

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

2008 ELECTIONS

County 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, 2008 ELECTIONS

COUNTY 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:

Michael Small
Nicole Ishiura
Stefani Poblete

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
2008 County, City and School District Election Dates by County		xvii
Trend Table A	Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year	xix
Trend Table B	Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction and Year.....	xxii
Trend Table C	Community Service District and County Service Area Measures by County	xxv
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	xxvi
Trend Table E	Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures, 1998-2008	xxvii
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	xxvii
Trend Table G	Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Year	xxviii
Trend Table H	Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year	xxviii
Trend Table I	Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Year	xxix
2008 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, 2008	3
Table B	Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2008	5
Table C	Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 2008.....	8

PART 1 VOTE TOTALS, ELECTION OUTCOMES AND TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES	9
Table 1.1 Vote Totals for County Ballot Measures by County, 2008	11
Table 1.2 Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 2008	15
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2008	22
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2008	24
 PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES.....	 27
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for County Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2008.....	29
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2008.....	58

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: 1995-2008

CEDA now encompasses 14 years of election data, including three gubernatorial election years (1998, 2002 and 2006), four presidential elections (1996, 2000, 2004, and 2008) and seven odd-numbered years devoted to local races. The 2008 election contained both Assembly and Senate seat elections and 12 statewide propositions. As a presidential election year, 2008 was characterized by a large voter turnout, and an accompanying surge in minority voter participation. This report begins with an overview of some of the multi-year election trends then continues to a discussion of the 2008 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. At all local election levels, there appear to be a number of consistent features across elections, while other election characteristics seem to vary considerably from year to year, particularly between on and off year election cycles. The following section discusses the patterns and trends over the 14 years of CEDA data collection.


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

- The number of local ballot measures offered to voters clearly seems to “piggy-back” on state and national elections. From 1995 through 2008 there were, on average, 428 ballot measures per year. In even number years, the average was 603 measures, while odd years average 252. During the 14-year period, 63% of all the ballot measures passed. As of the 2008 election, the percentage of measures passed remained constant across odd and even year elections, despite the fact that the number of measures was nearly 2.4 times in even as opposed to odd years. (See Trend Table A).
 - Among all the various types of ballots measures, *charter amendments* had the largest percentage of measures passed, with more than three-quarters (77%) of *charter amendment* measures passing during the 14-year period. The second best success was among *recall measures* with slightly more than two-thirds (67%) passing. However, it should be noted that this type 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* (53%), 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 (209; 49%), followed by the school district (148; 34%) and county (71; 17%). However, within these levels, the school districts had the largest percentage of measures passing (67%), followed by county (57%) and city (53%) (See Trend Table A).
- During the 14 years of CEDA data collection, the number of ballot measures in even years peaked in 2004 with 715 measures. The current 2008 election saw 593 measures, with an overall passage rate of 75%--the highest rate of any year since CEDA data collection was initiated.

- 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 2008 focused on this topic. The number of education measures has exceeded the number of measures dealing with other specific topics in all but two years, 1996 and again in 2007 (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%. 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 12 percent of the total ballot measures in local elections. However, in the 2007 and 2008 election cycles the percentage of measures dealing with revenue stood at higher percentages, 17 percent and 16 percent, respectively, perhaps signaling the concerns with revenue in the down economy.
 - In 2008, among all county measures, revenue issues accounted for about 12 percent; but among city's measures, revenue accounted for about 31 percent of the issues.
 - Since the 2005 election year, there have been no revenue issues at the school district level.
- Figure 1 provides an overview of the number of ballot measures and the percent of measures passing in each of the 14 years of data. As can be seen in the green trend line in Figure 1, the actual number of ballot initiatives 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, with a slight uptick in the past two years (See Figure 1).
 - Overall, 63 percent of ballot measures passed and the pass rates held fairly constant in even year elections (63% passing rate) and in odd years (63% passing rate), although as previously noted, there was a slight uptick in the 2007 and 2008 election years (See Trend Table A).



- 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 14 years (1995-2008). 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 measures. County measures had 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).
- 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 19 percent better passing rate for *tax* propositions, a 28 percent better passing rate for *recall* measures, a 15 percent better passing rate for *bond* proposals. In fact only one type of measure, *charter amendments*, had a better passing rate for even as opposed to odd year elections (a 67% versus 65% passing rate) (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 67 percent respectively, while *initiatives* and *taxes* had the lowest pass rates with 49 percent and 53 percent passing (Again, see Trend Table A).

Trends in Bond and Tax Measures


- *Bonds* and *tax* measures each made up about 28% of the measures, a little more than one-half (56%) of all ballot measures over the 14 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* accounted for only 6% of the total local ballot measures (See Trend Table A).
 - School districts remain responsible for the vast majority of the *bonds* placed before voters—about 93% over 14 years of data collection. This is not surprising given the fact that bonds made up approximately 74% of the six types of measures in school district elections.
 - *Tax* measures are more dispersed, with over a third sponsored by counties (39%). Slightly less than a third (32%) is accounted for by cities, while less than one-fifth (15%) of local tax measures had their origin in local school districts (See Trend Table A).
- In the 14 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%, while the pass rate for taxes during the period was 53% (See Trend Table A).
 - Another trend observed during the 14-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 59% in odd years compared with 51% 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 57% in odd years and 38% in even years. The discrepancy for odd and even years was less for cities, with an average 59% pass rate in odd years and a 54% pass rate in even years. For

School Districts tax measures passed at nearly the same rate in odd and even years, about 60 and 61 percent, respectively (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 54%) 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 14. 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 11-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. The current year again displayed a slight uptick in number of measures, but it is too early to determine whether this signals an increasing and perhaps cyclical trend, or simply reflects a yearly variation.



- 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 seems to add even further evidence that this is not the case. Although the 2003 election seems to be an anomaly in this regard, other years of data collection, particularly the last four, suggest that as CSD/CSA measures increase or decrease as a percentage of all county measures, their passage rate sees a corresponding increase or decrease. That is, when the percentage of county measures that are CSD/CSA oriented increases, their passage rate also increases and when they decrease, their passage rate also decreases (See Figure 4 below).
- In the eleven years of CEDA data on CSD/CSA elections (since 1998), 242 ballot measures have presented CSD/CSA issues across the 58 counties. However, the use of CSD/CSA measures varied widely among these counties. Six counties accounted for nearly two-thirds (62%) of CSD/CSA-related measures—Contra Costa (19), El Dorado (38), Kern (16), Marin (33), San Diego (26) and San Luis Obispo (20). By contrast, 23 counties have had 5 or fewer CSD/CSA measures on their ballots over the 11-year period (See Trend Table C).



- In the 11 years since their inception, the principal type of CSD/CSA measure has involved taxes (167; 69%). Interestingly, another funding mechanism, bond measures, has only appeared as CSD/CSA proposals five times (2% of the total measures). Behind taxes, Gann Limit issues (24; 10%) and Ordinances (23; 10%) were a distant second and third in terms of prevalence on the ballot. Recalls (18), Bond measures (5)

and Advisory measures (5) together only accounted for about twelve percent of the total number of measures during the 11-year period (See Trend Table D).

- During the 11 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 (61%) and more apt to fail in even years (59% fail). Including this most recent year (2008) of data CSDs/CSAs and counties have very similar passage rates in terms of tax measures, 48 percent and 42 percent respectively. On the other hand, cities do slightly better than CSDs/CSAs, passing 55 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 2008 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 percent 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 related had a 39 percent pass rate, while CDS/CSA tax measures enjoyed a 48 percent passage rate (See Trend Table E).
- Public safety remains the most common focus of CSD/CSA measures (78 of the 242 measures; 32%). General Services (31) and Governance (31) were tied as the second most prevalent ballot measure, followed by Transportation (28) Public Facilities (25), Revenue (22), Environment (6) and Land Use (4) measures.
 - It is interesting to note that there were no Governance or Public Facility or Land Use measures for two years after tracking of CSDs/CSAs was initiated in 1998, but Governance has appeared as a CSD/CSA issue in every election since then. Public Facilities measures had appeared in all but one (2003), prior to the 2008 election, but this topic again had no measures presented in the current election (2008). By contrast, Land Use, which also did not appear as CSD/CSA measure in 1998, has only appeared in two elections, 2000 and 2005. Also interesting is the fact that three Environmental measures appeared in the first two years of CSD/CSA initiatives (1998 & 1999) but have not appeared since (See Trend Table F).

TRENDS REGARDING CANDIDATES

During the 14 years of CEDA tracking of local office elections, 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 14 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 2005 and the 2007 elections, school district candidates have the largest number of candidates in the off-year election cycles where they make up about two-thirds of the candidates on the ballot.
- In two of the prior even-year elections, 2000 and 2004, and again in the 2008 election, there were a slightly greater percentage 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 14 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.
- Over the 14 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 24 percent were seeking CSD/CSA seats.
- On average, during the 14 years of CEDA data collection, slightly less than one-third (about 31%) of all candidates for local offices were incumbents.
 - About 34 percent of those seeking school district seats were incumbents.
 - Approximately 25 percent of those seeking city council positions were incumbents.
 - About 26 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 seat races in odd-year elections. (See Trend Table I).
- During the 14 year period, nearly four out of every five (79%) incumbents running for local reelection won their respective offices (See Figure 5 and Trend Table I).
 - Seventy-seven (77%) percent of incumbent school district candidates won their elections.
 - About 79 percent of incumbent city council office holders won their elections.
 - About 81 percent of those running for county supervisor¹ seats held the office (See Trend Table I).

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.

- In local elections, during the past 14 years, a little more than half (52%) of winning candidates were 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.



2008 ELECTION DATA

BALLOT MEASURES

California voters faced a total of 593 county, city and school district local ballot measures in 2008 of which 445 or 75% were enacted. The number of measures is slightly below the average of 603 measures in even numbered years since 1996 but the pass rate in 2008 was above average. Bonds and tax measures were the most common, accounting for 389 or 66% of all measures. The most frequent topics of local ballot measures were governance (99 measures or 17% of all); revenue (92 measures or 16%) and land use (43 measures or 7%). Only 2% of all local measures were placed on the ballot through the initiative process.

Bond mania returned to California during 2008. Voters faced 201 separate local bond measures totaling \$35.6 trillion. Of these, voters approved 169 totaling \$33.6 trillion and rejected 32, totaling \$2.0 trillion. The CEDA Report for 2007 noted a marked decline in the number of bond measures with only 22 county, city and school district bonds on that year's ballot of which 12 were approved for a pass rate of 55 percent. This is in comparison to a mean of 71 bond measures in odd-number years with a pass rate of 60 percent since 1995. However, the 201 bond measures in 2008 is the second highest total since 1995 (there were 245 such measures in 2002) and the 2008 pass rate of 84 percent is the highest since 1995. Consequently, it would appear that whatever dynamics that had led to the unprecedented rejection of two state bond measures in 2006 and record low number of local bonds in 2007 were no longer operative in 2008.

There were three county bonds totaling \$840 million; one in Santa Clara for the Santa Clara Valley Medical Center and two in the City-County of San Francisco for hospital earthquake safety and for parks. The five city bond measures totaled \$199 million. All five were approved by the voters in Berkeley (\$26 million for branch libraries) Gilroy (\$37 million for earthquake retrofitting), Martinez (\$30 million for parks and libraries), San Jose (\$76 million for libraries and community centers) and San Juan Capistrano (\$30 million for open space and parks). As usual, school districts accounted for the overwhelming majority of bond measures. School districts proposed 193 bond measures of which 161 passed totaling \$32.5 trillion and 32, totaling \$2 trillion, failed. School bond measures ranged from \$715,000 in Tulare County's Stone Corral Elementary District (with about 140 students) to Los Angeles Unified's \$7 billion bond measure (both measures passed). Other notably large bond measures included \$3.5 billion for Los Angeles Community College, \$2.1 billion for San Diego Unified, \$1.2 billion for Long Beach Unified, and \$500 million each for San Bernardino Community College, Center Joint Unified (Sacramento County) and Victor Valley Union High School District. Indeed, more than fifty bond measures exceeded \$100 million.

The 2007 CEDA Report also noted the unusual number and high success rates of local tax measures. A total of 61 tax measures faced local voters in 2007 of which 45 or 74 percent were approved. That was the highest pass rate for tax measures since 1995. Indeed, the median number of tax measures in odd numbered years since 1995 is 69 with a pass rate of 59 percent. This pattern, in contrast with bond measures, did continue in 2008 with a total of 188 tax measures facing local voters who approved 126 for a pass rate of 67%. Since 1995, the average number of tax measures in even numbered years is 167 with a pass rate of approximately 51 percent. Thus 2008 witnessed an above average number of tax measures which were significantly more likely to pass than the average since 1995. Tax measures with

especially high pass rates included hotel/occupancy taxes (15 measures of which 12 or 80% passed); sales tax increases or extensions (44 measures of which 28 or 64% were enacted) and business taxes (5 of which 3 or 60% passed).

Of particular interest is the fate of San Diego's Measure A that would have created a parcel tax to fund a regional fire protection agency. The measure failed, receiving only 63.6% when a two-thirds vote was needed. In 2003, 2006 and 2007 San Diego was hit with devastating wildfires. The October 2006 fire was one of the worst in California history. Thousands of acres burned, more than 2,400 homes and business were destroyed and 16 people died. Reports after the 2003 and 2006 fires indicated a serious contributing factor to the devastation was the shortage of fire fighting resources (e.g., San Diego policy's of not investing in fire-fighting aircraft relying instead on mutual assistance arrangements with the state, Los Angeles and Orange Counties, the latter having aircraft assets. Unfortunately, when the San Diego fires started, both LA and Orange also had wildfires and thus their aircrafts were unavailable for use in San Diego). As reported in the 2004 CEDA Report, San Diego voters turned down Measure C which would have increased the City's hotel tax to fund emergency services. The failure of Measure C, which garnered 61% of the vote but not the requisite two-thirds) contributed to the resignation of the city fire chief in 2006. The failure of Measure A apparently leaves San Diego still in search of fire service funding.

Public opinion polls in California tend to indicate dissatisfaction with elected officials. That dissatisfaction was both reflected and rebutted by local ballot measures in 2008. Dissatisfaction was evidenced by the revival of term limit measures. From 2005 through 2007 the only term limit measures were efforts to ease existing term limits (5 were defeated and three passed). The last time a local government enacted term limits was in 2004. In 2008, however, three cities (Lynwood, Pinole and Tracy) and one county (Ventura) enacted term limits. Voters in Downey rejected a term limit measure while those in Garden Grove and Santa Ana eased existing term limit ordinances. On the other hand, voters in Placer County approved a pay raise for the county supervisors and the City of Albany did the same for council members. There were 11 measures that sought to change elective positions such as City Clerk to appointed ones, of which seven failed and five passed. The successful measures were in more populous and urban areas (e.g., County of Marin and the Cities of Concord, Los Gatos) while voters in less populous and less urban areas voted to keep their elected positions (e.g., Colusa, Nevada City, San Juan Bautista, Yuba City). Chula Vista went its own way voting to change the appointed City Attorney to an elected position.

As always local voters faced ballot measures consistent with California's tradition of eclectic, entertaining and sometimes eccentric politics. In 2008 these included:

- An unsuccessful San Francisco measure to rename a water treatment plant the "George W. Bush Sewage Plant;"
- Another unsuccessful San Francisco measure to declare it the City's policy to turn Alcatraz into an International Peace Center;
- A third unsuccessful San Francisco measure to require the police not to enforce laws against prostitution;

- A Porterville measure to add “In God We Trust” to the city’s motto and a measure in Villa Park to require that “In God We Trust” be displayed in the City Council Chambers. Both measures passed;
- The City of Riverside regulated the number of crowing roosters and required the roosters to be housed from sunset to sunrise in noise reducing acoustical structures; and
- The Manila Community Service District in Humboldt County voted against fluoridating its water.

County Measures. In 2008 there were a total of 90 county ballot measures. All of the state’s counties had at least one ballot measure. Of the 90 county measures, 56 or 62% passed while 34 or 38% failed. The bulk of county measures were ordinances (40) and tax measures (33). Governance issues predominated (25) with public safety and facilities issues (14 measures each) also frequent. The City and County of San Francisco accounted for a third of all county measures with 32 measures of which 21 or 66% were enacted. Fresno, Humboldt, Lassen, Monterey, San Diego, Sutter and Yuba Counties each had a single county ballot measure which was defeated. In contrast to 2007 when no land use measure was passed, county voters approved 6 of 7 land use measures in 2008.

Unusually, there was a county recall election in 2008. Voters in Mono County recalled their tax assessor, James Lovett. Lovett, who had been appointed to the position in 2007, had been accused of spending as little as six hours a week doing the job for which he was paid \$134,000 annually. A drunk-driving arrest and critical grand jury report helped convince Mono County voters, who recalled Lovett on a vote of 2,697 to recall and 181 against.

City Measures. Voters in 165 cities passed judgment on a total of 258 city ballot measures of which 188 or 73% passed and 70 or 27% failed. The overall total is less than the average in even numbered year election since 1996 of 302 measures, though the 73% pass rate is the highest in any year since 1995. The majority of city measures dealt with taxes (111 or 43% of all city measures), ordinances (80 or 31%), and charter amendments (35 or 14%). Measure topics included revenues (81 or 31%), governance (74 or 29%), land use (36 or 14%) and public safety issues (25 or 10%). City voters approved 79 of 111 tax measures or 71% and all of the five bonds measures on the ballot. There were a total of nine initiative measures of which 8 were approved. The only unsuccessful initiative was a Berkeley measure to eliminate municipal limits on medical marijuana. Buellton, Pleasanton, and San Juan Capistrano each adopted initiatives protecting open space or establishing growth limits.

An interesting development occurred in the City of Sierra Madre in Los Angeles County which had a ballot measure which would have prevented the City from reducing the number of budget positions in the police department and required the City to provide police with salary and benefits higher than the average provided by other cities in the area. This measure was an initiative sponsored by the Sierra Madre Police Officers Association but was defeated by a 2:1 margin.

A total of eight city elected officials faced recall elections in 2008 of which only 3 or 38% were successful. Two members of the Pinole City Council were decisively recalled while in the City of Commerce one council member was recalled by a margin of 35 votes while another survived the recall by 18 votes. Three members of the Maywood City Council easily defeated recall attempts. The mayor of Colton also rebuffed a recall.

School District Measures. The year 2008 saw a total of 245 school district ballot measures of which 201 or 82% were approved and 44 or 18% were rejected by the voters. In comparison, the average for even numbered years since 1996 is 191 with a 69% pass rate. Thus 2008 was above average in both the number of school district measures considered and the number that were approved by the voters. Bond measures accounted for 193 of the 245 school district measures. Indeed, school bonds represented 33% of all local ballot measures in 2008. In addition, there were 44 tax measures or 18% of school measures. The tax measures enjoyed a pass rate of 75%, just slightly more than the overall tax measure approval rate of all local ballot measures of 74%.

A pattern of fewer than average recall elections continued in 2008. In 2007 no elected school board official faced a recall. In 2008 there were recall elections, but only 3 which is below the even-year average of 5 and is the second lowest number of recalls since 1995 (the lowest two occurred in 2003 and 2004). There has not been double-digit number of recalls of school trustees since 2001 when 14 such elections were held. One trustee from Manhattan Beach Unified and two trustees from Capistrano Unified were successfully recalled.

Live Oak Unified School District in Sutter County defeated a measure to abolish the district trustee areas and elect the school board at-large.

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

A total of 5,246 Californians ran for local elected office in 2008 of which 2,462 were elected 47% were elected. The even-year average since 1996 is 5,472; the number of 2008 candidates is the third lowest and the fourth highest of all even-numbered election years since 1996. Whatever woes California experienced last year, the willingness of its citizens to run for public office did not suffer appreciably. Offices filled included 188 county supervisorial seats, 167 other county offices, 834 city council seats, 227 other city positions and 1,046 school district trustee positions for a total of 2,462 positions.

A little more than a third of all local candidates were incumbents seeking reelection (1,804 or 34%). Being an incumbent greatly increased a candidate's chances of victory as 76% of incumbents won. As large as a percentage this is, it does not translate to a lack of turnover in local office as only 56% of winning candidates were incumbents. In other words, of the 2,462 people elected to local office, 1,085 or 44% were non-incumbents. Because of the defeat of incumbents seeking reelection (427) or incumbents who do not, for whatever reason, run for reelection, more than two-fifths of all local officials elected in 2008 were brand new to their office.

County Races. All fifty-eight California counties elected their officials in even-numbered years. Counties elect five-member board of supervisors (their four year terms are staggered so not all seats are up each year) except the City and County of San Francisco which has an eleven member board. Counties also elect sheriffs, clerks, district attorneys and members of the governing boards of community service districts (CSD), which are agencies of the county. In 2008 a total of 188 county supervisor seats, 95 community service district directors and 72 other county offices were contested.

Incumbent county supervisors were usually successful in seeking reelection with 85% of incumbents winning their races. However, incumbents accounted for only 61% of all 188 winners: 74 non-incumbents were elected, 20 of who beat incumbents while 114 incumbents were reelected. Boards of Supervisors thus experienced a 39% turnover in 2008. Incumbent

supervisors were defeated in 16 counties and forced into run-off elections in another five counties. In Modoc and San Luis Obispo Counties two of the three incumbents seeking reelection were defeated. In Plumas County of the two incumbents seeking reelection one was defeated and the other reelected with only 50.3% of the vote. In contrast, all three Tehama County incumbents were not only reelected, they faced no challengers.

The numbers were reversed in elections for the Boards of Directors of CSDs: a total of 95 directors were elected of whom 53 or 56% were non-incumbents and 42 or 44% were incumbents. A total of 26 incumbent directors seeking reelection were defeated.

Superior Court judges were the most likely incumbents to be reelected with 94% of those who sought reelection being successful. However of the 54 judgeships filled by election in 2008, only 15 or 28% were incumbent judges while 39 or 72% were non-incumbents. Only one incumbent judge was defeated, Judge Thomas Mellon, who was beat by a San Francisco County Supervisor. This data needs to be considered within the context that in California most superior court vacancies are, in fact, filled by gubernatorial appointment. Superior Courts judges are elected but if a vacancy occurs during the term of an incumbent judge, the governor has the authority to fill the vacancy by appointment. The appointed judge appears on the next election ballot.

City Races. Nearly 2,300 Californians ran for 1,061 elective city offices in 2008. There were 1,875 candidates for city councils, 210 for mayorships, 101 for city treasurer, 72 for city clerk and 24 for other city offices. Incumbents won 83% of their races but non-incumbents represented 41% of all winners.

A total of 570 incumbent city council members sought reelection of which 456 or 80% were victorious and only 114 or 20% were defeated. On the other hand, of the 834 city council seats filled in 2008, 378 or 45% were won by non-incumbents. Incumbent mayors were especially successful with 55 or 87% of the 63 seeking reelection being successful. Again, however there was a 30% turnover among the state's mayors as 24 of the 79 elected in 2008 were non-incumbents. Only 2 of 55 incumbent city clerks (Colton and Fillmore) and 4 of 61 incumbent city treasurers (Avalon, Coachella, Fillmore and Lake Elsinore) were defeated for incumbent reelection rates of 96% for city clerks and 93% for city treasurers. Voters in Fillmore ousted the City Clerk and City Treasurer as well as one of the two incumbent city council members running for reelection. Interestingly, in at least 19 cities all incumbent city council members seeking reelection were defeated.

School District Races. More than a thousand Californians were elected to school boards in 2008. Specifically, 1,046 school trustees were elected of whom 577 were incumbents and 469 were non-incumbents. The incumbents' reelection rate was 70% but incumbents accounted for only 55% of winners while non-incumbents represented 45% of elected trustees. The 70% reelection rate was, interestingly, the lowest since 1995 but the 55% of winning candidates who were incumbents is the fourth highest since 1995. In 27 districts all incumbents seeking reelection were defeated.

It should be noted that the total number of school board candidates in 2008, 2,182, was below the even-number year average since 1996 of 2,279 and represents a slight downward trend. The number of candidates was 2,548 in 1996, dropped in 1998 (2,432) and 2000 (2,059), reversed in 2002 (2,450), but has again declined every year since.

2008 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	2/5	3/4	4/8	5/6	6/3	6/24	8/26	11/4	12/9
Alameda	✓	✓			✓			✓	
Alpine					✓			✓	
Amador					✓			✓	
Butte	✓				✓			✓	
Calaveras					✓			✓	
Colusa					✓			✓	
Contra Costa	✓				✓			✓	
Del Norte					✓			✓	
El Dorado					✓			✓	
Fresno	✓				✓			✓	
Glenn	✓				✓			✓	
Humboldt	✓				✓			✓	
Imperial	✓				✓			✓	
Inyo					✓			✓	
Kern	✓				✓			✓	
Lake					✓			✓	
Lassen					✓			✓	
Los Angeles	✓		✓		✓			✓	✓
Madera	✓				✓			✓	
Marin	✓				✓			✓	
Mariposa	✓				✓			✓	
Mendocino	✓				✓			✓	
Merced	✓				✓			✓	
Modoc					✓			✓	
Mono					✓			✓	
Monterey	✓				✓			✓	
Napa	✓				✓			✓	
Nevada					✓			✓	
Orange	✓				✓	✓		✓	

2008 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	2/5	3/4	4/8	5/6	6/3	6/24	8/26	11/4	12/9
Placer	✓				✓			✓	
Plumas					✓			✓	
Riverside	✓				✓			✓	
Sacramento	✓				✓			✓	
San Benito					✓			✓	
San Bernardino	✓				✓			✓	
San Diego	✓				✓			✓	
San Francisco	✓				✓			✓	
San Joaquin	✓				✓			✓	
San Luis Obispo					✓			✓	
San Mateo	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	
Santa Barbara	✓				✓			✓	
Santa Clara	✓				✓			✓	
Santa Cruz	✓				✓		✓	✓	
Shasta	✓				✓			✓	
Siskiyou					✓			✓	
Solano					✓			✓	
Sonoma	✓				✓	✓		✓	
Stanislaus	✓				✓			✓	
Sutter					✓			✓	
Tehama					✓			✓	
Trinity					✓			✓	
Tulare	✓				✓			✓	
Tuolumne					✓			✓	
Ventura					✓	✓		✓	
Yolo					✓			✓	
Yuba	✓				✓			✓	

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	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate
ALL MEASURES																					
1995-2008	428	100	63	118	28	67	118	28	53	94	22	60	15	4	67	10	2	49	53	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	252	100	63	71	28	60	69	27	59	48	19	61	15	6	69	6	2	49	32	13	79
COUNTY																					
1995-2008	71	17	57	2	3	60	28	39	42	23	32	64	2	3	72	2	3	47	7	10	65
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	32	13	67	2	7	73	12	36	57	10	32	70	3	8	83	0	1	67	2	8	65
CITY																					
1995-2008	209	49	53	6	3	63	68	32	55	63	30	57	7	3	66	8	4	49	45	22	79
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	115	46	64	3	3	54	34	29	59	31	27	53	5	4	74	5	4	46	30	26	80
SCHOOL DISTRICT																					
1995-2008	148	34	67	109	74	67	22	15	61	8	5	78	6	4	68	0	0	100			
EVEN YEARS	191	32	69	153	80	70	21	11	61	8	4	76	5	3	76						
ODD YEARS	104	41	62	66	63	60	23	22	60	7	7	80	8	7	62	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
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

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	
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	
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							

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	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate
ALL MEASURES																											
1995-2008	428	100	63	147	34	67	98	23	63	36	8	50	26	6	48	23	5	45	19	4	60	12	3	51	52	12	49
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	54	9	57
ODD YEARS	252	100	63	104	41	62	56	22	73	19	7	50	12	5	55	11	4	63	12	5	66	6	2	51	27	12	73
COUNTY																											
1995-2008	71	17	57	1	1	78	20	28	69	7	10	46	9	12	45	8	12	48	5	8	63	8	11	64	8	11	51
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	12	11	53
ODD YEARS	32	13	67	0	1	100	9	29	75	3	8	39	3	10	54	4	13	72	3	10	74	3	11	75	4	9	43
CITY																											
1995-2008	209	49	62	1	1	63	76	36	68	29	14	58	17	8	57	14	7	56	14	7	63	4	2	43	43	21	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	60	20	63
ODD YEARS	115	46	64	1	1	50	44	39	72	16	14	52	9	8	56	7	6	52	9	8	63	3	2	26	24	22	78
SCHOOL																											
1995-2008	148	34	67	145	98	58	2	1	63				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	0	83
EVEN YEARS	191	32	70	187	98	56	2	1	43				0	0	0				0	0	0				1	1	83
ODD YEARS	104	41	62	102	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	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	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	
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	
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	

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

	1998			1999			2000			2001			2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			2008			1998-2008																	
	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate																		
Butte							1	100	100																						1	10	100																		
Calaveras																																4	57	75																	
Contra Costa	1	33	100				4	80	25	1	100	100	2	100	50				3	60	67	3	100	100				2	100	100	3	100	67	19	73	68															
El Dorado	2	12	50				7	78	29				1	50	100	6	100	0	2	20	100	14	88	64	2	100	0	3	100	100	1	50	0	38	57	47															
Fresno	1	50	100																													1	8	100																	
Humboldt																																1	100	0	4	36	25														
Imperial																																	1	13	100																
Inyo							1	50	100																								1	13	100																
Kern	6	100	50				2	100	0	4	100	75																					16	80	50																
Lake																																1	100	100	2	33	50														
Lassen							1	33	0				4	80	25																		7	64	29																
Marin				4	100	100	5	100	80	10	91	90	3	100	100	1	100	100																	33	79	94														
Mendocino				1	100	0							1	100	0																			3	43	33															
Monterey													1	100	0																			1	9	0															
Nevada							1	100	100																									1	25	100															
Orange	1	100	100													1	100	100																2	12	100															
Placer	1	33	100																														1	33	0	2	18	50													
Plumas							1	100	100	2	100	100				1	50	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	75	33																									1	100	100	6	38	67												
San Bernardino	2	100	50				3	100	67				1	100	0	1	100	0	1	20	0												1	50	100	9	64	44													
San Diego	10	83	30				3	60	33	1	100	100	2	40	0																			2	40	100	5	100	100	26	59	50									
San Joaquin																																			1	100	100	1	25	100											
San Luis Obispo				5	100	100	1	33	0				1	50	100																				4	67	50	4	100	100	5	83	100								
San Mateo																																			1	14	100				1	25	100	2	12	100					
Santa Barbara										1	100	0																											1	10	0										
Santa Cruz																																					1	100	0	1	11	0									
Shasta							1	100	0																												1	100	0												
Siskiyou							2	100	100																												5	83	0				2	100	0	3	75	33	12	86	25
Sonoma							1	20	100	1	100	100				1	100	100																						1	50	0				4	25	75			

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

	1998			1999			2000			2001			2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			2008			1998-2008		
	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate	N	%	Pass Rate			
Stanislaus																								1	50	0				1	25	0	2	25	0	
Trinity																									1	50	100							1	20	100
Tulare															1	100	100																	2	67	0
Tuolumne				1	100	0				1	33	0																						2	25	100
Yuba							2	67	50								1	25	0															3	25	33
Total for CSD/CSA Measures Over All Counties	26	21	54	14	42	71	40	35	48	21	58	81	18	18	44	13	46	38	29	20	48	31	54	74	20	22	50	13	45	92	17	19	59	242	29	59

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

	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	26	21	54	19	16	58													7	6	14
1999	14	42	71	11	33	64									3	9	100				
2000	40	35	48	28	24	29	1	1	100	3	3	67			6	5	100	2	2	100	
2001	21	58	81	11	31	82	2	6	100				3	8	100	3	8	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	29	20	48	23	16	39				1	1	100			2	1	100	3	2	67	
2005	31	54	74	23	40	65	2	4	100				3	5	100	1	2	100	2	4	100
2006	20	22	50	14	15	50							4	4	25				2	2	100
2007	13	45	92	3	10	67							8	28	100	1	3	100	1	3	100
2008	17	19	59	10	11	40				1	1	0			4	4	100	2	2	100	
1998-2008	242	29	59	167	20	48	5	1	100	5	1	60	18	2	83	24	3	96	23	3	61

TREND TABLE E COMPARISON OF PASS RATES FOR COUNTY-WIDE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT/ COUNTY SERVICE AREA TAX MEASURES, 1998-2008

	Total Number of County Measures	NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE MEASURES		CSD/CSA MEASURES		NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE TAX MEASURES		CSD/CSA COUNTY TAX MEASURES	
		Number of Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	Pass Rate
1998	121	95	60	26	54	13	9	19	58
1999	33	19	64	14	71	5	20	11	64
2000	116	75	50	40	48	24	30	28	29
2001	36	15	67	21	81	2	50	11	82
2002	98	80	59	18	44	24	50	14	36
2003	28	15	87	13	38	1	0	11	27
2004	142	113	56	29	48	36	47	23	39
2005	57	26	50	31	74	1	100	23	65
2006	93	73	52	20	50	30	37	14	50
2007	29	16	63	13	92			3	67
2008	90	73	63	17	59	23	43	10	40
1998-2008	843	600	58	242	59	159	39	167	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	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	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate
1998	26	21	54				12	10	58				3	2	33	2	2	50				6	5	17			
1999	14	42	71				2	6	50				3	9	0	5	15	100									
2000	40	35	48	2	2	0	10	9	30	2	2	100				6	5	17	5	4	40	5	4	60	1	1	100
2001	21	58	81				6	17	100	4	11	75				1	3	0	4	11	75	4	11	75	2	6	100
2002	18	18	44				11	11	45	3	3	67							3	3	33	1	1	0			
2003	13	46	38				5	18	40	2	7	100													6	21	17
2004	29	20	48				17	12	47	1	1	0				3	2	33	4	3	50	1	1	0	2	1	100
2005	31	54	74	2	4	0	1	2	100	3	5	100				6	11	100	6	11	67	9	16	78	4	7	50
2006	20	22	50				7	8	71	5	5	40				2	2	50	2	2	0	2	2	50	2	2	50
2007	13	45	92							9	31	100				1	3	0	1	3	100	2	7	100			
2008	17	19	59				7	8	43	2	2	100				2	2	50				1	1	0	5	6	80
1998-2008	242	29	59	4	0	0	78	9	52	31	4	81	6	1	17	28	3	57	25	3	52	31	4	55	22	3	59

TREND TABLE G NUMBER OF CANDIDATES BY JURISDICTION AND YEAR

	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES			
	ALL CANDIDATES	COUNTY CANDIDATES	CITY CANDIDATES	SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES
1995	2,381	0	754	1,627
1996	5,530	822	2,160	2,548
1997	2,498	25	748	1,729
1998	5,502	1,167	1,903	2,432
1999	2,293	138	738	1,417
2000	5,153	894	2,200	2,059
2001	2,525	189	702	1,634
2002	6,072	1,412	2,210	2,450
2003	2,106	213	571	1,322
2004	5,155	878	2,232	2,045
2005	2,580	167	1,005	1,408
2006	5,644	1,247	2,162	2,235
2007	2,051	207	833	1,011
2008	5,246	782	2,282	2,182
Total	54,736	8,141	20,500	26,099

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	2,381	0	0	0	*	*
1996	5,530	822	574	70	*	*
1997	2,498	25	21	84	*	*
1998	5,502	1,167	362	31	22	2
1999	2,293	138	5	4	109	79
2000	5,153	894	501	56	174	19
2001	2,525	189	0	0	186	98
2002	6,072	1,412	362	26	266	19
2003	2,106	213	10	5	181	85
2004	5,155	878	523	60	235	27
2005	2,580	167	4	2	155	93
2006	5,644	1,247	366	29	235	19
2007	2,051	207	10	5	179	86
2008	5,246	782	441	56	174	22
TOTAL	54,736	8,141	3,179	39	1,916	24

*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	23	28
	1997	30	5	23	33
	1998	32	27	26	32
	1999	30	0	23	32
	2000	30	30	26	32
	2001	30	0	24	32
	2002	34	32	27	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	30	30	38
PERCENTAGE OF INCUMBENTS WHO WIN	1995	79	0	78	78
	1996	79	69	75	78
	1997	76	0	79	74
	1998	85	86	82	83
	1999	77	0	80	75
	2000	79	87	80	75
	2001	77	0	79	76
	2002	82	78	79	79
	2003	76	0	72	77
	2004	80	78	81	76
	2005	79	0	81	77
	2006	81	86	78	78
	2007	76	0	78	75
	2008	76	85	80	70
PERCENTAGE OF WINNING CANDIDATES WHO ARE INCUMBENTS	1995	49	0	39	50
	1996	47	43	42	47
	1997	49	0	45	49
	1998	55	56	48	53
	1999	51	0	45	51
	2000	52	67	51	50
	2001	50	0	51	49
	2002	56	56	49	56
	2003	50	0	39	54
	2004	55	55	51	57
	2005	52	0	50	52
	2006	55	59	51	56
	2007	49	0	52	48
	2008	56	61	55	55

2008 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, 2008

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION STATEMENT		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	14	8	4	0	15	1			3	1					0	1			36	11	47
Amador	1	0																	1	0	1
Butte			2	2															2	2	4
Calaveras			1	0															1	0	1
Colusa	1	1													0	1			1	2	3
Contra Costa	9	2	4	0							2	0	2		6	0			23	2	25
Del Norte			1	0															1	0	1
El Dorado	0	1	4	1											1	0			5	2	7
Fresno	4	3	5	5											0	1			9	9	18
Glenn			1	2											1	0			2	2	4
Humboldt	5	0	2	0			0	1							2	0			9	1	10
Imperial	1	1	0	2											1	0			2	3	5
Inyo			1	0															1	0	1
Kern	1	2	8	0															9	2	11
Kings			2	0															2	0	2
Lake	1	0																	1	0	1
Lassen	0	1	1	0															1	1	2
Los Angeles	19	7	28	1	1	1	5	0	1	0	2	4			6	4			62	17	79
Madera			2	0											0	1			2	1	3
Marin	5	0	1	0									2		3	1			11	1	12
Mariposa			1	0															1	0	1
Mendocino	0	1	1	1											1	0			2	2	4
Merced			2	1											1	0			3	1	4
Modoc	0	1																	0	1	1
Mono	1	0	0	1							1	0							2	1	3
Monterey	2	3	2	1			1	0											5	4	9
Napa			0	1											4	0			4	1	5
Nevada	1	0	0	2											0	4			1	6	7

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION STATEMENT		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Orange	1	2	9	0	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	0			9	2			28	4	32
Placer	0	3	3	4	1	0									1	1			5	8	13
Riverside	4	0	6	0											6	0			16	0	16
Sacramento	2	0	3	0											1	0			6	0	6
San Benito	0	1	1	1											1	2			2	4	6
San Bernardino	3	2	12	0	2	0	1	0			0	1			3	1			21	4	25
San Diego	5	3	11	0	5	0	1	0							6	3			28	6	34
San Francisco	5	0	2	0											13	11	2	0	22	11	33
San Joaquin			3	0											2	0			5	0	5
San Luis Obispo	1	0			1	0									0	1			2	1	3
San Mateo	7	5	3	0	0	2													10	7	17
Santa Barbara	5	2	2	1	1	0			1	0									9	3	12
Santa Clara	9	1	10	0	2	0							1	0	4	2			26	3	29
Santa Cruz	6	2	1	2									1	0					8	4	12
Shasta			5	1															5	1	6
Siskiyou	1	3	1	0															2	3	5
Solano	1	0	1	0											1	0			3	0	3
Sonoma	4	2	3	1											1	1			8	4	12
Stanislaus	0	2	4	0	1	0			2	0					1	0			8	2	10
Sutter			1	0											1	2			2	2	4
Tehama					1	0									1	0			2	0	2
Trinity			1	0															1	0	1
Tulare	0	1	7	1	1	0													8	2	10
Tuolumne	1	0																	1	0	1
Ventura	3	1	4	0					1	0					3	3			11	4	15
Yolo	3	0	1	0			1	0											5	0	5
Yuba	0	1	2	1											0	1			2	3	5
All Counties	126	62	169	32	35	4	10	1	10	1	7	5	6	0	80	43	2	0	445	148	593

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	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	7	1	2	0	2	4	14	2			0	1	1	2			2	0	7	1	1	0	36	11	47
Amador					1	0																	1	0	1
Butte	2	2																					2	2	4
Calaveras	1	0																					1	0	1
Colusa					1	0	0	1										0	1				1	2	3
Contra Costa	7	1	2	0	0	1	6	0			1	0	2	0				5	0				23	2	25
Del Norte	1	0																					1	0	1
El Dorado	4	1									1	1											5	2	7
Fresno	5	5			2	1	0	1					0	1				2	1				9	9	18
Glenn	2	2																					2	2	4
Humboldt	2	0															0	1	5	0	2	0	9	1	10
Imperial	0	2			0	1					1	0					1	0					2	3	5
Inyo	1	0																					1	0	1
Kern	8	0									0	1						1	1				9	2	11
Kings	2	0																					2	0	2
Lake											1	0											1	0	1
Lassen	1	0											0	1									1	1	2
Los Angeles	30	3	4	1	2	1	5	7					1	0	1	0		18	4	1	1		62	17	79
Madera	2	0					0	1															2	1	3
Marin	4	0			2	0	1	1	1	0								3	0				11	1	12
Mariposa	1	0																					1	0	1
Mendocino	1	2			1	0																	2	2	4
Merced	2	1					1	0															3	1	4
Modoc					0	1																	0	1	1
Mono	0	1					1	0					1	0									2	1	3
Monterey	3	1					1	0			0	1						1	2				5	4	9

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	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
Napa	0	1	3	0			1	0															4	1	5
Nevada	0	2	0	2			0	2			1	0											1	6	7
Orange	10	0	7	1			7	1					1	0					1	2	2	0	28	4	32
Placer	3	5	1	0			1	1					0	1					0	1			5	8	13
Riverside	6	0	1	0			5	0											4	0			16	0	16
Sacramento	3	0			1	0	1	0											1	0			6	0	6
San Benito	1	1	1	0			0	2											0	1			2	4	6
San Bernardino	12	0	2	0	0	2	3	1					1	1					3	0			21	4	25
San Diego	11	0	1	3	2	1	7	0					4	1					3	1			28	6	34
San Francisco	2	0			0	1	9	4	1	0			4	2	1	2	2	0	2	0	1	2	22	11	33
San Joaquin	3	0					1	0											1	0			5	0	5
San Luis Obispo			0	1			1	0					1	0									2	1	3
San Mateo	7	2	0	2	1	0							0	1					2	2			10	7	17
Santa Barbara	4	1			0	2					1	0					2	0	2	0			9	3	12
Santa Clara	14	0	2	1	1	0	2	0					4	1					3	1			26	3	29
Santa Cruz	4	2			1	1			1	0			1	0					1	1			8	4	12
Shasta	5	1																					5	1	6
Siskiyou	1	0			1	2													0	1			2	3	5
Solano	2	0	1	0																			3	0	3
Sonoma	5	3															1	1	2	0			8	4	12
Stanislaus	4	0	2	0	0	1	2	0			0	1											8	2	10
Sutter	2	0					0	2															2	2	4
Tehama							2	0															2	0	2
Trinity	1	0																					1	0	1
Tulare	7	1			0	1															1	0	8	2	10
Tuolumne					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, 2008

	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
Ventura	5	2	2	0			2	0			0	2					2	0					11	4	15
Yolo	2	0									1	0					2	0					5	0	5
Yuba	2	1	0	1													0	1					2	3	5
All Counties	202	44	31	12	19	20	73	26	3	0	7	7	21	11	2	2	8	2	71	21	8	3	445	148	593

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2008

		County Supervisor		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	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	85.1	114	61.8	42	94.1	16	80.0	456	91.4	170	69.9	577	76.3	1,375
	Lose	14.9	20	38.2	26	5.9	1	20.0	114	8.6	16	30.1	249	23.7	426
	Total	100.0	134	100.0	68	100.0	17	100.0	570	100.0	186	100.0	826	100.0	1,801
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	24.1	74	50.0	53	37.3	56	29.0	378	25.8	57	34.6	469	31.6	1,087
	Lose	75.9	233	50.0	53	62.7	94	71.0	927	74.2	164	65.4	887	68.4	2,358
	Total	100.0	307	100.0	106	100.0	150	100.0	1,305	100.0	221	100.0	1,356	100.0	3,445
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	60.6	114	44.2	42	22.2	16	54.7	456	74.9	170	55.2	577	55.8	1,375
	Non-Incumbent	39.4	74	55.8	53	77.8	56	45.3	378	25.1	57	44.8	469	44.2	1,087
	Total	100.0	188	100.0	95	100.0	72	100.0	834	100.0	227	100.0	1,046	100.0	2,462
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	7.9	20	32.9	26	1.1	1	11.0	114	8.9	16	55.2	249	15.3	426
	Non-Incumbent	92.1	233	67.1	53	98.9	94	89.0	927	91.1	164	78.1	887	84.7	2,358
	Total	100.0	253	100.0	79	100.0	95	100.0	1,041	100.0	180	100.0	1,136	100.0	2,784
All Candidates	Incumbent	30.4	134	39.1	68	10.2	17	30.4	570	45.7	186	37.9	826	34.3	1,801
	Non-Incumbent	69.6	307	60.9	106	89.8	150	69.6	1,305	54.3	221	62.1	1,356	65.7	3,445
	Total	100.0	441	100.0	174	100.0	167	100.0	1,875	100.0	106	100.0	2,182	100.0	5,246

*Directors of Community Service Districts, and Community Service Areas

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	2/5/2008	Measure A	Property Tax	Facilities: Health Facilities	165,330	401,001	41.2%	Fail ^T
		Measure B	Property Tax	Facilities: Health Facilities	122,676	394,964	31.1%	Fail ^T
	6/3/2008	Measure F	Utility Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	125,436	190,730	65.8%	Pass
ALPINE	No County Measures							
AMADOR	11/4/2008	Measure M	Sales Tax	Safety: Fire	12,075	17,424	69.3%	Pass ^T
BUTTE	No County Measures							
CALAVERAS	No County Measures							
COLUSA	No County Measures							
CONTRA COSTA	11/4/2008	Measure F	Property Tax	Safety: Police	870	2,187	39.8%	Fail ^T
		Measure R	Gann Limit	Revenues	1,190	1,499	79.4%	Pass
		Measure S	Gann Limit	Revenues	2,385	3,306	72.1%	Pass
DEL NORTE	No County Measures							
EL DORADO	11/4/2008	Measure H	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	285	512	55.7%	Fail ^T
		Measure Y	Ordinance	Transport: Traffic Regulation/Reduction	59,835	83,332	71.8%	Pass
FRESNO	11/4/2008	Measure L	Sales Tax	Facilities: Libraries	163,792	258,324	63.4%	Fail ^T
GLENN	No County Measures							
HUMBOLDT	2/5/2008	Measure B	Advisory	General Services: Water	60	224	26.8%	Fail
IMPERIAL	2/5/2008	Measure X	Ordinance	General Services: Wastewater/Sewage	13,826	20,065	68.9%	Pass
	11/4/2008	Measure D	Sales Tax	Transport	28,523	34,039	83.8%	Pass ^T
INYO	No County Measures							
KERN	No County Measures							
KINGS	No County Measures							
LAKE	6/3/2008	Measure A	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	31	40	77.5%	Pass ^T
LASSEN	11/4/2008	Measure R	Property Tax	Facilities: Sports Facilities	4,625	8,779	52.7%	Fail ^T
LOS ANGELES	No County Measures							
MADERA	No County Measures							
MARIN	2/5/2008	Measure B	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	165	201	82.1%	Pass ^T
	11/4/2008	Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	71,158	119,640	59.5%	Pass
		Measure F	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	1,996	2,514	79.4%	Pass
		Measure G	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	1,904	2,507	75.9%	Pass

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
MARIPOSA	No County Measures							
MENDOCINO	6/3/2008	Measure B	Ordinance	Safety: Civil Fines/Criminal Penalties	14,577	27,946	52.2%	Pass
MERCED	No County Measures							
MODOC	No County Measures							
MONO	6/3/2008	Recall 1	Recall	Governance: Recall	2,697	2,878	93.7%	Pass
MONTEREY	11/4/2008	Measure Z	Sales Tax	Transport: Mass Transit	77,137	123,319	62.6%	Fail ^T
NAPA	2/5/2008	Measure K	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	24,407	42,507	57.4%	Pass
	6/3/2008	Measure N	Ordinance	Land Use: Voter Approval	31,691	46,766	67.8%	Pass
	11/4/2008	Measure P	Ordinance	Land Use: Voter Approval	33,128	53,461	62.0%	Pass
NEVADA	No County Measures							
ORANGE	11/4/2008	Measure J	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	768,374	1,021,705	75.2%	Pass
		Measure R	Ordinance	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	39,056	69,884	55.9%	Pass
PLACER	6/3/2008	Measure K	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	57	93	61.3%	Fail ^T
	11/4/2008	Measure R	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	38,398	151,752	25.3%	Fail
		Measure S	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	86,661	149,190	58.1%	Pass
PLUMAS	No County Measures							
PLACER	No County Measures							
SACRAMENTO	11/4/2008	Measure S	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	30,584	57,114	53.5%	Pass
SAN BENITO	No County Measures							
SAN BERNARDINO	2/5/2008	Measure I	Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Formation/Annexation	3,636	4,506	80.7%	Pass
	11/4/2008	Measure S	Charter Amendment	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	451,087	548,912	82.2%	Pass
SAN DIEGO	11/4/2008	Measure A	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	717,183	1,128,011	63.6%	Fail ^T
SAN FRANCISCO	2/5/2008	Measure A	Mello/Roos Bond	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	177,194	248,426	71.3%	Pass ^T
		Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	158,883	245,496	64.7%	Pass
		Measure C	Ordinance	Other	69,251	246,552	28.1%	Fail
	6/3/2008	Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	118,729	160,327	74.1%	Pass
		Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	91,924	158,303	58.1%	Pass
		Measure D	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	91,642	155,323	59.0%	Pass
		Measure E	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	80,489	155,405	51.8%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Housing: Affordable	58,756	159,868	36.8%	Fail
Measure G	Ordinance	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	99,008	158,431	62.5%	Pass		

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure H	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	104,012	154,877	67.2%	Pass
(continued)	11/4/2008	Measure A	GO Bond	Facilities: Health Facilities	300,595	358,644	83.8%	Pass ^T
		Measure B	Ordinance	Housing: Affordable	166,299	347,833	47.8%	Fail
		Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	124,395	326,814	38.1%	Fail
		Measure D	Development Tax	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	226,513	332,741	68.1%	Pass
		Measure E	Ordinance	Governance: Elections	195,605	325,467	60.1%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Governance: Elections	144,592	321,284	45.0%	Fail
		Measure G	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	202,011	323,365	62.5%	Pass
		Measure H	Ordinance	Facilities: Public Works	133,214	344,895	38.6%	Fail
		Measure I	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	117,050	318,861	36.7%	Fail
		Measure J	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	183,372	329,566	55.6%	Pass
		Measure K	Ordinance	Safety: Civil Fines/Criminal Penalties	140,185	342,420	40.9%	Fail
		Measure L	Ordinance	Facilities: Public Works	132,097	310,537	42.5%	Fail
		Measure M	Ordinance	Housing	195,023	331,439	58.8%	Pass
		Measure N	Property Tax	Environment: Regulation	223,808	326,429	68.6%	Pass
		Measure O	Utility Tax	General Services	208,044	311,723	66.7%	Pass
		Measure P	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	101,230	306,895	33.0%	Fail
		Measure Q	Business Tax	Revenues	233,411	314,589	74.2%	Pass
		Measure R	Ordinance	Other	101,376	335,109	30.3%	Fail
		Measure S	Ordinance	Revenues: Tax Repeal/Reduction/Limit	167,974	301,791	55.7%	Pass
		Measure T	Ordinance	General Services: Social/Welfare	200,649	327,663	61.2%	Pass
		Measure U	Policy/Position	Other	193,407	326,409	59.3%	Pass
		Measure V	Policy/Position	Curriculum/Policy Issues	179,639	328,808	54.6%	Pass
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures							
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No County Measures							
SAN MATEO	2/5/2008	Measure I	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	1,314	1,721	76.4%	Pass ^T
	6/3/2008	Measure O	Sales Tax	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	61,009	100,813	60.5%	Fail ^T
	11/4/2008	Measure Q	Business Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	120,709	254,787	47.4%	Fail
		Measure R	Business Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	119,618	254,021	47.1%	Fail
SANTA BARBARA	2/5/2008	Measure S	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	61,402	114,493	53.6%	Fail ^T
	11/4/2008	Measure A	Sales Tax	Transport	130,278	164,587	79.2%	Pass ^T

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SANTA CLARA	11/4/2008	Measure A	GO Bond	Facilities: Health Facilities	475,882	609,154	78.1%	Pass ^T
SANTA CRUZ	6/3/2008	Measure R	Sales Tax	Facilities: Libraries	39,105	53,529	73.1%	Pass ^T
	11/4/2008	Measure B	Utility Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	31,313	63,814	49.1%	Fail
SHASTA	No County Measures							
SIERRA	No County Measures							
SISKIYOU	11/4/2008	Measure M	Transient Occupancy Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	5,455	12,054	45.3%	Fail
		Measure N	Property Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	28	65	43.1%	Fail ^T
		Measure R	Property Tax	Safety: Police	652	1,050	62.1%	Fail ^T
		Measure T	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	435	567	76.7%	Pass ^T
SOLANO	11/4/2008	Measure T	Ordinance	Land Use: Open Space	97,747	137,970	70.8%	Pass
SONOMA	No County Measures							
STANISLAUS	2/5/2008	Measure E	Initiative	Land Use: Voter Approval	63,121	93,959	67.2%	Pass
		Measure L	Initiative	Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary	59,247	94,031	63.0%	Pass
	6/3/2008	Measure P	Property Tax	Safety	172	311	55.3%	Fail ^T
	11/4/2008	Measure S	Sales Tax	Transport: Roads	103,306	155,535	66.4%	Fail ^T
SUTTER	6/3/2008	Measure R	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	4,868	13,499	36.1%	Fail
TEHAMA	11/4/2008	Measure A	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	14,587	22,350	65.3%	Pass
		Measure B	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	12,319	22,147	55.6%	Pass
TRINITY	No County Measures							
TULARE	No County Measures							
TUOLUMNE	6/3/2008	Measure U	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	1,208	1,530	79.0%	Pass ^T
VENTURA	11/4/2008	Measure T	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	227,106	294,599	77.1%	Pass
YOLO	No County Measures							
YUBA	2/5/2008	Measure N	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	3,033	13,406	22.6%	Fail

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

ALAMEDA	2/5/2008	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Alameda County impose and collect a special tax on real property parcels in the County commencing on July 1, 2008 and continuing for thirty-five years at rates set forth in the measure, for the purposes of funding grants to Children's Hospital and Research Center Oakland for the construction, expansion, remodeling, renovation, furnishing and equipping projects for Children's Hospital, reimbursing County costs for administration of the tax and ensuring continuing public use of the facilities?			
ALAMEDA	2/5/2008	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Alameda County impose and collect a special tax on real property parcels in the County commencing on July 1, 2008 and continuing for thirty years at rates set forth in the measure for the purpose of funding grants to Children's Hospital and Research Center Oakland for the construction, expansion, remodeling, renovation, furnishing and equipping projects for Children's Hospital?			
ALAMEDA	6/3/2008	Measure F	Pass
Shall an ordinance be approved to extend until 6/30/2021 the existing Utility Users Tax, collected only in the unincorporated areas (e.g., Ashland, Castro Valley, Cheryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo, Sunol), which may fund County services, including services to unincorporated areas (e.g., Sheriff, Library, Planning and Code enforcement), establishing the rate of 6.5% and further amending the tax to include video and cable services, repeal limitations on taxes paid by nonresidential users, and making clarifying and administrative changes.			
AMADOR	11/4/2008	Measure M	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Amador County enact a one-half cent sales tax for fire protection and emergency response services, with the proceeds allocated to local fire districts as described in Ordinance No. 1676 (including reallocation to reflect any changes in the number of districts), to be used for paid fire fighter-emergency medical response personnel to staff existing fire stations, administrative support, and volunteer insurance, training and incentive programs?			
CONTRA COSTA	11/4/2008	Measure F	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 2008-23, to provide additional funding for police protection services, be approved to authorize a special tax on property located in Zone 3006 of County Service Area P-6 in the unincorporated neighborhoods of East Richmond Heights and Bayo Vista (North Arlington area), at an initial annual amount of \$108 per parcel for single-family, residential parcels, with higher amounts for properties in other use categories identified in the ordinance?			
CONTRA COSTA	11/4/2008	Measure R	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit applicable to Crockett Community Services District be set at \$2,851,000 for the Fiscal Year 2008-2009?			
CONTRA COSTA	11/4/2008	Measure S	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit under California Constitution Article XIII B continue at \$725,000.00 and be adjusted for changes in the cost-of-living and population, with the increase effective for Fiscal Year 2008-2009 through 2011-2012 (inclusive) to provide for the expenditure of funds that will be available to DB L&L Zone #8 District for the stated fiscal years?			
EL DORADO	11/4/2008	Measure H	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a special tax be levied within the Cameron Estates Community Services District pursuant to Board Resolution No. 2007-04 for road improvements, upgrades, and maintenance according to the following schedule: A. Residential property: a maximum increase of \$250.00 over the current assessment of \$250.00 for a total amount of \$500.00 per year residential parcel? B. Commercial property, described as parcels 109-111-14-100, 109-111-15-100, 109-111-16-100, 109-111-17-100, and 109-111-18-100: a maximum of \$1,000,000 per year?			
EL DORADO	11/4/2008	Measure Y	Pass
Shall the voter-enacted Measure Y General Plan policies be extended ten years and amended to provide: (1) Traffic from major single-family residential subdivisions shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock) traffic congestion; (2) No additional county roadways may operate at Level of Service F without voter approval or 4/5ths vote of County Supervisors; (3) Developer-paid traffic fees, combined with any other funding source, shall pay to build necessary road improvements?			
FRESNO	11/4/2008	Measure L	Fail (2/3 required)
To add books, separate homework areas for children/youth, work with neighborhood schools to increase after school and job search programs, improve, upgrade, repair, and construct urban/rural Fresno County branch libraries; including disability access, fire safety, remove asbestos, improve energy efficiency and technology, shall Fresno County voters amend the one-eighth cent sales tax with a one-quarter cent sales tax for sixteen years with an independent public review of expenditures?			
HUMBOLDT	2/5/2008	Measure B	Fail
(ADVISORY) Whether Manila residents want fluoride added to their water by Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District (HBMWD) if HBMWD decides to implement fluoridation of water, with the prorated cost for Manila to be borne by Manila Community Services District ratepayers?			
IMPERIAL	2/5/2008	Measure X	Pass
Shall the ordinance to make unlawful the importation of sewage sludge and prohibit Imperial County agencies or governmental bodies from authorizing disposal of imported sewer sludge within the jurisdictional boundaries of Imperial County be adopted?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

IMPERIAL	11/4/2008	Measure D	Pass (2/3 required)
To repair potholes and maintain local streets and roads, reduce traffic congestion, improve County roads and highways, reduce air pollution, improve 9-1-1 response times, expand elderly and disabled transit, qualify for matching state and federal funds, provide citizen oversight and annual audits, shall Imperial County Local Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 1- 2008 be adopted, which will continue, but not increase, the existing half-cent sales tax for 40-years, per the locally adopted Expenditure Plan?			
LAKE	6/3/2008	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall a special annual tax of \$45.00 per-year-per-single-lot be imposed on all the single lots within the Butler-Keys Community Services District for a period of four (4) years commencing in the 2008/2009 fiscal year for the purpose of maintaining the streets within the Butler-Keys Community Services District and shall the District establish an annual appropriations limit in the amount of \$10,911.32 which shall also be effective for the four (4) fiscal years following the appropriation of this measure by the voters?			
LASSEN	11/4/2008	Measure R	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the proposed Honey Lake Valley Community Swimming Pool County Service Area be authorized to adopt a special tax not to exceed \$25 per annum on each inhabitable dwelling unit on each parcel of real property within the proposed Honey Lake Valley Community Swimming Pool County Service Area to be effective and collected with Lassen County general property taxes beginning in the fiscal year 2009-2010 with the proceeds from such taxes to be used to support the operation of 1) a community swimming pool to be constructed on land owned by the Lassen Union High School District, or 2) a comparable pool project of the same size, scope, and scale by another entity; and shall the appropriations limit of the proposed Honey Lake Valley Community Swimming Pool County Service Area required by Article 13B of the California Constitution be established at \$250,000? The Board of Supervisors sitting as the governing body of the county services area shall have the discretion to levy the special tax at a lower rate.			
MARIN	2/5/2008	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Muir Beach CSD Ordinance No. 2007-1, which imposes an annual special tax of two hundred(\$200.00) dollars for a period of four(4) years, commencing FY 2008-2009 and terminating in FY 2012-2013, on each parcel within the Muir Beach CSD for fire protection, including fuel abatement and emergency preparedness, be approved and shall the Muir Beach CSD appropriations limit be increased by the amount of this voter-approved tax?			
MARIN	11/4/2008	Measure B	Pass
Shall the County of Marin establish an appointed director of finance consolidating the offices of auditor, controller, tax collector and treasurer, and create an appointed public administrator, with the provision that an annual independent audit be conducted and that the director of finance can only be removed with a public hearing and 4/5 vote of the Board of Supervisors?			
MARIN	11/4/2008	Measure F	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit established for Marinwood Community Services District pursuant to Article XIII B of the California Constitution be increased over the appropriations limit established by said article for each of the fiscal years 2008-09 through 2011-12 in the amount equal to the revenue received from the special tax for fire protection services previously approved by the voters in November 2003.			
MARIN	11/4/2008	Measure G	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit established for Marinwood Community Services District pursuant to Article XIII B of the California Constitution be increased over the appropriations limit established by said article for each of the four fiscal years 2009-10 through 2012-13 in the amount equal to the revenue received from the special tax for park maintenance previously approved by the voters in March, 2005.			
MENDOCINO	6/3/2008	Measure B	Pass
Shall the ordinance titled "The Repeal Of (Measure G) Mendocino County Code Chapter 9.36 Cannabis Personal Use Ordinance For Mendocino County, And Adoption Of New Guidelines For Maintenance And Possession Of Medical Marijuana That Do Not Exceed The Minimum State Limits" be approved?			
MONO	6/3/2008	Recall 1	Pass
Shall James Lovett be recalled (removed) from the office of Mono County Assessor?			
MONTEREY	11/4/2008	Measure Z	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Monterey County voters invest in our countywide transportation network by adopting a Transportation Investment Plan providing safety/congestion relief on Highways 1, 68, 156 and 101; pothole and local road repairs; alternatives to driving alone; bus service improvements; and, transportation for the elderly and persons with disabilities funded by a 25-year half-percent sales tax and state/federal matching funds, with a citizens' oversight committee and independent audits?			
NAPA	2/5/2008	Measure K	Pass
Shall Napa County Ordinance No. 08-01 be adopted? (Authorizes delicatessens with outdoor barbeques and wine tastings to be operated on lands in the Agricultural Produce Stand Combination Zoning District when accessory to a lawfully existing agricultural produce stand if a conditional use permit is first obtained)			
NAPA	6/3/2008	Measure N	Pass
Shall Napa County Ordinance No. 08-02 be adopted? (Prohibits amendment of the following provisions of Napa County General Plan/County Code without a vote of the people: (i) limits annual new residential development to 1% of county's housing stock (currently 114 units), (ii) requires 15% of residential developments to qualify as affordable housing, (iii) limits the height of single family residences to 35 feet, (iv) reduces minimum length of affordable housing guarantees from 40 to 10 years.)			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

NAPA	11/4/2008	Measure P	Pass
Shall Napa County Ordinance 08-03 be adopted? Extends to 2058 the effect of 1990 Measure J Initiative. Requires voter approval to change : (a) certain General Plan Policies relating to agricultural/open space lands, (b) agricultural/open space designation on the Land Use Map, and (c) certain land use policies adopted after passage of Measure J. Permits the Board of Supervisors to change the agricultural/open space land use designation without voter approval under specified conditions.			
ORANGE	11/4/2008	Measure J	Pass
Shall the ordinance amending the County Charter to require voter approval for certain increases in retirement benefits for County employees and officials be adopted?			
ORANGE	11/4/2008	Measure R	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted to ratify and implement certain policies relating to the Orange County Great Park project with regard to the governing structures and responsibilities of the City of Irvine and the Orange County Great Park Corporation, funding and construction, operation and maintenance considerations, and major policies and programs?			
PLACER	6/3/2008	Measure K	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Northstar Community Services District be authorized to levy a special tax for the NCSD Fuels Management Program on all real properties within the District in the sum of \$209.03, provided said special tax may be adjusted annually, beginning on July 1, 2009, using the Consumer Price Index for San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose. Said tax is to be collected with Placer County General Taxes commencing with the forthcoming 2008/2009 fiscal year and continuing each year thereafter.			
PLACER	11/4/2008	Measure R	Fail
Shall Article II, Section 207 of the Placer County Charter be amended to adjust the current \$30,000.00 maximum compensation for Placer County Supervisors, put in place by the voters of Placer County in 1992, to a maximum of \$48,000, effective January 1, 2009, with such amount adjusted each January 1 thereafter in accordance with a specially designated U.S. Department of Labor Consumer Price Index?			
PLACER	11/4/2008	Measure S	Pass
Shall Article V, Section 507 of the Placer County Charter be amended to change the terms of the County Counsel's employment from serving at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors to employment consistent with state general law, which provides for a four year term and removal during that term for neglect of duty, malfeasance or misconduct in office, or other good cause shown?			
SACRAMENTO	11/4/2008	Measure S	Pass
Shall the Cosumnes Community Services District change the system in which Board members are elected from the current at-large electoral system, meaning Board members may reside anywhere in the jurisdiction and are elected by all voters within the District, to a system in which the Cosumnes Community Services District jurisdiction is divided into five equally- populated geographical divisions, with one Board member elected from each division by all voters within the District?			
SAN BERNARDINO	2/5/2008	Measure I	Pass
Shall the order adopted on September 19, 2007, by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of San Bernardino ordering the reorganization to include formation of the Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District, Detachment from County Service Area 56 and the Dissolution of County Service Area 9, County Service Area 56 Improvement Zone F-1, and County Service Area 70 Improvement Zones L and P-4, known as LAFCO 3070, be approved subject to the terms and conditions as more particularly described in the order?"			
SAN BERNARDINO	11/4/2008	Measure S	Pass
Shall the Charter of the County of San Bernardino be amended to establish a higher standard of ethics for staff members of County elected officers?			
SAN DIEGO	11/4/2008	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
To improve wildfire prevention and firefighting capabilities, shall the County of San Diego ordinance be adopted to establish a special fire protection parcel tax and provide for the establishment of a Regional Fire Protection Agency to coordinate expenditures and regional efforts including: Specialized emergency equipment such as helicopters and airplanes; Wildfire training programs for emergency personnel; Communications systems to improve response times; and, Brush clearing and other programs to help prevent wildfires?			
SAN FRANCISCO	2/5/2008	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the City incur \$185,000,000 of bonded indebtedness to fund certain costs associated with the construction, reconstruction, purchase and/or improvement of park and recreation facilities located within the City, under the jurisdiction of the Recreation Park Commission or under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission as further described in Section 3 of the ordinance placing this measure onto the ballot, and paying other costs necessary and convenient for effectuating those purposes, including costs connected with or incidental to the authorization, issuance and sale of the bonds; and authorizing landlords to pass-through to residential tenants in units subject to Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (the "Residential Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance") 50% of the increase in the real property taxes attributable to the cost of the repayment of the bonds?			
SAN FRANCISCO	2/5/2008	Measure B	Pass
Shall the City allow certain retirement-eligible police officers to continue working for up to three additional years while accumulating their regular retirement benefits in tax deferred retirement accounts?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

SAN FRANCISCO	2/5/2008	Measure C	Fail
Shall it be City policy that the City should explore and facilitate the acquisition of Alcatraz Island from the United States government to transform it into a Global Peace Center?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure B	Pass
Shall the City increase the years of service required for new City employees and certain employees of the School District, the Superior Court and the Community College District to qualify for employer-funded retiree health benefits, establish a separate Retiree Health Care Trust Fund to fund retiree health care costs, and increase retirement benefits and retirement cost-of-living adjustments for certain City employees?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure C	Pass
Shall the City prohibit San Francisco Employees' Retirement System members who are convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude in connection with their employment from receiving any retirement benefits funded with employer contributions?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure D	Pass
Shall it be City policy that the membership of City boards and commissions reflect the interests and contributions of both men and women of all races, ethnicities, sexual orientations and types of disabilities and that City officers and agencies support the nomination, appointment or confirmation of female, minority and disabled candidates to fill seats on those bodies?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure E	Pass
Shall the City set qualifications for members of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and change the process for appointing members to the PUC by requiring a majority of the Board of Supervisors to approve the Mayor's appointments to the PUC?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure F	Fail
Shall it be City policy that any mixed-use development plan the City approves for Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard require 50% of all new housing units developed in the area be affordable, give preferences for the rental or purchase of new affordable housing to families of low and moderate income, and, if Alice Griffith housing is rebuilt, replace the units on a one-to-one basis; and shall the City be prohibited from selling, conveying or leasing any City-owned land at Candlestick Point unless the Board of Supervisors finds that the mixed-use development plan for this area incorporates these policies?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure G	Pass
Shall it be City policy to encourage timely development of a mixed-use project in the Bayview on Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard, including a new 49ers stadium or a non-stadium alternative; shall the City be authorized to transfer park land in Candlestick Point for non-recreational use if the land is replaced with new public parks or open spaces of at least equal size and the transfer meets the measure's policy objectives; and shall Propositions D and F, approved by the voters in June 1997, be repealed?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	Measure H	Pass
Shall it be unlawful for City elected officials, candidates or political committees they control to solicit or accept campaign contributions from contractors who are prohibited from making contributions to these elected officials, candidates and political committees because the contractor has a pending contract or a recently approved contract before the official or the Board on which the official or an appointee of the official sits?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
To ensure the availability of San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center in the event of a natural disaster or emergency, by building and/or rebuilding and improving the earthquake safety of the hospital and to pay related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$887,400,000 in general obligation bonds subject to independent oversight and regular audits?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure B	Fail
Shall the City establish an Affordable Housing Fund; set aside from the property tax 2 ½ cents for every \$100 of assessed value for this Fund through 2024; and use this Fund, subject to public review, to acquire and develop new affordable housing units meeting certain priorities and income limitations?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure C	Fail
Shall the City prohibit City employees from serving on most Charter created boards and commissions?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure D	Pass
Shall the City provide funds to develop Pier 70, based on new City hotel and payroll expense tax revenues from the development, if the Board of Supervisors approves a financial and land use plan for Pier 70?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure E	Pass
Shall the City adopt state law signature requirements for petitions to recall City officials?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure F	Fail
Shall the City shift all City elections except special elections to even-numbered years after the November 2011 election?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure G	Pass
Shall the City allow City employees to purchase retirement system credit for unpaid parental leave taken before July 1, 2003, as long as the purchase price covers all City costs?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure H	Fail
Shall the City: evaluate making the City the primary provider of electric power in San Francisco; consider options to provide energy to San Francisco residents, businesses and City departments; mandate deadlines for the City to meet its energy needs through clean and renewable energy sources; establish a new Office of the Independent Ratepayer Advocate to make recommendations about utility rates to the City's Public Utilities Commission; and allow the Board of Supervisors to approve the issuance of revenue bonds to pay for any public utility facilities without voter approval?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure I	Fail
Shall the City create an Office of the Independent Ratepayer Advocate to make recommendations about utility rates to the City's Public Utilities Commission?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure J	Pass
Shall the City establish a seven-member Historic Preservation Commission and give it authority over historic preservation-related decisions in the City?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure K	Fail
Shall the City: stop enforcing laws against prostitution; stop funding or supporting the First Offender Prostitution Program or any similar anti-prostitution program; enforce existing criminal laws that prohibit crimes such as battery, extortion and rape, regardless of the victim's status as a sex worker; and fully disclose the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes against sex workers?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure L	Fail
Shall the City guarantee that the City provide first-year funding for the Community Justice Center, authorize the Director of Property to lease space for the CJC, and define the CJC's scope and operations?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure M	Pass
Shall the City's Residential Rent Ordinance be amended to prohibit specific acts of tenant harassment by landlords and to provide for enforcement by means of court orders, rent reduction, monetary awards or criminal penalties?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure N	Pass
Shall the City increase its transfer tax on sales of real estate worth more than \$5 million to 1.5% and reduce the tax by up to 1/3 on sales of residences where the seller installed solar energy systems or made seismic safety improvements?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure O	Pass
Shall the City replace the Emergency Response Fee with an Access Line Tax at the same rates and with the same exemptions, and revise the Telephone Users Tax?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure P	Fail
Shall the City change the size and composition of the Transportation Authority Board and encourage the Authority to use City agencies and departments to perform staff functions, to obtain expert financial review before adopting Authority budgets, and to adopt the same ethics and public records laws that apply to City agencies?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure Q	Pass
Shall the City specify that certain partnerships and other businesses are subject to the City's payroll expense tax and expand the payroll expense tax exemption for small businesses so that businesses with annual payroll expenses of \$250,000 or less would not have to pay the tax?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure R	Fail
Shall the City change the name of the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant to the George W Bush Sewage Plant?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure S	Pass
Shall it be City policy that the voters will not approve any new set-aside of City revenue unless the set-aside identifies a new funding source, includes limits on annual increases, and automatically expires after 10 years?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure T	Pass
Shall the City be required to provide enough free and low-cost substance abuse treatment services to meet demand and to maintain funding for such services?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure U	Pass
Shall it be City policy that its elected representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives vote against any further funding for the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Iraq, except for funds to withdraw troops?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2008	Measure V	Pass
Shall it be City policy to encourage the School Board to reverse its decision to terminate JROTC and to continue to offer JROTC in San Francisco public high schools?			
SAN MATEO	2/5/2008	Measure I	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Resolution No. 069094 of the County of San Mateo continuing the levy of a special tax for four years at a maximum rate of \$65 per parcel per year for fire protection and extended police services be approved?			
SAN MATEO	6/3/2008	Measure O	Fail (2/3 required)
To better support parks and recreation services provided by cities, special districts, and San Mateo County, including: Supporting after-school and summer programs for children and teens; providing overdue maintenance and repairs to parks, trails, and recreation areas; preserving natural open spaces; maintaining and improving park bathrooms and facilities; repairing and upgrading playgrounds and playing fields; Shall San Mateo County enact a one-eighth (1/8) cent sales tax, with annual audits and reports to the community?			
SAN MATEO	11/4/2008	Measure Q	Fail
Shall Chapter 5.148 be added to the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, which would impose a business license tax of eight percent of gross receipts on operators of commercial parking facilities located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County?			
SAN MATEO	11/4/2008	Measure R	Fail
Shall Chapter 5.150 be added to the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, 1L which would impose a business license tax of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of gross receipts on operators of vehicle rental businesses located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County?			
SANTA BARBARA	2/5/2008	Measure S	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a special property tax of \$35.15 per parcel of property be approved to preserve, complete and support Santa Barbara County's Trauma System and Emergency Medical Services Network in order to provide rapid emergency medical and trauma care to all people residing in the county?			
SANTA BARBARA	11/4/2008	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall voters approve an ordinance to: repair potholes; provide safe routes to school; widen Highway 101 south of Santa Barbara to relieve congestion; implement local street/highway safety improvements; expand public bus services/passenger rail, with increased senior/disabled accessibility; synchronize traffic signals; earthquake retrofit bridges/overpasses; increase pedestrian/bike safety; by continuing, but not increasing the existing half-cent sales tax for 30 years with local control, independent financial audits and public review of expenditures?			
SANTA CLARA	11/4/2008	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
To prevent state mandated shutdown of one-half of Santa Clara Valley Medical Center's beds; closure of SCVMC's trauma, burn center; and, loss of disaster response, by rebuilding, and improving earthquake safety of the hospital, meeting state seismic laws, and help replace closed medical facilities in downtown San Jose, shall the County of Santa Clara issue \$840 million in general obligation bonds with independent citizens' oversight committee, annual audits, and no money for administrators' salaries?			
SANTA CRUZ	6/3/2008	Measure R	Pass (2/3 required)
To support and maintain local public libraries and library services through acquiring books, children's educational materials, computers and technology; increase and improve children's reading, adult literacy, senior and other educational programs; and upgrade local library facilities, shall Ordinance No. 1 of the Santa Cruz County Public Library Authority be amended to continue the existing 1/4 cent sales tax for libraries with no increase?			
SANTA CRUZ	11/4/2008	Measure B	Fail
Shall the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors repeal the existing Emergency Response Fee on telephone land lines that currently finances 9-1-1 services, and be authorized to replace the fee with a tax in the same amount per access line on land lines and cellular lines in the unincorporated area of the County so as to enable the Board of Supervisors to allocate additional funding for public services including public safety and 9-1-1 services?			
SISKIYOU	11/4/2008	Measure M	Fail
Shall there be an increase of two percent (2%) to the general tax for the privilege of transient occupancy in any hotel as defined in Title 8, Chapter 4 of the Siskiyou County Code, which increase would set the total transient occupancy tax at ten percent (10%) of the rent charged by the operator?			
SISKIYOU	11/4/2008	Measure N	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the county levy a special tax in the Scott Valley Fire and Emergency response zone to be used only for fire and emergency response purposes not to exceed forty dollars (\$40.00) each year for each improved parcel, with lesser amounts for unimproved parcels and additional parcels beyond the first parcel, subject to cost of living adjustment not to exceed four percent (4%) in any year?			
SISKIYOU	11/4/2008	Measure R	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Lake Shastina Community Services District increase its special tax for police protection services to \$97.00 per parcel per year? Said tax is to be used to obtain, furnish, operate and maintain police assets and police and public safety related services for the protection of life and property in the Lake Shastina Community Services District?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2008

SISKIYOU	11/4/2008	Measure T	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the McCloud Community Services District levy a new special parcel tax to replace the existing special tax enacted by the voters on June 3, 1997 commencing in fiscal year 2009-2010 to provide fire protection, emergency response and ambulance services at the rates and for the land use categories specified in resolution 05, 2008?			
SOLANO	11/4/2008	Measure T	Pass
Shall Ordinance No. 2008-01 to amend the 1994 Orderly Growth initiative to reflect agriculture and open space policies, land use designations, and the Land Use Diagram in the 2008 Solano County General Plan and to extend the amended initiative until December 31, 2028 be adopted?			
STANISLAUS	2/5/2008	Measure E	Pass
(INITIATIVE) Should the 30-Year Land Use Restriction Initiative be approved, which would require majority approval of County-wide voters for each change in County General Plan land use designation from "agriculture" to "residential" in Stanislaus County, except within the nine cities of the County?			
STANISLAUS	2/5/2008	Measure L	Pass
(INITIATIVE) Should the Stanislaus County Responsible Planning and Growth Control Initiative be approved, which would initiate a comprehensive update of the County General Plan; and would limit residential development until a new General Plan is approved?			
STANISLAUS	6/3/2008	Measure P	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Keyes Community Services District's service charge for street lighting be increased from \$10 to \$20 a year for three years and then to \$25 a year for each parcel of land within the District, effective January 1, 2008?			
STANISLAUS	11/4/2008	Measure S	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a one-half cent sales tax be approved for 20 years, requiring ongoing citizen oversight, and securing state/federal matching funds for countywide road improvements, including: Improving safety/reducing congestion on local highways; Improving intersections and synchronizing traffic signals; Improving emergency response times for police/fire; Enhancing student safety around schools; Improving travel along east-west corridors; Retrofitting/replacing bridges; and Filling potholes, fixing, widening and extending local roads?			
SUTTER	6/3/2008	Measure R	Fail
Shall the ordinance, which provides that a charter commission be elected to propose a charter, be adopted?			
TEHAMA	11/4/2008	Measure A	Pass
Shall the members of the Tehama County Board of Supervisors be elected by District?			
TEHAMA	11/4/2008	Measure B	Pass
Shall the Tehama County Charter be amended to allow adjustments in the Board of Supervisors' compensation if specifically recommended by the Grand Jury?			
TUOLUMNE	6/3/2008	Measure U	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the charges on parcels and businesses, for the purpose of operating an ambulance service in the South County Ambulance Zone of County Service Area No. 21, as proposed by Resolution No. 25-08 of the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors, be approved?			
VENTURA	11/4/2008	Measure T	Pass
Shall an ordinance of the Ventura County Board of Supervisors be adopted prohibiting any person from serving more than three consecutive four-year terms as a member of the Ventura County Board of Supervisors?			
YUBA	2/5/2008	Measure N	Fail
Shall the approval of the Yuba Highlands Development Project pursuant to Resolution 2007-95, consisting of approximately 2,600 acres and including Single Family Low Density, Single Family Medium Density, Multi-Family, Core Commercial, Business Park, Public Facility and Open Space, be adopted?			

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION STATEMENT		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	1	2																	1	2	3
Amador	1	0																	1	0	1
Contra Costa	0	1											2	0					2	1	3
El Dorado	0	1													1	0			1	1	2
Fresno	0	1																	0	1	1
Humboldt							0	1											0	1	1
Imperial	1	0													1	0			2	0	2
Lake	1	0																	1	0	1
Lassen	0	1																	0	1	1
Marin	1	0											2	0	1	0			4	0	4
Mendocino															1	0			1	0	1
Mono											1	0							1	0	1
Monterey	0	1																	0	1	1
Napa															3	0			3	0	3
Orange					1	0									1	0			2	0	2
Placer	0	1			1	0									0	1			1	2	3
Sacramento															1	0			1	0	1
San Bernardino					1	0									1	0			2	0	2
San Diego	0	1																	0	1	1
San Francisco	4	0	2	0											13	11	2	0	21	11	32
San Mateo	1	3																	1	3	4
Santa Barbara	1	1																	1	1	2
Santa Clara			1	0															1	0	1
Santa Cruz	1	1																	1	1	2
Siskiyou	1	3																	1	3	4
Solano															1	0			1	0	1

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION STATEMENT		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Stanislaus	0	2							2	0									2	2	4
Sutter															0	1			0	1	1
Tehama					1	0									1	0			2	0	2
Tuolumne	1	0																	1	0	1
Ventura															1	0			1	0	1
Yuba															0	1			0	1	1
All Counties	14	19	3	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	4	0	26	14	2	0	56	34	90

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY 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													0	2					1	0			1	2	3	
Amador					1	0																	1	0	1	
Contra Costa					0	1													2	0			2	1	3	
El Dorado											1	1											1	1	2	
Fresno													0	1									0	1	1	
Humboldt																	0	1					0	1	1	
Imperial											1	0					1	0					2	0	2	
Lake											1	0											1	0	1	
Lassen													0	1									0	1	1	
Marin					1	0	1	0											2	0			4	0	4	
Mendocino					1	0																	1	0	1	
Mono							1	0															1	0	1	
Monterey											0	1											0	1	1	
Napa			3	0																			3	0	3	
Orange							1	0					1	0									2	0	2	
Placer							1	1											0	1			1	2	3	
Sacramento							1	0															1	0	1	
San Bernardino							2	0															2	0	2	
San Diego					0	1																	0	1	1	
San Francisco	1	0			0	1	9	4	1	0			4	2	1	2	2	0	2	0	0	1	2	21	11	32
San Mateo					1	0							0	1					0	2			1	3	4	
Santa Barbara					0	1					1	0											1	1	2	
Santa Clara													1	0									1	0	1	
Santa Cruz					0	1							1	0									1	1	2	
Siskiyou					1	2													0	1			1	3	4	

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2008

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY 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	
Solano			1	0																				1	0	1
Stanislaus			2	0	0	1					0	1												2	2	4
Sutter							0	1																0	1	1
Tehama							2	0																2	0	2
Tuolumne					1	0																		1	0	1
Ventura							1	0																1	0	1
Yuba			0	1																				0	1	1
All Counties	1	0	6	1	6	8	19	6	1	0	4	3	7	7	1	2	3	1	7	4	1	2	56	34	90	

PART 2
VOTE TOTALS FOR
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ 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	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Haggerty	Scott Patrick	Mbr, Alameda Co Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	29,763	30,255	98.4%	Yes	
			4	Full	Miley	Nate	Alameda County Supervisor	Yes	2	25,994	34,613	75.1%	Yes	
					White	Steve	Retired Business Owner	No	2	8,426	34,613	24.3%	No	
		5	Full	Carson	Keith	Alameda Co Board of Supervisors, Dist 5	Yes	1	42,772	43,416	98.5%	Yes		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	9	Full	Hayashi	Dennis	Public Interest Attorney	No	4	77,550	177,189	43.8%	Runoff	
					Daly	Phil	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	45,020	177,189	25.4%	Runoff	
				Kolakowski	Victoria S.	Administrative Law Judge	No	4	35,149	177,189	19.8%	No		
				Reid	Dennis	Criminal Law Attorney	No	4	18,457	177,189	10.4%	No		
	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Dublin-San Ramon SD			Full	Halket	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	4	7,765	28,237	27.5%	Yes
						Scannell	Dan	Senior Policy Analyst	No	4	7,566	28,237	26.8%	No
						Howard	Dwight L. "Pat"	Incumbent	Yes	4	7,370	28,237	26.1%	No
						Pulice	David	Senior Control Engineer	No	4	5,381	28,237	19.1%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	9	Full	Hayashi	Dennis	Public Interest Attorney	No	2	309,896	502,817	61.6%	Yes	
				Daly	Phil	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	188,201	502,817	37.4%	No		
ALPINE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Veatch	Henry "Skip"	Incumbent	Yes	1	77	89	86.5%	Yes	
			3	Full	Bennett	Phillip D.	Incumbent	Yes	1	25	45	55.6%	Yes	
			5	Full	Sweeney	Tom	Retired Educator	No	1	84	98	85.7%	Yes	
ALPINE	6/3/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	DeVore	David L.	Alpine County Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	284	495	57.4%	Yes	
					Dustman	Karen	Prosecutor	No	2	211	495	42.6%	No	
AMADOR	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Plasse	Maurice "John"	Retired Businessman/Rancher	No	4	1,203	2,243	53.6%	Yes	
					Gonsalvez	John	Planning Commissioner/Businessman	No	4	394	2,243	17.6%	No	
					Escamilla	Rosalie Pryor	Mayor, City of Jackson	No	4	324	2,243	14.4%	No	
					Berry	Ken	Software Developer	No	4	318	2,243	14.2%	No	
		2	Full	Forster	Richard M.	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	1	1,169	1,225	95.4%	Yes		
		4	Full	Boitano	Louis D.	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,143	1,999	57.2%	Yes		
		Pincus	David	Certified Mortgage Planner	No	2	848	1,999	42.4%	No				
BUTTE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Connelly	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	2	5,183	8,798	58.9%	Yes	
					Andoe	Gordon	Business Owner	No	2	3,552	8,798	40.4%	No	
			4	Full	Lambert	Steve	Farmer/Businessman	No	3	5,390	6,866	78.5%	Yes	
					Jensen	Mark A.	Care Worker/Provider	No	3	988	6,866	14.4%	No	
					Byrne	John	Real Estate Investor	No	3	462	6,866	6.7%	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.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ 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			
BUTTE (continued)	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Yamaguchi	Kim	County Supervisor	Yes	3	6,406	11,109	57.7%	Yes			
					Huffman	Robin	College Anthropology Instructor	No	3	2,511	11,109	22.6%	No			
					Grumbles	Dwight "D.H."	Flooring Contractor/Business Owner	No	3	2,156	11,109	19.4%	No			
CALAVERAS	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Tofanelli	Gary	Business Owner	No	3	814	2,209	36.8%	Runoff			
					McDaniel	Zerrall	Business Owner	No	3	791	2,209	35.8%	Runoff			
					Mazzaferro	Katherine	Banker	No	3	604	2,209	27.3%	No			
			2	Full	Wilensky	Steve	District 2 Supervisor	Yes	2	1,884	2,690	70.0%	Yes			
					Morse	John	Machinist	No	2	806	2,690	30.0%	No			
			4	Full	Tryon	Tom	County Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	4	1,180	2,768	42.6%	Runoff			
	Seaton	Steven Lee			City Council Member	No	4	783	2,768	28.3%	Runoff					
	Klass	Ron			Business Owner	No	4	464	2,768	16.8%	No					
	Lunsford	Sarah			Writer	No	4	341	2,768	12.3%	No					
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Tofanelli	Gary	Business Owner	No	2	2,404	4,452	54.0%	Yes			
McDaniel					Zerrall	Business Owner	No	2	2,042	4,452	45.9%	No				
4			Full	Tryon	Thomas M.	County Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	2	2,438	4,702	51.9%	Yes				
				Seaton	Stephen Lee	City Council Member	No	2	2,251	4,702	47.9%	No				
COLUSA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Indrieri	Tom	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	1	466	479	97.3%	Yes			
					Marshall	Mark D.	Incumbent	Yes	2	300	485	61.9%	Yes			
			3	Full	Ash	Kevin	Farmer/Painter	No	2	182	485	37.5%	No			
					Evans	Gary J.	Incumbent/Contractor	Yes	1	448	463	96.8%	Yes			
			CONTRA COSTA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Uikema	Gayle B.	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	1	30,545	31,356	97.4%	Yes
								3	Full	Piepho	Mary Nejedly	Supervisor, District 3	Yes	2	25,258	47,809
Houston	Guy Spencer	Business Owner/Legislator				No	2			21,756	47,809	45.5%	No			
5	Full	Glover				Federal D.	Supervisor, District 5	Yes	5	7,715	22,981	33.6%	Runoff			
		Nunn				Erik	Chief Financial Officer	No	5	6,192	22,981	26.9%	No			
		Agopian				Gary S.	Antioch USD Board of Trustees	No	5	4,772	22,981	20.8%	Runoff			
		Rocha				Mary	No Ballot Designation	No	5	3,370	22,981	14.7%	No			
		Parscal				Don	Chief Executive Officer	No	5	850	22,981	3.7%	No			
		11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Glover	Federal D.	Supervisor, District 5	Yes	2	34,421	66,147	52.0%	Yes		
Agopian	Gary S.					Antioch USD Board of Trustees	No	2	31,496	66,147	47.6%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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)	6/3/2008	DIRECTOR, Discovery Bay CSD		Full	Simon	Mark S.	Small Business Owner	No	4	2,739	8,485	32.3%	Yes	
					Tetreault	Ray	Retired	No	4	2,338	8,485	27.6%	Yes	
					Finetti	Jennifer H.	Business Owner/Managing Director	No	4	2,082	8,485	24.5%	No	
					Doran	Robert "Bob"	Retired	Yes	4	1,306	8,485	15.4%	No	
	DIRECTOR, San Ramon SD	Full	Halket	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	4	13,085	49,098	26.7%	Yes			
			Scannell	Dan	Senior Policy Analyst	Yes	4	12,766	49,098	26.0%	Yes			
			Howard	Dwight L. "Pat"	Incumbent	Yes	4	12,620	49,098	25.7%	Yes			
			Pulice	David	Senior Controls Engineer	No	4	10,403	49,098	21.2%	No			
DEL NORTE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McNamer	Leslie	Incumbent	Yes	2	400	670	59.7%	Yes	
					Norton	Jim	No Ballot Designation	No	2	270	670	40.3%	No	
			2	Full	McClure	Martha	Educator/Incumbent	Yes	2	488	956	51.0%	Yes	
					Slert	Charles	Architect	No	2	468	956	49.0%	No	
			5	Full	Finigan	David	Incumbent	Yes	2	586	987	59.4%	Yes	
					Wick	Charlie	Literacy Resource Developer	No	2	401	987	40.6%	No	
EL DORADO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Knight	John	El Dorado Hills Fire Board Member	No	4	2,392	8,399	28.5%	Runoff	
					Norris	Harry	Local Business Owner	No	4	2,377	8,399	28.3%	Runoff	
					Dorr	Bob	Mediator	No	4	2,070	8,399	24.6%	No	
					Frentzen	Shiva	Businesswoman	No	4	1,560	8,399	18.6%	No	
			2	Full	Nutting	Ray	Businessman/Rancher	No	6	5,218	11,211	46.5%	Runoff	
					Smiley	Barbara	Hospital Volunteers Manager	No	6	1,686	11,211	15.0%	Runoff	
					Teresi	Sam	Businessman	No	6	1,639	11,211	14.6%	No	
					Michelin	Rachel	Non Profit Director	No	6	1,051	11,211	9.4%	No	
					Dean	Harry	Rancher/E.D.C. Employee	No	6	836	11,211	7.5%	No	
					Tumboo	George	Business Owner	No	6	781	11,211	7.0%	No	
			3	Full	Sweeney	James R. "Jack"	Incumbent	Yes	1	5,437	5,437	100.0%	Yes	
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Bailey	Steven	Attorney/Businessman	No	2	24,090	36,149	66.6%	Yes
						Huckaby	Robert P.	Attorney	No	2	12,059	36,149	33.4%	No
			11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Knight	John R.	El Dorado Hills Fire Board Member	No	2	8,852	16,840	52.6%
Norris	Harry	Businessman/EID Director					No	2	7,988	16,840	47.4%	No		
2	Full	Nutting			Ray	Businessman/Rancher	No	2	14,730	21,631	68.1%	Yes		
		Smiley			Barbara	Hospital Volunteers Manager	No	2	6,901	21,631	31.9%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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		
EL DORADO (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Cameron Estates CSD		Full	Johnson	Angela	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	336	791	42.5%	Yes		
					Murphy	Dana P.	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	284	791	35.9%	Yes		
					Rigg	Blaine "Smokey"	Businessman	No	3	171	791	21.6%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Cameron Park CSD		Full	Green	Richard K.	Retired Fire Chief	No	4	3,600	11,687	30.8%	Yes		
					Clarke	Alan	Incumbent	Yes	4	3,582	11,687	30.6%	Yes		
					Randall	Bill	Local Business Owner	No	4	3,120	11,687	26.7%	No		
					Fuller	Joe	Retired Scientist/Physicist	No	4	1,385	11,687	11.9%	No		
		DIRECTOR, El Dorado Hills CSD		Full	Gertsch	Guy	Businessman	No	3	8,383	20,330	41.2%	Yes		
					Mattock	Noelle	Governmental Affairs Representative	No	3	7,486	20,330	36.8%	Yes		
					Stockdale	Myrls	Attorney	No	3	4,461	20,330	21.9%	No		
		FRESNO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Anderson	Susan B.	Fresno County Supervisor, District 2	Yes	3	18,834	35,265	53.4%	Yes
							Calhoun	Brian	Councilmember/Educator	No	3	10,382	35,265	29.4%	No
Dictos	Paul						Auditor/Controller/CPA	No	3	6,049	35,265	17.2%	No		
3	Full			Perea	Henry	Board of Supervisors District #3	Yes	1	9,655	9,655	100.0%	Yes			
				5	Full	Poochigian	Debbie	Businesswoman	Yes	2	15,963	28,893	55.2%	Yes	
Magsig	Nathan					Councilman/Independent Businessman	No	2	12,930	28,893	44.8%	No			
SUPERIOR JUDGE				10	Full	Kelley	Jim	Deputy District Attorney	Yes	4	34,053	91,386	37.3%	Runoff	
						Treisman	Douglas O.	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	24,882	91,386	27.2%	Runoff	
						Lostracco	Glenn	Attorney at Law	No	4	16,383	91,386	17.9%	No	
			Shinaver			Gary	Chief Public Defender	No	4	16,068	91,386	17.6%	No		
11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Del Rey CSD			Full	Ledesma	Martina C.	Accounts Payable Clerk	Yes	4	98	289	33.9%	Yes		
					Ozuna	Kimberly	Unit Director	Yes	4	95	289	32.9%	Yes		
					Leija	Julio	Maintenance Facility Supervisor	No	4	48	289	16.6%	No		
		Leija			Juan Homer	Incumbent	No	4	47	289	16.3%	No			
	SUPERIOR JUDGE		10	Full	Kelley	Jim	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	125,414	219,218	57.2%	Yes		
					Treisman	Douglas O.	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	92,777	219,218	42.3%	No		
					GLENN	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Viegas	John K.	Retired Police Captain	No	3	584
Payer	William "Bill"	Business Owner	No	3						414	1,161	35.7%	No		
Cavins	Andrew	Student	No	3						163	1,161	14.0%	No		
3	Full	Soeth	Steven	General Contractor	No	2	830	1,463	56.7%	Yes					
		Amaro	John	County Supervisor	Yes	2	633	1,463	43.3%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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	
GLENN (continued)	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	McDaniel	Leigh W.	Farmer/Engineer	No	4	394	800	49.3%	Runoff	
					Grigsby-Puente	Lee A.	Business Woman	No	4	195	800	24.4%	Runoff	
					Perraie	Tracy Ollenberger	Homemaker/Farmer	No	4	131	800	16.4%	No	
					Campos	Jesus V.	Retired Educator	No	4	80	800	10.0%	No	
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Twede	Peter Billiou	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	3,014	5,340	56.4%	Yes	
					Stewart	Dwayne R.	Assistant District Attorney	No	2	2,326	5,340	43.6%	No	
		11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	McDaniel	Leigh W.	Business Woman	No	2	1,023	1,579	64.8%	Yes
						Grigsby-Puente	Lee Ann	Farmer/Engineer	No	2	548	1,579	34.7%	No
HUMBOLDT	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Jimmy	1st District Supervisor of Humboldt	Yes	2	4,599	6,469	71.1%	Yes	
					Vevoda	John M.	Self-Employed Dairyman	No	2	1,862	6,469	28.8%	No	
			2	Full	Rodoni	Roger	Incumbent	Yes	3	2,930	8,025	36.5%	No	
					Clendenen	Cliff	Businessman	No	3	2,848	8,025	35.5%	Runoff	
					Fennell	Estelle	Journalist	No	3	2,225	8,025	27.7%	Runoff	
			3	Full	Lovelace	Mark	Environmental Consultant	No	3	3,039	5,874	51.7%	Yes	
	Plumley	Bryan			Financial Advisor	No	3	2,076	5,874	35.3%	No			
	Pitino	Paul			Arcata City Councilman	No	3	739	5,874	12.6%	No			
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Hinrichs	Joyce	Judicial Officer	No	1	21,287	21,710	98.1%	Yes		
				11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Clendenen	Cliff	Apple Farmer/Businessman	No	2	5,008	12,635
		Fennell	Estelle	Journalist				No	2	3,625	12,635	28.7%	No	
	IMPERIAL	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Terrazas	Jesus "Jack"	Business Owner	No	2	1,675	3,265	51.3%	Yes
Carter						Harold D.	Retired Sheriff/Coroner	No	2	1,590	3,265	48.7%	No	
3				Full	Kelley	Michael W.	Chief Probation Officer	No	7	901	3,462	26.0%	Runoff	
					Dale	Geoff	Businessman/Councilman	No	7	669	3,462	19.3%	Runoff	
					Vogel	Jeanne	School Board Trustee	No	7	477	3,462	13.8%	No	
					Saucedo	Ray	Small Business Owner	No	7	467	3,462	13.5%	No	
					Dhillon	David S.	No Ballot Designation	No	7	409	3,462	11.8%	No	
					Larson	Mark L.	Consultant	No	7	272	3,462	7.9%	No	
4		Full	Earley	Allen	Entrepreneur	No	7	267	3,462	7.7%	No			
			Wyatt	Gary	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,990	3,707	53.7%	Yes			
		11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Nava	Maria Elena	Migrant Education Coordinator	No	2	1,717	3,707	46.3%	No
						Kelley	Michael W.	Chief Probation Officer	No	2	4,414	8,177	54.0%	Yes
						Dale	Geoff	Businessman/Councilman	No	2	3,699	8,177	45.2%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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	
INYO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Cash	Susan	Incumbent	Yes	2	439	783	56.1%	Yes	
					Gardner	Ted	Retired Law Enforcement	No	2	344	783	43.9%	No	
			4	Full	Fortney	Marty	Businessman	No	2	589	999	59.0%	Yes	
					Hambleton	Carroll "Butch"	Retired 4th District Supervisor	No	2	410	999	41.0%	No	
			5	Full	Cervantes	Richard	5th District Supervisor	Yes	3	418	834	50.1%	Yes	
					Dorame	Michael A.	Retired County Supervisor	No	3	303	834	36.3%	No	
	Wenzel	William "Bill"			Handyman	No	3	113	834	13.5%	No			
			MARSHALL		Full	Barton	Floyd "Justin"	No Ballot Designation	No	1	3,749	3,749	100.0%	Yes
			SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Lamb	Brian	Superior Court Judge	Yes	3	2,137	4,906	43.6%	Runoff
		Hardy		Thomas L.		Attorney At Law	No	3	1,560	4,906	31.8%	Runoff		
		Johnson		Mark		Assistant District Attorney	No	3	1,209	4,906	24.6%	No		
		11/4/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Lamb	Brian	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	4,117	8,136	50.6%	Yes
		Hardy	Thomas L.	Attorney At Law		No	2	4,019	8,136	49.4%	No			
KERN	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McQuiston	Jon	Fire District Supervisor	Yes	1	15,758	15,758	100.0%	Yes	
					4	Full	Watson	Ray	Incumbent	Yes	2	13,166	22,412	58.7%
			Thompson	Cliff			Businessman	No	2	9,246	22,412	41.3%	No	
			5	Full	Rubio	Michael	Incumbent	Yes	1	6,491	6,491	100.0%	Yes	
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	24	Full	Errea	Larry	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	51,699	73,818	70.0%	Yes
						Landsgaard	Olaf A.	Attorney	No	2	22,119	73,818	30.0%	No
	30	Full		Mitchell	Holly N.	Deputy District Attorney	No	6	22,057	77,796	28.4%	Runoff		
				Brehmer	Charles R.	Attorney/Arbitrator/Mediator	No	6	21,463	77,796	27.6%	Runoff		
				Brady	Matt	General Counsel/Attorney	No	6	19,644	77,796	25.3%	No		
				Heider	Tony K.	Assistant Public Defender	No	6	6,313	77,796	8.1%	No		
				Gardina	Michael R.	Attorney At Law	No	6	4,862	77,796	6.2%	No		
	Butkiewicz	Frank	Attorney At Law	No	6	3,457	77,796	4.4%	No					
		11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Bear Valley CSD		Full	Zanutto	Rick	Retired Businessman/Farmer	No	4	1,644	5,073	32.4%	Yes
		Northcutt	Rob	Retired Business Owner		No	4	1,523	5,073	30.0%	Yes			
		Darling	Phillip H.	Incumbent		Yes	4	1,035	5,073	20.4%	No			
		Sheppard	Bob	Incumbent		Yes	4	871	5,073	17.2%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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
KERN (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Desert Lake CSD		Full	Wiggs	David	Teacher	No	6	162	662	24.5%	Yes
					Job	Jeremeh	Director of Facilities	No	6	138	662	20.8%	Yes
					Smith	Nancy	Business Manager	No	6	97	662	14.7%	Yes
					Blue	Garry	Millwright	No	6	91	662	13.7%	No
					Lucks	Timothy	Incumbent	Yes	6	90	662	13.6%	No
					Byler	Lawrence	Incumbent	Yes	6	84	662	12.7%	No
	DIRECTOR, East Niles CSD		Full	Dominquez	Gloria M.	Senior Administrative Analyst	No	7	2,912	13,898	21.0%	Yes	
				Pipkin	Scott W.	Businessman	No	7	2,530	13,898	18.2%	Yes	
				White	Laurel	Incumbent	Yes	7	2,351	13,898	16.9%	Yes	
				Nazar S.	Kooner	Farmer	No	7	1,900	13,898	13.7%	No	
				Adams	William D.	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,610	13,898	11.6%	No	
				Harger	Richard H.	Retired	Yes	7	1,456	13,898	10.5%	No	
				Cazares	Fidel V.	Retired	No	7	1,139	13,898	8.2%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Golden Hills CSD		Full	Garrison	Mary Beth	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,847	6,876	26.9%	Yes	
				Smith	David	Airforce Quality Assurance	No	6	1,650	6,876	24.0%	Yes	
				Cassil	Kathy	Retired Teacher	No	6	1,164	6,876	16.9%	Yes	
				Thompson	Gloria	Bookkeeper	No	6	819	6,876	11.9%	No	
				Foster	Jon	Retired	No	6	775	6,876	11.3%	No	
				Depew	Ron	Mortgage Lender	Yes	6	621	6,876	9.0%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Rosamond CSD		Full	Lord	Kim E.	Treated Water Specialist	No	4	1,837	7,104	25.9%	Yes	
Glennan				Byron	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,833	7,104	25.8%	Yes		
Wood				Greg	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,751	7,104	24.6%	No		
Landsgaard				Daniel	Realtor/Businessman	No	4	1,683	7,104	23.7%	No		
DIRECTOR, Stallion Springs CSD		Full	Simpson	Glenn L.	Retired Business Man	No	4	659	2,385	27.6%	Yes		
			Burt	Dave	Building Inspector	No	4	628	2,385	26.3%	Yes		
			Gunshinan	Irene E.	Incumbent	Yes	4	598	2,385	25.1%	Yes		
			Beardslee	Marilyn	Urban Regional Planner	No	4	500	2,385	21.0%	No		
SUPERIOR JUDGE		30	Full	Brehmer	Charles R.	Attorney/Arbitrator/Mediator	No	2	105,679	207,973	50.8%	Yes	
				Mitchell	Holly N.	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	102,294	207,973	49.2%	No	
KINGS	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Valle	Richard F.	District Director	No	3	656	1,454	45.1%	Runoff
					Kwast	Terry W.	Businessman	No	3	604	1,454	41.5%	Runoff
					Craighead	Sidney K.	Retired	No	3	194	1,454	13.3%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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			
KINGS (continued)	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Taylor	Alene	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,210	2,780	43.5%	Runoff			
					Fagundes	Richard	Farmer	No	3	842	2,780	30.3%	Runoff			
					Mattos	Andrew	Records Manager	No	3	728	2,780	26.2%	No			
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Laporte	James	Incumbent	Yes	2	8,467	11,356	74.6%	Yes			
					Strickland	Greg "Strick"	Career Prosecutor	No	2	2,889	11,356	25.4%	No			
		11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Valle	Richard F.	District Director	No	2	2,353	3,989	59.0%	Yes		
	Kwast					Terry W.	Businessman	No	2	1,603	3,989	40.2%	No			
	5		Full	Fagundes	Richard	Famer	No	2	4,130	6,890	59.9%	Yes				
				Taylor	Alene	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,540	6,890	36.9%	No				
				DIRECTOR, Armona CSD		Full	Bittner	Eddie	Teacher	No	5	376	1,713	21.9%	Yes	
	Dillon		Irene	Incumbent	Yes		5	362	1,713	21.1%	Yes					
	Watson		Mike	Incumbent	Yes		5	344	1,713	20.1%	Yes					
	Tafolla		Juan M.	Preschool Teacher	No		5	322	1,713	18.8%	No					
	Chavarin		Victor	Production Worker	No	5	298	1,713	17.4%	No						
	LAKE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	La Faver	Susanne	Business Consultant/Educator	No	6	811	2,545	31.9%	Runoff		
Comstock						James S.	Financial Representative/Rancher	No	6	800	2,545	31.4%	Runoff			
Dombush						Don	General Building Contractor	No	6	290	2,545	11.4%	No			
Fergusson						Scott	Business Owner	No	6	275	2,545	10.8%	No			
Macintyre						Robert	Firefighter/College Instructor	No	6	225	2,545	8.8%	No			
Luiz						Joey	Winery Business Manager	No	6	144	2,545	5.7%	No			
11/4/2008		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Farrington	Anthony	County Supervisor	Yes	1	1,702	1,702	100.0%	Yes			
					5	Full	Brown	Robert	Supervisor/Businessman/Rancher	Yes	2	1,752	2,899	60.4%	Yes	
							Stark	Robert	Water District Manager	No	2	1,147	2,899	39.6%	No	
					La Faver	2	Full	Comstock	James	Rancher/School Board	No	2	2,857	2,857	100.0%	Yes
								Susanne	Susanne	Business Consultant/Educator	No	2	2,555	2,555	100.0%	Yes
					LASSEN	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pyle	Robert F.	First District Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	4	763	1,349
Neely	Claud R.	No Ballot Designation	No	4						204	1,349	15.1%	No			
White	Kay E.	Tree Farmer	No	4						197	1,349	14.6%	No			
Wilson	Virginia	No Ballot Designation	No	4						184	1,349	13.6%	No			
2	Full	Chapman	Jim	Lassen County Supervisor, District 2				Yes	2	699	941	74.3%	Yes			
		Wood	Ronald Lee	Private Investigator/Notary				No	2	228	941	24.2%	No			
4	Full	Dahle	Brian Dwain	Farmer				Yes	1	864	891	97.0%	Yes			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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				
LASSEN (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, West Patton Village CSD		Full	Johnson	Eula Kay	Incumbent	Yes	6	168	582	28.9%	Yes				
					Krupa	Patricia H.	Incumbent	Yes	6	164	582	28.2%	Yes				
					Hankins	Kathleen	Veterans Service Representative	No	6	76	582	13.1%	No				
					McKee	Soledad	Federal Employee	No	6	60	582	10.3%	No				
					Flores	Felicia	Employee Services Assistant	No	6	58	582	10.0%	No				
				DIRECTOR, Westwood CSD		Full	Hutchinson	Blake	Freight Rate Specialist	No	6	53	582	9.1%	No		
							Binswanger	Sheri	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	500	1,573	31.8%	Yes		
							House	Kristine Ann	Incumbent	Yes	4	413	1,573	26.3%	Yes		
							Silva	Elta L.	House Wife	No	4	379	1,573	24.1%	Yes		
							Champion, Jr.	Joseph	Retired	No	4	266	1,573	16.9%	No		
LOS ANGELES	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Ridley-Thomas	Mark	State Senator	No	9	68,192	149,442	45.6%	Runoff				
					Parks	Bernard C.	Los Angeles City Councilmember	No	9	59,069	149,442	39.5%	Runoff				
					Alvarez	Antonio	Real Estate Agent	No	9	5,733	149,442	3.8%	No				
					Aubrey	Martin L. K.	Painter	No	9	4,803	149,442	3.2%	No				
					Neusom	Thomas	Attorney	No	9	3,519	149,442	2.4%	No				
					Smith Jr.	Delaney	Physician/Pharmacist/Educator	No	9	2,748	149,442	1.8%	No				
					Griffin	Morris	Maintenance Technician	No	9	2,274	149,442	1.5%	No				
					Fenton	Drew "Doc"	Medical Doctor	No	9	2,117	149,442	1.4%	No				
					Thompson	Florian	Dental Medicine	No	9	987	149,442	0.7%	No				
							4	Full	Knabe	Don	Supervisor, Fourth District	Yes	3	95,062	135,728	70.0%	Yes
									Cabral	Marylou	Community Volunteer	No	3	23,703	135,728	17.5%	No
									Shah	Jay	Medical Doctor	No	3	16,963	135,728	12.5%	No
							5	Full	Antonovich	M. D.	Supervisor, Los Angeles County	Yes	2	114,634	144,509	79.3%	Yes
				Hinze	Stephen Mark	Warehouse Worker			No	2	29,875	144,509	20.7%	No			
				DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Cooley	Steve	District Attorney, Los Angeles County	Yes	3	400,155	616,921	64.9%	Yes		
							Robles	Albert	Constitutional Attorney/Professor	No	3	120,924	616,921	19.6%	No		
							Ipsen	Steve	County Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	95,842	616,921	15.5%	No		
				SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Ramirez	Daniel P.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	1	462,583	462,583	100.0%	Yes		
							4	Full	Dau	Ralph W.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	378,743	569,560	66.5%	Yes
									Singer	Syndee R.	Trial Attorney	No	2	190,817	569,560	33.5%	No
		35	Full				Dominguez	Juan C.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	1	443,091	443,091	100.0%	Yes		
		41	Full				Villalobos	Michael	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	1	439,490	439,490	100.0%	Yes		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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	6/3/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE	55	Full	Guzman	Hector M.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	1	439,029	439,029	100.0%	Yes
(continued)			69	Full	Silberman	Harvey A.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	303,658	576,369	52.7%	Yes
					Murillo	Serena R.	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	272,711	576,369	47.3%	No
			72	Full	Merritt	Hilleri G.	Criminal Trial Prosecutor	No	3	281,854	578,952	48.7%	Runoff
					Simons	Steven A.	Consumer Rights Attorney	No	3	178,306	578,952	30.8%	Runoff
					Chomel	Marc Alain	Supervising Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	118,792	578,952	20.5%	No
			82	Full	Loo	Cynthia	Superior Court Referee	No	3	228,634	587,739	38.9%	Runoff
					Rubinson	Thomas	Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	213,138	587,739	36.3%	Runoff
					Lee	Mark	Criminal Prosecutor/Professor	No	3	145,967	587,739	24.8%	No
			84	Full	Connolly	Pat	Criminal Gang Prosecutor	No	4	230,774	585,037	39.4%	Runoff
					Jones	Lori-Ann	Superior Court Commissioner	No	4	160,318	585,037	27.4%	Runoff
					Henry	Bob	Prosecutor Deputy Attorney-General	No	4	106,814	585,037	18.3%	No
					Gutierrez	J.	Administrative Law Judge	No	4	87,131	585,037	14.9%	No
			94	Full	O'Gara	Michael J.	Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	218,553	552,022	39.6%	Runoff
					Mack	C. Edward	Criminal Trial Attorney	No	3	186,834	552,022	33.8%	Runoff
					Abele	Eduard R.	Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	146,635	552,022	26.6%	No
			95	Full	Nieto	Patricia	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	323,537	570,791	56.7%	Yes
					Winters	Lance E.	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	247,254	570,791	43.3%	No
			101	Full	Lopez	Daniel S.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	1	441,765	441,765	100.0%	Yes
			102	Full	Sandoval	Jose	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	1	434,661	434,661	100.0%	Yes
			119	Full	Moses	Jared D.	Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	301,217	554,448	54.3%	Yes
					Weitzman	Douglas W.	Consumer Law Attorney	No	3	136,149	554,448	24.6%	No
					Davenport	Robert	Retired Lieutenant Colonel	No	3	117,082	554,448	21.1%	No
			123	Full	Blanchard	Kathleen	Gang Homicide Prosecutor	No	3	354,449	584,152	60.7%	Yes
					Nadir	Allan A.	Criminal Gang Prosecutor	No	3	143,954	584,152	24.6%	No
					Nixon	Richard A.	Attorney at Law	No	3	85,749	584,152	14.7%	No
			125	Full	Bianco	James N.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	422,136	568,837	74.2%	Yes
					Johnson	Bill	International Corporate Lawyer	No	2	146,701	568,837	25.8%	No
			154	Full	Jesic	Michael V.	Criminal Gang Prosecutor	No	3	240,284	560,142	42.9%	Runoff
					Crabb	Rocky L.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	191,214	560,142	34.1%	Runoff
					Bruguera	P. "Pablo"	California Deputy Attorney-General	No	3	128,644	560,142	23.0%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ 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)	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Ridley-Thomas	Mark	State Senator	No	2	309,654	506,096	61.2%	Yes
					Parks	Bernard	Los Angeles City Councilmember	No	2	196,442	506,096	38.8%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	72	Full	Merritt	Hilleri	Criminal Trial Prosecutor	No	2	1,290,705	2,423,112	53.3%	Yes
					Simons	Steven	Consumer Rights Attorney	No	2	1,132,407	2,423,112	46.7%	No
			82	Full	Rubinson	Thomas	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	1,229,088	2,423,273	50.7%	Yes
					Loo	Cynthia	Superior Court Referee	No	2	1,194,185	2,423,273	49.3%	No
			84	Full	Connolly	Pat	Criminal Gang Prosecutor	No	2	1,450,758	2,366,131	61.3%	Yes
					Jones	Lori-Ann	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	915,373	2,366,131	38.7%	No
		94	Full	O'Gara	Michael	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	1,464,361	2,317,767	63.2%	Yes	
				Mack	Edward	Criminal Trial Attorney	No	2	853,406	2,317,767	36.8%	No	
		154	Full	Jesic	Michael	Criminal Gang Prosecutor	No	2	1,483,211	2,348,822	63.1%	Yes	
				Crabb	Rocky	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	865,611	2,348,822	36.9%	No	
MADERA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Dominici	Ronn	Incumbent	Yes	1	2,966	3,017	98.3%	Yes
					Rodriguez	Max	Madera County Supervisor	Yes	2	887	1,456	60.9%	Yes
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Silva	John V.	Hay Business Owner	No	2	563	1,456	38.7%	No
					Li Calsi	Ernie	District Attorney	No	2	10,668	17,469	61.1%	Yes
MARIN	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Austin	Brian T.	Attorney/College Instructor	No	2	6,739	17,469	38.6%	No
					Brown	Harold C	Incumbent	Yes	1	11,146	11,423	97.6%	Yes
					McGlashan	Charles F.	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	10,006	10,205	98.0%	Yes
MARIPOSA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Kinsey	Steve	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	7,234	7,478	96.7%	Yes
					Turpin	Lyle	Incumbent	Yes	3	639	982	65.1%	Yes
					Silverman	David L.	Business Consultant	No	3	268	982	27.3%	No
	4	Full	Baer	William	Business Owner	No	3	75	982	7.6%	No		
			Phillips	Thomas B.	Firefighter	No	4	492	1,253	39.3%	Runoff		
			Cann	Kevin	Deputy Supt Yosemite National Park	No	4	445	1,253	35.5%	Runoff		
			Borchard	Robert L.	City Planner	No	4	175	1,253	14.0%	No		
	5	Full	Fritz	Dianne A.	Incumbent	Yes	4	141	1,253	11.3%	No		
Allen			James H.	Retired Sheriff	No	1	980	980	100.0%	Yes			
11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Phillips	Thomas	Firefighter	No	2	957	1,998	47.9%	No	
				Cann	Kevin	Deputy Supt Yosemite National Park	No	2	1,036	1,998	51.9%	Yes	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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		
MARIPOSA (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Lake Don Pedro CSD		Full	Marquette	Steve	Building Supply CEO	No	6	347	1,510	23.0%	Yes		
					Barton	L.W. "Wes"	Retired Business Consultant	No	6	320	1,510	21.2%	Yes		
					Kinsella	William	Retired Police Detective	No	6	266	1,510	17.6%	Yes		
					Duste	Eleanor	Incumbent	Yes	6	265	1,510	17.5%	No		
					Gile	Kalvin	Incumbent	Yes	6	157	1,510	10.4%	No		
					Afanasiev	Victor	Retired Medical Instrumentation	No	6	147	1,510	9.7%	No		
					Short	Ross	Emery	Cattle Rancher	No	2	417	652	64.0%	Yes	
					Barclay	Jean	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	233	652	35.7%	No		
MENDOCINO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brown	Carre	Executive Administrator	No	5	2,007	5,433	36.9%	Runoff		
					Delbar	Mike	First District Supervisor	Yes	5	1,935	5,433	35.6%	Runoff		
					Brown	Dolly	Businesswoman/Educator	No	5	1,034	5,433	19.0%	No		
					Morrison	Ukiah	No Ballot Designation	No	5	273	5,433	5.0%	No		
					Rickel	Jimmy	Substance Abuse Consultant	No	5	164	5,433	3.0%	No		
					2	Full	McCowen	John	Ukiah City Councilmember	No	4	1,376	4,152	33.1%	Runoff
					Clifton	Estelle P.	Registered Forest Professional	No	4	1,056	4,152	25.4%	Runoff		
					Mulheren	Jim	Businessman/Planning Commissioner	No	4	900	4,152	21.7%	No		
					Mayfield, Jr.	Ross	Emergency Services Consultant	No	4	797	4,152	19.2%	No		
					4	Full	Smith	Kendall	4th District Supervisor	Yes	2	3,435	5,466	62.8%	Yes
	Deeter	Paula	Land Use Planner	No	2	1,998	5,466	36.6%	No						
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brown	Carre	Executive Administrator	No	2	4,582	7,636	60.0%	Yes		
					Delbar	Mike	First District Supervisor	Yes	2	3,020	7,636	39.5%	No		
					2	Full	McCowen	John	Ukiah City Councilmember	No	2	3,335	6,212	53.7%	Yes
Clifton					Estelle P.	Registered Forest Professional	No	2	2,858	6,212	46.0%	No			
MERCED	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pedrozo	John	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,540	1,540	100.0%	Yes		
					2	Full	Walsh	Hubert "Hub"	Administrator/Manager	No	5	2,212	5,691	38.9%	Runoff
					Sanders	Jim	President MCAN	No	5	1,475	5,691	25.9%	Runoff		
					Price	John E.	Businessman	No	5	1,314	5,691	23.1%	No		
					Steed	Casey	Business Owner	No	5	388	5,691	6.8%	No		
	Alexander	John S.	MBA - Executive Director	No	5	302	5,691	5.3%	No						
	4	Full	Kelsey	Deidre	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,591	3,806	68.1%	Yes				
	Sherron	Claudine L.	Business Owner	No	2	1,215	3,806	31.9%	No						
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Walsh	Hubert "Hub"	Administrator/Manager	No	2	7,841	13,443	58.3%	Yes		
					Sanders	Jim	President MCAN	No	2	5,602	13,443	41.7%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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	
MODOC	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Bullock	Jeffrey Dean	Truck Driver/Transportation	No	2	397	657	60.4%	Yes	
					Dunn	Mike	Incumbent	Yes	2	255	657	38.8%	No	
			3	Full	Cantrall	Patricia D.	Incumbent	Yes	2	373	617	60.5%	Yes	
					Nicholson	Walter	Business Owner	No	2	243	617	39.4%	No	
			4	Full	Wills	James	Retired CHP Lieutenant	No	3	294	627	46.9%	Runoff	
					Crabtree	Loren "Shorty"	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	279	627	44.5%	Runoff	
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Crabtree	Loren "Shorty"	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	532	1,024	52.0%	Yes	
					Wills	James	Retired CHP Lieutenant	No	2	485	1,024	47.4%	No	
			6/3/2008	COUNTY ASSESSOR ^R	Short	Henning	Jody	State of California Property Assessor	No	4	1,359	2,855	47.6%	Yes
						Musil	Robert	Assistant Assessor	No	4	817	2,855	28.6%	No
MONO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Hazard	Duane "Hap"	Incumbent	Yes	2	526	753	69.9%	Yes	
					Conti	Joseph V.	No Ballot Designation	No	2	227	753	30.1%	No	
					Burdette	Dorothy A.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	281	632	44.5%	Runoff	
					Magee-Bauer	Vikki	Incumbent	Yes	3	267	632	42.2%	Runoff	
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Winkler	John E. "Jack"	Professional Engineer	No	3	84	632	13.3%	No	
					Reid	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	1	573	573	100.0%	Yes	
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Magee-Bauer	Vikki	Incumbent	Yes	2	603	927	65.0%	Yes	
					Burdette	Dorothy	Professional Customer Service	No	2	324	927	35.0%	No	
	MONTEREY	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Armenta	Fernando	Incumbent	Yes	1	3,141	3,141	100.0%	Yes
						4	Full	Parker	Jane	Health Services Executive	No	2	6,160	11,857
Mette-McCutchon				Ila	Monterey County Supervisor	Yes		2	5,697	11,857	48.0%	No		
5				Full	Potter	Dave	Monterey County Supervisor	Yes	2	15,439	20,974	73.6%	Yes	
					Ask	Don	Retired Postmaster	No	2	5,535	20,974	26.4%	No	
11/4/2008				SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Wills	Thomas	Attorney	No	4	15,226	46,484	32.8%
		Hood	Mark				Criminal Prosecutor	No	4	13,087	46,484	28.2%	Runoff	
		Hornik	Todd				Monterey County Prosecutor	No	4	9,784	46,484	21.0%	No	
		Williams	Luma Serrano				California State Attorney	No	4	8,387	46,484	18.0%	No	
11/4/2008		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Hood	Mark	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	64,716	110,084	58.8%	Yes	
	Hornik				Todd	Monterey County Prosecutor	No	2	45,368	110,084	41.2%	No		

^RTo be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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		
NAPA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Luce	Mark	Incumbent	Yes	3	3,245	6,678	48.6%	Runoff		
					Martin	Harry V.	Businessman/Publisher	No	3	1,719	6,678	25.7%	Runoff		
					Rodrigues	Mike	Entrepreneur/Consultant	No	3	1,714	6,678	25.7%	No		
			4	Full	Dodd	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	1	4,169	4,169	100.0%	Yes		
			5	Full	Caldwell	Keith	Retired Fire Chief	No	4	1,901	5,550	34.3%	Runoff		
					Simpson	Gary L.	Retired Sheriff	No	4	1,642	5,550	29.6%	Runoff		
	Jager	Rich			Planning Commissioner/Businessman	No	4	1,399	5,550	25.2%	No				
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Luce	Mark	Napa County Supervisor	Yes	2	8,148	11,609	70.2%	Yes		
					Martin	Harry V.	Businessman/Publisher	No	2	3,461	11,609	29.8%	No		
					5	Full	Caldwell	Keith	Retired Fire Chief	No	2	6,373	11,666	54.6%	Yes
			Simpson	Gary L.	Retired Sheriff		No	2	5,293	11,666	45.4%	No			
			NEVADA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Beason	Nate	Incumbent	Yes	1	5,151	5,151	100.0%
2						Full	Schofield	Ed	Nevada County Fair CEO	No	3	2,837	6,301	45.0%	Runoff
	Kilborn	Alan R.					Police Officer/Businessman	No	3	2,486	6,301	39.5%	Runoff		
	Joehnck	Robert "Bob"					Attorney	No	3	978	6,301	15.5%	No		
5	Full	Owens				Ted S.	Incumbent	Yes	1	3,393	3,393	100.0%	Yes		
11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2		Full	Schofield	Ed	CEO, Nevada County Fair	No	2	6,126	10,751	57.0%	Yes		
				Kilborn	Alan R.	Peace Officer/Businessman	No	2	4,625	10,751	43.0%	No			
ORANGE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Nguyen	Janet	Orange County Supervisor, 1st District	Yes	3	24,920	44,834	55.6%	Yes		
					Nguyen	Dina	Garden Grove Councilmember/Attorney	No	3	12,653	44,834	28.2%	No		
					Van Tran	Hoa	Consumer Attorney/Businessman	No	3	7,261	44,834	16.2%	No		
			3	Full	Campbell	Bill	Orange County Supervisor	Yes	2	50,858	63,855	79.6%	Yes		
					Ritze	Donald	Businessman	No	2	12,997	63,855	20.4%	No		
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Thompson	Nick	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	160,040	265,324	60.3%	Yes	
		Bartlett				Michael J. "Mike"	Business Attorney/Litigator	No	2	105,284	265,324	39.7%	No		
		8		Full	Fish	Jon	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	155,867	262,796	59.3%	Yes		
					Collins	Barry	Administrative Law Judge	No	2	106,929	262,796	40.7%	No		
		12		Full	Carrillo	Debra	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	92,472	269,284	34.3%	Runoff		
					Marsh	Kermit	Westminster Councilman/Attorney	No	4	67,099	269,284	24.9%	Runoff		
			Flory		Michael	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	56,875	269,284	21.1%	No			
			Jones	KC	Judicial Attorney, County of Orange	No	4	52,838	269,284	19.6%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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		
ORANGE (continued)	6/3/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE	25	Full	Nguyen	John Nho Trong	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	203,702	253,033	80.5%	Yes		
					Nguyen	Timothy Sy	Trial Attorney	No	2	49,331	253,033	19.5%	No		
	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Rossmoor CSD		Full	Hough	Shannon G.	Legislative Analyst/Homemaker	No	4	2,749	9,465	29.0%	Yes		
					Casey	Ronald	Information Technology Manager	No	4	2,283	9,465	24.1%	Yes		
					Rips	Jeffrey T.	Director, Membership Services	No	4	2,238	9,465	23.6%	Yes		
					Cohen	Robert M.	Professional Businessperson	No	4	2,195	9,465	23.2%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE		12	Full	Carrillo	Debra	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	581,954	909,019	64.0%	Yes	
						Marsh	Kermit	Westminster Councilman/Attorney	No	2	327,065	909,019	36.0%	No	
PLACER	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR		Full	Holmes	James Wendell	Placer County Supervisor	Yes	1	10,019	10,257	97.7%	Yes		
					Uhler	Kirk Lewis	Appointed Supervisor, Businessman	Yes	1	9,887	10,133	97.6%	Yes		
					Montgomery	Jennifer	Small Business Owner	No	3	5,445	13,187	41.3%	Runoff		
						Kranz	Bruce L.	Placer County Supervisor, District 5	Yes	3	4,873	13,187	37.0%	Runoff	
						Houston	Bob	Businessman	No	3	2,838	13,187	21.5%	No	
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR		5	Full	Montgomery	Jennifer	Small Business Owner	No	2	13,001	23,726	54.8%	Yes	
						Kranz	Bruce L.	Placer County Supervisor, District 5	Yes	2	10,676	23,726	45.0%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Auburn Valley CSD		Full	Seifert	Diane B.	No Ballot Designation	Yes	5	130	449	29.0%	Yes		
					Carroll	Frank Joseph	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	5	104	449	23.2%	Yes		
					Moorman	Robert J.	No Ballot Designation	Yes	5	88	449	19.6%	Yes		
					Mott	Douglas Henry	No Ballot Designation	No	5	81	449	18.0%	No		
Lester	Philip N.	Real Estate Broker	No	5	36	449	8.0%	No							
PLUMAS	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR		Full	Swofford	Terry	Retired Vocational Teacher	No	4	465	1,110	41.9%	Runoff		
						Pearson	B.J.	Real Estate Broker	No	4	334	1,110	30.1%	Runoff	
						Powers	Bill	Plumas County Supervisor District One	Yes	4	272	1,110	24.5%	No	
						Douglas	Larry F.	Retired Businessman	No	4	34	1,110	3.1%	No	
					2	Full	Meacher	Robert	Plumas County Supervisor District 2	Yes	2	621	1,235	50.3%	Yes
							Williamson	Donald L.	Business Manager	No	2	606	1,235	49.1%	No
					4	Full	Simpson	Lori	Assistant Museum Director	No	2	726	1,194	60.8%	Yes
							Comstock	Rose	Plumas County Supervisor District 4	Yes	2	465	1,194	38.9%	No
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR		1	Full	Swofford	Terry	Retired Vocational Teacher	No	2	1,333	1,920	69.4%	Yes	
						Pearson	B.J.	Real Estate Broker	No	2	572	1,920	29.8%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Buster	Bob	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	2	18,769	30,370	61.8%	Yes	
					Schiavone	Frank	Riverside Councilmember/Businessman	No	2	11,601	30,370	38.2%	No	
			3	Full	Stone	Jeff	Riverside County Supervisor	Yes	2	32,223	45,031	71.6%	Yes	
	Foote	Deane			Organic Farmer/Businessman	No	2	12,808	45,031	28.4%	No			
	SUPERIOR JUDGE			6	Full	Rushton	Michael J.	Deputy District Attorney	No	1	130,258	130,258	100.0%	Yes
						18	Full	Vineyard	John W.	Lawyer	No	3	77,552	146,307
				Molloy	John	Deputy District Attorney		No	3	44,244	146,307	30.2%	No	
				Knighen	Anne M.	Judicial Staff Attorney	No	3	24,511	146,307	16.8%	No		
	SACRAMENTO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Peters	Susan	Sacramento County Supervisor	Yes	2	21,341	38,517	55.4%	Yes
Harding						Warren	Parks Director	No	2	17,064	38,517	44.3%	No	
4				Full	MacGlashan	Roberta	Sacramento Co Supervisor, District 4	Yes	1	24,055	24,605	97.8%	Yes	
		11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Cosumnes CSD		Full	Rutter	Guy	Retired Fire Chief	Yes	7	19,777	113,531	17.4%	Yes
Albiani				Gil A.		Incumbent	Yes	7	19,477	113,531	17.2%	Yes		
Orrock				Michelle		Businesswoman	Yes	7	18,684	113,531	16.5%	Yes		
Russell				Sandi		Retired Safety Officer	No	7	17,772	113,531	15.7%	No		
McElroy				Douglas		Incumbent	Yes	7	14,464	113,531	12.7%	No		
Johnson				Jimmie		Businessman	No	7	13,801	113,531	12.2%	No		
DIRECTOR, Rancho Murieta CSD		Full	Mobley	Steven	Sheriff's Sergeant	Yes	4	1,513	5,043	30.0%	Yes			
			Ferraro	Betty	Retired Educator	Yes	4	1,354	5,043	26.8%	Yes			
			Pasek	Jerry	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	1,131	5,043	22.4%	No			
			Kuntz	Wayne W.	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,027	5,043	20.4%	No			
SUPERIOR JUDGE				6	Full	McBrien	Peter J.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	1	285,310	296,967	96.1%	Yes
						13	Full	Koller	Marjorie	Superior Court Commissioner	No	1	280,195	285,834
	16			Full	Culhane	Kevin R.		Attorney/Law Professor	No	1	281,831	287,326	98.1%	Yes
SAN BENITO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Barrios	Margie	Small Business Owner	No	3	862	1,592	54.1%	Yes	
					Brians	Grant	Farmer	No	3	457	1,592	28.7%	No	
					Flores-Voropaeff	Bonnie	Business Owner	No	3	264	1,592	16.6%	No	
			2	Full	Botelho	Anthony	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,241	2,235	55.5%	Yes	
					Freitas	Anthony	Agribusiness Farmer	No	2	988	2,235	44.2%	No	
			5	Full	De La Cruz	Jaime	Incumbent	Yes	2	855	1,392	61.4%	Yes	
					Cruz	Marian	Retired Elementary Teacher	No	2	533	1,392	38.3%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ 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 BERNARDINO	2/5/2008	DIRECTOR, Phelan Pinon Hills CSD ^P		Full	Roberts	Mark	Retired	No	7	2,564	15,304	16.8%	Yes	
					Anderson	Ken	Business Owner	No	7	2,531	15,304	16.5%	Yes	
					Johnson	Charlie	Business Owner	No	7	2,347	15,304	15.3%	Yes	
					Adams	Mike	Journalist	No	7	2,324	15,304	15.2%	Yes	
					Morrissette	Al	IT Financial Consultant	No	7	2,073	15,304	13.5%	Yes	
					Roberts	David "Snowline"	Retired Systems Analyst	No	7	1,990	15,304	13.0%	No	
					Perry	Jon	Consulting Groundwater Geologist	No	7	1,475	15,304	9.6%	No	
	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR		1	Full	Mitzelfelt	Brad	San Bernardino County Supervisor	Yes	4	22,041	35,319	62.4%	Yes
						Vogler	Rita K.	City of Hesperia Councilmember	No	4	7,195	35,319	20.4%	No
						Nelson	Bob	Retired Systems Analyst	No	4	3,439	35,319	9.7%	No
						Conaway	Bob	Attorney	No	4	2,644	35,319	7.5%	No
		3	Full	Derry	Neil	City Councilman/Businessman	No	2	22,567	43,493	51.9%	Yes		
				Hansberger	Dennis	Businessman/County Supervisor	Yes	2	20,926	43,493	48.1%	No		
		5	Full	Gonzales	Josie	San Bernardino County Supervisor	Yes	1	14,972	14,972	100.0%	Yes		
				SUPERIOR JUDGE										
		7	Full	McCann	Bridgid "Briye"	Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	67,081	131,351	51.1%	Yes		
				Echols	Ben	Educator/Attorney	No	3	32,401	131,351	24.7%	No		
	Gass			James R.	Trial Attorney	No	3	31,869	131,351	24.3%	No			
	10			Full	Kersey	Cheryl C.	Deputy District Attorney	No	1	111,831	111,831	100.0%	Yes	
					11/4/2008									
	DIRECTOR, Big Bear CSD	Full	Ollila	Rick	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,665	7,199	23.1%	Yes			
Beck			Barbara R.	Community Relations Specialist	No	6	1,413	7,199	19.6%	Yes				
Brown			Daniel Jospeh	Business Owner/Engineer	No	6	1,368	7,199	19.0%	No				
Colven			Robert W.	Retired Peace Officer	No	6	1,237	7,199	17.2%	No				
Russo			John	Facilities Director	No	6	885	7,199	12.3%	No				
Nelson			Rick	Business Owner	No	6	631	7,199	8.8%	No				
DIRECTOR, Big River CSD		Full	Hall	Joan	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	177	570	31.1%	Yes			
			Gaffney	Robyn	Incumbent	Yes	4	137	570	24.0%	Yes			
			Harvey	Nelson	Community Volunteer	No	4	130	570	22.8%	Yes			
			Halik	Jennifer	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	126	570	22.1%	No			
DIRECTOR, Yermo CSD		Full	Smith	Bob	Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	3	286	659	43.4%	Yes			
			Weems	Loney	Incumbent	Yes	3	192	659	29.1%	Yes			
			Henderson	Michael	Incumbent	Yes	3	181	659	27.5%	No			

^PProposed community service district.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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 DIEGO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cox	Greg	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	2	44,535	60,162	74.0%	Yes	
					Johnson	Howard	CEO/Office Supervisor	No	2	15,627	60,162	26.0%	No	
			2	Full	Jacob	Dianne	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	2	69,753	89,788	77.7%	Yes	
					Reyes	Rudy	Educator/Scientist/Archaeologist	No	2	20,035	89,788	22.3%	No	
			3	Full	Slater-Price	Pam	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	2	67,141	95,340	70.4%	Yes	
					Van Doom	John	Engineer/Consultant	No	2	28,199	95,340	29.6%	No	
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	6/3/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Bowman	Blaine K.	Deputy District Attorney	No	1	316,293	316,293	100.0%	Yes
						19	Full	Haehnle	Garry	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	183,235	353,939
				Cooper	Paul E.	Chief Police Attorney		No	2	170,704	353,939	48.2%	No	
				45	Full	Kirvin	Evan Patrick	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	201,402	355,414	56.7%	Yes
						Faigin	Robert	Sheriff's Chief Attorney	No	2	154,012	355,414	43.3%	No
				SAN FRANCISCO	6/3/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE	12	Full	Sandoval	Gerardo C.	S.F. Board of Supervisors, Member	No	3	57,002
Mellon	Thomas	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes						3	56,247	130,992	42.9%	Runoff	
Mallen	Mary E.	Attorney	No						3	17,152	130,992	13.1%	No	
11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full		Mar	Eric	Member Board of Education	No	9	11,625	28,686	40.5%	Yes	
					Lee	Sue	Nonprofit Executive Director	No	9	9,733	28,686	33.9%	Yes	
					Wang	Alicia	Educator/Professor/Mother	No	9	4,206	28,686	14.7%	Yes	
					Larkin	Brian J.	Engineer	No	9	995	28,686	3.5%	No	
					Jungreis	Jason	Attorney	No	9	610	28,686	2.1%	No	
					Belloni	Nicholas C.	Independent Television Producer	No	9	536	28,686	1.9%	No	
					Gakuba	Fidel Chrys	Father/Management Consultant	No	9	361	28,686	1.3%	No	
					Flamik	George	Businessman	No	9	324	28,686	1.1%	No	
					D'Silva	Sherman R.	Manager	No	9	254	28,686	0.9%	No	
		3	Full		Chiu	David	Attorney/Small Businessperson	No	9	10,209	27,067	37.7%	Yes	
					Alioto Jr.	Joseph	Small Business Attorney	No	9	6,268	27,067	23.2%	Yes	
					McCarthy	Denise	Non-Profit Executive	No	9	3,165	27,067	11.7%	Yes	
					Cheng	Claudine	Attorney/Community Coordinator	No	9	2,492	27,067	9.2%	No	
					DeNunzio	Mike	Independent Financial Manager	No	9	1,330	27,067	4.9%	No	
					Jefferson	Lynn	Nonprofit Organization Coordinator	No	9	1,234	27,067	4.6%	No	
Gantner	Tony	Attorney	No	9	1,191	27,067	4.4%	No						
Pang	Wilma	College Professor	No	9	939	27,067	3.5%	No						
Quessey	Mark	Industrial Designer	No	9	204	27,067	0.8%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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 (continued)	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Chu	Carmen	Appointed San Francisco Supervisor	Yes	3	15,353	29,316	52.4%	Yes
					Dudum	Ron	Small Business Person	No	3	10,304	29,316	35.1%	Yes
					Ferguson	David	School Teacher/Manager	No	3	3,606	29,316	12.3%	Yes
			5	Full	Mirkarimi	Ross	San Francisco Supervisor	Yes	3	27,482	35,513	77.4%	Yes
					O'Donnell	Owen P.	Retired Environmental Attorney	No	3	5,962	35,513	16.8%	Yes
					Anderson	Rob	Dependent Care Provider	No	3	1,982	35,513	5.6%	Yes
			7	Full	Elsbermd	Sean R.	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	3	22,019	30,986	71.1%	Yes
					Lagos	Julian P.	Public School Teacher	No	3	5,792	30,986	18.7%	Yes
					Whitmer	Billy Bob	Teacher	No	3	2,964	30,986	9.6%	Yes
			9	Full	Campos	David	Civil Rights Attorney	No	7	9,440	26,387	35.8%	Yes
					Sanchez	Mark	President, School Board	No	7	7,616	26,387	28.9%	Yes
					Quezada	Eric	Non-Profit Executive Director	No	7	5,337	26,387	20.2%	Yes
					Royale	Eva	Nonprofit Administrator/Mother	No	7	1,830	26,387	6.9%	No
					Valtin	Tom	Environmental Journalist	No	7	857	26,387	3.2%	No
					Storey	Eric	Telecommunications Technician	No	7	802	26,387	3.0%	No
					Matthews	Vern	Handyman	No	7	466	26,387	1.8%	No
			11	Full	Avalos	John	Legislative Aide	No	8	6,918	24,537	28.2%	Yes
					Safai	Ahsha	Non-Profit Education Advisor	No	8	5,941	24,537	24.2%	Yes
					Lim	Myrna	Business Owner/Journalist	No	8	4,442	24,537	18.1%	Yes
					Ramos	Julio	Trustee, San Francisco CCD	No	8	3,626	24,537	14.8%	No
					Knox	Randy	Attorney	No	8	2,324	24,537	9.5%	No
					Goodnature	Mary	Information Technology Manager	No	8	455	24,537	1.9%	No
					Bermudez	Adrian	Environmental Health Investigator	No	8	410	24,537	1.7%	No
					Horn	Eli M.	Program Director	No	8	391	24,537	1.6%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	12	Full	Sandoval	Gerardo C.	S.F. Board of Supervisors, Member	No	2	156,227	292,015	53.5%	Yes
					Mellon	Thomas	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	134,339	292,015	46.0%	No
SAN JOAQUIN	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Villapudua	Carlos	Senior Legislative Assistant	No	5	3,196	9,231	34.6%	Runoff
					Foster	Beverly A.	Social Services Director	No	5	1,931	9,231	20.9%	Runoff
					Silva	Anthony R.	Businessman/School Trustee	No	5	1,834	9,231	19.9%	No
					Giovanetti	Gary S.	Health Benefits Advisor	No	5	1,642	9,231	17.8%	No
					Carter	Sandra L.	Retired Telephone Technician	No	5	609	9,231	6.6%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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 JOAQUIN (continued)	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Bestolarides	Steve J.	Retired Businessman/Councilmember	No	4	7,229	13,897	52.0%	Yes					
					Davis	Sandra K.	Registered Nurse/Administrator	No	4	2,919	13,897	21.0%	No					
					Garibaldi	Albert E.	Assistant Direct Superintendent	No	4	2,574	13,897	18.5%	No					
					Goad	Nancy	Business Owner/Educator	No	4	1,143	13,897	8.2%	No					
				5	Full	Ornellas	Leroy	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	2	10,170	12,701	80.1%	Yes				
						Benigno	Thomas A.	Retired Business Person	No	2	2,471	12,701	19.5%	No				
						SUPERIOR JUDGE		10	Full	Urie	Phil	Criminal Prosecutor	No	4	19,672	65,016	30.3%	Runoff
										Morris	James M.	Attorney	No	4	19,104	65,016	29.4%	Runoff
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Villapudua	Carlos	Senior Legislative Assistant	No	2	14,752	25,185	58.6%	Yes					
					Foster	Beverly A.	Social Services Director	No	2	10,346	25,185	41.1%	No					
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	10	Full	Urie	Phil	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	91,576	178,357	51.3%	Yes					
					Morris	James M.	Attorney	No	2	86,148	178,357	48.3%	No					
Drivon					David E.	Attorney At Law	No	4	17,118	65,016	26.3%	No						
Pacheco					Frank	Attorney At Law	No	4	8,820	65,016	13.6%	No						
SAN LUIS OBISPO		6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Mecham	Frank R.	Mayor/Businessman	No	2	8,606	13,386	64.3%	Yes				
						Ovitt	Harry L.	County Supervisor, 1st District	Yes	2	4,720	13,386	35.3%	No				
	3			Full	Hill	Adam	Educator	No	2	7,438	12,870	57.8%	Yes					
					Lenthall	Jerry	County Supervisor	Yes	2	5,410	12,870	42.0%	No					
	5			Full	Patterson	James R.	County Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	2	5,933	11,539	51.4%	Yes					
					Arnold	Debbie	Rancher/Businesswoman	No	2	5,584	11,539	48.4%	No					
	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Cambria CSD	Full	Clift	Muril	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	7	1,740	9,363	18.6%	Yes						
				Demicco	Frank J.	Construction Manager	No	7	1,630	9,363	17.4%	Yes						
				MacKinnon	Allan S.	Retired Corporate Executive	No	7	1,548	9,363	16.5%	Yes						
				Da Vega	Richard A.	Retired Government Manager	No	7	1,470	9,363	15.7%	No						
				Cobin	Joan	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,209	9,363	12.9%	No						
				Funke-Bilu	Ilan	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,098	9,363	11.7%	No						
Finchamp				Clive N.	Writer	No	7	638	9,363	6.8%	No							
DIRECTOR, Creston Hills Ranch CSD				Full	Blankenship	Tom	Incumbent	Yes	4	13	45	28.9%	Yes					
Prowse	Michael	Incumbent	Yes		4	13	45	28.9%	Yes									
Olson	Jon E.	Retired	No		4	10	45	22.2%	No									
Courtney	Nina	Café Owner	No		4	9	45	20.0%	No									

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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 LUIS OBISPO (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Heritage Ranch CSD		Full	Gourley	Richard	Retired	No	3	538	1,324	40.6%	Yes			
					Burgess	Dan	General Contractor	No	3	399	1,324	30.1%	Yes			
					Kraemer	Ed	No Ballot Designation	No	3	371	1,324	28.0%	No			
				Short	Clarke	Don	Retired	No	2	404	808	50.0%	Yes			
					Mack	Dennis	Businessman	No	2	396	808	49.0%	No			
		DIRECTOR, Los Osos CSD	Full	Ochylski	Marshall E.	Attorney/Land Planner	No	5	4,329	13,193	32.8%	Yes				
				Kelly	Maria M.	Community Volunteer	No	5	3,735	13,193	28.3%	Yes				
				Venditti	Karen	Retired Financial Representative	No	5	3,047	13,193	23.1%	No				
				Perlman	Alon	Health Care Provider	No	5	1,444	13,193	10.9%	No				
				Duggan	David B.	Audio Video Technician	No	5	575	13,193	4.4%	No				
		DIRECTOR, Oceano CSD	Full	Hill	Jim	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,213	4,289	28.3%	Yes				
				Lucey	Mary K.	Small Business Owner	No	4	1,212	4,289	28.3%	Yes				
				Dahl	Vern	Incumbent	Yes	4	972	4,289	22.7%	Yes				
				Bookout	Bill	Local Business Owner	No	4	851	4,289	19.8%	No				
SAN MATEO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Church	Mark	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	67,828	80,550	84.2%	Yes			
					Nikas	Demetrios	No Ballot Designation	No	2	12,722	80,550	15.8%	No			
			4	Full	Jacobs Gibson	Rose	Supervisor	Yes	2	51,820	75,550	68.6%	Yes			
					Bostic	John B.	Governor Board Member	No	2	23,730	75,550	31.4%	No			
					Tissier	Adrienne J.	Supervisor	Yes	1	72,234	72,234	100.0%	Yes			
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	7	Full	Franchi	Don	Court Attorney/Family Law Facilitator	No	2	41,288	80,232	51.5%	Yes			
					Nastari	Jerry E.	Trial Attorney/Arbitrator	No	2	38,944	80,232	48.5%	No			
SANTA BARBARA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Carbajal	Salud	First District Supervisor	Yes	1	11,213	11,213	100.0%	Yes			
					3	Full	Farr	Doreen	Retired Businesswoman/Consultant	No	5	5,441	15,177	35.9%	Runoff	
							Pappas	Steven	Board President/Businessman	No	5	3,898	15,177	25.7%	Runoff	
							Smyser	Dave	Agricultural Consultant/Attorney	No	5	3,175	15,177	20.9%	No	
							Bearman	David "Dave"	Physician/Director, Goleta West SD	No	5	1,472	15,177	9.7%	No	
							Pointer	Victoria	Councilmember, City of Buellton	No	5	1,191	15,177	7.8%	No	
					4	Full	Gray	Joni	Incumbent	Yes	2	8,313	14,484	57.4%	Yes	
							Sterling	John I.	Retired Police Chief	No	2	6,171	14,484	42.6%	No	
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	Mackinnon	John	Senior County Prosecutor	No	4	24,496	61,210	40.0%	Runoff
								Beebe	Jed	Superior Court Attorney	No	4	13,429	61,210	21.9%	Runoff
								Ready	Kevin	Santa Barbara County Counsel Attorney	No	4	11,838	61,210	19.3%	No
Cutler	Lynn S.	Deputy District Attorney	No	4				11,447	61,210	18.7%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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 (continued)	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Farr	Doreen	Retired Businesswoman/Consultant	No	2	18,165	35,524	51.1%	Yes		
					Pappas	Steven	Board President/Businessman	No	2	17,359	35,524	48.9%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	Beebe	Jed	Superior Court Attorney	No	2	72,144	139,104	51.9%	Yes		
					MacKinnon	John	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	66,960	139,104	48.1%	No		
SANTA CLARA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Shirakawa	George M.	Governing Board Mbr, East Side UHSD	Yes	6	9,430	26,621	35.4%	Runoff		
					Hobbs	Richard	Gov Bd Mbr, San Jose-Evergreen CCD	No	6	8,878	26,621	33.3%	Runoff		
					Martinez-Roach	Patricia	Schoolteacher/Mother/Consultant	No	6	3,773	26,621	14.2%	No		
					Chavez	Frank	Governing Board Mbr, Alum Rock SD	No	6	2,399	26,621	9.0%	No		
					Lopez	Richard L.	Director of Marketing	No	6	1,200	26,621	4.5%	No		
					Diaz	Andrew Abraham	Glass Bottle Recycler	No	6	941	26,621	3.5%	No		
					3	Full	Cortese	Dave	Vice Mayor, City of San Jose	Yes	3	17,813	42,396	42.0%	Runoff
							Lee	Otto	Councilmember/Patent Attorney	No	3	13,280	42,396	31.3%	Runoff
							Esteves	Jose "Joe"	Mayor/Manager/Businessman	No	3	11,303	42,396	26.7%	No
					5	Full	Kniss	Liz	Mbr, Santa Clara Co Bd of Supervisors	Yes	1	51,502	51,502	100.0%	Yes
				SUPERIOR JUDGE	8	Full	Ritchie	Diane	Attorney/Mediator, Santa Clara County	No	5	52,878	194,302	27.2%	Runoff
							Liroff	Lane	Deputy District Attorney	No	5	37,625	194,302	19.4%	Runoff
							Valencia	Jesus "Jess"	Superior Court Commissioner	No	5	36,900	194,302	19.0%	No
							Boyarsky	Jay Steven	Deputy District Attorney	No	5	35,233	194,302	18.1%	No
							Pitsker	Tim	Co of Santa Clara Criminal Prosecutor	No	5	31,666	194,302	16.3%	No
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Shirakawa	George M.	Governing Board Mbr, East Side UHSD	No	2	40,253	74,774	53.8%	Yes		
Hobbs					Richard	Gov Bd Mbr, San Jose-Evergreen CCD	No	2	34,521	74,774	46.2%	No			
				3	Full	Cortese	Dave	Vice Mayor, City of San Jose	No	2	56,845	103,596	54.9%	Yes	
						Lee	Otto	Councilmember/Patent Attorney	No	2	46,751	103,596	45.1%	No	
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	8	Full	Ritchie	Diane	Attorney/Mediator, Santa Clara County	No	2	275,934	503,084	54.8%	Yes	
						Liroff	Lane	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	227,150	503,084	45.2%	No	
SANTA CRUZ	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Danner	Betty J.	Business Consultant	No	6	4,522	11,632	38.9%	Runoff		
					Leopold	John	Cabrillo College Trustee	No	6	4,083	11,632	35.1%	Runoff		
					Busenhart	Carolyn	Business Owner/Hairdresser	No	6	1,558	11,632	13.4%	No		
					Pisenti	Michael J. "Mike"	Businessman/Communications Engineer	No	6	594	11,632	5.1%	No		
					Hay	William	Retired Comptroller	No	6	429	11,632	3.7%	No		
					McIssac	Hugh	Mediator	No	6	374	11,632	3.2%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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 CRUZ (continued)	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Pirie	Ellen	County Supervisor	Yes	3	7,758	11,015	70.4%	Yes			
					Young	Dan	Music Director/Biogeographer	No	3	1,779	11,015	16.2%	No			
					Deitch	Douglas	Nonprofit Executive Director	No	3	1,405	11,015	12.8%	No			
			5	Full	Stone	Mark	Incumbent	Yes	3	8,136	12,623	64.5%	Yes			
					Smith	David R.	Business Owner	No	3	2,506	12,623	19.9%	No			
					Stewart, Jr.	Gordon "Gordy"	Environmental Consultant	No	3	1,875	12,623	14.9%	No			
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Symons	Ariadne "Ari"	Assistant District Attorney	No	2	29,655	49,244	60.2%	Yes				
				Wright	Steve	Attorney At Law	No	2	19,315	49,244	39.2%	No				
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Leopold	John	Cabrillo College Trustee	No	2	12,357	22,609	54.7%	Yes			
					Danner	Betty J.	Business Consultant	No	2	10,149	22,609	44.9%	No			
SHASTA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Moty	Leonard	Police Chief	No	3	3,480	6,865	50.7%	Yes			
					Wilson	John P.	Businessman	No	3	2,340	6,865	34.1%	No			
					Heckman	Paul G.	Deputy Sheriff	No	3	1,019	6,865	14.8%	No			
			3	Full	Hawes	Glenn	Incumbent	Yes	2	4,339	6,475	67.0%	Yes			
					Waggoner	Bruce P.	Supervising Attorney	No	2	2,126	6,475	32.8%	No			
			4	Full	Hartman	Linda K.	Incumbent	Yes	1	5,177	5,300	97.7%	Yes			
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	9	Full	Flynn	Dan	Prosecutor	No	2	15,966	31,335	51.0%	Yes				
				Reed	James E.	Attorney At Law	No	2	15,245	31,335	48.7%	No				
	SIERRA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Adams	Lee	Retired Sheriff/Coroner	No	3	196	339	57.8%	Yes		
						Villarreal	Pete	Retired Probation Officer	No	3	114	339	33.6%	No		
Johnston						Jim	Business Owner	No	3	29	339	8.6%	No			
3				Full	Nunes	Bill	Supervisor, District 3	Yes	2	255	338	75.4%	Yes			
					Macey	Bob	Farmer/Contractor	No	2	83	338	24.6%	No			
4				Full	Goicoechea	David	No Ballot Designation	No	2	167	261	64.0%	Yes			
					Mitchell	Brooks	Incumbent	Yes	2	94	261	36.0%	No			
SISKIYOU				6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cook	Jim	County Supervisor	Yes	2	1,276	2,112	60.4%	Yes
								Bergeron	Leo "T"	Businessman/Rancher/Granger	No	2	832	2,112	39.4%	No
	2	Full	Hardy			Jim	Educator/Trustee/Consultant	No	3	977	2,479	39.4%	Runoff			
			Valenzuela			Ed	Mayor Pro-Tem	No	3	853	2,479	34.4%	Runoff			
			Meyer			Chris	Business Owner	No	3	645	2,479	26.0%	No			
	4	Full	Bennett			Grace M.	Business Person	No	3	916	2,548	35.9%	Runoff			
			Intiso			Anthony	Retired Businessman/Government	No	3	904	2,548	35.5%	Runoff			
	Schettino	Joe	No Ballot Designation			No	3	722	2,548	28.3%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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		
SISKIYOU (continued)	6/3/2008	SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Dixon	Karen L.	Commissioner Superior Court	No	3	6,256	11,658	53.7%	Yes		
					Thamer	Michael	Attorney	No	3	4,687	11,658	40.2%	No		
					Young	Richard L.	Attorney at Law	No	3	687	11,658	5.9%	No		
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Valenzuela	Ed	Mayor Pro-Tem	No	2	2,169	4,306	50.4%	Yes		
					Hardy	Jim	Educator/Trustee/Consultant	No	2	2,128	4,306	49.4%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Lake Shastina CSD	Full	Bennett	Grace M.	Business Person	No	2	2,169	4,250	51.0%	Yes			
				Intiso	Anthony	Retired Businessman	No	2	2,062	4,250	48.5%	No			
				Roths	Beverly	Incumbent	Yes	3	517	1,540	33.6%	Yes			
				Pavlik	Tony	Business Owner	No	3	514	1,540	33.4%	Yes			
SOLANO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Kondylis	Barbara R.	Solano County Supervisor	Yes	2	6,191	8,693	71.2%	Yes		
					Lewis	Benjamin W.	Web Developer	No	2	2,444	8,693	28.1%	No		
					2	Seifert	Linda J.	Non-Profit Boardmember/Attorney	No	2	8,338	13,238	63.0%	Yes	
						Silva	John F.	Supervisor District 2	Yes	2	4,862	13,238	36.7%	No	
					5	Full	Thomson	Skip	Appraiser/Hospital Boardmember	No	4	5,016	12,687	39.5%	Runoff
							Reagan	Mike	County Supervisor, District 5	Yes	4	4,352	12,687	34.3%	Runoff
	Williams	James "Jim"	Taxpayer Association President	No			4	2,111	12,687	16.6%	No				
	Everett	Judith	Business Manager	No			4	1,156	12,687	9.1%	No				
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Reagan	Mike	County Supervisor, District 5	Yes	2	16,628	32,657	50.9%	Yes		
					Thomson	Skip	Appraiser/Hospital Boardmember	No	2	15,914	32,657	48.7%	No		
	SONOMA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brown	Valerie K.	Sonoma County Supervisor, 1st District	Yes	4	11,399	25,858	44.1%	Runoff	
						Pier	Will	Ecologist, Educator, Commissioner	No	4	6,005	25,858	23.2%	Runoff	
Reber						David J.	Affordable Home Builder	No	4	5,137	25,858	19.9%	No		
Wiesner						Lawrence R.	Accountant/Educator/Parent	No	4	3,262	25,858	12.6%	No		
3						Full	Zane	Shirlee	CEO, Service Nonprofit	No	4	6,029	17,570	34.3%	Runoff
							Wright	Sharon	Small Business Owner	No	4	4,842	17,570	27.6%	Runoff
							Smith	Tim	Councilmember	Yes	4	3,866	17,570	22.0%	No
							Jacobi	Veronica	Santa Rosa Councilwoman, Engineer	No	4	2,735	17,570	15.6%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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		
SONOMA (continued)	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Carrillo	Efren	Consumer Financial Educator	No	8	5,881	21,431	27.4%	Runoff		
					Furch	Rue	Environmental Advocate, Mom	No	8	5,106	21,431	23.8%	Runoff		
					Hirshfield	Maddy	Legislative Aide, Sonoma County	No	8	3,584	21,431	16.7%	No		
					Lynch	Tom "Manure Man"	Builder/Community Activist	No	8	1,986	21,431	9.3%	No		
					Maresca	Jim	Environmental/Retired Businessman	No	8	1,903	21,431	8.9%	No		
					Smith	Guy F.	Agricultural Property Management	No	8	1,454	21,431	6.8%	No		
					Kahane	Dan	Water Programs Specialist	No	8	1,017	21,431	4.7%	No		
					Alvarez	Eddie	Volunteer/Businessman	No	8	449	21,431	2.1%	No		
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brown	Valerie K.	Sonoma County Supervisor, 1st District	Yes	2	23,912	46,527	51.4%	Yes		
					Pier	Will	Ecologist, Educator, Commissioner	No	2	22,615	46,527	48.6%	No		
					3	Full	Zane	Shirlee	CEO, Service Nonprofit	No	2	20,002	36,247	55.2%	Yes
							Wright	Sharon	Small Business Owner	No	2	16,245	36,247	44.8%	No
					5	Full	Carrillo	Efren	Consumer Financial Educator	No	2	20,550	40,495	50.7%	Yes
							Furch	Rue	Environmental Advocate, Mom	No	2	19,945	40,495	49.3%	No
STANISLAUS	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	O'Brien	Bill	County Supervisor / Business Owner	Yes	1	8,504	8,504	100.0%	Yes		
					2	Full	Chiesa	Vito	Farmer / Small Businessman	No	2	7,471	12,749	58.6%	Yes
							Weidman	Les	Rancher / Retired Sheriff	No	2	5,278	12,749	41.4%	No
					5	Full	DeMartini	Jim	Farmer / Supervisor	Yes	2	4,590	6,374	72.0%	Yes
							Fantazia	John G.	Mayor of Newman	No	2	1,784	6,374	28.0%	No
					SUTTER	6/3/2008	CHARTER COMMISSIONER ^P	Full	Sillman	Jackie R.	Recycling Coordinator	No	32	3,935	86,770
Mathews	Barbara	Registered Nurse	No	32					3,913	86,770	4.5%	Yes			
Maynard	Clay	Retired Naval Officer	No	32					3,667	86,770	4.2%	Yes			
Van Oosterhout	Bob	Pilot	No	32					3,626	86,770	4.2%	Yes			
Mackensen	Robert E.	Retired Architect	No	32					3,617	86,770	4.2%	Yes			
Capaul	Bruce D.	Civil Engineer	No	32					3,546	86,770	4.1%	Yes			
Stout	Holly Geneva	Attorney	No	32					3,367	86,770	3.9%	Yes			
Shumate	Mary Alice	Library/Literacy Services	No	32					3,237	86,770	3.7%	Yes			
Leighton	Lloyd	No Ballot Designation	No	32					3,160	86,770	3.6%	Yes			
Perkins	Kevin	Planner	No	32					3,010	86,770	3.5%	Yes			
Shannon	Jana	Planning Commissioner	No	32					2,970	86,770	3.4%	Yes			
Arnold	Wade	Retired Businessman	No	32					2,942	86,770	3.4%	Yes			
Flores	Ramon	Farmer/Educational Consultant	No	32					2,937	86,770	3.4%	Yes			

^PProposed charter commission.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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
SUTTER (continued)	6/3/2008	CHARTER COMMISSIONER ^P		Full	Dunn	Maynard Winey	Retired Businessman	No	32	2,866	86,770	3.3%	Yes
					Southard	Forrest "Frosty"	Building Services Supervisor	No	32	2,857	86,770	3.3%	Yes
					Kent	Bob	Businessman	No	32	2,746	86,770	3.2%	No
					Harper	Ben	Public Works Maintenance	No	32	2,675	86,770	3.1%	No
					Cucchi	Dan	Planner	No	32	2,672	86,770	3.1%	No
					Smith	Hugh	Retired Public Administrator	No	32	2,663	86,770	3.1%	No
					Greathouse	Milton	No Ballot Designation	No	32	2,630	86,770	3.0%	No
					Schmidt	Liesl	Regional Community Builder	No	32	2,517	86,770	2.9%	No
					Dais	Rick L.	Citizen	No	32	2,472	86,770	2.8%	No
					Powell	Elizabeth	Real Estate	No	32	2,415	86,770	2.8%	No
					Darnell	Mike	Policy Director	No	32	2,289	86,770	2.6%	No
					Singh	Darshan	Correctional Officer	No	32	2,259	86,770	2.6%	No
					Stengel	Joe	Retired County Employee	No	32	2,225	86,770	2.6%	No
					Long	Mark	No Ballot Designation	No	32	1,772	86,770	2.0%	No
					Darrough	Shelley	No Ballot Designation	No	32	1,693	86,770	2.0%	No
					Garcia	Ernie	CBOC-Member	No	32	1,545	86,770	1.8%	No
					Shepard	Walt	No Ballot Designation	No	32	1,540	86,770	1.8%	No
					Poma	Richard L.	No Ballot Designation	No	32	1,416	86,770	1.6%	No
					Snow	Truth	No Ballot Designation	No	32	1,293	86,770	1.5%	No
		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Montna	Larry	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,103	2,486	44.4%	Runoff
					Libby	Rick	Farmer/Rancher	No	5	434	2,486	17.5%	Runoff
					Boone	Jeffrey K.	Farmer/Businessman	No	5	409	2,486	16.5%	No
					Russell	Melinda M.	Retired Analyst	No	5	304	2,486	12.2%	No
					Singh	Gabrial	Technologist/Farmer	No	5	234	2,486	9.4%	No
		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Whiteaker	Jim	Educator/County Supervisor	Yes	2	1,832	3,500	52.3%	Yes
					Oakley	Sylvia Y.	Financial Analyst	No	2	1,661	3,500	47.5%	No
			5	Full	Gallagher	James	Agriculture Business Attorney	No	1	2,498	2,542	98.3%	Yes
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Montna	Larry	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,860	5,502	52.0%	Yes
Libby					Rick	Farmer/Rancher	No	2	2,616	5,502	47.5%	No	
TEHAMA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Avilla	Gregg	Incumbent	Yes	1	8,577	8,771	97.8%	Yes
					Russell	George	Incumbent	Yes	1	8,501	8,697	97.7%	Yes
					Warner	Ron	Incumbent	Yes	1	8,397	8,605	97.6%	Yes

^PProposed charter commission.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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
TEHAMA (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Gerber/Las Flores CSD		Full	Johnston	Carol A.	Retired District Manager	No	3	165	439	37.6%	Yes
					Humphreys	Tommie R.	Retired Drywall	No	3	160	439	36.4%	Yes
					Leffet	Jamie P.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	109	439	24.8%	No
					Long	Larry D.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	153	292	52.4%	Yes
					Peterson	Eric J.	No Ballot Designation	No	2	138	292	47.3%	No
TRINITY	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Morris	Judy	Business Owner/Consultant	No	3	362	819	44.2%	Runoff
					Hammer	David	Attorney At Law	No	3	258	819	31.5%	Runoff
					Frost	Kelly	Former Board Clerk	No	3	199	819	24.3%	No
					Jaegal	Roger	Trinity County Supervisor	Yes	1	524	524	100.0%	Yes
					Reiss	Wendy	Incumbent	Yes	1	567	567	100.0%	Yes
					Woodward	James	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,375	3,809	62.4%	Yes
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Heryford	Eric	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	1,434	3,809	37.6%	No
					Morris	Judy	Business Owner/Consultant	No	2	626	1,209	51.8%	Yes
					Hammer	David	Attorney At Law	No	2	101	1,209	8.4%	No
					Superior Judge								
TULARE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Ishida	Allen	Incumbent	Yes	2	5,751	7,707	74.6%	Yes
					Christian	Guy	District Attorney Investigator	No	2	1,919	7,707	24.9%	No
					Vander Poel	Pete	Company Controller	Yes	2	4,164	6,286	66.2%	Yes
					Isherwood	Patrick	Probation Administrator	No	2	2,021	6,286	32.2%	No
					Cox	Phil	Incumbent	Yes	1	7,886	8,083	97.6%	Yes
					Selesia, Sr.	Randall "Randy" S.	Towing Service Owner	No	3	1,014	2,595	39.1%	Runoff
TUOLUMNE	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bass	Liz	Incumbent	Yes	3	877	2,595	33.8%	Runoff
					Garaventa	Jim	County Planning Commissioner	No	3	693	2,595	26.7%	No
					Gray	John L.	Retired Association Manager	No	2	1,570	3,029	51.8%	Yes
					Thornton	Mark V.	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,449	3,029	47.8%	No
					Pland	Dick	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,484	2,551	58.2%	Yes
					Torchia	Domenic	Air Traffic Controller	No	2	1,050	2,551	41.2%	No
	11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bass	Liz	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,607	5,040	51.7%	Yes
					Selesia, Sr.	Randall "Randy" S.	Towing Service Owner	No	2	2,409	5,040	47.8%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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	
TUOLUMNE (continued)	11/4/2008	DIRECTOR, Lake Don Pedro CSD		Full	Marquette	Steve	Building Supply CEO	No	6	224	970	23.1%	Yes	
					Barton	L.W. "Wes"	Retired Business Consultant	No	6	205	970	21.1%	Yes	
					Kinsella	William Alfred	Retired Police Detective	No	6	172	970	17.7%	Yes	
					Afanasiev	Victor	Retired Medical Instrumentation	No	6	145	970	14.9%	No	
					Duste	Ellie	Incumbent	Yes	6	130	970	13.4%	No	
					Gile	Kalvin	Incumbent	Yes	6	88	970	9.1%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Twain Harte CSD		Full	Ross	Emery	Cattle Rancher	No	2	269	373	72.1%	Yes	
					Barclay	Jean	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	101	373	27.1%	No	
					Knudson	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	4	478	1,678	28.5%	Yes	
					Johnson	Jim	Incumbent	Yes	4	465	1,678	27.7%	Yes	
					Bryant	William "Bill"	Incumbent	Yes	4	430	1,678	25.6%	Yes	
					Graydon	Jeri	Realtor	No	4	289	1,678	17.2%	No	
VENTURA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bennett	Steve	Supervisor, 1st District	Yes	1	20,593	21,250	96.9%	Yes	
					3	Long	Kathy	Supervisor, 3rd District	Yes	2	17,734	21,910	80.9%	Yes
						Hanson	Socorro Lopez	Executive Director	No	2	4,021	21,910	18.4%	No
			5	Full	Flynn	John K.	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	3	5,913	12,282	48.1%	Runoff	
					Zaragoza	John C.	Councilmember/Businessman	No	3	4,323	12,282	35.2%	Runoff	
					O'Leary	Denis	Teacher/School Trustee	No	3	1,996	12,282	16.3%	No	
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	Bennett	Jeff	Chief Deputy D.A.	No	2	62,108	96,478	64.4%	Yes
						Orellana	Roberto	Assistant County Counsel	No	2	33,610	96,478	34.8%	No
			11/4/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Zaragoza	John C.	Councilmember/Businessman	No	2	21,605	40,099	53.9%
	Flynn	John K.					Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	18,264	40,099	45.5%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Bell Canyon CSD	Full		Douglas	Gerard	Incumbent	Yes	5	483	1,925	25.1%	Yes		
				Christie	Howard J.	Incumbent	Yes	5	412	1,925	21.4%	Yes		
				Tickner	Lana	Marriage Family Therapist	No	5	381	1,925	19.8%	Yes		
				Crockett	William E.	Attorney	No	5	370	1,925	19.2%	No		
				Tickner	John J.	Director Bell Canyon CSD	Yes	5	266	1,925	13.8%	No		
	DIRECTOR, Channel Island Beach CSD	Full		Moore	Keith A.	CIBCSO Director	Yes	4	674	2,043	33.0%	Yes		
Hensley				Jim	Community Volunteer	No	4	579	2,043	28.3%	Yes			
McDonald				Susan M.	Retired Records Administrator	No	4	411	2,043	20.1%	No			
Crandall			Kaye J.	Retired Case Manager	No	4	374	2,043	18.3%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2008

COUNTY	DATE	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
YOLO	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McGowen	Mike	Incumbent	Yes	1	4,846	4,846	100.0%	Yes
			4	Full	Provenza	Jim	Assistant District Attorney	No	3	4,065	8,021	50.7%	Yes
					Ferrera	John D.	Senior Policy Director	No	3	2,739	8,021	34.1%	No
		Kennedy			Cathy	Businesswoman	No	3	1,217	8,021	15.2%	No	
		5	Full	Chamberlain	Duane	Incumbent	Yes	2	4,014	5,630	71.3%	Yes	
				Smith	Mel	Businessman	No	2	1,616	5,630	28.7%	No	
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Fall	Tim	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	21,213	27,719	76.5%	Yes
Walker	James				Deputy District Attorney	No	2	6,506	27,719	23.5%	No		
YUBA	6/3/2008	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Nicoletti	John	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,016	1,441	70.5%	Yes
					Dias	Richard "Ricky D"	Road Worker II	No	2	425	1,441	29.5%	No
			3	Full	Griego	Mary Jane	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,137	1,881	60.4%	Yes
		Mullikin			John	Small Business Owner	No	3	379	1,881	20.1%	No	
		Peterson			Mike	Small Business Owner	No	3	365	1,881	19.4%	No	
		4	Full	Abe	Roger T.	Farmer/Attorney	No	2	1,179	1,726	68.3%	Yes	
				Schrader	Donald	Incumbent	Yes	2	547	1,726	31.7%	No	

Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2008

		County Supervisor		Director, CSD*		Superior Judge		District Attorney/ Marshall		Assessor/Charter Commissioner		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	85.1	114	61.8	42	93.8	15	100.0	1	0.0	0	78.5	172
	Lose	14.9	20	38.2	26	6.3	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	21.5	47
	Total	100.0	134	100.0	68	100.0	16	100.0	1	0.0	0	100.0	219
Non- Incumbent Candidates	Win	24.1	74	50.0	53	35.1	39	33.3	1	44.4	16	32.5	183
	Lose	75.9	233	50.0	53	64.9	72	66.7	2	55.6	20	67.5	380
	Total	100.0	307	100.0	106	100.0	111	100.0	3	100.0	36	100.0	563
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	60.6	114	44.2	42	27.8	15	50.0	1	0.0	0	48.5	172
	Non-Incumbent	39.4	74	55.8	53	72.2	39	50.0	1	100.0	16	51.5	183
	Total	100.0	188	100.0	95	100.0	54	100.0	2	100.0	16	100.0	355
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	7.9	20	32.9	26	1.4	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	11.0	47
	Non-Incumbent	92.1	233	67.1	53	98.6	72	100.0	2	100.0	20	89.0	380
	Total	100.0	253	100.0	79	100.0	73	100.0	2	100.0	20	100.0	427
All Candidates	Incumbent	30.4	134	39.1	68	12.6	16	25.0	1	0.0	0	28.0	219
	Non-Incumbent	69.6	307	60.9	106	87.4	111	75.0	3	100.0	36	72.0	563
	Total	100.0	441	100.0	174	100.0	127	100.0	4	100.0	36	100.0	782

* Directors of Community Service Districts, County Service Areas and Community Planning Areas.