | No | 3 | 1,910 | 4,137 | 46.2% | Runoff | | |
| | | | | | Berumen | | | Christina L. | School District Clerk | No | 3 | 1,308 | 4,137 | 31.6% | Runoff | | |
| | | | | | Woods | | | Brandie Rivera | Accounting Clerk | No | 3 | 919 | 4,137 | 22.2% | No | | |
| | | | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | Full | Rubio | Susan | City Clerk/Teacher | No | 5 | 2,403 | 8,089 | 29.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | Garcia | Marlen | Councilmember, City of Baldwin Park | Yes | 5 | 1,835 | 8,089 | 22.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | Sembello | Cruz Baca | Businesswoman/Educator | No | 5 | 1,795 | 8,089 | 22.2% | No |
| | | | | | | | | | Bejarano | Anthony J. | Councilmember, City of Baldwin Park | Yes | 5 | 1,400 | 8,089 | 17.3% | No |
| | | | | | | | | | Huang | Henry | Television Producer/Host | No | 5 | 656 | 8,089 | 8.1% | No |
| | | | | | CITY TREASURER | | | Full | Contreras | Maria Antonieta | City Treasurer | Yes | 1 | 3,736 | 3,736 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | MAYOR | | | Full | Lozano | Manuel | Mayor | Yes | 2 | 2,752 | 4,686 | 58.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | Pacheco | Ricardo | Councilmember/ Park Engineer | No | 2 | 1,934 | 4,686 | 41.3% | No |
| | | | | | Bell Gardens | | | 11/3/2009 | Bell Gardens | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Flores | Priscilla | Mayor/Teacher | No | 7 | 1,438 |
| Infanzon | Sergio | Appointed Councilmember | No | 7 | | 1,213 | 7,144 | | | | | 17.0% | Yes | | | | |
| Crespo | Daniel | Councilmember/Probation Officer | Yes | 7 | | 1,165 | 7,144 | | | | | 16.3% | Yes | | | | |
| Arias | Luis A. | Businessman | No | 7 | | 1,160 | 7,144 | | | | | 16.2% | No | | | | |
| Garcia | Cristina | Professor | No | 7 | | 1,051 | 7,144 | | | | | 14.7% | No | | | | |
| Sanchez | Javier | Section Floor person Supervisor | No | 7 | | 936 | 7,144 | | | | | 13.1% | No | | | | |
| Viurquiz | Martha Anne C. | Legal Representative | No | 7 | | 181 | 7,144 | | | | | 2.5% | No | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Diamond Bar | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Tye | Steve | Diamond Bar Councilmember/Businessman | Yes | 7 | 3,472 | 14,441 | 24.0% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Everett | Ron | Appointed Councilmember | No | 7 | 2,945 | 14,441 | 20.4% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Chang | Ling-Ling | Teacher/Water Board member | No | 7 | 2,727 | 14,441 | 18.9% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Velasquez | Robert L. | Water Systems manager | No | 7 | 1,520 | 14,441 | 10.5% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Liu | David T. | Businessman/Civil Engineer | No | 7 | 1,453 | 14,441 | 10.1% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Huang | Lucy | Dietician/Business Owner | No | 7 | 1,311 | 14,441 | 9.1% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Dhand | S. | Physician | No | 7 | 1,013 | 14,441 | 7.0% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Duarte | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Finlay | Margaret E. | Duarte City Councilmember | Yes | 9 | 1,591 | 7,909 | 20.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Paras-Caracci | | | Tzeitel | Duarte City Councilmember | Yes | 9 | 1,431 | 7,909 | 18.1% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Reyes | | | Phil | Business Consultant | No | 9 | 1,307 | 7,909 | 16.5% | Yes | |
| | | Zesati | Rosalie Gomez | Medi-Cal Case Manager | No | 9 | | | 1,066 | 7,909 | 13.5% | No | | | | | |
| | | Reilly | Liz | Instructional Aide-Valley View | No | 9 | | | 1,033 | 7,909 | 13.1% | No | | | | | |
| | | Brooks-Washingt. | Joann J. | Accountant | No | 9 | | | 442 | 7,909 | 5.6% | No | | | | | |
| | | Sanchez | Tony | Industrial Sales Representative | No | 9 | | | 423 | 7,909 | 5.3% | No | | | | | |
| | | Moss | Arthur L. | Businessman | No | 9 | | | 413 | 7,909 | 5.2% | No | | | | | |
| | | Wilson-Buchan. | Margie | Business Advisor | No | 9 | 203 | 7,909 | 2.6% | No | | | | | | | |
| | | El Monte | CITY CLERK | Full | Gutierrez | Lorene | El Monte City Clerk | Yes | 2 | 2,853 | 5,034 | 56.7% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | Patel | Bharat | Business Owner/Public Owner | No | 2 | 2,181 | 5,034 | 43.3% | No | | | | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Macias | Norma | Businesswoman/Project Manager | No | 6 | 3,082 | 10,220 | 30.2% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | Gomez | Juventino J. | Mayor Pro Tem | No | 6 | 1,737 | 10,220 | 17.0% | Yes | | | | |
| Garner | Richard | | | | Environmental Services | No | 6 | 1,671 | 10,220 | 16.4% | No | | | | | | |
| Barrios | Art | | | | Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 1,495 | 10,220 | 14.6% | No | | | | | | |
| Lam | Kien | | | | Project Manager | No | 6 | 1,453 | 10,220 | 14.2% | No | | | | | | |
| Nunez | Angel R. | | | | Retired Purchasing Agent | No | 6 | 782 | 10,220 | 7.7% | No | | | | | | |
| CITY TREASURER | Full | | Velasco | Henry J. | El Monte City Treasurer | Yes | 2 | 2,715 | 5,036 | 53.9% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | Thomas | Richard | Disaster Management Consultant | No | 2 | 2,321 | 5,036 | 46.1% | No | | | | | | |
| MAYOR | Full | Quintero | Andre | Criminal Prosecutor | No | 2 | 3,998 | 5,915 | 67.6% | Yes | | | | | | | |
| | | Gutierrez | Ernest G. | Mayor/Teacher | Yes | 2 | 1,917 | 5,915 | 32.4% | No | | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Hawaiian Gardens | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Bruce | Barry | Minister | No | 11 | 539 | 2,727 | 19.8% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Rodriguez | Reynaldo O. | No Ballot Designation | No | 11 | 508 | 2,727 | 18.6% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Oyama-Canada | Michiko A. | Incumbent | Yes | 11 | 390 | 2,727 | 14.3% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Macias | Teresa | No Ballot Designation | No | 11 | 242 | 2,727 | 8.9% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Mason | Valerie | Property Management | No | 11 | 238 | 2,727 | 8.7% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Martinez | Cresencia | No Ballot Designation | No | 11 | 189 | 2,727 | 6.9% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Schultze | Betty J. | Incumbent | Yes | 11 | 179 | 2,727 | 6.6% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Canoy | Mary Magdalene | No Ballot Designation | No | 11 | 133 | 2,727 | 4.9% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Rowe | Donald | No Ballot Designation | No | 11 | 131 | 2,727 | 4.8% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Winford | Grant | Transportation Supervisor | No | 11 | 114 | 2,727 | 4.2% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Barriga | Luz C. | Insurance Sales Manager | No | 11 | 64 | 2,727 | 2.3% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Hawthorne | | | CITY CLERK | | Full | Huber | Norb | High School Teacher | No | 2 | 2,232 |
| Carey | Patrick | Retired Pilot Manger | No | 2 | 1,613 | | | | | | | 3,845 | 42.0% | No | | | |
| CITY COUNCIL | | | | Full | Vargas | | | | Alex | | Engineer/Community Volunteer | No | 7 | 2,401 | 7,765 | 30.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | English | | | | Angie | | City Clerk/District Representative | No | 7 | 1,670 | 7,765 | 21.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | Valentine | | | | Olivia J. | | Arbitrator and Mediator | No | 7 | 1,339 | 7,765 | 17.2% | No |
| | | | | | Monteiro | | | | Alexandre "Alex" | | Non-Profit Business Executive | No | 7 | 992 | 7,765 | 12.8% | No |
| | | | | | Brewster | | | | Alicia | | Community Leader | No | 7 | 506 | 7,765 | 6.5% | No |
| | | | | | Williams | | | | Leithelle | | Small Business Owner | No | 7 | 435 | 7,765 | 5.6% | No |
| | | | | | Fallon | | | | Gregory | | Accountant | No | 7 | 422 | 7,765 | 5.4% | No |
| | | | | | CITY TREASURER | | | | | | | Full | Lubene | Thierry | Incumbent | Yes | 1 |
| MAYOR | | | | Full | Guidi | Larry | Mayor | Yes | 2 | 2,321 | 4,568 | 50.8% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | Juarez | Daniel "Danny" | Councilman/Auditor/Accounting | No | 2 | 2,247 | 4,568 | 49.2% | No | | | | |
| Hermosa Beach | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Fishman | Howard L. | Public Sector Consultant | No | 8 | 2,015 | 8,208 | 24.5% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Duclos | Jeff | College Academic/Businessman | No | 8 | 1,509 | 8,208 | 18.4% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Bobko | Patrick "Kit" | City Councilman/Prosecutor | Yes | 8 | 1,319 | 8,208 | 16.1% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Keegan | Michael | City Councilman/Businessman | Yes | 8 | 1,120 | 8,208 | 13.6% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Ochs | Josh | Local Business Owner | No | 8 | 866 | 8,208 | 10.6% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Midstokke | Kathleen L. | City Clerk | No | 8 | 762 | 8,208 | 9.3% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Reed | Christopher | Finance Consultant | No | 8 | 533 | 8,208 | 6.5% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Schoonover | Marc Richard | Antique Dealer | No | 8 | 84 | 8,208 | 1.0% | No | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Irwindale | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Fuentes | David "Chico" | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 239 | 806 | 29.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Ortiz | H. Manuel | Office Clerk/Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 231 | 806 | 28.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Hernandez | Raul Anthony | Route Sales Representative | No | 5 | 203 | 806 | 25.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Osmonson | Darlene "Fraijo" | Educator | No | 5 | 92 | 806 | 11.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Gonzales | Patricia "Patsy" | Secretary/Planning Commissioner | No | 5 | 41 | 806 | 5.1% | No |
| | | La Puente | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Argudo | David E. | Business owner | No | 4 | 1,178 | 3,758 | 31.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lujan | Louie | La Puente City Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 907 | 3,758 | 24.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Chavez | Renee | Healthcare Provider | No | 4 | 843 | 3,758 | 22.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Storing | Lola K. | La Puente City Council Member | Yes | 4 | 830 | 3,758 | 22.1% | No |
| | | Lomita | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | King | Tim | Retired Councilman/LAPD | No | 6 | 1,039 | 4,876 | 21.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Gazeley | James R. | Retired Postal Manger | No | 6 | 961 | 4,876 | 19.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Estrada | Margaret | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 887 | 4,876 | 18.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Thompson | James P. | Businessman/Attorney at Law | No | 6 | 884 | 4,876 | 18.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Roehm | John J. | Service Executive | No | 6 | 674 | 4,876 | 13.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Hirsch | VJ | High School Teacher | No | 6 | 431 | 4,876 | 8.8% | No |
| | | Lynwood | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Santillan | Maria Teresa | Mayor | No | 7 | 1,146 | 5,988 | 19.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Morton | Jim | Appointed Incumbent | No | 7 | 1,099 | 5,988 | 18.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Rodriguez | Ramon | Councilman/Businessman | Yes | 7 | 812 | 5,988 | 13.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Pygatt | Iris | Businesswoman | No | 7 | 810 | 5,988 | 13.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Jacinto | Edwin R. | Executive Finance Director | No | 7 | 711 | 5,988 | 11.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Carr | Patricia | County Employee/Businesswoman | No | 7 | 707 | 5,988 | 11.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Lopez | Walter A. | Volunteer Non-Profit Director | No | 7 | 703 | 5,988 | 11.7% | No |
| | | Maywood | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Calderon | Sergio | Teacher/Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 1,135 | 6,250 | 18.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Martin | Thomas Ramon | Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 1,053 | 6,250 | 16.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Aguirre | Felipe | Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 1,045 | 6,250 | 16.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Varela | Edward "Ed" | Hearing Representative | No | 6 | 1,010 | 6,250 | 16.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Medina | Ramon | Businessman | No | 6 | 1,007 | 6,250 | 16.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Magana | Oscar | Planning Commissioner | No | 6 | 1,000 | 6,250 | 16.0% | No |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|---------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|--------|-------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Montebello | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Molinari | William M. "Bill" | Councilman/Business Owner | Yes | 9 | 2,885 | 16,799 | 17.2% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Barajas | Arturo R. "Art" | Businessman/City Commissioner | No | 9 | 2,738 | 16,799 | 16.3% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Gomez | Frank A. | Professor of Chemistry | No | 9 | 2,300 | 16,799 | 13.7% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Veneziano | Giuseppe "Joe" | Business Administrator | No | 9 | 2,172 | 16,799 | 12.9% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Vasquez | Rosemarie "Rosie" | Mayor | No | 9 | 1,785 | 16,799 | 10.6% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Cadena-Perez | Nancy | Analyst/City Commissioner | No | 9 | 1,518 | 16,799 | 9.0% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Javaheri | Jamshid "Jimmy" | Businessman | No | 9 | 1,379 | 16,799 | 8.2% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Manzur | Jorge | Businessman | No | 9 | 1,298 | 16,799 | 7.7% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Garcia | Richard | Public Advocate/Government Relations | No | 9 | 724 | 16,799 | 4.3% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Palmdale | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Lackey | Tom | Highway Patrolman/Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 3,763 | 14,459 | 26.0% | Yes |
| Bettencourt | Laura | Crime Analyst/Educator | No | 6 | 3,486 | | | | | | | 14,459 | 24.1% | Yes | | | | | | |
| Fox | Steve | Educator/Attorney/Trustee | No | 6 | 2,195 | | | | | | | 14,459 | 15.2% | No | | | | | | |
| Wilson | Warren G. | Retired Television Newscaster | No | 6 | 2,101 | | | | | | | 14,459 | 14.5% | No | | | | | | |
| Woods | Brian | Los Angeles Police Officer | No | 6 | 1,958 | | | | | | | 14,459 | 13.5% | No | | | | | | |
| Smith | V. Jesse | Labor Organizer SEIU-UHW | No | 6 | 956 | | | | | | | 14,459 | 6.6% | No | | | | | | |
| MAYOR | Full | Ledford, Jr. | James C. | Mayor | Yes | | | | | | | 2 | 6,414 | 8,146 | 78.7% | Yes | | | | |
| | | Kester | Desmond "Des" | Los Angeles County Supervising Appraiser | No | | | | | | | 2 | 1,732 | 8,146 | 21.3% | No | | | | |
| Pico Rivera | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | | | | | | | Armenta | David W. | City Council Member | Yes | 7 | 1,923 | 8,989 | 21.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Camacho | Gustavo | Businessman/Planning Commissioner | No | 7 | 1,763 | 8,989 | 19.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Ramirez | E.A. "Pete" | Police Lieutenant Retired | No | 7 | 1,312 | 8,989 | 14.6% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Morones | Martin "Marty" | Government Verification Officer | No | 7 | 1,300 | 8,989 | 14.5% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Beilke | Ron | Councilman/Business Owner | Yes | 7 | 1,234 | 8,989 | 13.7% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Alvarado | Luis E. | Small Business Owner | No | 7 | 1,051 | 8,989 | 11.7% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Riesgo | Raul | Marketing Consultant | No | 7 | 406 | 8,989 | 4.5% | No | | | | | | |
| Rancho Palos Verdes | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Misetich | Anthony | Businessman/Association President | No | 7 | 2,875 | 12,712 | 22.6% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Campbell | Brian | Independent Business Owner | No | 7 | 2,354 | 12,712 | 18.5% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | McTaggart | John C. | Retired Engineer | No | 7 | 1,728 | 12,712 | 13.6% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Mueller | Craig T. | Satellite Communications Engineer | No | 7 | 1,690 | 12,712 | 13.3% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Tetreault | Paul L. | Planning Commissioner/Attorney | No | 7 | 1,485 | 12,712 | 11.7% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Knight | Jim | Planning Commissioner | No | 7 | 1,419 | 12,712 | 11.2% | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Lewis | Jeff | Planning Commissioner/Attorney | No | 7 | 1,161 | 12,712 | 9.1% | No | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
| LOS ANGELES (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Santa Fe Springs | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Gonzalez | Louie | Teacher/Mayor | No | 8 | 1,277 | 6,780 | 18.8% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Putnam | Betty | Incumbent | Yes | 8 | 1,068 | 6,780 | 15.8% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Trujillo | Juanita | Pharmacy Manger | No | 8 | 1,063 | 6,780 | 15.7% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | Madrigal | Michael | Planning Commissioner | No | 8 | 952 | 6,780 | 14.0% | No | |
| | | | | | | Zamora | Jose Angel | Teacher | No | 8 | 813 | 6,780 | 12.0% | No | |
| | | | | | | Puentes | Lillian Carrillo | Administrator/Planning Commissioner | No | 8 | 710 | 6,780 | 10.5% | No | |
| | | | | | | Hayes | Albert "AJ" | Community Services Employee Governing Board Member, Rio Hondo CCD | No | 8 | 493 | 6,780 | 7.3% | No | |
| | | | | | | | Mendez | Gary | CCD | No | 8 | 404 | 6,780 | 6.0% | No |
| | | South El Monte | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Garcia | Angelica | Councilmember/School Counselor | Yes | 4 | 692 | 1,977 | 35.0% | Yes | |
| | Gonzales | | | | | Joseph J. | City Councilman | Yes | 4 | 596 | 1,977 | 30.1% | Yes | | |
| | Figuroa | | | | | Blanca M. | Mayor | Yes | 4 | 432 | 1,977 | 21.9% | No | | |
| | Pardo | | | | | Raul | Educator | No | 4 | 257 | 1,977 | 13.0% | No | | |
| | | | MAYOR | | Full | Aguinaga | Luis "Louie" | Councilmember/Business Owner | No | 1 | 857 | 857 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | South Pasadena | CITY CLERK | | Full | Kilby | Sally | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 2,825 | 2,825 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | Cacciotti | | | | | Michael A. | Prosecutor/Incumbent/Environmentalist | Yes | 3 | 2,564 | 6,591 | 38.9% | Yes | | |
| | Putnam | | | | | Philip C. | Councilmember/CPA/Attorney | Yes | 3 | 2,239 | 6,591 | 34.0% | Yes | | |
| | Sherman | | | | | Bill | Retired Physician/Commissioner | No | 3 | 1,788 | 6,591 | 27.1% | No | | |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Robinette | Victor A. | CPA/Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 2,693 | 2,693 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | West Covina | CITY CLERK | | Full | Carrico | Laurie J. | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 5,106 | 5,106 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | CITY COUNCIL | Lane | Sherri | Councilmember/Businesswoman | Yes | 6 | 5,152 | 23,998 | 21.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Touhey | Michael | Councilmember/Business Owner | Yes | 6 | 4,788 | 23,998 | 20.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Sanderson | Shelley | Councilmember/Business Owner | Yes | 6 | 4,645 | 23,998 | 19.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | Sykes | Frederick | Planning Commissioner | No | 6 | 4,032 | 23,998 | 16.8% | No |
| | | | | | | | Rozatti | Colleen B. | Educator/Commissioner/Realtor | No | 6 | 3,291 | 23,998 | 13.7% | No |
| | | | | | | | Gomez-Pedroza | Steve | Legal Studies Student | No | 6 | 2,090 | 23,998 | 8.7% | No |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Smithson | Marian | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 5,057 | 5,057 | 100.0% | Yes | |
| | | 12/8/2009 | Los Angeles | CITY COUNCIL | 2 | Full | Krekorian | Paul | San Fernando Valley Assemblymember | No | 2 | 11,462 | 20,237 | 56.6% | Yes |
| | Essel | | | | | | Christine | Businesswoman/Neighborhood Advocate | No | 2 | 8,775 | 20,237 | 43.4% | No | |
| MADERA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS- TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|---------|-----------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| MARIN | 11/3/2009 | Corte Madera | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Condon | Carla Stone | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 1,671 | 5,716 | 29.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Furst | Diane L. | Mother | No | 4 | 1,559 | 5,716 | 27.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lappert | Michael | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 1,463 | 5,716 | 25.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Topor | George | Retired | No | 4 | 1,008 | 5,716 | 17.6% | No |
| | | Fairfax | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Hartwell-Herrero | Pam | Director, Nonprofit Organization | No | 7 | 1,263 | 6,397 | 19.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Weinsoff | Davis | Environmental Attorney | No | 7 | 1,186 | 6,397 | 18.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Reed | John | Chair, Volunteer Organization | No | 7 | 1,169 | 6,397 | 18.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Madsen | William B. "Bill" | Firefighter | No | 7 | 872 | 6,397 | 13.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Brandborg | Susan | Incumbent/Educator | Yes | 7 | 848 | 6,397 | 13.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Baker | Wendy "Wenden" | Government Relations | No | 7 | 783 | 6,397 | 12.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Lang | Christopher | Landscape Contractor/Gardener | No | 7 | 275 | 6,397 | 4.3% | No |
| | | Larkspur | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Lundstrom | Joan L. | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 2,145 | 7,224 | 29.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Rikind | Len | Real Estate Attorney | No | 4 | 1,959 | 7,224 | 27.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Hillmer | Daniel J. "Dan" | Mayor, City Council Member | Yes | 4 | 1,801 | 7,224 | 24.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | McCluney | Chris | Stock Trader | No | 4 | 1,298 | 7,224 | 18.0% | No |
| | | Mill Valley | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Berman | Andy | Father/Businessperson | Yes | 3 | 2,856 | 6,543 | 43.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Marshall | Shawn E. | Councilmember/Mother/Consultant | Yes | 3 | 2,399 | 6,543 | 36.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Gordon | George B. | Financial Investment Advisor | No | 3 | 1,270 | 6,543 | 19.4% | No |
| | | Novato | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Athas | Denise | Small Businesswoman | No | 5 | 5,136 | 18,313 | 28.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Eklund | Pat | Councilmember/Environmental Manager | Yes | 5 | 4,866 | 18,313 | 26.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lucan | Eric | Business Consultant | No | 5 | 4,539 | 18,313 | 24.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Coleman | John | Retired | No | 5 | 2,032 | 18,313 | 11.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Sluis | Elaenor | Retired Teacher | No | 5 | 1,711 | 18,313 | 9.3% | No |
| | | San Anselmo | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | McInerney | Tom | Attorney | No | 6 | 2,087 | 9,622 | 21.7% | Yes |
| Coleman | Kay | | | | | Volunteer Coordinator | No | 6 | 1,931 | 9,622 | 20.1% | Yes | | |
| Kroot | Jeff | | | | | Architect | No | 6 | 1,627 | 9,622 | 16.9% | Yes | | |
| Breen | Peter A. | | | | | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 1,522 | 9,622 | 15.8% | No | | |
| House | Judy | | | | | Appointed Incumbent | No | 6 | 1,433 | 9,622 | 14.9% | No | | |
| Freeman | Ted W. | | | | | Incumbent | Yes | 6 | 993 | 9,622 | 10.3% | No | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------|-----|
| MARIN (continued) | 11/3/2009 | San Rafael | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Heller | Barbara | Vice-Mayor | No | 6 | 5,398 | 18,191 | 29.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Levine | Marc | Nonprofit Executive Director | No | 6 | 4,892 | 18,191 | 26.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Ford | Gary | Community Banker | No | 6 | 4,100 | 18,191 | 22.5% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Mayer | David | Employment Program representative | No | 6 | 1,429 | 18,191 | 7.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Hoyt | Whitney | Assistant Principal | No | 6 | 1,298 | 18,191 | 7.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Holm | Eric | Retired Adjudications Officer | No | 6 | 1,049 | 18,191 | 5.8% | No | | |
| | Sausalito | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Ford | Carolyn | Small Business Owner | No | 2 | 1,377 | 2,421 | 56.9% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | De Bruyn | Rene Buddy | Realtor | No | 2 | 1,034 | 2,421 | 42.7% | No | | | |
| | Tiburon | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Fredericks | Alice | Mayor of Tiburon | Yes | 5 | 1,449 | 5,252 | 27.6% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | Fraser | Jim | Planning Commissioner | No | 5 | 1,144 | 5,252 | 21.8% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | O'Donnell | Emmett | Businessman/Planning Commissioner | No | 5 | 1,074 | 5,252 | 20.4% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | Kunzweiler | John | Management Consultant | No | 5 | 1,014 | 5,252 | 19.3% | No | | | |
| | | | | | McCullough | Brian | Businessman/Entrepreneur/Contractor | No | 5 | 551 | 5,252 | 10.5% | No | | | |
| | MARIPOSA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MENDOCINO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MERCED | 5/19/2009 | Atwater | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Rivero | Jeff | No Ballot Designation | No | 6 | 1,326 | 2,847 | 46.6% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Rasmussen | Lesla A. | Community Volunteer | No | 6 | 626 | 2,847 | 22.0% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Dash | Linda | Office Manager | No | 6 | 472 | 2,847 | 16.6% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Murphy, III | James E. | Plumbing Foreman | No | 6 | 311 | 2,847 | 10.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Lentz | Onis C. | Retired | No | 6 | 55 | 2,847 | 1.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Carvey | Tim | Business Owner | No | 6 | 42 | 2,847 | 1.5% | No | | |
| | 11/3/2009 | Merced | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Blake | Bill | Merced County Undersheriff | No | 5 | 3,752 | 13,789 | 27.2% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Pedrozo | Josh | Teacher | No | 5 | 2,885 | 13,789 | 20.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Rawling | Mary-Michal | Program Manager | No | 5 | 2,552 | 13,789 | 18.5% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Cervantes | Richard L. | Welding Supervisor | No | 5 | 2,459 | 13,789 | 17.8% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Pollard | Carl | Medical Transport Driver | No | 5 | 2,079 | 13,789 | 15.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | | MAYOR | Full | Spriggs | Bill | Appraiser | No | 3 | 2,345 | 6,232 | 37.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | Gabriault-Acosta | Michele | City Councilwoman | No | 3 | 2,270 | 6,232 | 36.4% | No |
| | | | | | | | | Osorio | Rick | Retired Businessperson | No | 3 | 1,551 | 6,232 | 24.9% | No |
| MODOC | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MONO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MONTEREY | 5/5/2009 | Gonzales | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Lopez | Jose G. | Business Owner | No | 3 | 276 | 557 | 49.6% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Olsen | Ivan | Retired Salesperson | No | 3 | 175 | 557 | 31.4% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Williams | Elizabeth | Retired Business Woman | No | 3 | 106 | 557 | 19.0% | No | | |
| NAPA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| NEVADA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ORANGE | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLACER | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLUMAS | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | 6/2/2009 | Riverside | CITY COUNCIL | 2 | Full | Melendrez | Andy | Council Member | Yes | 3 | 2,299 | 3,331 | 69.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Rasso | Ruben | Retired Deputy Sheriff | No | 3 | 732 | 3,331 | 22.0% | No |
| | | | | | | Smith | Ahmad R. | Small Business Owner | No | 3 | 300 | 3,331 | 9.0% | No |
| | | | | 4 | Full | Davis | Paul | Business Owner | Yes | 2 | 4,042 | 7,709 | 52.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Schiavone | Frank | Councilmember/Business Owner | No | 2 | 3,667 | 7,709 | 47.6% | No |
| | | | | 6 | Full | Hart | Nancy E. | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 1,299 | 2,177 | 59.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Scherer | Bill | Mechanic | No | 3 | 713 | 2,177 | 32.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Alfaro | Ann | Retired Pharmacy Clerk | No | 3 | 165 | 2,177 | 7.6% | No |
| | 11/3/2009 | Blythe | CITY CLERK | | Full | Sutterfield | Mallory | City Manager's Assistant | Yes | 2 | 917 | 1,742 | 52.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lang | Beverly | Deputy City Clerk | Yes | 2 | 825 | 1,742 | 47.4% | No |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | de Coninck | Joseph "Joey" | Businessman/Farmer | Yes | 8 | 939 | 4,965 | 18.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Galvan | Oscar G. | Retired Driver | Yes | 8 | 902 | 4,965 | 18.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Patel | Sam | Small Business Owner | Yes | 8 | 718 | 4,965 | 14.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Smith | William J. "Willie" | Businessman/College Administrator | No | 8 | 687 | 4,965 | 13.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Hanson | Quenton E. | Small Business Developer | No | 8 | 659 | 4,965 | 13.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Mays | Beverly A. | Incumbent | Yes | 8 | 528 | 4,965 | 10.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Crain | Robert A. | Incumbent | Yes | 8 | 366 | 4,965 | 7.4% | No |
| | | | | | | McAndrew | Mike | Real Estate Broker | No | 8 | 166 | 4,965 | 3.3% | No |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Martin | Leann Kay | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 1,377 | 1,377 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | Desert Hot Springs | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Matas | Scott | Small Business Owner | Yes | 5 | 1,270 | 3,838 | 33.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Pye | Jana | Financial Analyst | Yes | 5 | 998 | 3,838 | 26.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Martin | Russ | Retired Police Sergeant | No | 5 | 893 | 3,838 | 23.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Scheurer | Terry | City Commissioner/Businessman | No | 5 | 365 | 3,838 | 9.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Bentley | Robert "Bobby" | Independent Paralegal/Businessman | No | 5 | 312 | 3,838 | 8.1% | No |
| | | | MAYOR | | Full | Parks | Yvonne | Mayor, Desert Hot Springs | Yes | 2 | 1,289 | 2,101 | 61.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Betts | Russell | Councilman/Business Owner | No | 2 | 812 | 2,101 | 38.6% | No |
| | | Norco | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Bash | Kevin | Business Owner/Educator | Yes | 4 | 1,465 | 4,840 | 30.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Sullivan | Harvey C. | Retired Electrician | Yes | 4 | 1,407 | 4,840 | 29.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Hall | Frank | Norco Council Member | Yes | 4 | 1,331 | 4,840 | 27.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Mac Gregor | Richard L. | Appointed Norco City Councilman | No | 4 | 637 | 4,840 | 13.2% | No |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------|-----|
| RIVERSIDE (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Palm Springs | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Foat | Ginny | Palm Springs City Councilwoman | Yes | 11 | 3,853 | 16,340 | 23.6% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Mills | Chritopher "Chris" | Councilmember/Architect/Businessman | Yes | 11 | 3,504 | 16,340 | 21.4% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Beaty | Barbara | Businesswoman | No | 11 | 3,089 | 16,340 | 18.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Carden | David | Realtor | No | 11 | 2,796 | 16,340 | 17.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Osterberger | Jim | Business Owner | No | 11 | 886 | 16,340 | 5.4% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Gallardo | Michael A. | Publisher | No | 11 | 657 | 16,340 | 4.0% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Walhour | Mark D. | Father/Retired NCO | No | 11 | 538 | 16,340 | 3.3% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Sweatte | Drew | Small Business Employee | No | 11 | 502 | 16,340 | 3.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Dobrecevic | Alexander P. | Student | No | 11 | 175 | 16,340 | 1.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Garcia-Mohsin | Eloise | Artist | No | 11 | 171 | 16,340 | 1.0% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Tymon | John | Singer/Songwriter/Inventor | No | 11 | 169 | 16,340 | 1.0% | No | | |
| | | | | | | | | Riverside | MAYOR | | Full | Loveridge | Ron | Mayor | Yes | 2 |
| | | | | | | Gage | Art | Businessman | No | 2 | 6,421 | 20,808 | 30.9% | No | | |
| SACRAMENTO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAN BENITO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 3/17/2009 | San Bernardino | CITY COUNCIL | 4 | Full | Shorett | Fred | Self-employed Businessman | No | 4 | 2,330 | 3,202 | 72.8% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Arnett | Joe | University IT Manager | No | 4 | 636 | 3,202 | 19.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Valdivia | John | Pharmaceutical Representative | No | 4 | 182 | 3,202 | 5.7% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Saman | Saman | Businessman | No | 4 | 54 | 3,202 | 1.7% | No | | |
| | 11/3/2009 | San Bernardino | CITY COUNCIL | 1 | Full | Marquez | Virginia | Congressional Representative | No | 2 | 684 | 1,338 | 51.1% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Estrada | Esther R. | Incumbent | Yes | 2 | 654 | 1,338 | 48.9% | No | | |
| | | | | | | 2 | Desjardins | Jason | Small Business Owner | No | 2 | 649 | 1,228 | 52.9% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Baxter | Dennis J. | City Council Member, Ward 2 | Yes | 2 | 579 | 1,228 | 47.1% | No | |
| | | | | | | 4 | Shorett | Fred | Businessman/Council Member | Yes | 2 | 2,029 | 3,849 | 52.7% | Yes | |
| | | | | | | | Arnett | Joe | Technology Manager/Educator | No | 2 | 1,820 | 3,849 | 47.3% | No | |
| | | | | | | MAYOR | Full | Morris | Mayor Pat | Mayor, City Of San Bernardino | Yes | 3 | 8,349 | 14,930 | 55.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | Penman | Jim | San Bernardino City Attorney | No | 3 | 5,376 | 14,930 | 36.0% | No |
| Avila | Rick | General Engineering Contractor | No | 3 | 1,205 | | | 14,930 | 8.1% | No | | | | | | |
| SAN DIEGO | 5/19/2009 | Coronado | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Denny | Barbara | Attorney | No | 3 | 2,046 | 4,766 | 42.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Monroe | Philip | Retired | No | 3 | 1,673 | 4,766 | 35.1% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Mitchell | Jerry | Businessman | No | 3 | 1,047 | 4,766 | 22.0% | No | | |
| | 12/8/2009 | Oceanside | CITY COUNCIL ^R | 1 | Full | Lowery | Charles | Businessman | No | 3 | 9,802 | 16,211 | 60.5% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | Martin | Rex | Retired 911 Director | No | 3 | 4,587 | 16,211 | 28.3% | No | | |
| | | | | | | Kratcoski | Rick | Grounds Supervisor | No | 3 | 1,822 | 16,211 | 11.2% | No | | |

^RTo be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|-----------------|---|---------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| SAN FRANCISCO | County and City Contests included in County Report. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAN JOAQUIN | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAN MATEO | 11/3/2009 | Belmont | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Warden | Dave | Medical Engineering Manager | No | 5 | 2,358 | 10,223 | 23.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lieberman | Warren | Incumbent City Council member | Yes | 5 | 2,268 | 10,223 | 22.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Feierbach | Coralin | City Council Member | Yes | 5 | 2,148 | 10,223 | 21.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Nikoloff | Gin | Belmont Business owner | No | 5 | 1,734 | 10,223 | 17.0% | No |
| | | | | | | McGuinness | Michael J. "Mike" | Software Sales Executive | No | 5 | 1,715 | 10,223 | 16.8% | No |
| | | Brisbane | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Conway | W. Clarke | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 570 | 2,201 | 25.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lentz | Cliff | Planning Commissioner | No | 5 | 546 | 2,201 | 24.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Richardson | A. Sepi | Incumbent/Mayor/Chief Financial officer | Yes | 5 | 488 | 2,201 | 22.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Barnes | Michael G. | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 460 | 2,201 | 20.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Manara | Emile | Retired Special Agent, D.E.A. | No | 5 | 137 | 2,201 | 6.2% | No |
| | | Burlingame | CITY CLERK | | Full | Kearney | Mary Ellen | Appointed Incumbent | No | 1 | 3,656 | 3,656 | 100.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Brownrigg | Michael | Business Owner/Dad | No | 4 | 3,412 | 12,267 |
| | | | Keighran | Ann | Incumbent | Yes | | 4 | 3,297 | 12,267 | 26.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | Baylock | Cathy | Incumbent | Yes | | 4 | 2,825 | 12,267 | 23.0% | Yes | | |
| | | | O'Mahony | Rosalie M. | Incumbent/Mathematics professor | Yes | 4 | 2,733 | 12,267 | 22.3% | No | | | |
| | | Foster City | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Frisella | Pam k. | Incumbent | Yes | 5 | 2,328 | 7,626 | 30.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Bronitsky | Charles "Charlie" | Real Estate Attorney | No | 5 | 1,759 | 7,626 | 23.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Perez | Herb | Olympic Medalist Instructor | No | 5 | 1,474 | 7,626 | 19.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Yu | Wing | Entrepreneur/Educator | No | 5 | 1,384 | 7,626 | 18.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Gologorsky | Linda Haskin | Community Volunteer | No | 5 | 681 | 7,626 | 8.9% | No |
| | | Half Moon Bay | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Patridge | Naomi | Incumbent | Yes | 8 | 1,449 | 8,196 | 17.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Alifano | Allan | Local Business Owner | No | 8 | 1,263 | 8,196 | 15.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Kowalczyk | Rick | Business Consultant | No | 8 | 1,116 | 8,196 | 13.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Ruddock | Deborah "Debbie" | Senior Project Manager | No | 8 | 1,053 | 8,196 | 12.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Handler | Dan | Small Business Owner | No | 8 | 1,030 | 8,196 | 12.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Freer | Sofia | Retired High School Science Teacher | No | 8 | 976 | 8,196 | 11.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Muteff | George | Financial Business Consultant | No | 8 | 882 | 8,196 | 10.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Hoelzel | Charles T. | Personal Banker | No | 8 | 427 | 8,196 | 5.2% | No |
| | | Millbrae | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Papan | Gina | Millbrae City Council Member | Yes | 3 | 2,329 | 5,740 | 40.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Holober | Nadia V. | Attorney, Commissioner | No | 3 | 2,307 | 5,740 | 40.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Kalos-Gunn | Lorrie Anne | Battalion Chief | No | 3 | 1,104 | 5,740 | 19.2% | No |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | Full | Morse | Doris | Community Volunteer | No | 1 | 2,457 | 2,457 | 100.0% | Yes | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------|--------|--------|-------|-----|
| SAN MATEO (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Portola Valley | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Richards | F. John | Architect | No | 3 | 1,055 | 3,048 | 34.6% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Driscoll | Ted | Venture Capitalist | No | 3 | 1,005 | 3,048 | 33.0% | Yes | | | | |
| Derwin | Maryann Moise | | | | | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 988 | 3,048 | 32.4% | Yes | | | | | | |
| | | Redwood City | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Ira | Jeff J. | Councilmember/CPA | Yes | 5 | 5,077 | 18,854 | 26.9% | Yes | | | | |
| | Gee | | | | | Jeff | Architect/Vice-President | No | 5 | 4,644 | 18,854 | 24.6% | Yes | | | | | |
| | Seybert | | | | | John | Director of Operations | No | 5 | 3,724 | 18,854 | 19.8% | Yes | | | | | |
| | Borgens | | | | | Janet | Small Business Owner | No | 5 | 2,867 | 18,854 | 15.2% | No | | | | | |
| | Wright | | | | | Cherlene L. | Appointee/Probation Officer | No | 5 | 2,542 | 18,854 | 13.5% | No | | | | | |
| | | San Bruno | CITY CLERK | | Full | Bonner | Carol | City Clerk | Yes | 1 | 3,841 | 3,841 | 100.0% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Medina | Rico E. | Personnel Manger/Council Member | Yes | 2 | 3,353 | 6,535 | 51.3% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Full | Ibarra | Ken | Council Member | Yes | 2 | 3,182 | 6,535 | 48.7% | Yes | | | |
| | | | CITY TREASURER | | Full | Marty | John | Treasurer | Yes | 1 | 3,751 | 3,751 | 100.0% | Yes | | | | |
| | | MAYOR | | | Full | Ruane | Jim | Vice Mayor | No | 2 | 3,230 | 4,416 | 73.1% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | Full | Araujo | Miguel | Community Volunteer | No | 2 | 1,186 | 4,416 | 26.9% | No | | | |
| | | San Carlos | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Grassilli | Bob | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 4,392 | 12,813 | 34.3% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Klein | Andy | Businessman | No | 3 | 4,303 | 12,813 | 33.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | | Grocott | Matt | Incumbent | Yes | 3 | 4,118 | 12,813 | 32.1% | Yes |
| | | San Mateo | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Lim | David G. | Deputy District Attorney | No | 5 | 7,019 | 29,688 | 23.6% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Ross | Robert | Retired City of San Mateo Police Lieutenant | No | 5 | 6,103 | 29,688 | 20.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | | Grotte | Brandt | Incumbent and Mayor | Yes | 5 | 5,768 | 29,688 | 19.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | | Hansson | Frederick Arn | Councilmember | Yes | 5 | 5,580 | 29,688 | 18.8% | No |
| | | | | | | | | | | Sanchez | Bertha Hall | Registered Nurse, MSN | No | 5 | 5,218 | 29,688 | 17.6% | No |
| | | South San Francisco | CITY CLERK | | Full | Martinelli-Larson | Krista | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 5,111 | 5,111 | 100.0% | Yes | | | | |
| | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | Full | Gonzalez | pedro | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 3,736 | 13,695 | 27.3% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Addiego | Mark N. | City Councilmember | Yes | 4 | 3,687 | 13,695 | 26.9% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | | | Matsumoto | Karyl | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 3,652 | 13,695 | 26.7% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | | | Wolfe | Kamala Silva | Medical Legal Research | No | 4 | 2,620 | 13,695 | 19.1% | No | | |
| | | CITY TREASURER | | | Full | Battaglia | Richard A. "Dick" | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 5,113 | 5,113 | 100.0% | Yes | | | | |
| | | Woodside | CITY COUNCIL | | 2 | Full | Gordon | Deborah Cody | Incumbent | Yes | 1 | 612 | 612 | 100.0% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | 4 | Full | Tanner | David | General Contractor | No | 1 | 594 | 594 | 100.0% | Yes | | |
| | | | | | | 6 | Full | Kasten | Anne | Retired Businesswoman | No | 1 | 647 | 647 | 100.0% | Yes | | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| SANTA BARBARA | 11/3/2009 | Santa Barbara | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | House | Grant | City Councilmember | Yes | 13 | 9,679 | 62,930 | 15.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | White | Harwood "Bendy" | Planning Commissioner | No | 13 | 8,893 | 62,930 | 14.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Hotchkiss | Frank | Businessman | No | 13 | 7,560 | 62,930 | 12.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Self | Michael Kathleen | Businesswoman | No | 13 | 7,513 | 62,930 | 11.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Channing | Dianne | Small Business Owner | No | 13 | 6,765 | 62,930 | 10.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Pritchett | David | Environmental Scientist | No | 13 | 5,580 | 62,930 | 8.9% | No |
| | | | | | | McCammon | Catherine G. "Cathie" | Community Volunteer | No | 13 | 3,912 | 62,930 | 6.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Thyne, III | John J. | Businessman/Attorney/Teacher | No | 13 | 3,753 | 62,930 | 6.0% | No |
| | | | | | | Tevis | Justin | Buyer-Inventor Manager | No | 13 | 2,765 | 62,930 | 4.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Cruz | Cruzito Herrera | Community Social Worker | No | 13 | 2,098 | 62,930 | 3.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Gibbs, Jr.,MD | John W. | M.D. Retired | No | 13 | 2,072 | 62,930 | 3.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Anderson | R.Lane | Community Organizer | No | 13 | 1,414 | 62,930 | 2.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Raisin | Bonnie | No Ballot designation | No | 13 | 926 | 62,930 | 1.5% | No |
| | | | MAYOR | | Full | Schneider | Helene | Santa Barbara City Councilmember | No | 5 | 10,433 | 22,717 | 45.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Francisco | Dale | City Council member | No | 5 | 7,684 | 22,717 | 33.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Cushman | Stephen M. | Non-Profit President | No | 5 | 3,696 | 22,717 | 16.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Garrett | Isaac | Realtor | No | 5 | 484 | 22,717 | 2.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Hansen | Bob | Homeless Advocate | No | 5 | 420 | 22,717 | 1.8% | No |
| SANTA CLARA | 11/3/2009 | Cupertino | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Mahoney | Orrin | Incumbent | Yes | 7 | 4,822 | 26,605 | 18.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Chang | Barry | Small Business Owner | No | 7 | 4,212 | 26,605 | 15.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Santoro | Mark R. | Incumbent | Yes | 7 | 4,142 | 26,605 | 15.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Miller | Marty | Businessman/Planning Commissioner | No | 7 | 3,804 | 26,605 | 14.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Nihalani | Mahesh | Small Business Owner | No | 7 | 3,348 | 26,605 | 12.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Nguyen | Daniel | Stat. Research Analyst, Veterans Hospital | No | 7 | 3,309 | 26,605 | 12.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Paul | Darcy | Attorney | No | 7 | 2,968 | 26,605 | 11.2% | No |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|----------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| SANTA CLARA (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Palo Alto | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Klein | Larry | Attorney | Yes | 14 | 7,829 | 59,929 | 13.1% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Holman | Karen C. | Small Business Owner/Consultant | No | 14 | 7,688 | 59,929 | 12.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Price | Gail A. | Executive Director | No | 14 | 7,533 | 59,929 | 12.6% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Shepard | Nancy | Managerial Accountant | No | 14 | 6,455 | 59,929 | 10.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Scharraf | Gregory "Greg" | Attorney | No | 14 | 5,939 | 59,929 | 9.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Leong | Leon | Business Person | No | 14 | 5,016 | 59,929 | 8.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Dykwel | Dan | Marketing Comm. Consultant/ Realtor | No | 14 | 4,412 | 59,929 | 7.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Levens | Corey A. | Corp Atty/Education/Neighborhood Activist | No | 14 | 3,717 | 59,929 | 6.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Hackmann | John Morrow | Attorney, General Practice | No | 14 | 3,709 | 59,929 | 6.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Steen | Brian | Land Use Consultant | No | 14 | 3,007 | 59,929 | 5.0% | No |
| | | | | | | Gray | Timothy W. "Tim" | Business Advisor/Accountability Champion | No | 14 | 2,127 | 59,929 | 3.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Gaither | Chris | Community Volunteer | No | 14 | 1,302 | 59,929 | 2.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Weiss | Mark | Business Owner/Activist | No | 14 | 732 | 59,929 | 1.2% | No |
| | | | | | | Frost | Visctor Allen | Homeless Advocate/Panhandler | No | 14 | 463 | 59,929 | 0.8% | No |
| | | | | | | | | Sunnyvale | CITY COUNCIL | 1 | Full | Spitaleri | Anthony "Tony" | Retired Fire Captain |
| | | | | | | Meyering | Pat | Lawyer/College Instructor | No | 2 | 8,177 | 17,695 | 46.2% | No |
| | | | | 2 | Full | Moylan | Christopher R. | Scientist/City Councilmember | Yes | 2 | 9,792 | 17,680 | 55.4% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Flores | Michael "Mike" | Entrepreneur/Engineer/Teacher | No | 2 | 7,888 | 17,680 | 44.6% | No |
| | | | | 3 | Full | Griffith | James R. "Jim" | Engineering Manager | No | 2 | 9,968 | 17,522 | 56.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Kelly | Penny M. | Small Business Owner | No | 2 | 7,554 | 17,522 | 43.1% | No |
| SANTA CRUZ | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SHASTA | 5/19/2009 | Mt. Shasta | CITY COUNCIL | | | Boss | Ned | Retired Utility Consultant | No | 2 | 503 | 946 | 53.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Boyd | Susie | Community Volunteer | No | 2 | 439 | 946 | 46.4% | No |
| | 11/3/2009 | Shasta Lake | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Dixon | Ron | Retired | No | 4 | 748 | 2,671 | 28.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Lucero | Dolores | Business Owner | No | 4 | 728 | 2,671 | 27.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Palmer | Gracious | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 662 | 2,671 | 24.8% | No |
| | | | | | | Hurlhey | Bonnie | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 530 | 2,671 | 19.8% | No |
| SIERRA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SISKIYOU | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SOLANO | 4/7/2009 | Dixon | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Besneatte | Dane | Attorney at Law | No | 3 | 1,011 | 2,715 | 37.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Coppes | Victoria "Tori" | Appointed Incumbent | No | 3 | 906 | 2,715 | 33.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Graska | Drew A. | Field Service Engineer | No | 3 | 792 | 2,715 | 29.2% | No |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS- TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------|-------|-------|
| SOLANO (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Benicia | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Schartzman | Alan M. | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 3,529 | 10,906 | 32.4% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Hughes | Mark | Incumbent | Yes | 4 | 3,524 | 10,906 | 32.3% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Smith | Dan | Writer/Health Educator | No | 4 | 2,698 | 10,906 | 24.7% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Biggs | Jubal | Congressional Legislative Aide | No | 4 | 1,128 | 10,906 | 10.3% | No | | | |
| | | Fairfield | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Mraz | John | Retired Policeman/Vice-Mayor | No | 8 | 5,178 | 27,489 | 18.8% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Moylan | Catherine "Cat" | Appointed City Councilwoman | No | 8 | 4,896 | 27,489 | 17.8% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Bertani | Pam | Patent Lawyer/Litigator | No | 8 | 4,767 | 27,489 | 17.3% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Courtemanche | Teresa | Community Foundation President | No | 8 | 4,687 | 27,489 | 17.1% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Johnson | Jamie | Business Employment Manager | No | 8 | 3,892 | 27,489 | 14.2% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Travis | Brian | Deputy Sherriff | No | 8 | 2,655 | 27,489 | 9.7% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Lopez | German | Mortgage Branch Manager | No | 8 | 738 | 27,489 | 2.7% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | Vangundy | Gino | University Analyst | No | 8 | 650 | 27,489 | 2.4% | No | | | |
| | | | | | | MAYOR | | Full | Price | Harry T. | Incumbent | No | 6 | 8,735 | 14,642 | 59.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | Reyff | Ray | President Electrical Company | No | 6 | 1,582 | 14,642 | 10.8% | No |
| | | | | | | | | | Rivera | George | Businessman | No | 6 | 1,301 | 14,642 | 8.9% | No |
| | | | | | | | | | Holliday | James Abram | College Student | Yes | 6 | 1,106 | 14,642 | 7.6% | No |
| | | McAuliffe | John W. | Consultant | No | | | | 6 | 965 | 14,642 | 6.6% | No | | | | |
| | | Barnett | Stephen | Legal Search Consultant | No | | | | 6 | 916 | 14,642 | 6.3% | No | | | | |
| | | Vallejo | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Gomes | Stephanie | Vallejo City Councilmember | Yes | 7 | 7,356 | 37,678 | 19.5% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Brown | Marti | Senior Urban Planner | No | 7 | 7,188 | 37,678 | 19.1% | Yes | | | |
| Sunga | Hermie R. | | | | | Vice Mayor | No | 7 | 5,901 | 37,678 | 15.7% | Yes | | | | | |
| Logan, Jr. | Jonathan | | | | | Local Government Administrator | No | 7 | 5,166 | 37,678 | 13.7% | No | | | | | |
| Barrtee | Tom | | | | | Incumbent | Yes | 7 | 5,122 | 37,678 | 13.6% | No | | | | | |
| Nelson | Marie "Punkie" | | | | | Retired Manager | No | 7 | 4,556 | 37,678 | 12.1% | No | | | | | |
| Kurshan | Sam | | | | | Information Technology Consultant | No | 7 | 2,292 | 37,678 | 6.1% | No | | | | | |
| SONOMA | 11/17/2009 | | | | | Cotati | CITY COUNCIL ^R | 1 | Short | Harvey | Susan | Planning Commissioner | No | 3 | 800 | 1,400 | 57.1% |
| | | Hardy | Linell L. | Community Volunteer | No | | | | | 3 | 376 | 1,400 | 26.9% | No | | | |
| | | Kirchmann | Eric | Educator/Volunteer | No | | | | | 3 | 210 | 1,400 | 15.0% | No | | | |
| STANISLAUS | 11/3/2009 | Ceres | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Vierra | Chris | City of Ceres Council Member | Yes | 3 | 1,898 | 4,680 | 40.6% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Lane | Ken | City of Ceres Council Member | Yes | 3 | 1,521 | 4,680 | 32.5% | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | Kline | Michael "Mike" | Sales/Planning Commissioner | No | 3 | 1,221 | 4,680 | 26.1% | No | | | |

^RTo be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS-TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM- BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| STANISLAUS (continued) | 11/3/2009 | Modesto | CITY COUNCIL | 2 | Full | Geer | Dave | Security Police Officer | No | 2 | 596 | 1,049 | 56.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Nava | Al | Military Veteran/Student | No | 2 | 448 | 1,049 | 42.7% | No |
| | | | | 4 | Full | Muratore | Joe | Business Owner | No | 3 | 2,135 | 3,830 | 55.7% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Perine | Jeff | Educator | No | 3 | 1,227 | 3,830 | 32.0% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Stanford | Robert W. "Pollo" | Businessman | No | 3 | 456 | 3,830 | 11.9% | No |
| | | | | 5 | Full | Olsen | Kristin | Councilmember/University Spokesperson | Yes | 2 | 3,090 | 4,693 | 65.8% | Yes |
| | | | Cataline | | | Joe | Small Business Owner | No | 2 | 1,591 | 4,693 | 33.9% | No | |
| | | | Riverbank | MAYOR | Full | Madueno | Virginia "Arauz" | Business Owner | No | 6 | 1,030 | 2,525 | 40.8% | Yes |
| | | | | | | O'Brien | Richard Dennis | Businessman/Retired Military | No | 6 | 920 | 2,525 | 36.4% | No |
| | | | | | | White | David A. | Councilmember | Yes | 6 | 342 | 2,525 | 13.5% | No |
| | | | | | | Ensley | Mark | Shop Superintendent | No | 6 | 153 | 2,525 | 6.1% | No |
| | | | | | | King | Larry | Business Owner | No | 6 | 60 | 2,525 | 2.4% | No |
| | | | | | | Guitierrez | Paul A. | Retired | No | 6 | 15 | 2,525 | 0.6% | No |
| SUTTER | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TEHAMA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TRINITY | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TULARE | 11/3/2009 | Visalia | CITY COUNCIL | Full | Lane | Mike | Management Analyst | No | 9 | 7,647 | 34,713 | 22.0% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Gubler | Warren | Businessman/Attorney | No | 9 | 6,746 | 34,713 | 19.4% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Nelsen | Steven | Businessman | No | 9 | 5,487 | 34,713 | 15.8% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Collins | Gregory F. | Incumbent | Yes | 9 | 5,240 | 34,713 | 15.1% | No | |
| | | | | | Gamboa | Jesus J. | Incumbent | Yes | 9 | 4,574 | 34,713 | 13.2% | No | |
| | | | | | Wheeler | Mary | No Ballot Designation | No | 9 | 1,700 | 34,713 | 4.9% | No | |
| | | | | | Fry | Paul F. | General Manager | No | 9 | 1,271 | 34,713 | 3.7% | No | |
| | | | | | Miller | Andrew | Director, Visalia Memorial District | No | 9 | 1,136 | 34,713 | 3.3% | No | |
| | | | | | Prado | Dominic | Student | No | 9 | 810 | 34,713 | 2.3% | No | |
| TUOLUMNE | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| VENTURA | 5/19/2009 | Moorpark | CITY COUNCIL | Short | Pollock | David | Governing Board Member, Moorpark USD | No | 7 | 2,285 | 6,475 | 35.3% | Yes | |
| | | | | | Sweet | Nathan | Firefighter/Paramedic | No | 7 | 1,881 | 6,475 | 29.1% | No | |
| | | | | | Bagwell | David K. | Business Owner | No | 7 | 1,340 | 6,475 | 20.7% | No | |
| | | | | | Pflaumer | Thomas | Financial Loan Officer | No | 7 | 443 | 6,475 | 6.8% | No | |
| | | | | | Magdaleno | Jose "Joe" | Businessman/Entrepreneur | No | 7 | 173 | 6,475 | 2.7% | No | |
| | | | | | Miller | Jonathon | Insurance Claims Adjuster | No | 7 | 133 | 6,475 | 2.1% | No | |
| | | | | | Hoffman, III | James K. | Project Manager | No | 7 | 76 | 6,475 | 1.2% | No | |

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2009

| COUNTY | DATE | CITY | OFFICE | DIS- TRICT/ SEAT | TERM OF OFFICE | CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME | CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME | CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION | IN- CUM BENT | NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES | VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE | TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹ | PER- CENT OF VOTE | ELECTED |
|---------|------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| VENTURA | 11/3/2009 | San Buenaventura | CITY COUNCIL | | Full | Tracy | Michael "Mike" | Retired Police Chief | No | 15 | 9,777 | 76,021 | 12.9% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Andrews | Neal | City Councilmember/Businessman | Yes | 15 | 9,246 | 76,021 | 12.2% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Monahan | Jim | Businessman/Ventura City Council Member | Yes | 15 | 8,749 | 76,021 | 11.5% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Brennan | Brian | Councilmember | Yes | 15 | 7,830 | 76,021 | 10.3% | Yes |
| | | | | | | Summers | Ed | Incumbent | Yes | 15 | 6,906 | 76,021 | 9.1% | No |
| | | | | | | Cozzens | Kenneth M. | Small Business Owner | No | 15 | 5,927 | 76,021 | 7.8% | No |
| | | | | | | O'Hara | Maureen C. | Attorney | Yes | 15 | 4,368 | 76,021 | 5.7% | No |
| | | | | | | Rencher | Brian Lee | Financial Advisor | No | 15 | 4,008 | 76,021 | 5.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Halderman | Wendy | Business Owner | No | 15 | 3,714 | 76,021 | 4.9% | No |
| | | | | | | Knox, III | William M. | Tax Attorney | No | 15 | 3,557 | 76,021 | 4.7% | No |
| | | | | | | Gibson | Mike | Business Manager | No | 15 | 3,537 | 76,021 | 4.7% | No |
| | | | | | | Harris | Camille | Retired Business Owner | No | 15 | 3,246 | 76,021 | 4.3% | No |
| | | | | | | Mechanick | Phil | Local Businessman | No | 15 | 1,975 | 76,021 | 2.6% | No |
| | | | | | | Baker | Melody Joy | Small Business Owner | No | 15 | 1,680 | 76,021 | 2.2% | No |
| Dugan | Robert E. "Bob" | Businessman | No | 15 | 1,441 | 76,021 | 1.9% | No | | | | | | |
| YOLO | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YUBA | No City Contests | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Offices, 2009

| | | City Attorney | | City Clerk | | City Controller | | City Council | | City Treasurer | | Mayor | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---|------------|----|-----------------|---|--------------|-----|----------------|----|---------|----|---------|-----|
| | | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N |
| Incumbent Candidates | Win | 100.0 | 1 | 93.8 | 15 | 0.0 | 0 | 79.5 | 155 | 100.0 | 16 | 83.3 | 15 | 82.1 | 202 |
| | Lose | 0.0 | 0 | 6.3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 20.5 | 40 | 0.0 | 0 | 16.7 | 3 | 17.9 | 44 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 16 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 195 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 246 |
| Non- Incumbent Candidates | Win | 28.6 | 2 | 44.4 | 4 | 33.3 | 1 | 28.0 | 151 | 54.5 | 6 | 19.5 | 8 | 28.2 | 172 |
| | Lose | 71.4 | 5 | 55.6 | 5 | 66.7 | 2 | 72.0 | 389 | 45.5 | 5 | 80.5 | 33 | 71.8 | 439 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 9 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 540 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 | 41 | 100.0 | 611 |
| Winning Candidates | Incumbent | 33.3 | 1 | 78.9 | 15 | 0.0 | 0 | 50.7 | 155 | 72.7 | 16 | 65.2 | 15 | 54.0 | 202 |
| | Non-Incumbent | 66.7 | 2 | 21.1 | 4 | 100.0 | 1 | 49.3 | 151 | 27.3 | 6 | 34.8 | 8 | 46.0 | 172 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 306 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 | 374 |
| Losing Candidates | Incumbent | 0.0 | 0 | 16.7 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 9.3 | 40 | 0.0 | 0 | 8.3 | 3 | 9.1 | 44 |
| | Non-Incumbent | 100.0 | 5 | 83.3 | 5 | 100.0 | 2 | 90.7 | 389 | 100.0 | 5 | 91.7 | 33 | 91.7 | 439 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 424 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 36 | 100.0 | 478 |
| All Candidates | Incumbent | 12.5 | 1 | 64.0 | 16 | 0.0 | 0 | 26.5 | 195 | 59.3 | 16 | 30.5 | 18 | 28.9 | 246 |
| | Non-Incumbent | 87.5 | 7 | 36.0 | 9 | 100.0 | 3 | 73.5 | 540 | 40.7 | 11 | 69.5 | 41 | 71.1 | 611 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 735 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 857 |