

An aerial photograph of San Francisco, California, showing a dense residential area in the foreground and a prominent skyline of skyscrapers in the background. The sky is clear and blue. A white rectangular box with a yellow horizontal line is overlaid on the image, containing the text 'City Offices and Ballot Measures'.

City Offices and Ballot Measures

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES:

CANDIDATES AND BALLOT MEASURES 2019 ELECTIONS

California State University, Sacramento
Institute for Social Research & The Center for California Studies

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT
ELECTION OUTCOMES:
CANDIDATES AND BALLOT MEASURES, 2019 ELECTIONS

CITY OFFICES AND BALLOT MEASURES

Leonor Ehling, M.P.P.
Executive Director, Center for California Studies

Shannon A. Williams, Ph.D.
Director, Institute for Social Research

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

Fleur M. Marfori, B.A.
Graduate Research Assistant, Institute for Social Research

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

Institute for Social Research
California State University, Sacramento
304 S Street, Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 278-4317 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
2019 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	v
Trend Table B Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction, and Year	x
Trend Table C Community Service District and County Service Area Measures by County	xv
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	xx
Trend Table E Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures by Year	xxi
Trend Table F Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic & Year	xxii
Trend Table G Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Year	xxii
Trend Table H Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year	xxiv
Trend Table I Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Year	xxv
2019 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, 2019	2
Table B Summary of Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2019	3
Table C Summary of Election Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Offices, 2019	4
Part 1 Vote Totals, Election Outcomes and Text for City Ballot Measures	5
Table 1.1 Vote Totals for City Ballot Measures by County, 2019	6
Table 1.2 Text for City Ballot Measures by County, 2019	9
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2019	13
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2019	14
Part 2 Vote Totals for City Office Candidates	15
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for City Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2019	16
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Offices, 2019	23

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) at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) 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. Utilizing quantitative and qualitative methods, ISR produces various types of assessments, program and policy evaluations, survey research, workload studies, and specialized analyses. Services include research design, sampling design, data collection and coding, computer-assisted telephone and field interviewing, mailed and online surveys, focus groups, database management, and statistical analysis. ISR has completed hundreds of projects with more than 50 federal, state and community agencies, private firms, and many academic units. Faculty affiliates of the Institute offer specific content expertise in a wide variety of disciplines, including the social sciences, health and human services, 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.

2019 COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/29	2/26	3/5	3/12	4/9	4/16	5/7	5/14	6/4	6/18	8/13	8/27	10/15	11/5
Alameda					●		●		●					●
Alpine														●
Amador														
Butte														
Calaveras														●
Colusa														
Contra Costa														●
Del Norte														
El Dorado														
Fresno			●								●			●
Glenn														
Humboldt														
Imperial														●
Inyo														
Kern														
Kings														
Lake														
Lassen							●							
Los Angeles		●	●		●	●		●	●		●		●	●
Madera														
Marin												●		●
Mariposa														
Mendocino														
Merced														
Modoc							●							
Mono														
Monterey														
Napa									●					
Nevada														
Orange	●			●										●

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																					
1995-2019	398	100	67	105	26	72	127	32	63	80	20	62	13	3	73	10	2	46	46	11	77
Even Years	616	100	69	173	28	75	191	31	62	126	21	63	15	2	72	15	2	48	69	11	77
Odd Years	197	100	63	42	21	61	68	34	65	38	19	62	12	6	74	5	2	41	24	12	77
County																					
1995-2019	64	16	59	2	3	73	27	43	49	19	29	65	2	3	76	3	4	43	7	10	67
Even Years	105	17	57	3	3	70	46	44	47	31	29	63	2	2	59	5	4	42	12	11	66
Odd Years	26	13	67	1	5	78	10	39	57	7	28	71	2	8	89	1	3	50	2	7	72
City																					
1995-2019	200	50	67	5	2	60	75	38	66	56	28	60	6	3	74	7	3	48	39	19	79
Even Years	308	50	67	8	3	63	118	38	66	89	29	61	8	3	72	10	3	51	58	19	79
Odd Years	100	51	65	2	2	50	36	36	66	26	26	57	4	4	76	4	4	41	22	22	78
School District																					
1995-2019	134	34	72	98	73	73	24	18	67	5	4	80	5	4	71	0	0	50			
Even Years	203	33	75	162	80	76	27	13	67	7	3	82	5	2	78	0	0	0			
Odd Years	71	36	64	39	55	61	21	30	66	4	6	77	6	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	
2016	872	100	79	294	34	91	279	32	73	138	16	72	10	1	90	37	4	41	86	10	83	
2017	113	100	63	8	7	38	73	65	64	20	18	65	1	1	100	3	3	0	7	6	86	
2018	704	100	80	182	26	81	329	47	84	98	14	66	9	1	89	11	2	36	58	8	93	
2019	67	100	79	3	4	100	43	64	88	15	22	67				4	6	0	1	1	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	
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	
2016	151	17	59	4	3	100	68	45	56	38	25	66	3	2	100	12	8	25	17	11	59	
2017	14	12	57				11	79	55	3	21	67										
2018	102	14	75	3	3	67	72	71	78	11	11	82	1	1	100	2	2	0	8	8	75	
2019	16	24	88	1	6	100	10	63	90	3	19	67							1	6	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			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	49	27	41	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	19	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	14	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		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	27	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	0	40	37	73	19	18	53	5	5	100	1	1	0	38	24	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	2	1	0	63	48	68	28	22	61	3	2	33	3	2	33	18		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					35	65	23	22	70	10	10	100	2	2	0	28	14		82
	2012	248	47	67	5	2	20	93	38	72	83	33	58	12	5	92				41	17	61	
	2013	90	66	68			37		49	77	30	33	53	3	3	67	1	1	100	10	27		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	11		60	
2016	393	45	77	9	2	67	174	44	79	96	24	74	1	0	100	25	6	48	69	18	88		
2017	81	72	65		2	50	50	62	66	17	21	65	1	1	100	3	4	0	7	19	9	86	
2018	391	56	80	9	2	56	224	57	86	84	21	63	5	1	80	9	2	44	46	12	96		
2019	41	61	76	1	2	100	24	59	92	12	29	67				4	10	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	
School District Measures	1995	117	46	52	87	74	46	13	11	38	6	5	100	8	7	88	1	1	100			
	1996	85	15	62	51	60	67	8	9	63	20	24	60	3	4	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	76	228	91	77	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	208	37	58	175	84	59	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	80	193	79	81	44	18	75	3	1	67	3	1	100						
	2009	47	24	66	5	11	40	32	68	66	1	2	100	9	19	78						
	2010	148	31	64	92	62	72	44	30	45	4	3	100	7	5	57	1	1	0			
	2011	47	27	64	9	19	78	31	66	68	2	4	100	4	9	0						
	2012	206	39	82	150	73	83	46	22	72	9	4	100	1	0	100						
	2013	35	26	80	11	31	73	16	46	94	4	11	25	4	11	100						
	2014	208	36	83	184	88	80	21	10	100	2	1	100	1	0	100						
2015	32	27	94	10	31	90	13	41	92				9	28	100							
2016	328	38	90	281	86	92	37	11	78	4	0	0	6	2	83							
2017	18	16	56	6	33	33	12	67	67													
2018	211	30	84	170	81	82	31	15	87	3	0	0	3	1	100				4	2	100	
2019	10	15	80	1	10	100	9	90	78													

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						
	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	34	81	8	5	75	9	5	56	5	3	100	4	2	50	2	1	50	34	20	74
	2012	530	100	72	209	39	82	98	18	71	23	4	57	13	2	38	23	4	57	11	2	73	12	2	50	99	19	79
	2013	137	100	72	35	26	80	28	20	71	14	10	50	9	7	67				4	3	50	4	3	50	39	28	79
	2014	577	100	73	208	36	83	114	20	75	45	8	60	33	6	70	20	3	85	13	2	85	19	3	47	104	18	64
2015	120	100	74	32	27	94	23	19	83	17	14	35	8	7	50	5	4	60	2	2	100	3	3	33	21	18	86	
2016	872	100	79	331	38	90	116	13	78	99	11	61	53	6	70	30	3	50	26	3	54	29	3	48	150	17	85	
2017	113	100	63	18	16	56	13	12	85	13	12	54	15	13	40	5	4	60	6	5	67	4	4	25	36	32	81	
2018	704	100	80	206	29	83	114	16	80	55	8	53	35	5	74	13	2	62	123	17	92	24	3	79	102	14	87	
2019	67	100	81	10	15	80	9	13	89	8	12	38	13	19	92	2	3	50	1	1	100	3	4	100	17	25	94	

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

		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				
County Measures	1995																											
	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				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							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				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							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							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							14	48	93	5	17	0	0	0					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							7	44	86	3	19	33	0	0								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	9	75				4	33	100	2	17	100	2	17	50							3	25	33			
	2014	84	15	57				20	24	85	15	18	60	10	12	50	9	11	78	3	4	33	11	13	27	9	11	22
2015							12	35	83	4	12	25	5	15	40	2	6	50	1	3	100	3	9	33	2	6	50	
2016	151	17	59				28	19	54	44	29	34	21	14	57	7	5	57	12	8	58	18	12	33	19	13	74	
2017							3	21	67				1	7	0	2	14	100	3	21	67	3	21	33	2	14	50	
2018	102	14	75	1	1	100	15	15	80	12	12	58	9	9	67	4	4	75	14	14	86	18	18	89	20	20	70	
2019	16	24	88				3	19	100				7	44	86							3	19		1	6	100	

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						
	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
	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	66	68					27	67	12	13	42	7	8	71				4	4	50	1	1	100	39	43	79
	2014	285	49	71				94	33	72	30	11	60	23	8	78	11	4	91	10	4	100	8	3	75	95	33	68
	2015		45	70					20	82	13	24	38	3	6	67	3	6	67	1	2	100				19	35	89
	2016	393	45	77	3	1	67	88	22	85	70	18	64	32	8	78	23	6	48	14	4	50	11	3	73	131	33	86
	2017	81	72	65					12	90	13	16	54	14	17	43	3	4	33	3	4	67	1	1	0	34	42	82
	2018	391	56	80	2	1	50	92	24	78	43	11	51	26	7	77	9	2	56	109	28	93	9	2	56	85	22	88
	2019	41	61	76				6	15	83	8	20	38	6	15	100	2	5	50	1	2	100				16	39	94

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

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

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

	2003			2004			2005			2006			2007		
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Alpine															
Butte															
Calaveras							3	100	100				1	50	0
Colusa															
Contra Costa				3	60	67	3	100	100	1	33	100	2	100	100
El Dorado	6	100	17	2	20	100	14	88	64	2	100	0	3	100	100
Fresno															
Humboldt				1	25	100	2	100	0						
Imperial							1	50	100						
Inyo															
Kern				3	100	33				1	33	100			
Lake				1	100	0									
Lassen				1	100	100				1	100	0			
Los Angeles															
Marin	1	100	100				2	100	100	4	100	100	1	100	100
Mendocino				1	50	100									
Modoc															
Monterey															
Nevada															
Orange	1	100	100												
Placer															
Plumas	1	50	100												
Riverside	2	100	0	2	100	100									
Sacramento															
San Bernardino	1	100	0	1	50	0				1	33	100			
San Diego				3	33	33				1	20	100			
San Joaquin													1	100	100
San Luis Obispo				4	67	50	4	100	100	5	83	40			
San Mateo				1	14	100									
Santa Barbara										1	25	0			
Santa Cruz							1	100	0						
Shasta															
Siskiyou				5	83	0				2	100	0			
Sonoma	1	100	100							1	50	0			
Stanislaus										1	50	0			
Sutter										1	100	0			
Trinity										2	100	100			
Tulare				1	100	100	1	100	100						
Tuolumne															
Yolo															
Yuba				1	25	0									
Total for CSD/CSA Measure Over All Counties	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		
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Alpine															
Butte															
Calaveras													1	50	100
Colusa															
Contra Costa	3	100	67				1	50	100	2	100	100	1	100	100
El Dorado	1	50	0	1	100	0	3	75	67				1	50	0
Fresno										2	100	100			
Humboldt	1	100	0							1	100	100			
Imperial															
Inyo															
Kern							1	100	0						
Lake	1	100	100												
Lassen													1	100	0
Los Angeles															
Marin	3	75	100	1	100	100	7	88	43	3	100	100	1	50	100
Mendocino													1	33	0
Modoc															
Monterey															
Nevada													1	100	0
Orange															
Placer	1	33	0										1	100	0
Plumas										1	100	0			
Riverside							1	25	0						
Sacramento	1	100	100												
San Bernardino	1	50	100	1	100	100				1	100	100			
San Diego															
San Joaquin															
San Luis Obispo													1	50	100
San Mateo	1	25	100										1	100	100
Santa Barbara				1	100	100							1	14	100
Santa Cruz															
Shasta				1	100	100	2	100	0						
Siskiyou	3	75	33												
Sonoma													1	100	0
Stanislaus	1	25	0												
Sutter															
Trinity															
Tulare															
Tuolumne	1	100	100										1	100	100
Yolo				1	100	100							1	100	0
Yuba															
Total for CSD/CSA Measure Over All Counties	18	20	61	6	38	83	15	23	40	10	50	90	14	18	50

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

	2013			2014			2015			2016			2017		
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Alpine															
Butte															
Calaveras										1	20	0	2	100	50
Colusa													1	0	0
Contra Costa										1	33	100			
El Dorado	2	100	50	5	45	60	5	83	40	4	50	0	2	100	0
Fresno															
Humboldt	1	100	100												
Imperial				2	100	0									
Inyo															
Kern	1	25	0				1	50	100	1	50	0			
Lake															
Lassen				3	75	33	2	100	100	2	67	100			
Los Angeles	1	2	100							4	67	100			
Marin	1	11	100	1	25	100	2	22	100				1	100	0
Mendocino															
Modoc				2	0	0	2	100	0	2	100	100			
Monterey													1	100	0
Nevada				1	50	0							1	100	100
Orange															
Placer															
Plumas							4	100	100	1	100	100			
Riverside															
Sacramento															
San Bernardino	1	9	0				2	40	0	3	100	67	1	100	100
San Diego				1	100	0				1	33	0			
San Joaquin															
San Luis Obispo							1	100	100						
San Mateo										1	33	100			
Santa Barbara										2	67	50			
Santa Cruz															
Shasta															
Siskiyou				1	33	0				2	29	50			
Sonoma															
Stanislaus															
Sutter															
Trinity															
Tulare															
Tuolumne															
Yolo															
Yuba															
Total for CSD/CSA Measure Over All Counties	7	58	57	16	19	38	19	56	12	25	17	60	9	64	44

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

	2018			2019		
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Alpine				1	13	100
Butte						
Calaveras				1	13	100
Colusa						
Contra Costa	3	5	67	1	13	100
El Dorado	6	14	83			
Fresno						
Humboldt						
Imperial				2	25	50
Inyo						
Kern						
Lake	1	3	100			
Lassen						
Los Angeles						
Marin	1	3	100			
Mendocino						
Modoc						
Monterey						
Nevada						
Orange						
Placer						
Plumas				1	13	100
Riverside						
Sacramento						
San Bernardino						
San Diego	2	6	50			
San Joaquin						
San Luis Obispo	1	3	0	1	13	100
San Mateo						
Santa Barbara						
Santa Cruz						
Shasta						
Siskiyou						
Sonoma				1	13	100
Stanislaus						
Sutter						
Trinity						
Tulare	1	1	0			
Tuolumne	1	3	100			
Yolo						
Yuba						
Total for CSD/CSA Measure Over All Counties	16	16	75	8	100	88

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	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
2016	25	17	60	17	11	47				1	1	0	2	1	100	1	1	100	4	3	100
2017	9	64	44	6	43	33													3	21	67
2018	16	16	75	14	14	71									1	1	100	1	1	100	
2019	8	50	88	7	44	86									1	6	100				
1998-2019	402	28	58	281	19	48	7	0	100	10	1	50	28	2	82	35	2	91	41	3	80

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

	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			5	40
2014	84	68	62	16	38	20	40	13	31
2015	34	15	60	19	63	2	0	9	56
2016	151	126	59	25	60	51	59	17	47
2017	14	5	80	9	44	5	80	6	33
2018	102	86	24	16	75	58	79	14	71
2019	16	8	88	8	88	2	100	7	86
1998-2019	1,442	1,042	57	402	58	359	52	281	48

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

	ALL CSD/CSA			LAND USE			PUBLIC SAFETY			GOVERNANCE			ENVIRONMENT			TRANSPORTATION			PUBLIC FACILITIES			GENERAL SERVICES			REVENUE		
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing
1998	31	25	55				12	10	42				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				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		4		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	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	
2016	25	17	60	1	1	0	10	7	70	6	4	100			3	2	0				1	1	100	4	3	25	
2017	9	64	44							3	21	67			3	21	33	1	7	100	1	7	0	1	7	0	
2018	16	16	88				5	5	60	2	2	100			7	7	71							2	2	100	
2019	8	50	88				7	44	86						1	6	100										
1998-2019	402	28	59	7	0	14	131	9	53	62	4	82	6	0	33	56	4	48	39	3	54	41	3	66	49	3	57

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
	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
	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
2016	5,118	723	2,361	2,034
2017	763	78	494	191
2018	6,526	1,176	2,700	2,650
2019	304	43	193	68
Total	89,917	13,116	35,845	41,006

*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
2016	5,118	723	431	60	158	22
2017	763	78	0	0	78	100
2018	6,526	1,176	324	28	192	16
2019	304	43	14	33	15	35
Total	89,917	13,116	4,671	36	3,101	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
2016	32	31	28	34	74	82	75	68	49	63	47	46
2017	29	--	26	31	80	--	86	70	55	--	59	47
2018	34	30	27	36	76	84	72	69	52	60	45	49
2019	22	7	18	19	78	100	79	54	44	33	41	28
1995-2019	32	29	27	34	79	83	78	75	53	61	49	51

*We excluded runoffs from totals.

**2019 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, 2019

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		INITIATIVE		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	OTAL
Alameda	2 F	0 P	1 F	0 P			0 F	1 P			1 F	0 P	4 F	1 T	5
Alpine	1 F	0 P											1 F	0 P	1
Calaveras	2	0									1	0	3	0	3
Contra Costa	2	0					0	1					2	1	3
Fresno	1	0											1	0	1
Imperial	0	1							1	0			1	1	2
Los Angeles	12	2	1	0			0	1			5	0	18	3	21
Marin	4	1											4	1	5
Napa											0	1	0	1	1
Orange	2	0											2	0	2
Placer											0	2	0	2	2
Plumas	1	0											1	0	1
San Diego							0	1					0	1	1
San Francisco	1	0	1	0	1	0					2	1	5	1	6
San Luis Obispo	1	0											1	0	1
San Mateo	6	1											6	1	7
Santa Clara	1	0											1	0	1
Sonoma	1	0									1	0	2	0	2
Stanislaus	1	0									0	1	1	1	2
All Counties	38	5	3	0	1	0	0	4	1	0	10	5	53	14	67

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2019

	EDUCATION		FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		GOVERNANCE		HOUSING		LAND USE		OTHER		REVENUE		SAFETY		TRANSPORT		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	OTAL
Alameda	3	0									1	1									4	1	5
Alpine																	1	0			1	0	1
Calaveras							1	0							1	0			1	0	3	0	3
Contra Costa			1	0							0	1					1	0			2	1	3
Fresno					1	0															1	0	1
Imperial																	1	1			1	1	2
Los Angeles	1	1					4	0			1	0	0	1	8	1	4	0			18	3	21
Marin	2	0	0	1											2	0					4	1	5
Napa									0	1											0	1	1
Orange																	2	0			2	0	2
Placer											0	2									0	2	2
Plumas																	1	0			1	0	1
San Diego											0	1									0	1	1
San Francisco							2	0	1	0			0	1					2	0	6	0	6
San Luis Obispo																	1	0			1	0	1
San Mateo	1	1					1	0							4	0					6	1	7
Santa Clara	1	0																			1	0	1
Sonoma											1	0					1	0			2	0	2
Stanislaus							0	1							1	0					1	1	2
All Counties	8	2	1	1	1	0	8	1	1	1	3	5	0	2	16	1	12	1	3	0	54	13	67

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2019

		COUNTY SUPERVISOR		CITY COUNCIL		SCHOOL BOARD		DIRECTOR, CSD ¹		OTHER COUNTY OFFICES		OTHER CITY OFFICES		TOTAL ^{2,3}	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	100.0	1	78.8	26	53.8	7	77.8	7	100.0	4	100.0	7	77.6	52
	Lose	0.0	0	21.2	7	46.2	6	22.2	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	22.4	15
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	33	100.0	13	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0	7	100.0	67
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	15.4	2	25.3	38	32.7	18	50.0	3	20.0	2	66.7	2	27.4	65
	Lose	84.6	11	74.7	112	67.3	37	50.0	3	80.0	8	33.3	1	72.6	172
	Total	100.0	13	100.0	150	100.0	55	100.0	6	100.0	10	100.0	3	100.0	237
Wining Candidates	Incumbent	33.3	1	40.6	26	28.0	7	70.0	7	66.7	4	77.8	7	44.4	52
	Non-Incumbent	66.7	2	59.4	38	72.0	18	30.0	3	33.3	2	22.2	2	55.6	65
	Total	100.0	3	100.0	64	100.0	25	100.0	10	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	117
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	5.9	7	14.0	6	40.0	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	8.0	15
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	11	94.1	112	86.0	37	60.0	3	100.0	8	100.0	1	92.0	172
	Total	100.0	11	100.0	119	100.0	43	100.0	5	100.0	8	100.0	1	100.0	187
All Candidates	Incumbent	7.1	1	18.0	33	19.1	13	60.0	9	28.6	4	70.0	7	22.0	67
	Non-Incumbent	92.9	13	82.0	150	80.9	55	40.0	6	71.4	10	30.0	3	78.0	237
	Total	100.0	14	100.0	183	100.0	68	100.0	15	100.0	14	100.0	10	100.0	304

¹Includes Directors of Community Service Districts and County Service Areas.

²Percent may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

³Runoffs are excluded from totals.

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL	
ALAMEDA	4/9/2019	Alameda	Measure B	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	9,400	21,322	44.1%	Fail	
			Measure A	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	11,341	21,534	52.7%	Pass	
ALPINE	No City Measures									
AMADOR	No City Measures									
BUTTE	No City Measure									
CALAVERAS	11/5/2019	Angels Camp	Measure C	Transient Occupancy Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	726	885	82.0%	Pass	
			Measure D	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	602	881	68.3%	Pass	
COLUSA	No City Measures									
CONTRA COSTA	11/5/2019	Brentwood	Measure L	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	4,334	15,197	28.5%	Fail	
		El Cerrito	Measure H	Property Tax	Facilities: Parks & Recreation	4,591	5,860	78.3%	Pass ^f	
DEL NORTE	No City Measures									
EL DORADO	No City Measures									
FRESNO	11/5/2019	Parlier	Measure S	Sales Tax	General Services	276	530	52.1%	Pass	
GLENN	No City Measures									
HUMBOLDT	No City Measures									
IMPERIAL	No City Measures									
INYO	No City Measures									
KERN	No City Measures									
KINGS	No City Measures									
LAKE	No City Measures									
LASSEN	No City Measures									
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Glendora	Measure E	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	3,524	6,566	53.7%	Pass	
		Huntington Park	Measure C	Revenue Bond	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	1,899	2,203	86.2%	Pass	
		Manhattan Beach	Measure A	Transient Occupancy Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	5,186	6,774	76.6%	Pass	
		Signal Hill	Measure M	Ordinance	Governance: Elections	646	1,131	57.1%	Pass	
			Measure N	Ordinance	Governance: Elections	805	1,146	70.2%	Pass	
		West Hollywood	Measure B	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	3,546	5,883	60.3%	Pass	
			Measure Y	Business Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	4,541	5,951	76.3%	Pass	
		6/4/2019	Arcadia	Measure A	Sales Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	4,811	7,539	63.8%	Pass
		11/5/2019	Claremont	Measure CR	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	3,870	7,881	49.1%	Fail
			Hermosa Beach	Measure CC	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	2,463	3,698	66.6%	Pass
	Measure H			Transient Occupancy Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	3,067	3,935	77.9%	Pass	
	Inrindale		Measure I	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	117	193	60.6%	Pass	
	Lynwood		Measure PS	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	1,384	1,815	76.3%	Pass	
	Monrovia		Measure K	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	2,803	4,424	63.4%	Pass	
	Rancho Palos Verde		Measure B	Initiative	Other	2,325	10,064	23.1%	Fail	
	San Marino		Measure SM	Property Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	1,664	2,342	71.1%	Pass ^f	
	Sierra Madre	Measure S	Sales Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	1,975	2,441	80.9%	Pass		
	South Pasadena	Measure A	Sales Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	2,985	4,434	67.3%	Pass		
		Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	2,610	4,314	60.5%	Pass		
	MADERA	No City Measures								

^fIndicates measure required two-thirds of the vote to pass. ^fIndicates measure required 55% of the vote to pass. All other city measures required a majority vote.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
MARIN	11/5/2019	Fairfax	Measure F	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	2,052	2,543	80.7%	Pass ^T
		San Anselmo	Measure M	Property Tax	Facilities: Parks & Recreation	2,686	4,417	60.8%	Fail ^T
MARIPOSA	No City Measures								
MENDOCINO	No City Measures								
MERCED	No City Measures								
MODOC	No City Measures								
MONO	No City Measures								
MONTEREY	No City Measures								
NAPA	6/4/2019	St. Helena	Measure F	Ordinance	Housing: Rent Control	594	1,476	40.2%	Fail
NEVADA	No City Measures								
ORANGE	11/5/2019	Stanton	Measure A	Business Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	2,003	3,003	66.7%	Pass
			Measure B	Transient Occupancy Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	1,916	3,011	63.6%	Pass
PLACER	6/18/2019	Loomis	Measure C	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	796	2,299	34.6%	Fail
			Measure D	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	790	2,295	34.4%	Fail
PLUMAS	No City Measures								
RIVERSIDE	No City Measures								
SACRAMENTO	No City Measures								
SAN BENITO	No City Measures								
SAN BERNARDINO	No City Measures								
SAN DIEGO	5/7/2019	Solana Beach	Measure B	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	1,625	3,352	48.5%	Fail
SAN FRANCISCO	County and City Measures in County Report								
SAN JOAQUIN	No City Measures								
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No City Measures								
SAN MATEO	11/5/2019	Brisbane	Measure B	Transient Occupancy Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	723	1,023	70.7%	Pass
			Measure C	Business Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	863	1,027	84.0%	Pass
			Measure E	Business Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	832	1,020	81.6%	Pass
			Measure G	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	4,677	7,591	61.6%	Pass
		San Bruno							
SANTA BARBARA	No City Measures								
SANTA CLARA	No City Measures								
SANTA CRUZ	No City Measures								
SHASTA	No City Measures								
SIERRA	No City Measures								
SISKIYOU	No City Measures								
SOLANO	No City Measures								
SONOMA	11/5/2019	Rohnert Park	Measure B	Ordinance	Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary	5,733	6,328	90.6%	Pass
STANISLAUS	11/5/2019	Oakdale	Measure H	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	2,020	2,749	73.5%	Pass ^T
			Measure I	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	1,143	2,697	42.4%	Fail
SUTTER	No City Measures								
TEHAMA	No City Measures								
TRINITY	No City Measures								
TULARE	No City Measures								
TUOLUMNE	No City Measures								
YOLO	No City Measures								

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
YUBA		No City Measures							

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

ALAMEDA	4/9/2019	Alameda	Measure B	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the initiative to change the land use and zoning designations for a 3.65-acre parcel on McKay Avenue, from Office/Administrative-Professional to Open Space, which prohibits the conversion of vacant federal buildings into a senior assisted living facility, medical clinic and supportive services for homeless individuals, and limits the use of the property to parks and related uses, be adopted?				
ALAMEDA	4/9/2019	Alameda	Measure A	Pass
Shall an ordinance confirming the City Council's actions to permit reuse of vacant federal buildings on a 3.65-acre parcel on McKay Avenue and allow for the development of a wellness center for senior assisted living and supportive services for homeless individuals by changing the General Plan designation from "Federal Facilities" to "Office," removing the Government Combining District classification and maintaining the existing zoning district designation, be adopted?				
CALAVERAS	11/5/2019	Angels Camp	Measure C	Pass
Shall the measure permanently increasing the City of Angels' transient occupancy tax from ten percent (10%) to twelve percent (12%), to generate an additional \$200,000 annually from hotel and vacation rental guests, to fund essential public services including emergency fire response and protection, police patrols, public works maintenance, business attraction and retention; and to increase the City's appropriations limit for Fiscal Years 2020-2024 by the amount of tax proceeds received by the increase, be approved?				
CALAVERAS	11/5/2019	Angels Camp	Measure D	Pass
Shall the offices of City Clerk and City Treasurer be appointive?				
CONTRA COSTA	11/5/2019	Brentwood	Measure L	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the Initiative to Allow for Development of Residential Dwellings and Commercial/Civic Uses, and the Protection of Open Space, by amending the Urban Limit Line, the Brentwood General Plan, and Municipal Code; Adopting a New Specific Plan; Constructing Road Improvements; and Providing Funds for Public Facilities be adopted?				
CONTRA COSTA	11/5/2019	El Cerrito	Measure H	Pass (2/3rds required)
To maintain El Cerrito's quality of life, continuing local control of recreation services/parks, including maintaining/improving: swim center pools, locker rooms/restrooms; city parks, walking paths, playfields/open space; and program space for children, families, adults/seniors; shall a measure be adopted extending the 2000 voter approved measure, with no increase of the current \$58.46 per single family residential unit or other rates, until repealed by voters, providing \$650,000 annually, with all funds benefiting El Cerrito?				
FRESNO	11/5/2019	Parlier	Measure S	Pass
To protect, maintain and improve essential City services including police, fire, 911 emergency, gang prevention programs, neighborhood police patrols, maintain streets, reduce criminal activity, attract and retain businesses and jobs, and maintain youth/senior and other programs and services, shall the City of Parlier increase the sales tax by one cent (\$.01) providing for approximately \$400,000 annually, until ended by voters?				
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Glendora	Measure E	Pass
To maintain existing City services including public safety, youth/adult programs, fix streets/potholes, address quality of life issues, maintain library services, address rising pension costs, implement technology projects, and improve the financial health of the City, shall the Measure be adopted approving an ordinance enacting a three-quarters percent (0.75%) transactions and use tax providing approximately \$5,000,000 annually in general revenue, to be levied until ended by the voters with all funds staying local, for Glendora?				
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Huntington Park	Measure C	Pass
Shall the City of Huntington Park take all reasonable and necessary steps to negotiate with Costco for a store location in Huntington Park, which could include land use, zoning, economic and financial incentives, or other concessions, with the revenues generated from the Costco store to be used to preserve police and public safety services, community programs, youth and after-school parks and recreation services, and improving City parks, fixing City streets and public infrastructure?				
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Manhattan Beach	Measure A	Pass
To fund essential City services such as police patrols/crime prevention, fire, paramedic/9-1-1 emergency response, street maintenance, pothole repair, community facilities, infrastructure improvements/other general services, shall an ordinance be adopted increasing the City's existing transient occupancy (hotel) tax paid by hotel/motel guests up to 14%, providing more than \$1,000,000 annually for City services, until ended by voters, requiring citizen oversight, independent audits, and all funds locally controlled?				

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Signal Hill	Measure M	Pass
Shall the measure, amending the City Charter to change the City's General Municipal Election date to the Statewide Primary Election date of the first Tuesday after the first Monday in March of even-numbered years (from current date of the first Tuesday after the first Monday in March of odd-numbered years), commencing on March 8, 2022, and as a consequence extending one-time councilmember terms by one year, be adopted?				
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Signal Hill	Measure N	Pass
Shall the measure, amending the City Charter to change the City's General Municipal Election date to the Statewide General Election date of the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of even-numbered years (from current date of the first Tuesday after the first Monday in March of odd-numbered years), commencing on November 3, 2020, and as a consequence reducing one-time councilmember terms by four months, be adopted?				
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	West Hollywood	Measure B	Pass
Shall Resolution No. 18-5104 be adopted, approving a General Plan Amendment for the Arts Club Project at 8920 Sunset Boulevard, thereby allowing the project to proceed?				
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	West Hollywood	Measure Y	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted establishing a Cannabis Business Tax on gross receipts from the sale of adult-use cannabis and adult-use cannabis products, at a rate of 7.5%, estimated to raise \$5,500,000 annually to be used locally to fund general municipal services in West Hollywood such as public safety, street repair, homeless services, pedestrian/bike safety, and parks, until ended by voters and subject to annual public review of spending and independent financial audits?				
LOS ANGELES	6/4/2019	Arcadia	Measure A	Pass
To maintain 9-1-1 emergency response times, including to home break-ins and thefts; neighborhood, school and park police patrols, fire/paramedic services, fire station operations, emergency preparedness; retain/attract local businesses; maintain streets/infrastructure; provide other general services and maintain City finances, shall the City of Arcadia establish a 3/4¢ sales tax providing approximately \$8,600,000 annually until ended by voters, requiring annual independent financial audits, all funds remaining in Arcadia?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Claremont	Measure CR	Fail
Shall the measure providing general revenue to: maintain existing City services including public safety, youth/senior programs and special events; repair and replace infrastructure and facilities; maintain right-of-way landscaping, parks, and trees; address rising operational costs; restore reserves and improve the financial health of the City, by setting a permanent three-quarter cent (0.75%) transactions (sales) and use tax, resulting in approximately \$2,500,000 annually, for Claremont services, programs, and projects, be adopted?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Hermosa Beach	Measure CC	Pass
Shall the office of city clerk be appointive?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Hermosa Beach	Measure H	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted increasing the transient occupancy tax (hotel bed tax) paid by hotel/motel guests from 12% to 14% of room revenue raising approximately \$550,000 annually to be controlled and used locally for general municipal services in Hermosa Beach such as police, fire, and paramedic services, infrastructure/street repairs, and park upgrades, until ended by voters?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Irwindale	Measure I	Pass
To maintain City of Irwindale service levels including local police protection, 911 emergency response, public safety, senior citizen/park/transportation/recreation programs; maintain library services, and programs that create jobs/attract local businesses; fix potholes/streets; and other general City services; shall the measure enacting a three-quarters percent transactions and use sales tax to be levied annually to generate an estimated \$1,180,000 until ended by voters be adopted requiring an ordinance, and funds only for Irwindale?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Lynwood	Measure PS	Pass
To protect and maintain vital city police services, fire protection, street and pothole repair, parks and recreation programs; and other essential services, shall the City of Lynwood remove the 10 year sunset provision from the existing one cent sales and use tax? All funds remain in Lynwood.				

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Monrovia	Measure K	Pass
To keep local sales tax dollars in Monrovia to fund general city services, including community center improvements, police, fire, 911, senior services, parks, recreation, clean water and others, shall the Monrovia Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance of 2019, placed on the ballot by the City Council, be approved, imposing a 0.75% transactions and use (sales) tax to collect approximately \$4.5 million annually spent only in Monrovia, with a Citizens Advisory Committee and annual spending plan?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Rancho Palos Verde	Measure B	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the measure, known as the HOSPITALITY WORKING CONDITIONS ORDINANCE, placed on the ballot by initiative petition, applicable to large hotels, golf courses and amusement parks, and which enacts a wage floor of \$15/hour (CPI adjustments), limits daily work hours, limits daily square footage of rooms cleaned, requires panic-buttons for employees, requires maintenance of detailed compliance records, prohibits employer retaliation against employees, requires employee notices, and imposes fines and attorneys' fees for violation, be adopted?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	San Marino	Measure SM	Pass (2/3rds required)
Shall the measure approving an ordinance to continue the Special Public Safety Tax for Paramedic Services, Fire Protection and Prevention and Police Protection in San Marino, providing approximately \$3.4 million annually until 2025, continuing the existing rate structure calculating the maximum amount charged to each parcel type based primarily on its zoning and applying police, fire, and paramedic cost components specified in the exhibit to the ordinance, with increases strictly limited each year, be adopted?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	Sierra Madre	Measure S	Pass
To maintain police, fire and paramedic response times; maintain police patrols, emergency planning and response; provide for parks, streets, sidewalks and parkway trees, library services, recreation programs, senior programs, and general finances, shall the City of Sierra Madre establish a 3/4¢ sales tax until ended by voters, providing approximately \$225,000 annually with all revenue remaining in Sierra Madre for the benefit of its residents?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	South Pasadena	Measure A	Pass
To maintain 9-1-1 emergency response times, including to home break-ins and thefts; neighborhood, school and park police patrols, fire/paramedic services, fire station operations, emergency preparedness; retain/attract local businesses; maintain streets/infrastructure; provide other general services and maintain City finances, shall the City of South Pasadena establish a 3/4¢ sales tax providing approximately \$1,500,000 annually until ended by voters, all funds remaining in South Pasadena?				
LOS ANGELES	11/5/2019	South Pasadena	Measure C	Pass
Shall the office of city clerk be appointive?				
MARIN	11/5/2019	Fairfax	Measure F	Pass (2/3rds required)
Shall an ordinance be adopted approving an eleven-year extension of Fairfax's special municipal services tax of \$195 in the first year and increasing \$5 annually to a maximum of \$250 for each business occupancy and dwelling unit, raising approximately \$711,000 to \$912,500 annually, to: Keep our local Police Station open 24/7; Maintain/enhance local Fire services and wildfire prevention efforts; Fund Public Works/safety projects; Maintain Youth/Senior programs; Continue the Citizens Oversight Committee?				
MARIN	11/5/2019	San Anselmo	Measure M	Fail (2/3rds required)
To restore and provide ongoing maintenance of 93-year-old Memorial Park, including replacing/repairing fields and playground equipment for safety, installing drainage, irrigation systems and new restrooms, improving senior accessibility with safe walkways, providing picnic areas, benches and shade trees, shall the Town of San Anselmo's measure authorizing an annual tax of \$98 per residential unit, with a senior discount, or per 1,500 square feet of non-residential use, providing approximately \$500,000 annually for 30 years, with independent oversight, be adopted?				
NAPA	6/4/2019	St. Helena	Measure F	Fail
Shall Ordinance No. 2018-9 be adopted to 1) establish a rent stabilization program for St. Helena mobile home park residents who opt into the program by signing a lease of twelve months or less; 2) provide mobile home park owners a just and reasonable return on investment; and 3) create a dispute resolution process for the park owner and residents if the owner proposes an annual rent increase that is above the permissible limit?				
ORANGE	11/5/2019	Stanton	Measure A	Pass
To improve general City services, such as police, fire and emergency response, parks and youth/senior services, and street repair, shall a measure enacting a tax on cannabis or hemp businesses up to \$ 12.00 per square foot for cultivation, 6% of gross receipts for retail businesses, and 4% for all other cannabis or hemp businesses, generating approximately \$1,000,000 - \$1,400,000 annually, until ended by voters, be adopted?				

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2019

ORANGE	11/5/2019	Stanton	Measure B	Pass
To maintain and improve essential Stanton public services including emergency paramedic response and fire protection, police patrolling homelessness and preventing burglaries, housing affordability programs and other City services, shall a measure amending the Stanton Municipal Code to increase the hotel/motel visitor tax from 8% to 12% be applied to hotel/motel guests, including visitors booking online, providing approximately \$250,000 annually, with audits, and all funds used locally, be adopted?				
PLACER	6/18/2019	Loomis	Measure C	Fail
Shall Ordinance 275, which rezones the Village at Loomis property, adopts a Preliminary Development Plan, and approves Development Standards for the project, be adopted?				
PLACER	6/18/2019	Loomis	Measure D	Fail
Shall Ordinance 276, which approves a Development Agreement for the Village at Loomis project, be adopted?				
SAN DIEGO	5/7/2019	Solana Beach	Measure B	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the proposed ordinance adding a Specific Plan Overlay and amending the Solana Beach Municipal Code (SBMC) to allow a state-licensed residential care facility of up to 99 beds for those in need of assisted living in the ER-2 (Estate Residential-2) Zone at 959 Genevieve Street be adopted?				
SAN MATEO	11/5/2019	Brisbane	Measure B	Pass
To pay for general municipal expenses, shall the City increase the uniform transient occupancy tax, payable by transients for the privilege of occupying a hotel room, to fourteen percent (14%) of the rent?				
SAN MATEO	11/5/2019	Brisbane	Measure C	Pass
To pay for general municipal expenses, shall the City revise/increase the annual business license tax on a liquid storage facility of up to six cents per barrel delivered over the rack to such facility in the preceding calendar year?				
SAN MATEO	11/5/2019	Brisbane	Measure E	Pass
To pay for general municipal expenses, shall the City establish a business license tax on cannabis businesses in the City in the amount of up to six percent (6%) of the gross receipts of such businesses?				
SAN MATEO	11/5/2019	San Bruno	Measure G	Pass
Shall the City of San Bruno's measure to fund city services/facilities such as neighborhood police patrols; fire prevention services; urban wildfire protection; crime suppression/investigation; pothole/street repair; increasing parking supply; upgrading parks/other city services/facilities; expanding services supporting local businesses; by levying a 1/2¢ sales tax, providing approximately \$4,000,000 annually, until ended by voters, with independent citizens' oversight, no money for Sacramento, all funds spent locally, be adopted?				
SONOMA	11/5/2019	Rohnert Park	Measure B	Pass
To continue the existing protections provided by the current Urban Growth Boundary ("UGB"), such as preventing urban sprawl, protecting community separators, and preserving agricultural land and open space, shall the City of Rohnert Park extend its UGB until December 31, 2040, exclude approximately 80 acres located in the County and south of Valley House Drive and west of Petaluma Hill Road, and require that future changes to the UGB be approved by the voters?				
STANISLAUS	11/5/2019	Oakdale	Measure H	Pass (2/3rds required)
To help prevent additional budget cuts and maintain City services, including police and fire protection, senior programs, and other general services, shall the City of Oakdale extend the existing 1/2 cent sales tax set to expire April 2020, for an additional eleven (11) years, with resident oversight and annual independent audits?				
STANISLAUS	11/5/2019	Oakdale	Measure I	Fail
Shall the office of the City Clerk be an appointed position?				

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2019

	TAXES		BONDS		INITIATIVES		ORDINANCE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	OTAL
Alameda					0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Calaveras	1 F	0 P	F	P	F	P	1 F	0 P	2 F	0	2
Contra Costa	1	0			0	1			1	1	2
Fresno	1	0							1	0	1
Los Angeles	11	1	1	0	0	1	5	0	17	2	19
Marin	1	1							1	1	2
Napa							0	1	0	1	1
Orange	2	0							2	0	2
Placer							0	2	0	2	2
San Diego					0	1			0	1	1
San Mateo	4	0							4	0	4
Sonoma							1	0	1	0	1
Stanislaus	1	0					0	1	1	1	2
All Counties	22	2	1	0	0	4	8	4	31	10	41

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2019

	FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		GOVERNANCE		HOUSING		LAND USE		OTHER		REVENUE		SAFETY		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	ASS	AIL	OTAL
Alameda									1	1							1	1	2
Calaveras					1	0							1	0			2	0	2
Contra Costa	1	0							0	1							1	1	2
Fresno			1	0													1	0	1
Los Angeles					4	0			1	0	0	1	8	1	4	0	17	2	19
Marin	0	1											1	0			1	1	2
Napa							0	1									0	1	1
Orange															2	0	2	0	2
Placer									0	2							0	2	2
San Diego									0	1							0	1	1
San Mateo													4	0			4	0	4
Sonoma									1	0							1	0	1
Stanislaus					0	1							1	0			1	1	2
All Counties	1	1	1	0	5	1	0	1	3	5	0	1	15	1	6	0	31	10	41

PART 2
VOTE TOTALS FOR
CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
ALAMEDA	No City Contests													
ALPINE	No City Contests													
AMADOR	No City Contests													
BUTTE	No City Contests													
CALAVERAS	No City Contests													
COLUSA	No City Contests													
CONTRA COSTA	No City Contests													
DEL NORTE	No City Contests													
EL DORADO	No City Contests													
FRESNO	3/5/2019	Clovis	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Whalen	Bob	Clovis Councilmember/Prosecutor	Yes	4	7,979	25,134	31.7%	Yes
						Bessinger	Drew M.	Councilmember/Police Chief	Yes	4	7,629	25,134	30.4%	Yes
						Flores	Jose "Joe"	Councilmember/Police Chief	Yes	4	7,309	25,134	29.1%	Yes
						Rivera	Maeketah	Community Service Officer	No	4	2,101	25,134	8.4%	No
	Fresno	CITY COUNCIL	2	Short	Karbassi	Mike	Small Business Owner	No	6	5,568	9,561	58.2%	Yes	
					Garcia	Lawrence D.	Owner/President/CEO	No	6	1,557	9,561	16.3%	No	
					Gordon	Jared	Business Attorney/Father	No	6	1,040	9,561	10.9%	No	
					Sandoval	Oscar	Special Needs Therapist	No	6	1,036	9,561	10.8%	No	
					Herman	George	Small Business Owner	No	6	213	9,561	2.2%	No	
					Arballo	Phil	Financial Advisor	No	6	135	9,561	1.4%	No	
GLENN	No City Contests													
HUMBOLDT	No City Contests													
IMPERIAL	No City Contests													
INYO	No City Contests													
KERN	No City Contests													
KINGS	No City Contests													
LAKE	No City Contests													
LASSEN	No City Contests													
LOS ANGELES	3/5/2019	Hidden Hills	CITY COUNCIL		Full	McCorkindale	Laura	Businesswoman	No	5	284	1,100	25.8%	Yes
						Weber	Larry G.	Incumbent	Yes	5	254	1,100	23.1%	Yes
						Siegel	Stuart	Incumbent	Yes	5	245	1,100	22.3%	Yes
						Landon	Marvin	Mayor Pro Tem	Yes	5	215	1,100	19.5%	No
						Spellman	Deb	MBA/Consultant	No	5	102	1,100	9.3%	No
	Manhattan Beach	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Hadley	Suzanne	Non-Profit Treasurer	No	7	3,111	12,491	24.9%	Yes	
					Stern	Hildy	Program Director	No	7	2,363	12,491	18.9%	Yes	
					Franklin	Joe	Businessman	No	7	2,172	12,491	17.4%	No	
					Burton	Mark	Municipal Law Attorney	No	7	1,972	12,491	15.8%	No	
					Powell	Wayne	Retired Councilmember/CFO	No	7	1,917	12,491	15.3%	No	
					Withers	Brian	Dentist	No	7	649	12,491	5.2%	No	
					Ungoco	Joseph A.	Strategic Communications Consultant	No	7	307	12,491	2.5%	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 CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED				
LOS ANGELES (continued)	3/5/2019	Montebello	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Torres	David	Consumer Protection Specialist	No	3	2,439	3,804	64.1%	Yes				
						Barajas	Art	Business Owner	No	3	1,001	3,804	26.3%	No				
						Romero	Vivian	Small Business Owner	No	3	364	3,804	9.6%	No				
		Palos Verdes Estates	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Kemps	Michael	Businessman/Technologist		7	2,057	9,876	20.8%	Yes				
	Mcgowan					David	Financial Executive	No	7	2,040	9,876	20.7%	Yes					
	Lozzi					Victoria A.	City Treasurer/Banker	No	7	1,967	9,876	19.9%	Yes					
	King					Jennifer L.	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,565	9,876	15.8%	No					
	Peterson					Betty Lin	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,164	9,876	11.8%	No					
	Mccarthy					Kevin F.	Law Enforcement Executive	No	7	842	9,876	8.5%	No					
	Groves					Jeff	Compliance Business Owner	No	7	241	9,876	2.4%	No					
		Redondo Beach	CITY CLERK		Full	Manzano	Eleanor	Redondo Beach City Clerk	Yes	1	8,899	8,899	100.0%	Yes				
	CITY COUNCIL					3	Full	Horvarth	Christian Anthony	Redondo Beach Councilmember	Yes	2	1,590	2,892	55.0%	Yes		
							Nafissi	Candace Allen	Community Relations Executive	No	2	1,302	2,892	45.0%	No			
					5	Full	Emdee	Laura	City Council Member	Yes	2	1,520	2,405	63.2%	Yes			
							Samples	Mel	Public Safety Consultant	No	2	885	2,405	36.8%	No			
			CITY TREASURER		Full	Diels	Steven	Redondo Beach City Treasurer	Yes	2	6,638	10,208	65.0%	Yes				
						Solomon	Eugene J.	Insurance/Financial Services	No	2	3,570	10,208	35.0%	No				
		Signal Hill	CITY CLERK		Full	Brooks	Carmen	Signal Hill Planning Commissioner	No	1	946	946	100.0%	Yes				
	CITY COUNCIL					Full	Jones	Keir	City Clerk	No	3	700	1,958	35.8%	Yes			
			Full	Hansen	Tina L.	Signal Hill City Councilmember	Yes	3	674	1,958	34.4%	Yes						
			Full	Wilson	Chris	Planning Commissioner	No	3	584	1,958	29.8%	No						
			CITY TREASURER		Full	Hopper	David	Certified Public Accountant	No	1	939	939	100.0%	Yes				
		West Hollywood	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Horvath	Lindsey P.	West Hollywood City Councilmember	Yes	11	3,949	16,230	24.3%	Yes				
	Meister					Lauren	West Hollywood City Councilmember	Yes	11	3,616	16,230	22.3%	Yes					
	D'amico					John	West Hollywood City Councilmember	Yes	11	2,441	16,230	15.0%	Yes					
	Shyne					Sepi	Attorney	No	11	2,300	16,230	14.2%	No					
	Mason					James Duke	Public Relations Specialist	No	11	1,331	16,230	8.2%	No					
	Thomas					Marquita	Non-Profit Executive Director	No	11	1,080	16,230	6.7%	No					
	Hood					Brendan	Marketing Analytics Director	No	11	482	16,230	3.0%	No					
	Demille					Tom	Artist	No	11	336	16,230	2.1%	No					
	Mooney					Shawn Davis	Senior Living Executive	No	11	285	16,230	1.8%	No					
	Cline					Jack	Registered Nurse	No	11	243	16,230	1.5%	No					
	Schmidt					Eric Jon	Retired Fitness Trainer	No	11	167	16,230	1.0%	No					
	4/9/2019					Vernon	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Menke	Carol R.	Commission, City of Vernon Housing		3	48	64	75.0%	Yes
										Acosta	ia I.	Administrative Assistant	No	3	9	64	14.1%	No
		Roberts	Jason C.	Business Man, Finance Director	No					3	7	64	10.9%	No				
		Compton	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Zurita	Janna	Councilwoman District 1, City of Compton	Yes	6	678	1,756	38.6%	Runoff				
	Chambers					Michelle	State Field Deputy	No	6	404	1,756	23.0%	Runoff					
	Jackson					Jasper "Jay"	Paralegal	No	6	351	1,756	20.0%	No					
	Alatorre					Richard	No Ballot Designation	No	6	224	1,756	12.8%	No					
	Green					Ronald	Business Owner/Investor	No	6	58	1,756	3.3%	No					
	Rodriguez					Francisco	Medical Assistant	No	6	41	1,756	2.3%	No					

4/16/2019

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
LOS ANGELES (continued)	4/16/2019	Compton	CITY COUNCIL	4	Full	Blakely	Justin A.	Paralegal/Businessman	No	3	565	1,296	43.6%	Runoff			
						Sharif	Emma	City Council Member	Yes	3	390	1,296	30.1%	Runoff			
		Compton	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Adkins	Inez "Tootie"	Businesswoman/Business Owner	No	3	341	1,296	26.3%	No			
						Chambers	Michelle	State Field Deputy	No	2	1,584	2,353	67.3%	Yes			
		Compton	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Zurita	Janna	Councilwoman District 1, City of Compton	Yes	2	769	2,353	32.7%	No			
						Sharif	Emma	City Council Member	Yes	2	943	1,736	54.3%	Yes			
		Los Angeles	CITY COUNCIL	12	Short	Blakely	Justin A.	Paralegal/Businessman	No	2	793	1,736	45.7%	No			
						Lundquist	Lorraine	Educator/Scientist/Mother	No	15	8,635	43,745	19.7%	Runoff			
6/4/2019						Lee	John	Parent/Small Businessman	No	15	8,197	43,745	18.7%	Runoff			
						Abrams	Scott	Congressman's Valley Director	No	15	5,300	43,745	12.1%	No			
						Beeber	Jay	Public Policy Director	No	15	4,169	43,745	9.5%	No			
						Ferry	Frank	Educator/Businessman	No	15	3,791	43,745	8.7%	No			
						Dinse	Charles Sean	Police Senior Lead	No	15	3,149	43,745	7.2%	No			
						Daar	Jeff	City Commissioner/Businessman	No	15	1,668	43,745	3.8%	No			
						Maloyan	Stella T.	Nonprofit Executive/Commissioner	No	15	1,532	43,745	3.5%	No			
						Amador	Carlos	Human Rights Advocate	No	15	1,411	43,745	3.2%	No			
						Saario	Brandon	TV Production Member	No	15	1,406	43,745	3.2%	No			
						Kayajian	Jack	City Attorney Administrator	No	15	1,233	43,745	2.8%	No			
						Singh	Navraj	Small Business Owner	No	15	987	43,745	2.3%	No			
						Cho	Annie Eunwoo	Businesswoman	No	15	864	43,745	2.0%	No			
						Yeager	Josh	Public Affairs Executive	No	15	734	43,745	1.7%	No			
						Rab	Raji	Aviator/Educator/Principal	No	15	669	43,745	1.5%	No			
						8/13/2019	Los Angeles	CITY COUNCIL	12	Short	Lee	John	Parent/Small Businessman	No	2	19,426	37,685
Lundquist	Lorraine	Educator/Scientist/Mother	No	2	18,259						37,685	48.5%	No				
	Vernon	CITY COUNCIL	11	Short	Gonzales	Diana Morales	No Ballot Designation	No	1	36	36	100.0%	Yes				
					Gulla	Dennis E.	Retired Business Owner	No	1	28	28	100.0%	Yes				
11/5/2019	Hermosa Beach	CITY COUNCIL	Full		Massey	Justin	City Councilmember	Yes		2,655	6,583	40.3%	Yes				
					Detoy	Michael	Firefighter	No	3	2,545	6,583	38.7%	Yes				
					Larson	Trent	Major Accounts Manager	No ³	3	1,383	6,583	21.0%	No				
10/15/2019		CITY TREASURER	Full		Nowicki	Karen S.	City Treasurer/CPA	Yes	1	3,033	3,033	100.0%	Yes				
					La Habra Heights	CITY COUNCIL	Full	Laherty	Dennis M.	U.S. Navy Chaplain	No	4	701	2,098	33.4%	Yes	
								Williams	Jane L.	Incumbent	Yes	4	616	2,098	29.4%	Yes	
								Miller	Kyle	Senate Policy Advisor	No	4	530	2,098	25.3%	No	
								Kimball	Ginarose	Businesswoman/Business Consultant	No	4	251	2,098	12.0%	No	
					Long Beach	CITY COUNCIL	1	Short	Zendejas	Mary	Health Care Director	No	8	858	2,723	31.5%	Yes
									Salgado	Mariela	Small Business Owner	No	8	695	2,723	25.5%	No
									Tagalao	Misi	Nonprofit Housing Executive	No	8	513	2,723	18.8%	No
									Morquecho	Ray	Small Business Owner	No	8	209	2,723	7.7%	No
									Ganem	Joe	Community Volunteer	No	8	162	2,723	5.9%	No
Gonzales	Elliot	Environmental Media Maker	No	8					149	2,723	5.5%	No					
					Black		Artist/Travel Coordinator	No	8	79	2,723	2.9%	No				
					Huling	Shirley	Homeschooler/Educator/Farmer	No	8	58	2,723	2.1%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
LOS ANGELES (continued)	11/5/2019	Pico Rivera	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Sanchez	Monica	Educator/City Commissioner	No	4	2,220	4,089	54.3%	Yes	
						Lutz	Erik	Housing Advocate/Businessman	No	4	1,107	4,089	27.1%	No	
						Rubalcava-Alvar.	Diego	Civil Engineering Technician	No	4	642	4,089	15.7%	No	
						Soto	Fernando	State Bar Investigator	No	4	120	4,089	2.9%	No	
		Rancho Palos Verdes	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Bradley	David	Engineer/Planning Commissioner	No	5	5,023	21,895	22.9%	Yes	
						Ferraro	Barbara	Educator	No	5	4,715	21,895	21.5%	Yes	
						Dyda	Ken	City Council Member	Yes	5	4,536	21,895	20.7%	Yes	
						Emenhiser	Dave	Businessman	No	5	4,087	21,895	18.7%	No	
		San Marino	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Talt	Steve	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,686	3,285	51.3%	Yes	
						Huang	Steven	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,599	3,285	48.7%	Yes	
MADERA	No City Contests														
MARIN	11/5/2019	Fairfax	CITY CLERK		Full	Gardner	Michelle	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,995	1,995	100.0%	Yes	
						CITY COUNCIL	Goddard	Renee L.	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,627	4,181	38.9%	Yes
							Hellman	Stephanie	Nonprofit Coordinator	No	3	1,292	4,181	30.9%	Yes
							Swift	Cindy	Retired Program Manager	No	3	1,262	4,181	30.2%	No
		CITY TREASURER	Garvin	Janet	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,942	1,942	100.0%	Yes				
			Novato	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Wernick	Susan	Novato Planning Commissioner	No	2	1,511	2,679	56.4%	Yes
							Petray	Jim	Certified Public Accountant	No	2	1,168	2,679	43.6%	No
		3	Full	Lucan	Eric	Councilmember/Local Businessman	Yes	2	1,656	2,115	78.3%	Yes			
				Morrison	Kevin	Community Nonprofit Consultant	No	2	459	2,115	21.7%	No			
				5	Full	Peele	Amy	Retired Clinical Director	No	3	1,029	1,983	51.9%	Yes	
		Hoch	Marie K.			Businessperson/HOA Director	No	3	857	1,983	43.2%	No			
		Galliani	Melissa			Sales Manager/Mother	No	3	97	1,983	4.9%	No			
		San Anselmo	CITY CLERK		Full	Kacmar	Carla	Incumbent	Yes	1	3,133	3,133	100.0%	Yes	
						CITY COUNCIL	Full	Burdo	Steve	Public Information Officer	No	4	2,522	7,082	35.6%
Greene	Ford		Town Councilmember	Yes	4			2,031	7,082	28.7%	Yes				
Pipkin	Kim		Idea Marketing Consultant	No	4			1,963	7,082	27.7%	No				
CITY TREASURER	Full		King	Tom	Writer/Hospital Representative	No	4	566	7,082	8.0%	No				
Dahlgren	Elizabeth	Incumbent	Yes	1	3,095	3,095	100.0%	Yes							
MARIPOSA	No City Contests														
MENDOCINO	No City Contests														
MERCED	No City Contests														
MODOC	No City Contests														
MONO	No City Contests														
MONTEREY	No City Contests														
NAPA	No City Contests														
NEVADA	No City Contests														
ORANGE	1/29/2019	Seal Beach	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Kalmick	Joe	Retired Business Owner	Yes	2	1,003	1,555	64.5%	Yes	
						Amundson	Peter	Small Businessman	No	2	552	1,555	35.5%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED						
ORANGE (continued)	11/5/2019	San Clemente	CITY COUNCIL		Full	James	Gene	Security Consultant	No	5	8,253	15,026	54.9%	Yes						
						Hinkle	Jackson	Marketing Specialist	No	5	4,683	15,026	31.2%	No						
						Coleman	Dee	Chief Executive Officer	No	5	785	15,026	5.2%	No						
						Selter	Christina	Small Business Owner	No	5	667	15,026	4.4%	No						
						Mclane	Michael (Mickey)	Retired Business Person	No	5	638	15,026	4.2%	No						
		Santa Ana	CITY COUNCIL	4	Short	Bacerra	Phil	Small Business Owner	No	6	3,815	13,908	27.4%	Yes						
						Escamilla	Manny	Urban Planner	No	6	3,666	13,908	26.4%	No						
						Mendoza	Beatriz	Victim Assistance Specialist	No	6	3,324	13,908	23.9%	No						
						Oliver Jr	Gale	Bishop/Pastor	No	6	1,424	13,908	10.2%	No						
						Oliva	Jennifer	Business Owner	No	6	1,154	13,908	8.3%	No						
						Sisco	Brandon	Business Owner/Entrepreneur	No	6	525	13,908	3.8%	No						
						PLACER No City Contests														
						PLUMAS No City Contests														
						RIVERSIDE	6/4/2019	Riverside	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Edwards	Erin	Nonprofit Manager	No	3	2,175	5,064	43.0%	Runoff
Gardner	Mike	Ward 1 Councilmember	Yes	3	1,840							5,064	36.3%	Runoff						
Falcone	Philip	Non-Profit Professional	No	3	1,049							5,064	20.7%	No						
3	Full	Fierro	Ronaldo	Restaurateur/Business Owner	No							7	1,942	5,622	34.5%	Runoff				
		Avery	Warren	Businessman	No							7	1,848	5,622	32.9%	Runoff				
		Rubio	Richard	Government Relations Officer	No							7	926	5,622	16.5%	No				
		Martin	Darryl	Educator/Grant Facilitator	No							7	623	5,622	11.1%	No				
		Skiles	Wayne J.	Businessman/Gemologist	No							7	180	5,622	3.2%	No				
		Pelgone	Lori Ann	Analyst	No							7	79	5,622	1.4%	No				
		Taken	Stevie	Tenant Relations Manager	No							7	24	5,622	0.4%	No				
5	Full	Mill	Sean	Businessman/Coach	No							3	1,984	4,436	44.7%	Runoff				
		Plascencia	Gaby	Educator/Youth Counselor	No							3	1,788	4,436	40.3%	Runoff				
		Armas	José	Business Operator Supervisor	No			3	664	4,436	15.0%	No								
		7	Full	Hemenway	Steve			Educator/Finance Director	No	6	1,248	2,766	45.1%	Runoff						
Pearce	William D.			Educator	No			6	866	2,766	31.3%	Runoff								
Torres Jr	Rodrigo			Small Business Owner	No			6	333	2,766	12.0%	No								
Denilofs	John Dave			Retired Taxi Driver	No			6	135	2,766	4.9%	No								
Rossouw	Maartin			Small Business Owner	No			6	96	2,766	3.5%	No								
Jordan	Thomas L.			IT Professional	No			6	88	2,766	3.2%	No								
Cathedral City	CITY COUNCIL	1	Short	Lamb	Rita			Retired School Administrator	No	2	645	1,251	51.6%	Yes						
				Kaplan	Shelley			Higher Education Consultant	No	2	606	1,251	48.4%	No						
Palm Springs	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Garner	Grace Elena			Attorney	No	4	843	1,693	49.8%	Yes						
				Young	Les			Retired Banker	No	4	546	1,693	32.3%	No						
				Myer	Scott	Civil Rights Attorney	No	4	269	1,693	15.9%	No								
				Shogren	Michael	Real Estate Agent	No	4	35	1,693	2.1%	No								
8/27/2019				2	Full	Woods	Dennis	Transportation-Urban Planner	No	3	1,261	2,326	54.2%	Yes						
						Alcantar	Adrian	Small Business Owner	No	3	584	2,326	25.1%	No						
11/5/2019						Maietta	Peter J.	Businessman/Design Consultant	No	3	481	2,326	20.7%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
RIVERSIDE (continued)	11/5/2019	Palm Springs	CITY COUNCIL	3	Full	Kors	Geoff	Palm Springs Councilmember	No	3	1,564	2,053	76.2%	Yes
						Pettit	Alan "Alfie"	Entertainer/Drag Queen	No	3	356	2,053	17.3%	No
						Dilger	Michael J.	Gig Economy Worker	No	3	133	2,053	6.5%	No
		Riverside	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Edwards	Erin	Nonprofit Manager	No	2	3,150	5,120	61.5%	Yes
						Gardner	Mike	Ward 1 Councilmember	Yes	2	1,970	5,120	38.5%	No
				3	Full	Fierro	Ronaldo	Business Owner/Restaurateur	No	2	2,926	5,528	52.9%	Yes
						Avery	Warren	Businessman	No	2	2,602	5,528	47.1%	No
				5	Full	Plascencia	Gaby	Educator/Youth Counselor	No	2	2,406	4,590	52.4%	Yes
						Mill	Sean	Businessman	No	2	2,184	4,590	47.6%	No
				7	Full	Hemenway	Steve	Educator/Finance Director	No	2	1,651	3,018	54.7%	Yes
Pearce	William D.	Educator	No	2	1,367	3,018	45.3%	No						
SACRAMENTO	No City Contests													
SAN BENITO	No City Contests													
SAN BERNARDINO	5/7/2019	San Bernardino	CITY COUNCIL	3	Full	Figueroa	Juan	Medical Social Worker	No	3	952	1,394	68.3%	Yes
						Ortiz	Treasure	Community Engagement Strategist	No	3	378	1,394	27.1%	No
						Aguirre	Anthony R.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	64	1,394	4.6%	No
SAN DIEGO	No City Contests													
SAN FRANCISCO	City and County Contests included in County Report													
SAN JOAQUIN	No City Contests													
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No City Contests													
SAN MATEO	11/5/2019	Brisbane	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Davis	Madison	Incumbent	Yes	2	766	1,525	50.2%	Yes
						O'Connell	Terry	Incumbent	Yes	2	759	1,525	49.8%	Yes
		Burlingame	CITY COUNCIL	Full	Beach	Emily	City of Burlingame Vice Mayor	Yes	3	4,045	10,569	38.3%	Yes	
					Colson	Donna	City of Burlingame Mayor	Yes	3	3,830	10,569	36.2%	Yes	
					Dunham	Mike	Education Consultant	No	3	2,694	10,569	25.5%	No	
		San Bruno	CITY COUNCIL	Full	Mason	Linda	Attorney	No	4	3,996	13,511	29.6%	Yes	
					Medina	Marty	Incumbent	Yes	4	3,777	13,511	28.0%	Yes	
					Marshall	Stephan A	Businessman/Realtor	No	4	2,904	13,511	21.5%	No	
					O'Connell	Irene	Incumbent	Yes	4	2,834	13,511	21.0%	No	
SANTA BARBARA	11/5/2019	Santa Barbara	CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Gutierrez	Alejandra	Community Liaison	No	3	963	2,018	47.7%	Yes
						Dominguez	Jason	City Councilmember/Educator	Yes	3	955	2,018	47.3%	No
						Cruz	Cruzito Herrera	Income Tax Preparer	No	3	100	2,018	5.0%	No
		2	Full	Jordan	Mike	Businessman/Planning Commissioner	No	5	1,509	4,076	37.0%	Yes		
				Campbell	Brian	Realtor	No	5	1,128	4,076	27.7%	No		
				Jory	Teri	Small Business Owner	No	5	759	4,076	18.6%	No		
				Boise	Tavis	Lead Lifeguard EMT	No	5	375	4,076	9.2%	No		
				Esparza	Luis	Attorney/Broker	No	5	305	4,076	7.5%	No		
SANTA CLARA	No City Contests													
SANTA CRUZ	No City Contests													
SHASTA	No City Contests													
SIERRA	No City Contests													
SISKIYOU	No City Contests													
SOLANO	No City Contests													

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2019

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT IF DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	TOTAL VOTES CAST	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SONOMA		No City Contests												
STANISLAUS		No City Contests												
SUTTER		No City Contests												
TEHAMA		No City Contests												
TRINITY		No City Contests												
TULARE		No City Contests												
TUOLUMNE		No City Contests												
VENTURA		No City Contests												
YOLO		No City Contests												
YUBA		No City Contests												

TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR CITY OFFICES, 2019

		CITY CLERK		CITY COUNCIL		CITY TREASURER		TOTAL ^{1,2}	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	100.0	3	78.8	26	100.0	4	82.5	33
	Lose	0.0	0	21.2	7	0.0	0	17.5	7
	Total	100.0	3	100	33	100	4	100	40
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	100.0	1	25.3	38	50.0	1	26.1	40
	Lose	0.0	0	74.7	112	50.0	1	73.9	113
	Total	100.0	1	100	150	100	2	100	153
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	75.0	3	40.6	26	80.0	4	45.2	33
	Non-Incumbent	25.0	1	59.4	38	20.0	1	54.8	40
	Total	100.0	4	100	64	100	5	100	73
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	5.9	7	0.0	0	5.8	7
	Non-Incumbent	0.0	0	94.1	112	100.0	1	94.2	113
	Total	0.0	0	100.0	119	100	1	100.0	120
All Candidates	Incumbent	75.0	3	18.0	33	66.7	4	20.7	40
	Non-Incumbent	25.0	1	82.0	150	33.3	2	79.3	153
	Total	100.0	4	100.0	183	100.0	6	100.0	193

¹We exclude runoffs from totals

²Percent may not sum to 100 due to rounding