

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

2015 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, 2015 ELECTIONS

COUNTY OFFICES AND BALLOT MEASURES

Steve Boilard, Ph.D.
Executive Director, Center for California Studies

David Barker, Ph.D.
Director, Institute for Social Research

Valory Messier, M.A.
Research Specialist, Institute for Social Research

Samantha Bielz, B.A.
Graduate Research Assistant, 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

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
2015 County, City, and School District Election Dates by County	iii
Trend Table A Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction, and Year	iv
Trend Table B Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction, and Year	ix
Trend Table C Community Service District, and County Service Area Measures by County	xiv
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	xvi
Trend Table E Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures, 1998-2015.....	xvii
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	xviii
Trend Table G Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Year	xix
Trend Table H Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year.....	xx
Trend Table I Percent of Incumbent Candidates, and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction, and Year	xxi
2015 Election Series Summary: Election Outcomes for County, City, and School District Ballot Measures, and Candidates	1
Table A Summary of Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Ballot Measures by Type of Measure, and County, 2015	3
Table B Summary of Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Ballot Measures by Type of Measure, and County, 2015	4
Table C Summary of Election Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Offices, 2014	5
Part 1 Vote Totals, Election Outcomes and Text for County Ballot Measures	7
Table 1.1 Vote Totals for County Ballot Measures by County, 2015	9
Table 1.2 Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 2015	12
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Type of Measure, and County, 2015	15
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure, and County, 2015	16
Part 2 Vote Totals for County Office Candidates	17
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for County Office Candidates by County, and Election Date, 2015.....	19
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2015	25

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 (ISR), 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

ISR staff collects election data periodically throughout each calendar year. This enables CEDA to incorporate results from special elections as well as all regularly scheduled elections. ISR staff enters election results from counties, cities, community colleges, and school districts into the CEDA database and then uses this database to generate three standard CEDA reports. 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.

ISR staff codes ballot measures for all jurisdictions 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

Among their other duties, the Secretary of State acts as 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.

2015 COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/6	1/27	2/17	2/24	3/3	3/10	3/24	3/31	4/7	4/14	4/21	5/5	5/12	5/19	6/2	6/16	6/23	8/25	9/1	10/6	11/3	11/17	12/8	
Contra Costa												✓										✓		
El Dorado								✓				✓											✓	
Fresno																							✓	
Humboldt																							✓	
Imperial																							✓	
Kern					✓																		✓	
Kings																							✓	
Lake																							✓	
Lassen												✓												
Los Angeles			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓						✓		
Madera															✓					✓				
Marin												✓											✓	
Mendocino																							✓	
Merced												✓												
Modoc												✓												
Mono																						✓		
Monterey																							✓	
Orange				✓										✓									✓	
Plumas	✓						✓																✓	
Riverside																✓							✓	
Sacramento									✓				✓											
San Bernardino							✓			✓					✓					✓			✓	
San Francisco																							✓	
San Joaquin																								✓
San Luis Obispo												✓												
San Mateo												✓							✓				✓	
Santa Barbara																							✓	
Santa Clara									✓			✓					✓						✓	
Santa Cruz																							✓	
Siskiyou					✓											✓							✓	
Sonoma																✓							✓	
Stanislaus																							✓	
Trinity																							✓	
Tulare																							✓	
Ventura												✓				✓							✓	

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

	All Measures			Bonds			Taxes			Ordinance			Recalls			Initiatives			Charter Amendment		
	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing
All Measures																					
1995-2015	390	100	65	102	26	69	117	30	58	83	21	61	15	4	72	9	2	49	47	12	76
Even Years	581	100	66	160	28	72	169	29	55	128	22	61	16	3	70	13	2	51	69	12	75
Odd Years	217	100	63	49	23	61	70	32	64	41	19	61	14	7	74	5	2	46	27	13	77
County																					
1995-2015	63	16	57	2	3	70	25	40	44	19	31	64	2	3	73	2	4	49	7	10	67
Even Years	100	17	54	3	3	65	41	41	41	32	32	62	2	2	50	4	4	49	11	11	66
Odd Years	28	13	67	2	5	76	10	37	54	8	29	71	2	9	89	1	3	50	2	8	71
City																					
1995-2015	195	50	64	5	3	59	67	35	61	57	29	59	7	4	73	6	3	49	41	21	77
Even Years	291	50	64	8	3	63	102	35	59	89	31	59	10	3	72	9	3	52	58	20	77
Odd Years	107	50	65	2	2	48	36	34	65	28	26	56	5	4	76	4	4	43	25	23	78
School District																					
1995-2015	133	34	69	95	71	70	25	19	65	6	5	79	6	4	70	0	0	50			
Even Years	190	33	72	150	79	72	26	14	63	7	4	81	5	2	76						
Odd Years	81	37	64	45	55	61	23	29	66	5	6	77	7	9	67	0	0	100			

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

	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	283	100	37	91	36	47	26	10	35	46	18	61	8	3	88	8	3	50	55	22	93
	1996	573	100	57	64	11	59	142	25	40	176	31	58	32	6	72	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	61	144	25	58	162	28	48	115	20	58	19	3	74	9	2	56	94	16	77
	1999	283	100	60	107	38	59	54	19	57	68	24	57	14	5	71	10	4	40	20	7	50
	2000	559	100	58	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	68	245	37	76	155	24	54	136	21	54	8	1	63	10	2	40	77	12	77
	2003	178	100	63	22	12	55	62	35	48	47	26	70	9	5	89	5	3	40	24	13	75
	2004	712	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	556	100	62	185	33	59	142	26	56	123	22	63	17	3	29	22	4	36	39	7	82
	2007	179	100	72	22	12	55	61	34	74	40	22	58	13	7	100	1	1	0	38	21	79
	2008	593	100	75	201	34	82	188	32	67	123	21	65	12	2	58	11	2	91	39	7	90
	2009	193	100	63	6	3	33	99	51	67	35	18	63	13	7	69	3	2	33	20	10	60
	2010	482	100	67	97	20	70	164	34	60	117	24	67	27	6	78	11	2	55	50	10	76
	2011	172	100	72	10	6	80	75	44	67	29	17	72	16	9	75	2	1	0	31	18	81
2012	530	100	72	156	29	81	178	34	69	112	21	62	14	3	93	2	0	50	51	10	63	
2013	137	100	72	11	8	73	65	47	78	34	25	50	8	6	88	4	3	100	11	8	73	
2014	577	100	73	193	33	81	175	30	69	81	14	72	7	1	57	14	2	57	72	12	76	
2015	120	100	74	13	11	77	47	39	79	20	17	75	14	12	100	9	8	22	11	9	64	

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

	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	
County Measures	1995	17	7	53			6	35	33	2	12	0				6	35	83				
	1996	114	20	44	3	3	33	34	30	26	41	36	54	5	4	80	7	6	14	17	15	47
	1997	24	7	63	7	29	57	7	29	71	4	17	100	2	8	50				4	17	25
	1998	125	22	59	1	1	0	53	42	40	32	26	75				4	3	25	25	20	76
	1999	38	13	63	1	3	100	21	55	48	8	21	63							4	11	100
	2000	116	21	49	6	5	83	51	44	27	28	24	50				8	7	88	8	7	38
	2001	37	16	73	3	8	100	14	38	71	11	30	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	140	20	54	0	2	0	60	43	45	47	34	62	1	1	0	4	3	25	18	13	56
	2005	57	19	63	3	5	67	24	42	67	16	28	56	3	5	100	3	5	67	2	4	50
	2006	95	17	52				45	47	40	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	42	40	44	65	1	1	100	2	2	100	4	4	100
	2009	16	8	69				4	25	50	6	38	67	1	6	100				2	13	100
	2010	64	13	53	3	5	67	25	39	48	22	34	59	4	6	50	2	3	50	6	9	50
	2011	20	12	80	1	5	100	7	35	71	4	20	75	2	10	100				3	15	67
2012	76	14	63	1	1	100	39	51	59	20	26	60	1	1	100	2	3	50	10	13	70	
2013	12	9	75				5	42	40				1	8	100	3	25	100	1	8	100	
2014	84	15	57	4	5	100	33	39	36	19	23	74	1	1	0	8	10	50	12	14	92	
2015	34	28	62	1	3	100	11	32	45	8	24	88	5	15	100	4	12	0	1	3	100	

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

	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	119	47	71	4	3	75	7	6	29	38	32	58				7	6	43	49	41	94
	1996	374	65	60	10	3	30	100	27	43	115	31	59	24	6	79	11	3	55	98	26	78
	1997	144	42	58	2	1	50	70	49	50	28	19	54	9	6	22	7	5	71	27	19	89
	1998	283	49	60	9	3	78	99	35	47	78	28	53	7	2	43	5	2	80	69	24	77
	1999	114	40	54	4	4	75	22	19	55	48	42	48	8	7	100	10	9	40	16	14	38
	2000	297	53	60	11	4	82	65	22	45	113	38	56	6	2	100	13	4	54	71	24	70
	2001	93	40	69	8	9	63	31	33	74	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	337	47	59	7	2	43	147	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	253	46	64	10	4	50	82	32	70	85	34	61	6	2	17	20	8	35	33	13	82
	2007	108	60	71	2	2	0	40	37	73	19	18	53	5	5	100	1	1	0	38	35	79
	2008	258	44	73	5	2	100	111	43	71	80	31	65	8	3	38	9	3	89	35	14	89
	2009	130	67	61	1	1	0	63	48	68	28	22	61	3	2	33	3	2	33	18	14	56
	2010	270	56	71	2	1	0	95	35	69	91	34	67	16	6	94	8	3	63	44	16	80
	2011	105	61	74				37	35	65	23	22	70	10	10	100	2	2	0	28	27	82
2012	248	47	67	5	2	20	93	38	72	83	33	58	12	5	92				41	17	61	
2013	90	66	68				44	49	77	30	33	53	3	3	67	1	1	100	10	11	70	
2014	285	49	71	5	2	100	121	42	72	60	21	70	5	2	60	6	2	67	60	21	73	
2015	54	45	70	2	4	0	23	43	87	12	22	67				5	9	40	10	19	60	

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

	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	
School District Measures	1995	117	46	52	87	74	46	13	11	38	6	5	100	8	7	88	1	1	100	117	46	52
	1996	85	15	62	51	60	67	8	9	63	20	24	60	3	4	0				85	15	62
	1997	174	51	62	118	68	59	23	13	70	13	7	92	18	10	44				174	51	62
	1998	164	29	62	134	82	57	10	6	100	5	3	40	12	7	92				164	29	62
	1999	131	46	62	102	78	58	11	8	82	12	9	92	6	5	33				131	46	62
	2000	146	26	63	118	81	57	6	4	67	13	9	92	5	3	100				146	26	63
	2001	103	44	71	62	60	76	23	22	70	4	4	25	14	14	64				103	44	71
	2002	250	38	76	228	91	77	15	6	53	3	1	100	2	1	100				250	38	76
	2003	61	34	52	20	33	55	36	59	47	3	5	67	2	3	100				61	34	52
	2004	235	33	73	172	73	77	51	22	53	5	2	100	4	2	100				235	33	73
	2005	103	35	69	52	50	77	40	39	55	6	6	67	5	5	100				103	35	69
	2006	208	37	58	175	84	59	15	7	27	8	4	88	7	3	43				208	37	58
	2007	42	23	67	19	45	58	18	43	78	5	12	60							42	23	67
	2008	245	41	80	193	79	81	44	18	75	3	1	67	3	1	100				245	41	80
	2009	47	24	66	5	11	40	32	68	66	1	2	100	9	19	78				47	24	66
	2010	148	31	64	92	62	72	44	30	45	4	3	100	7	5	57	1	1	0	148	31	64
	2011	47	27	64	9	19	78	31	66	68	2	4	100	4	9	0				47	27	64
2012	206	39	82	150	73	83	46	22	72	9	4	100	1	0	100				206	39	82	
2013	35	26	80	11	31	73	16	46	94	4	11	25	4	11	100				35	26	80	
2014	208	36	83	184	88	80	21	10	100	2	1	100	1	0	100				208	36	83	
2015	32	27	94	10	31	90	13	41	92	0	0	0	9	28	100				32	27	94	

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

	All Measures			Education			Governance			Land Use			Public Safety			Public Facilities			General Services			Transportation			Revenue		
	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing
All Measures																											
1995-2015	390	100	65	133	34	69	89	23	70	31	8	55	23	6	55	18	5	56	13	3	66	10	3	54	53	14	64
Even Years	581	100	65	190	33	72	133	23	68	47	8	57	36	6	55	29	5	54	16	3	67	16	3	56	81	14	61
Odd Years	217	100	65	81	37	64	49	23	73	17	8	50	11	5	56	9	4	63	10	5	63	5	2	48	27	12	74
County																											
1995-2015	61	16	57	1	1	82	18	29	70	6	11	47	8	13	45	7	12	52	4	6	66	7	11	58	7	12	47
Even Years	100	17	54	1	1	71	27	27	67	11	11	49	13	13	43	11	11	45	5	5	63	11	10	56	12	12	45
Odd Years	28	13	67	0	1	100	9	31	79	2	9	41	3	11	51	3	12	72	3	10	70	3	10	63	3	10	55
City																											
1995-2015	193	49	64	1	1	73	71	37	69	24	12	60	15	8	61	11	6	60	9	5	66	4	2	47	45	24	67
Even Years	291	50	64	2	1	80	106	36	68	34	11	64	23	8	62	18	6	60	11	4	70	6	2	55	69	24	64
Odd Years	108	50	65	1	1	57	39	37	72	15	14	52	8	7	58	5	5	59	7	7	60	2	2	27	24	22	76
School District																											
1995-2015	131	34	69	130	99	66	1	1	68							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50			
Even Years	190	33	72	184	97	66	1	0	40										0	0	0	0	0	50			
Odd Years	81	37	64	80	98	64	1	2	79							0	0	0									

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

	All Measures			Education			Governance			Land Use			Public Safety			Public Facilities			General Services			Transportation			Revenue			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
All Measures	1995	253	100	61	121	48	54	63	25	84	16	6	63	12	5	50	14	6	50				2	1	0	5	2	60
	1996	573	100	57	87	15	64	214	37	66	54	9	56	39	7	51	38	7	37	10	2	40	8	1	50	87	15	46
	1997	342	100	60	175	51	62	43	13	67	19	6	68	12	4	42	15	4	40	38	11	61	4	1	50	10	3	70
	1998	572	100	60	158	28	63	131	23	64	46	8	70	41	7	49	32	6	56	28	5	82	23	4	70	75	13	43
	1999	283	100	59	119	42	59	62	22	63	29	10	41	14	5	57	4	1	75	14	5	57	8	3	88	23	8	65
	2000	559	100	59	151	27	63	141	25	64	73	13	55	32	6	50	39	7	67	20	4	55	21	4	43	5	1	20
	2001	233	100	70	105	45	71	46	20	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	76	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	712	100	62	238	33	72	139	20	73	58	8	52	55	8	47	37	5	38	23	3	70	25	4	76	110	15	47
	2005	295	100	64	102	35	70	61	21	70	28	9	39	18	6	44	14	5	64	18	6	67	13	4	62	33	11	70
	2006	556	100	60	208	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	74	246	41	80	99	17	74	43	7	72	39	7	49	32	5	66	10	2	80	14	2	50	92	16	77
	2009	193	100	63	47	24	66	42	22	64	17	9	47	10	5	60	7	4	86	8	4	25	2	1	0	56	29	71
	2010	482	100	66	149	31	64	138	29	74	30	6	47	27	6	67	12	2	75	9	2	56	7	1	71	95	20	65
	2011	172	100	72	48	28	65	59	12	81	8	2	75	9	2	56	5	1	100	4	1	50	2	0	50	34	7	74
2012	530	100	72	209	39	82	98	20	71	23	5	57	13	3	38	23	5	57	11	2	73	12	2	50	99	21	79	
2013	137	100	72	35	26	80	28	6	71	14	3	50	9	2	67				4	1	50	4	1	50	39	8	79	
2014	577	100	73	208	36	83	114	24	75	45	9	60	33	7	70	20	4	85	13	3	85	19	4	47	104	22	64	
2015	120	100	74	32	27	94	23	5	83	17	4	35	8	2	50	5	1	60	2	0	100	3	1	33	21	4	86	

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

	All Measures			Education			Governance			Land Use			Public Safety			Public Facilities			General Services			Transportation			Revenue			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
County Measures	1995	17	7	53			7	41	71	3	18	33				3	18	67				1	6	0	3	18	33	
	1996	114	20	44	1	1	100	44	39	59	12	11	33	8	7	38	16	14	13	1	1	100	4	4	75	16	14	31
	1997	24	7	63	1	4	100	5	21	60	3	13	100	2	8	0	5	21	40	5	21	80	1	4	100	1	4	0
	1998	125	22	59				25	20	76	13	10	62	14	11	36	12	10	33	18	14	72	16	13	75	12	10	25
	1999	38	13	63				5	13	80				3	8	33	3	8	67	7	18	29	8	21	88	7	18	86
	2000	116	21	49	1	1	100	22	19	64	17	15	35	14	12	36	16	14	44	8	7	63	16	14	44	3	3	33
	2001	37	16	73	2	5	100	12	32	58	1	3	100	7	19	100	6	16	67	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	50	6	21	17
	2004	140	20	54	3	2	33	32	23	66	14	10	14	22	16	50	13	9	54	4	3	50	21	15	76	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	95	17	52				28	29	54	10	11	70	11	12	55	8	8	38	2	2	50	15	16	40	12	13	33
	2007	29	16	76				14	48	93	5	17	0				5	17	100	2	7	100	2	7	50			
	2008	90	15	62	1	1	100	25	28	76	7	8	86	14	16	43	14	16	50	4	4	75	7	8	57	11	12	64
	2009	16	8	69				7	44	86	3	19	33				3	19	100				1	6	0	2	13	50
	2010	64	13	53				23	36	57	6	9	50	12	19	50	2	3	100	1	2	0	5	8	80	11	17	45
	2011	20	12	80	1	5	100	10	50	80				5	25	60	1	5	100				1	5	100	2	10	100
	2012	76	14	63	1	1	100	19	25	74	7	9	43	7	9	43	12	16	67	1	1	100	5	7	40	18	24	72
	2013	12	2	75				4	33	100	2	17	100	2	17	50							3	25	33			
	2014	84	16	57				20	24	85	15	18	60	10	12	50	9	11	78	3	4	33	11	13	27	9	11	22
2015	34	28	62				12	35	83	4	12	25	5	15	40	2	6	50	1	3	100	3	9	33	2	6	50	

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

	All Measures			Education			Governance			Land Use			Public Safety			Public Facilities			General Services			Transportation			Revenue			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
City Measures	1995	119	47	71	4	3	100	56	47	86	13	11	69	12	10	50	11	9	45				1	1	0	2	2	100
	1996	374	65	60	2	1	100	170	45	68	42	11	62	31	8	55	22	6	55	8	2	38	4	1	25	71	19	49
	1997	144	42	58				38	26	68	16	11	63	10	7	50	10	7	40	33	23	58	3	2	33	9	6	78
	1998	283	49	60				101	36	62	33	12	73	27	10	56	20	7	70	10	4	100	7	2	57	62	22	47
	1999	114	40	54				45	39	53	29	25	41	11	10	64	1	1	100	7	6	86				16	14	56
	2000	297	53	60	7	2	71	119	40	64	56	19	61	18	6	61	23	8	83	12	4	50	5	2	40	2	1	0
	2001	93	40	69	3	3	0	33	35	73	6	6	67	4	4	25	11	12	64	3	3	67	3	3	33	27	29	89
	2002	309	47	60	1	0	0	110	36	65	37	12	38	27	9	70	24	8	54	13	4	62	5	2	40	72	23	63
	2003	89	50	67				42	47	69	15	17	60	7	8	57	5	6	60	4	4	100	6	7	33	7	8	100
	2004	337	47	59	2	1	100	107	32	75	44	13	64	33	10	45	24	7	29	19	6	74	4	1	75	91	27	47
	2005	135	46	61				48	36	73	22	16	41	12	9	50	6	4	50	9	7	56	4	3	25	29	21	72
	2006	253	46	64				81	32	62	41	16	59	26	10	81	14	6	43	10	4	60	7	3	71	49	19	69
	2007	108	60	71				49	45	78	13	12	54	5	5	100	3	3	67	5	5	80	2	2	0	31	29	68
	2008	258	44	73				74	29	73	36	14	69	25	10	52	18	7	78	6	2	83	7	3	43	81	31	79
	2009	130	67	61				35	27	60	14	11	50	10	8	60	4	3	75	8	6	25	1	1	0	54	42	72
	2010	270	56	71	1	0	100	115	43	77				15	6	80	10	4	70	8	3	63	2	1	50	84	31	68
	2011	107	62	75				51	48	82	8	7	75	4	4	50	4	4	100	4	4	50	1	1	0	32	30	72
2012	248	47	67	2	1	100	89	36	63	16	6	63	6	2	33	11	4	45	10	4	70	7	3	57	81	33	80	
2013	90	17	68				24	10	67	12	5	42	7	3	71				4	2	50	1	0	100	39	16	79	
2014	285	54	71				94	38	72	30	12	60	23	9	78	11	4	91	10	4	100	8	3	75	95	38	68	
2015	54	45	70				11	4	82	13	5	38	3	1	67	3	1	67	1	0	100				19	8	89	

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

	All Measures			Education			Governance			Land Use			Public Safety			Public Facilities			General Services			Transportation			Revenue			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
School District Measures	1995	117	46	52	117	100	52																					
	1996	85	15	62	84	99	63												1	1	0							
	1997	174	51	62	174	100	62																					
	1998	164	29	62	158	96	63	5	3	40												1	1	0				
	1999	131	46	62	119	91	59	12	9	92																		
	2000	146	26	63	143	98	62																					
	2001	103	44	71	100	97	73	1	1	0				2	2	0												
	2002	250	38	76	249	100	76															1	0	0				
	2003	61	34	52	61	100	52																					
	2004	235	33	73	233	99	73															2	1	100				
	2005	103	35	69	102	99	70	1	1	0																		
	2006	208	37	58	208	100	58																					
	2007	42	23	67	42	100	67																					
	2008	245	41	80	245	100	80																					
	2009	47	24	66	47	100	66																					
	2010	148	31	64	148	100	64																					
2011	47	27	64	47	100	64																						
2012	206	39	82	168	82	23																						
2013	35	7	80	35	17	80																						
2014	208	39	83	208	101	83																						
2015	32	27	94	32	16	94																						

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

	1998			1999			2000			2001			2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007				
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing		
Butte	2	67	100				1	100	100																							
Calaveras																					3	100	100				1	50	0			
Contra Costa	2	67	50				4	80	25	1	100	100	2	100	50				3	60	67	3	100	100	1	33	100	2	100	100		
El Dorado	2	12	50				7	78	29				1	50	100	6	100	17	2	20	100	14	88	64	2	100	0	3	100	100		
Fresno	1	50	100																													
Humboldt																			1	25	100	2	100	0								
Imperial																					1	50	100									
Inyo							1	50	100																							
Kern	6	100	50				2	100	0	4	100	75									3	100	33			1	33	100				
Lake																					1	100	0									
Lassen							1	33	0				4	80	25						1	100	100			1	100	0				
Los Angeles																																
Marin				4	100	100	5	100	80	10	91	90	3	100	100	1	100	100				2	100	100	4	100	100	1	100	100		
Mendocino				1	100	0							1	100	0						1	50	100									
Modoc																																
Monterey													1	100	0																	
Nevada							1	100	100																							
Orange	1	100	100													1	100	100														
Placer	1	33	100																													
Plumas							1	100	100	2	100	100				1	50	100														
Riverside	2	40	50	8	100	38				2	100	0	2	67	50	2	100	0	2	100	100											
Sacramento	2	40	100				3	75	33																							
San Bernardino	2	100	50				3	100	67				1	100	0	1	100	0	1	50	0				1	33	100					
San Diego	10	83	30				3	60	33	1	100	100	2	40	0				3	33	33				1	20	100					
San Joaquin																											1	100	100			
San Luis Obispo				5	100	100	1	33	0				1	50	100				4	67	50	4	100	100	5	83	40					
San Mateo																			1	14	100											
Santa Barbara										1	100	0													1	25	0					
Santa Cruz																					1	100	0									
Shasta							1	100	0																							
Siskiyou							2	100	100												5	83	0			2	100	0				
Sonoma							1	20	100	1	100	100				1	100	100							1	50	0					
Stanislaus																									1	50	0					
Sutter				1	100	0																			1	100	0					
Trinity																									2	100	100					
Tulare																					1	100	100	1	100	100						
Tuolumne				1	100	0	1	33	0																							
Yolo																																
Yuba							2	67	50												1	25	0									
Total for CSD/CSA Measure Over All Counties	31	25	55	20	53	60	40	34	48	22	59	77	18	18	44	13	46	38	30	21	50	31	54	74	24	25	50	8	28	88		

TREND TABLE C COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT, AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES BY COUNTY (CONTINUED)

	2008			2009			2010			2011			2012			2013			2014			2015			1998-2015		
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Butte																								3	33	100	
Calaveras												1	50	100										5	56	80	
Contra Costa	3	100	67				1	50	100	2	100	100	1	100	100									25	78	72	
El Dorado	1	50	0	1	100	0	3	75	67				1	50	0	2	100	50	5	45	60	5	83	40	55	59	49
Fresno										2	100	100												3	21	100	
Humboldt	1	100	0							1	100	100				1	100	100						6	46	50	
Imperial																		2	100	0				3	30	33	
Inyo																								1	13	100	
Kern							1	100	0						1	25	0				1	50	100	19	70	47	
Lake	1	100	100																					2	33	50	
Lassen												1	100	0				3	75	33	2	100	100	13	72	38	
Los Angeles															1	2	100							1	2	100	
Marin	3	75	100	1	100	100	7	88	43	3	100	100	1	50	100	1	11	100	1	25	100	2	22	100	49	63	88
Mendocino													1	33	0									4	33	25	
Modoc																		2	0	0	2	100	0				
Monterey																								1	9	0	
Nevada												1	100	0				1	50	0				3	38	33	
Orange																								2	11	100	
Placer	1	33	0									1	100	0										3	25	33	
Plumas										1	100	0									4	100	100	9	82	89	
Riverside							1	25	0															20	77	40	
Sacramento	1	100	100																					6	35	67	
San Bernardino	1	50	100	1	100	100				1	100	100				1	9	0				2	40	0	15	47	47
San Diego																		1	100	0				21	44	33	
San Joaquin																								2	33	100	
San Luis Obispo												1	50	100							1	100	100	22	76	73	
San Mateo	1	25	100									1	100	100										3	12	100	
Santa Barbara				1	100	100						1	14	100										3	21	33	
Santa Cruz																								1	11	0	
Shasta				1	100	100	2	100	0															4	100	25	
Siskiyou	3	75	33															1	33	0				14	70	21	
Sonoma												1	100	0										4	22	75	
Stanislaus	1	25	0																					2	25	0	
Sutter																								2	22	0	
Trinity																								2	40	100	
Tulare																								3	75	100	
Tuolumne	1	100	100									1	100	100										4	40	25	
Yolo				1	100	100						1	100	0										1	33	100	
Yuba																								3	25	33	
Total for CSD/CSA Measure Over All Counties	18	20	61	6	38	83	15	23	40	10	50	90	14	18	50	7	58	57	16	19	38	19	56	12	343	47	57

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

	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	31	25	55	22	18	45									1	1	0	8	6	88	
1999	20	53	60	16	42	56									3	8	100	1	3	0	
2000	40	34	48	28	24	29	1	1	100	3	3	67			6	5	100	2	2	100	
2001	22	59	77	12	32	75	2	5	100				3	8	100	3	8	100	2	5	0
2002	18	18	44	14	14	36									4	4	75				
2003	13	46	38	11	39	27												2	7	100	
2004	30	21	50	24	17	42				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	24	25	50	15	16	47							4	4	25	1	1	100	4	4	75
2007	8	28	88	3	10	67							3	10	100	1	3	100	1	3	100
2008	18	20	61	11	12	45				1	1	0			4	4	100	2	2	100	
2009	6	38	83	3	19	67							1	6	100	1	6	100	1	6	100
2010	15	23	40	11	17	36							4	6	50						
2011	10	50	90	4	20	75				1	5	100	2	10	100	2	10	100	1	5	100
2012	14	18	50	11	14	36							1	1	100				2	3	100
2013	7	58	57	5	42	40				1	0	100			1	8	100				
2014	16	19	38	13	15	31	2	0	100						1	1	0				
2015	19	56	63	9	26	56				2	0	0	5	15	100	1	3	100	2	6	50
1998-2015	344	30	57	237	20	46	7	1	100	9	1	56	26	2	81	32	3	91	33	3	79

TREND TABLE E COMPARISON OF PASS RATES FOR COUNTY-WIDE, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT/ COUNTY SERVICE AREA TAX MEASURES, 1998-2015

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	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	Percent Passing	
1998	125	94	61	31	55	31	35	22	45
1999	38	18	67	20	60	5	20	16	56
2000	116	76	50	40	48	23	26	28	29
2001	37	15	67	22	77	2	50	12	75
2002	98	80	59	18	44	24	50	14	36
2003	28	15	87	13	38	1	0	11	27
2004	140	110	55	30	50	36	47	24	42
2005	57	26	50	31	74	1	100	23	65
2006	95	71	52	24	50	30	37	15	47
2007	29	21	71	8	88	0	0	3	67
2008	90	72	63	18	61	22	0	11	45
2009	16	10	60	6	83	1	0	3	67
2010	64	49	57	15	40	14	57	11	36
2011	20	10	70	10	90	3	67	4	75
2012	76	62	66	14	50	28	68	11	36
2013	12	5	100	7	57	0	0	5	40
2014	84	68	62	16	38	20	40	13	31
2015	34	15	60	19	63	2	0	9	56
1998-2015	1,159	817	59	344	57	243	44	237	46

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

YEAR	ALL CSD/CSA			LAND USE			PUBLIC SAFETY			GOVERNANCE			ENVIRONMENT			TRANSPORTATION			PUBLIC FACILITIES			GENERAL SERVICES			REVENUE		
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing
1998	31	25	55				12	10	42				3	2	67	2	2	50	1	1	0	8	6	88	4	3	25
1999	20	53	60				2	5	50				3	8	0	5	13	100				5	13	40	5	13	80
2000	40	34	48	2	2	0	10	9	30	2	2	100				6	5	17	5	4	40	5	4	60	1	1	100
2001	22	59	77				6	16	100	4	11	75				1	3	0	5	14	60	4	11	75	2	5	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	30	21	50				17	12	47	1	1	0				4	3	50	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	24	25	50				7	7	71	7	7	43				2	2	50	3	3	0	2	2	50	3	3	67
2007	8	28	88							4	14	100				1	3	0	1	3	100	2	7	100			
2008	18	20	61				8	9	50	2	2	100				2	2	50				1	1	0	5	6	80
2009	6	38	83							2	13	100				1	6	0	2	13	100				1	6	100
2010	15	23	40				7	11	43	4	6	50				1	2	0							3	5	33
2011	10	50	90				4	20	75	4	20	100													2	10	100
2012	14	18	50	1	1	100	6	8	33	2	3	100				2	3	50	3	4	33						
2013	7	58	57				2	17	50	2	17	100				3	25	33									
2014	16	19	38				7	8	29	2	2	100				3	4	0	2	2	100				2	2	0
2015	19	56	63	1	3	0	4	12	50	7	21	86				3	9	33	2	6	50	1	3	100	1	3	100
1998-2015	344	30	57	6	1	17	109	9	49	51	4	80	6	1	33	42	4	48	38	3	53	39	3	67	42	4	60

TREND TABLE G NUMBER OF CANDIDATES BY JURISDICTION, AND YEAR

	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES			
	ALL CANDIDATES	COUNTY CANDIDATES	CITY CANDIDATES	SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES
1995	2,354	0	732	1,622
1996	5,330	667	2,141	2,522
1997	2,476	23	736	1,717
1998	5,354	1,037	1,893	2,424
1999	2,274	135	724	1,415
2000	5,012	796	2,166	2,050
2001	2,505	189	688	1,628
2002	5,896	1,266	2,188	2,442
2003	2,086	205	566	1,315
2004	5,035	782	2,212	2,041
2005	2,546	167	979	1,400
2006	5,498	1,136	2,132	2,230
2007	2,021	207	811	1,003
2008	5,237	782	2,282	2,173
2009	2,066	143	863	1,060
2010	6,022	1,177	2,321	2,524
2011	1,602	138	734	730
2012	5,208	776	2,332	2,100
2013	1,688	152	818	768
2014	5,675	1,204	2,172	2,299
2015	1,321	114	607	600
Total	77,206	11,096	30,097	36,063

*We excluded runoffs from totals.

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	2,354	0	0	0	*	*
1996	5,330	667	470	70	*	*
1997	2,476	23	19	83	*	*
1998	5,354	1,037	309	30	22	2
1999	2,274	135	5	4	109	81
2000	5,012	796	441	55	174	22
2001	2,505	189	0	0	186	98
2002	5,896	1,266	306	24	127	10
2003	2,086	205	10	5	175	85
2004	5,035	782	447	57	125	16
2005	2,546	167	4	2	155	93
2006	5,498	1,136	310	27	160	14
2007	2,021	207	10	5	161	78
2008	5,237	782	441	56	174	22
2009	2,066	143	0	0	141	99
2010	6,022	1,177	331	28	170	14
2011	1,602	138	6	4	103	75
2012	5,208	776	460	59	200	26
2013	1,688	152	11	7	138	91
2014	5,675	1,204	317	26	244	20
2015	1,321	114	5	4	94	82
Total	77,206	11,096	3,902	35	2,658	24

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

**We excluded runoffs from totals.

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

	PERCENT OF CANDIDATES WHO ARE INCUMBENTS				PERCENTAGE OF INCUMBENTS WHO WIN				PERCENTAGE OF WINNING CANDIDATES WHO ARE INCUMBENTS			
	% of All Candidates	% of County Supervisor Candidates	% of City Council Candidates	% of School District Candidates	% of All Candidates	% of County Supervisor Candidates	% of City Council Candidates	% of School District Candidates	% of All Candidates	% of County Supervisor Candidates	% of City Council Candidates	% of School District Candidates
1995	27	--	18	30	79	--	79	78	50	--	41	51
1996	27	24	23	28	79	75	74	78	48	51	41	47
1997	30	5	23	33	76	0	79	74	49	0	45	50
1998	32	30	26	32	86	87	82	83	57	63	48	53
1999	30	0	23	32	78	--	81	77	51	0	45	52
2000	30	30	27	32	79	90	80	74	52	73	51	49
2001	30	--	24	32	78	--	80	77	50	--	51	50
2002	34	34	27	36	82	81	79	79	57	63	50	56
2003	31	0	22	35	78	--	72	79	51	0	40	55
2004	33	28	28	37	81	81	81	76	55	59	51	57
2005	31	0	23	36	80	--	80	78	52	0	50	52
2006	35	29	29	36	82	90	78	78	56	68	51	55
2007	31	0	27	33	77	--	79	75	50	0	54	48
2008	34	30	30	38	76	86	80	70	56	61	55	54
2009	34	--	26	39	78	--	79	76	54	--	51	55
2010	35	28	29	39	82	83	82	79	59	61	56	59
2011	29	0	24	34	82	--	82	82	49	0	47	51
2012	27	28	25	30	74	78	74	71	43	58	41	43
2013	30	0	27	31	77	--	82	74	47	0	52	44
2014	35	31	30	38	77	89	77	71	54	64	51	51
2015	29	0	26	31	71	--	74	67	45	0	46	43
1995-2015	32	29	26	34	79	84	79	76	53	61	49	52

*We excluded runoffs from totals.

2015 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, 2015

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Contra Costa	3	0																	3	0	3
El Dorado	0	2	1	0			0	1			2	0							3	3	6
Fresno											6	0							6	0	6
Humboldt	1	0																	1	0	1
Imperial			1	0															1	0	1
Kern	1	1																	1	1	2
Lassen	0	1													1	0			1	1	2
Los Angeles	11	1	1	1	5	4									3	3			20	9	29
Madera											3	0							3	0	3
Marin	3	0	3	0									1	0	2	0			9	0	9
Mendocino			1	0															1	0	1
Modoc	0	1													1	0			1	1	2
Mono									1	0									1	0	1
Monterey	2	0																	2	0	2
Orange															0	1			0	1	1
Plumas	1	0									3	0							4		4
Riverside									0	1									0	1	1
San Bernardino	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1									2	3	5
San Francisco			1	0	1	0			0	4					4	0	1	0	7	4	11
San Joaquin									1	0									1	0	1
San Luis Obispo	1	0																	1	0	1
San Mateo	3	0	2	1											3	0			8	1	9
Santa Clara	3	0	0	1															3	1	4
Santa Cruz	2	0																	2	0	2
Siskiyou	2	0																	2	0	2
Sonoma	1	2																	1	2	3
Stanislaus	1	1					1	0	0	1					1	0			3	2	5
Trinity	0	1																	0	1	1
Ventura	1	0													1	0			2	0	2
All Counties	36	11	11	3	7	4	1	2	2	7	14	0	1	0	16	4	1		89	31	120

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2015

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Contra Costa	1	0																	2	0	3	0	3
El Dorado	1	0	0	1			2	0			0	2									3	3	6
Fresno	6	0																			6	0	6
Humboldt																			1	0	1	0	1
Imperial	1	0																			1	0	1
Kern					1	0													0	1	1	1	2
Lassen					0	1	1	0													1	1	2
Los Angeles	3	2	1	3	2	0	7	2	0	1			1	0					6	1	20	9	29
Madera	3	0																			3	0	3
Marin	3	0	2	0									1	0			1	0	2	0	9	0	9
Mendocino	1	0																			1	0	1
Modoc					0	1	1	0													1	1	2
Mono			1	0																	1	0	1
Monterey																			2	0	2	0	2
Orange			0	1																	0	1	1
Plumas							3	0					1	0							4	0	4
Riverside			0	1																	0	1	1
San Bernardino	1	0	1	1	0	1							0	1							2	3	5
San Francisco			1	2			2	1	1	1					3	0					7	4	11
San Joaquin															1	0					1	0	1
San Luis Obispo											1	0									1	0	1
San Mateo	3	0	0	1			3	0											2	0	8	1	9
Santa Clara	3	0											0	1							3	1	4
Santa Cruz	2	0																			2	0	2
Siskiyou																			2	0	2	0	2
Sonoma	1	1																		1	1	2	3
Stanislaus			0	1	0	1	1	0									1	0	1	0	3	2	5
Trinity					0	1															0	1	1
Ventura	1	0					1	0													2	0	2
All Counties	30	3	6	11	3	5	21	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	4	0	2		18	3	89	31	120

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2015

		City Council		County Supervisor		Director, CSD*		Other City Offices		Other County Offices		School Board Member		Total**	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	73.9	99	0.0	0	75.0	21	82.1	23	71.4	5	67.4	126	71.4	274
	Lose	26.1	35	0.0	0	25.0	7	17.9	5	28.6	2	32.6	61	28.6	110
	Total	100.0	134	0.0	0	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	7	100.0	187	100.0	384
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	30.3	118	20.0	1	53.0	35	32.7	18	12.5	1	40.2	166	36.2	339
	Lose	69.7	272	80.0	4	47.0	31	67.3	37	87.5	7	59.8	247	63.8	598
	Total	100.0	390	100.0	5	100.0	66	100.0	55	100.0	8	100.0	413	100.0	937
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	45.6	99	0.0	0	37.5	21	56.1	23	83.3	5	43.2	126	44.7	274
	Non-Incumbent	54.4	118	100.0	1	62.5	35	43.9	18	16.7	1	56.8	166	55.3	339
	Total	100.0	217	100.0	1	100.0	56	100.0	41	100.0	6	100.0	292	100.0	613
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	11.4	35	0.0	0	18.4	7	11.9	5	22.2	2	19.8	61	15.5	110
	Non-Incumbent	88.6	272	100.0	4	81.6	31	88.1	37	77.8	7	80.2	247	84.5	598
	Total	100.0	307	100.0	4	100.0	38	100.0	42	100.0	9	100.0	308	100.0	708
All Candidates	Incumbent	25.6	134	0.0	0	29.8	28	33.7	28	46.7	7	31.2	187	29.1	384
	Non-Incumbent	74.4	390	100.0	5	70.2	66	66.3	55	53.3	8	68.8	413	70.9	937
	Total	100.0	524	100.0	5	100.0	94	100.0	83	100.0	15	100.0	600	100.0	1,321

*Directors of Community Service Districts, and Community Service Areas,

**We excluded runoffs from the totals.

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL	
ALAMEDA	No County Measures									
ALPINE	No County Measures									
AMADOR	No County Measures									
BUTTE	No County Measures									
CALAVERAS	No County Measures									
COLUSA	No County Measures									
CONTRA COSTA	No County Measures									
DEL NORTE	No County Measures									
EL DORADO	3/31/2015	Recall	1	Recall	Governance: Recall	120	172	69.8%	Pass	
		Recall	2	Recall	Governance: Recall	118	172	68.6%	Pass	
	5/5/2015	Measure	A	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	62	96	64.6%	Fail [†]	
		11/3/2015	Measure	D	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	57	97	58.8%	Fail [†]
			Measure	E	Advisory	Land Use: Zoning	811	9,047	9.0%	Fail
FRESNO	No County Measures									
GLENN	No County Measures									
HUMBOLDT	No County Measures									
IMPERIAL	No County Measures									
INYO	No County Measures									
KERN	11/3/2015	Measure	B	Property Tax	Safety: Police	500	724	69.1%	Pass [†]	
KINGS	No County Measures									
LAKE	No County Measures									
LASSEN	5/5/2015	Measure	B1	Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Formation/Annexation	233	327	71.3%	Pass [†]	
		Measure	C	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	228	326	69.9%	Fail [†]	
LOS ANGELES	No County Measures									
MADERA	No County Measures									
MARIN	11/3/2015	Measure	H	Gann Limit	Revenues	1,168	1,434	81.5%	Pass	
		Measure	I	Property Tax	General Services: Maintenance	1,090	1,125	96.9%	Pass [†]	
MARIPOSA	No County Measures									
MENDOCINO	No County Measures									
MERCED	No County Measures									

[†] Indicates measure required two-thirds vote to pass. All other county measures required a majority vote.

[‡] Multi-County Community Service District. Results for Modoc County are reported separately.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
MODOC	5/5/2015	Measure	B2	Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Formation/Annexation	188	292	64.4%	Pass [†]
		Measure	C	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	182	294	61.9%	Fail [†]
MONO	No County Measures								
MONTEREY	No County Measures								
NAPA	No County Measures								
NEVADA	No County Measures								
ORANGE	No County Measures								
PLACER	No County Measures								
PLUMAS	1/6/2015	Measure	A	Property Tax	Facilities: Parks & Recreation	66	82	80.5%	Pass [†]
	3/24/2015	Recall	1	Recall	Governance: Recall	402	632	63.6%	Pass
		Recall	2	Recall	Governance: Recall	404	630	64.1%	Pass
		Recall	3	Recall	Governance: Recall	395	635	62.2%	Pass
RIVERSIDE	No County Measures								
SACRAMENTO	No County Measures								
SAN BENITO	No County Measures								
SAN BERNARDINO	9/1/2015	Measure	Z	Property Tax	Facilities: Parks & Recreation	18	71	25.4%	Fail [†]
	11/3/2015	Measure	CC	Advisory	Safety: Police	198	874	22.7%	Fail
SAN DIEGO	No County Measures								
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure	E	Initiative	Governance	65,044	194,257	33.5%	Fail
		Measure	F	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	88,945	200,293	44.4%	Fail
		Measure	G	Initiative	Environment	41,780	186,632	22.4%	Fail
		Measure	I	Initiative	Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary	83,415	194,958	42.8%	Fail
		Measure	A	GO Bond	Housing: Affordable	148,513	199,999	74.3%	Pass [†]
		Measure	B	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	133,718	196,582	68.0%	Pass
		Measure	C	Ordinance	Governance	144,053	192,496	74.8%	Pass
		Measure	D	Ordinance	Housing: Affordable	146,716	198,150	74.0%	Pass
		Measure	H	Policy/Position	Environment	148,213	184,708	80.2%	Pass
		Measure	J	Ordinance	Land Use	108,907	191,175	57.0%	Pass
Measure	K	Ordinance	Housing: Affordable	143,918	193,959	74.2%	Pass		
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures								
SAN LUIS OBISPO	5/5/2015	Measure	A-15	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	8	12	66.7%	Pass [†]
SAN MATEO	8/25/2015	Measure	Q	Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Formation/Annexation	60	60	100.0%	Pass

[†]Multi-County Community Service District.. Results for Lassen County are reported separately.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SANTA BARBARA	No County Measures								
SANTA CLARA	No County Measures								
SANTA CRUZ	No County Measures								
SHASTA	No County Measures								
SIERRA	No County Measures								
SISKIYOU	No County Measures								
SOLANO	No County Measures								
SONOMA	6/2/2015	Measure A		Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	32,741	85,371	38.4%	Fail ^T
STANISLAUS	No County Measures								
SUTTER	No County Measures								
TEHAMA	No County Measures								
TRINITY	11/3/2015	Measure W		Transient Occupancy Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	1,579	2,691	58.7%	Fail ^T
TULARE	No County Measures								
TUOLUMNE	No County Measures								
VENTURA	5/5/2015	Measure N		Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Formation/Annexation	216	265	81.5%	Pass
YOLO	No County Measures								
YUBA	No County Measures								

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2015

EL DORADO	3/31/2015	Recall 1	Pass
Shall James McCarthy be recalled (removed) from the office of Director of the Audubon Hills CSD?			
EL DORADO	3/31/2015	Recall 2	Pass
Shall Robert Verzello be recalled (removed) from the office of Director of the Audubon Hills CSD?			
EL DORADO	5/5/2015	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an annual special tax in an amount of \$250.00 on each parcel of real property be levied within Many Oaks Lane Zone of Benefit commencing fiscal year 2015/2016, to be used only for road improvement and maintenance services and drainage facility maintenance services, to replace the current benefit assessment?			
EL DORADO	11/3/2015	Measure D	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Cosumnes River Community Services District increase the current annual special tax to fund maintaining, upgrading, and improving District roads by \$100 per parcel per year such that the total tax will increase from \$150 to \$250 per parcel per year?			
EL DORADO	11/3/2015	Measure E	Fail
(ADVISORY) Should the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors re-zone the approximately 100 acres of the former executive golf course in El Dorado Hills from its current land use designation as "open space recreation" to a designation that allows residential housing and commercial development on the property?			
KERN	11/3/2015	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Stallion Springs Community Services District levy an annual special tax beginning with fiscal year 2017 of up to \$50 per parcel for the sole purpose of funding police protection services, all as provided in District resolution 2015-08?			
LASSEN	5/5/2015	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the order adopted on January 26, 2015 by the Local Agency Formation Commission of the County of Lassen ordering the formation of a District in the territory described, known as the Southern Cascades Community Services District, be approved?			
LASSEN	5/5/2015	Measure C	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a measure be adopted to assess a special tax of \$65 per annum per parcel regardless of the size for up to two parcels owned by each unique landowner regardless of which county the parcels are located, the special tax will be authorized only if the Southern Cascades Community Services District is formed and is collected in the same manner as taxes on real property, commencing in the fiscal year after which the voters have authorized the special tax, with the revenue to be used for local ambulance, emergency medical response and training and any lawful purpose of the Southern Cascades Community Services District?			
MARIN	11/3/2015	Measure H	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 2016-2017 through 2019-2020 in the amount equal to the revenue received from the special tax for fire protection and emergency services previously approved by the voters in November, 2011.			
MARIN	11/3/2015	Measure I	Pass (2/3 required)
To provide park, open space and street landscape maintenance, shall an ordinance be adopted to replace the existing special tax of \$189.56 per parcel with a special tax of \$189.56 per unit on each parcel within the Marinwood Community Services District, with an annual cost of living adjustment, and to increase the District appropriations limit by the amount of the proceeds received from the special tax?			
MODOC	5/5/2015	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the order adopted on January 26, 2015 by the Local Agency Formation Commission of the County of Lassen ordering the formation of a District in the territory described, known as the Southern Cascades Community Services District, be approved?			
MODOC	5/5/2015	Measure C	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a measure be adopted to assess a special tax of \$65 per annum per parcel regardless of the size for up to two parcels owned by each unique landowner regardless of which county the parcels are located, the special tax will be authorized only if the Southern Cascades Community Services District is formed and is collected in the same manner as taxes on real property, commencing in the fiscal year after which the voters have authorized the special tax, with the revenue to be used for local ambulance, emergency medical response and training and any lawful purpose of the Southern Cascades Community Services District?			
PLUMAS	1/6/2015	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Whitehawk Ranch Community Service District (CSD) adopt a tax increase of \$200.00 per parcel, commencing 2015, to provide for the maintenance, repairs, operations and upgrades including but not limited to the CSD's properties and services including: swimming pool, tennis courts, community center, gazebo, exercise/maintenance buildings, bocce ball pond area, equestrian center, related parking, burn area, road leading to burn area, RV storage area and approximately one hundred acres of hiking trails and open space requiring defensible space maintenance?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2015

PLUMAS	3/24/2015	Recall 1	Pass
Shall Michael Yost be recalled (removed) from office of Director of the Indian Valley CSD?			
PLUMAS	3/24/2015	Recall 2	Pass
Shall Jane Braxton Little be recalled (removed) from office of Director of the Indian Valley CSD?			
PLUMAS	3/24/2015	Recall 3	Pass
Shall Bradley Smith be recalled (removed) from the office of Director of the Indian Valley CSD?			
SAN BERNARDINO	9/1/2015	Measure Z	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall County Service Area 70, P-6 (El Mirage) levy an annual Special Tax of \$12 per parcel beginning in FY 2016/17 with an annual inflationary increase of 3.75% each year thereafter for the provision of recreation and park services?			
SAN BERNARDINO	11/3/2015	Measure CC	Fail
(ADVISORY) Shall the Helendale Community Services District pursue the exercise of legal authority to provide local police protection services at a cost that will be paid by customers of, and/or property owners in, the District in amounts and in a manner to be determined later in accordance with applicable legal requirements?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure E	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the City broadcast all City meetings live on the Internet; allow members of the public to submit electronically during the meeting live, written, video, or audio comments from any location and require those comments be played; require pre-recorded video testimony to be played during a meeting; and allow the public or board, commission, or committee members to request that discussion of a particular agenda item begin at a specific time?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure F	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the City limit short-term rentals of a housing unit to 75 days per year regardless of whether the rental is hosted or unhosted; require owners to provide proof that they authorize the unit as a short-term rental; require residents who offer short-term rentals to submit quarterly reports on the number of days they live in the unit and the number of days the unit is rented; prohibit short-term rentals of in-law units; allow interested parties to sue hosting platforms; and make it a misdemeanor for a hosting platform to unlawfully list a unit as a short-term rental?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure G	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the City define 'renewable, greenhouse-gas free electricity' to mean electricity derived exclusively from certain renewable resources located within or adjacent to the California border or electricity derived from Hetch Hetchy, except for electricity from other types of resources such as rooftop solar and other large hydroelectric facilities; require CleanPowerSF to inform customers and potential customers of the planned percentage of 'renewable, greenhouse-gas free electricity' to be provided; and prohibit CleanPowerSF from marketing, advertising or making any public statement that its electricity is 'clean' or 'green' unless the electricity is 'renewable, greenhouse gas-free electricity' as defined in this measure?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure I	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the City suspend the issuance of permits on certain types of housing and business development projects in the Mission District for at least 18 months; and develop a Neighborhood Stabilization Plan for the Mission District by January 31, 2017?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
To finance the construction, development, acquisition, and preservation of housing affordable to low- and middle-income households through programs that will prioritize vulnerable populations such as San Francisco's working families, veterans, seniors, disabled persons; to assist in the acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable rental apartment buildings to prevent the eviction of long-term residents; to repair and reconstruct dilapidated public housing; to fund a middle-income rental program; and to provide for homeownership down payment assistance opportunities for educators and middle-income households; shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$310 million in general obligation bonds, subject to independent citizen oversight and regular audits?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure B	Pass
Shall the City amend the Charter to allow parents who are both City employees to each take the maximum amount of paid parental leave for which they qualify for the birth, adoption or foster parenting of the same child, if both parents are City employees; and to provide each parent the opportunity to keep up to 40 hours of sick leave at the end of paid parental leave?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure C	Pass
Shall the City regulate expenditure lobbyists by requiring them to register with the Ethics Commission, pay a \$500 registration fee, and file monthly disclosures regarding their lobbying activities?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure D	Pass
Shall the City increase the height limit for 10 of the 28 acres of the Mission Rock site from one story to height limits ranging from 40 to 240 feet and make it City policy to encourage the development on the Mission Rock site provided that it includes eight acres of parks and open space and housing of which at least 33% is affordable for low- and middle-income households?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure H	Pass
Shall the City use the State definition of 'eligible renewable energy resources' when referring to terms such as 'clean energy,' 'green energy,' and 'renewable Greenhouse Gas-free Energy'; and shall CleanPowerSF be urged to inform customers and potential customers of the planned percentage of types of renewable energy to be supplied in each communication; and shall it be City policy for CleanPowerSF to use electricity generated within California and San Francisco when possible?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure J	Pass
Shall the City establish a Legacy Business Historic Preservation Fund, which would give grants to Legacy Businesses and to building owners who lease space to those businesses for terms of at least 10 years; and expand the definition of a Legacy Business to include those that have operated in San Francisco for more than 20 years, are at risk of displacement and meet the other requirements of the Registry?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	Measure K	Pass
Shall the City expand the allowable uses of surplus property to include building affordable housing for a range of households from those who are homeless or those with very low income to those with incomes up to 120% of the area median income; and, for projects of more than 200 units, make some housing available for households earning up to 150% or more of the area median income?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	5/5/2015	Measure A-15	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the County of San Luis Obispo, commencing Fiscal Year 2015/2016, and annually thereafter, impose, levy and collect a special tax on real property within Road Improvement Zone – Leonard Place of County Service Area No. 21, to provide road improvements within said Zone, with the special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding \$1,815 per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?			
SAN MATEO	8/25/2015	Measure Q	Pass
Shall the Merimont territory consisting of seventy (70) parcels located along Merimont Circle, Marbella Lane, and Alden Court in San Bruno, California, be transferred from the South San Francisco Unified School District to the San Bruno Park School District and San Mateo Union High School District, such that by operation of law, persons residing within that territory would become residents of the San Bruno Park School District and San Mateo Union High School District, and be subject to those districts' parcel taxes, effective July 1, 2016?			
SONOMA	6/2/2015	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the people of Sonoma County enact a one-quarter percent sales tax for general governmental purposes such as public safety, local roads and pothole repair, senior, student and veterans transit and other essential services within the nine cities and unincorporated area for 5 years with annual audits made available to the public showing how all revenue was spent the previous year?			
TRINITY	11/3/2015	Measure W	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the County of Trinity adopt an ordinance amending section 3.28 of the Trinity County Code by imposing a special five percent (5%) tax charged to guests of hotels and motels under the County's Transient Occupancy Tax Ordinance for the purpose of providing more funding to local law enforcement, fire protection and promotion of tourism, with the maximum amount collected not exceeding two million dollars \$2,000,000 per calendar year?			
VENTURA	5/5/2015	Measure N	Pass
Shall the resolution adopted on November 19, 2014, by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County ordering the formation of a waterworks district in the territory described, known as Ventura County Waterworks District No. 38, be approved, subject to the terms and conditions specified in the resolution?			

TABLE 1.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE, AND COUNTY, 2015

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/ POSITION		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
El Dorado	0	2					0	1			2	0							2	3	5
Kern	1	0																	1	0	1
Lassen	0	1												1	0				1	1	2
Marin	1	0											1	0					2	0	2
Modoc	0	1												1	0				1	1	2
Plumas	1	0									3	0							4	0	4
San Bernardino	0	1					0	1											0	2	2
San Francisco			1	0	1	0			0	4					4	0	1	0	7	4	11
San Luis Obispo	1	0																	1	0	1
San Mateo														1	0				1	0	1
Sonoma		1																	0	1	1
Trinity		1																	0	1	1
Ventura														1					1	0	1
All Counties	4	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	5	0	1	0	8	0	1	0	21	13	34

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE, AND COUNTY, 2015

	LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		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	TOTAL
El Dorado	0	1			2	0			0	2									2	3	5
Kern			1	0															1	0	1
Lassen			1		1	0													1	1	2
Marin														1	0	1	0		2	0	2
Modoc			1		1	0													1	1	2
Plumas					3	0					1	0							4	0	4
San Bernardino			1								0	1							0	2	2
San Francisco	1	2			2	1	1	1					3	0					7	4	11
San Luis Obispo									1	0									1	0	1
San Mateo					1	0													1	0	1
Sonoma			1														0	1	0	1	1
Trinity																			0	1	1
Ventura					1	0								0					1	0	1
All Counties	1	3	1	4	11	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	21	13	34

PART 2
VOTE TOTALS FOR
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INC- UMB- ENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELEC- TED
ALAMEDA		No County Contests											
ALPINE		No County Contests											
AMADOR		No County Contests											
BUTTE		No County Contests											
CALAVERAS		No County Contests											
COLUSA		No County Contests											
CONTRA COSTA		No County Contests											
DEL NORTE		No County Contests											
EL DORADO	3/31/2015	DIRECTOR, Audobon Hills CSD ^R	1	Short	Blackmun	Gene	Retired	No	1	118	126	93.7%	Yes
		DIRECTOR, Audobon Hills CSD ^R	2	Short	Anders	Russel L.	Dentist	No	1	117	124	94.4%	Yes
FRESNO		No County Contests											
GLENN		No County Contests											
HUMBOLDT	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Manila CSD		Full	Vander Meer	Carol	Nonprofit Consultant	No	6	143	564	25.4%	Yes
					Leopardo	Carla	Store Manager	No	6	131	564	23.2%	Yes
					Bramlett	Jan	Incumbent	Yes	6	123	564	21.8%	Yes
					Prosser	Beverly	Retired	No	6	67	564	11.9%	No
					Opalach	Susan	Itinerant Laborer	No	6	62	564	11.0%	No
					O'Leary	Daniel E.	Youth Group Leader	No	6	34	564	6.0%	No
		DIRECTOR, Willow Creek CSD		Full	Nelson	Bruce	Incumbent	Yes	6	220	799	27.5%	Yes
					Gower	Judy	Incumbent	Yes	6	162	799	20.3%	Yes
					O'Gorman	Tom	Farmer	No	6	149	799	18.6%	Yes
					Duggan	E.B.	No Ballot Designation	No	6	95	799	11.9%	No
					Goodman	Gina	Community Member	No	6	88	799	11.0%	No
					Adkins	Rod	Businessman	No	6	80	799	10.0%	No
IMPERIAL	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Salton CSD		Full	Pickrell	Bryon Leroy	Business Owner	No	3	139	320	43.4%	Yes
					Johnson	Dale R.	Incumbent	Yes	3	109	320	34.1%	Yes
					Fifield	John (Jack)	Incumbent	Yes	3	72	320	22.5%	No
INYO		No County Contests											
KERN		No County Contests											
KINGS		No County Contests											

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

^RCandidate to be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INC- UMB- ENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELEC- TED	
ORANGE	1/27/2015	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Short	Do	Andrew	Supervisor's Chief/Business owner	No	5	18,905	48,339	39.1%	Yes	
					Correa	Lou	California State Senator	No	5	18,862	48,339	39.0%	No	
					Phan	Chris	Councilmember/Deputy DA	No	5	7,857	48,339	16.3%	No	
					Van Nguyen	Chuyen	Television News Anchor	No	5	1,879	48,339	3.9%	No	
					Morfin-Moreno	Lupe	Office Specialist	No	5	834	48,339	1.7%	No	
PLACER	No County Contests													
PLUMAS	3/24/2015	DIRECTOR, Indian Valley CSD ^R	1-3	Short	Schramel	Lee Anne	Natural Resources Manager	No	6	385	1,593	24.2%	Yes	
					Shannon	Phillip	Deputy Sheriff-Coroner	No	6	360	1,593	22.6%	Yes	
					Heard	Robert	No Ballot Designation	No	6	337	1,593	21.2%	Yes	
					Admire	Mina L.	Business Manager	No	6	185	1,593	11.6%	No	
					Dannemiller	Wayne	Retired	No	6	183	1,593	11.5%	No	
	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, East Quincy CSD			Full	Beatty	Mike	General Building Contractor	No	4	309	816	37.9%	Yes
						Kolb	John E.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	294	816	36.0%	Yes
						Brown	Darrell	Retired Highway Patrol	No	4	251	263	95.4%	Yes
						Margason	Gregory	No Ballot Designation	No	4	201	816	24.6%	Yes
	DIRECTOR, Indian Valley CSD				Short	Holcomb	Sarah	No Ballot Designation	No	3	222	737	30.1%	Yes
						Admire	Mina L.	Business Manager/Bookkeeper	No	3	201	737	27.3%	Yes
						Rossington	Shauna L.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	130	737	17.6%	No
	DIRECTOR, Plumas Eureka CSD				Full	Bastian	Daniel B.	Civil Engineer	No	3	97	223	43.5%	Yes
						Bennett	Melinda	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	82	223	36.8%	Yes
						Tretten	Elmer L.	Incumbent	Yes	3	43	223	19.3%	No
	DIRECTOR, West Almanor CSD				Full	Knutsen	Dale E.	Incumbent	Yes	3	127	296	42.9%	Yes
						Forno	John	Retired Forester	No	3	121	296	40.9%	Yes
						Fullerton	Thomas	Incumbent	Yes	3	48	296	16.2%	No
	RIVERSIDE	No County Contests												
SACRAMENTO	No County Contests													
SAN BENITO	No County Contests													
SAN BERNARDINO	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Morongo Valley CSD		Full	Campos	Matthew M.	Programs/Development Director	No	3	205	507	40.4%	Yes	
					Tolbert	Johnny G.	Incumbent	Yes	3	168	507	33.1%	Yes	
					Liebertz	Jennifer	Teacher	No	3	134	507	26.4%	No	

^R Candidate to be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INC- UMB- ENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELEC- TED	
SAN BERNARDINO (continued)	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Newberry CSD		Full	Deel	Paula A.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	173	364	47.5%	Yes	
					Clark	Larry W.	Water Well Contractor	No	4	107	364	29.4%	Yes	
					Aker	Liana Marie	Wildlife Biologist	No	4	42	364	11.5%	No	
					Snively	Linda Deluca	Retired	No	4	42	364	11.5%	No	
			DIRECTOR, Phelan-Pinon Hills CSD		Full	Brandon	Alex	Director, Phelan-Pinon Hills CSD	Yes	5	561	2,381	23.6%	Yes
					Roberts	Mark W.	Hydrogeologist/PPHCSD Director	Yes	5	534	2,381	22.4%	Yes	
					Johnson	Charlie	Financial Management Consultant	No	5	513	2,381	21.5%	No	
					Courtney	Lynn	Business Owner	No	5	487	2,381	20.5%	No	
					Tuck, Jr.	William (Bill)	No Ballot Designation	No	5	286	2,381	12.0%	No	
SAN DIEGO	No County Contests													
SAN FRANCISCO	11/3/2015	CITY ATTORNEY		Full	Herrera	Dennis J.	City Attorney	Yes	1	154,336	154,336	100.0%	Yes	
		CITY TREASURER		Full	Cisneros	Jose	San Francisco Treasurer	Yes	1	139,038	139,038	100.0%	Yes	
		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Peskin	Aaron	President, Environmental Nonprofit	No	3	8,740	16,635	52.5%	Yes	
					Christensen	Julie	Supervisor, San Francisco District 3	Yes	3	7,243	16,635	43.5%	No	
					Pang	Wilma	Music Professor	No	3	652	16,635	3.9%	No	
		DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Gascon	George	San Francisco District Attorney	Yes	1	138,043	138,043	100.0%	Yes	
		MAYOR	Full	Lee	Ed	Mayor of San Francisco	Yes	6	105,298	188,692	55.8%	Yes		
				Herrera	Francisco	Musician-Educator	No	6	28,638	188,692	15.2%	No		
				Weiss	Amy Farah	Educator/Strategist/Activist	No	6	23,099	188,692	12.2%	No		
				Schuffman	Stuart	Journalist	No	6	18,211	188,692	9.7%	No		
				Graham	Kent	Retired Hospital Administrator	No	6	8,775	188,692	4.7%	No		
				Martin	Reed	Designer	No	6	4,612	188,692	2.4%	No		
		SHERIFF	Full	Hennessy	Vicki	Retired Interim Sheriff	Yes	3	113,111	185,288	61.0%	Yes		
Mirkarimi	Ross			Sheriff	Yes	3	61,249	185,288	33.1%	No				
Robinson	John			Business Owner	No	3	10,928	185,288	5.9%	No				
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Contests													
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No County Contests													
SAN MATEO	No County Contests													
SANTA BARBARA	No County Contests													
SANTA CLARA	No County Contests													
SANTA CRUZ	No County Contests													
SHASTA	No County Contests													

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2015

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INC- UMB- ENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELEC- TED
SIERRA		No County Contests											
SISKIYOU	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Hornbrook CSD		Full	Pappion	Nichole C.	Write-in Candidate, No Ballot Designation	No	5	52	163	31.9%	Yes
					Peterson	Melissa Ann	Write-in Candidate, No Ballot Designation	No	5	51	163	31.3%	Yes
					Phillips	Sally Kelly	No Ballot Designation	No	5	24	163	14.7%	No
					Scheimer	Randall L.	No Ballot Designation	No	5	20	163	12.3%	No
					Gifford	Roger	No Ballot Designation	No	5	13	163	8.0%	No
				Short	Slote	Patricia E.	Retired Insurance Agent	No	5	85	273	31.1%	Yes
				Puckett, Sr.	Robert D.	Retired Retail Worker	No	5	84	273	30.8%	Yes	
				Buckley	Lee	Volunteer Firefighter	No	5	67	273	24.5%	Yes	
				Pappion	Chante	Homemaker	No	5	27	273	9.9%	No	
				Olson	Kimberly	No Ballot Designation	No	5	10	273	3.7%	No	
SOLANO		No County Contests											
SONOMA		No County Contests											
STANISLAUS	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Keyes CSD		Full	Landers	Davie	Retired City Worker	No	3	103	265	38.9%	Yes
					Bernal	Mike	Incumbent	Yes	3	89	265	33.6%	Yes
					Aguilar	Antonio (Tony)	No Ballot Designation	No	3	68	265	25.7%	No
		DIRECTOR, Riverdale Park Tract CSD		Full	Murphy	Kelland	Incumbent	Yes	4	21	58	36.2%	Yes
					Culwell-Caro	Diana M.	Incumbent	Yes	4	19	58	32.8%	Yes
					Horn	Timi	Massage Therapist	No	4	10	58	17.2%	Yes
					Caro	Rudy	Incumbent	Yes	4	8	58	13.8%	No
		Short		Bixler	George	Retired Worker	No	3	19	44	43.2%	Yes	
				Shugart	Duane	Janitor	No	3	13	44	29.5%	Yes	
				Hodges	Rita M.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	12	44	27.3%	No	
SUTTER		No County Contests											
TEHAMA		No County Contests											
TRINITY		No County Contests											
TULARE	11/3/2015	DIRECTOR, Richgrove CSD		Full	Hernandez	Atzimba	No Ballot Designation	No	5	43	169	25.4%	Yes
					Sanchez	Alberto H.	Agricultural Laborer	No	5	40	169	23.7%	Yes
					Flores	Juanita B.	Incumbent	Yes	5	35	169	20.7%	No
					Sabado	Albert	Athletic Director	No	5	28	169	16.6%	No
					Rodriguez	Rose B.	Retired School Secretary	No	5	23	169	13.6%	No
TUOLUMNE		No County Contests											
VENTURA		No County Contests											

TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY OFFICES, 2015

		County Supervisor		Director, CSD		Other County*		Total**	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	0.0	0	75.0	21	71.4	5	74.3	26
	Lose	0.0	0	25.0	7	28.6	2	25.7	9
	Total	0.0	0	100.0	28	100.0	7	100.0	35
Non- Incumbent Candidates	Win	20.0	1	53.0	35	12.5	1	46.8	37
	Lose	80.0	4	47.0	31	87.5	7	53.2	42
	Total	100.0	5	100.0	66	100.0	8	100.0	79
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	37.5	21	83.3	5	41.3	26
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	62.5	35	16.7	1	58.7	37
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	56	100.0	6	100.0	63
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	18.4	7	22.2	2	17.6	9
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	4	81.6	31	77.8	7	82.4	42
	Total	100.0	4	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	51
All Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	70.2	28	46.7	7	30.7	35
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	5	29.8	66	53.3	8	69.3	79
	Total	100.0	5	100.0	94	100.0	15	100.0	114

* Runoffs are excluded from totals.

**Percent may not sum to 100 due to rounding.