



**City Offices and Ballot
Measures**

**CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY, AND
SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES:**

**CANDIDATES AND BALLOT MEASURES
2021 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, 2021 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

Sebastian Cambrey, 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
2021 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.....	xxiii
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
2021 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, 2021.....	2
Table B Summary of Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2021.....	3
Table C Summary of Election Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Offices, 2021	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, 2021	6
Table 1.2 Text for City Ballot Measures by County, 2021	9
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2021	12
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2021	13
Part 2 Vote Totals for City Office Candidates	14
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for City Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2021	15
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Offices, 2021	21

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.

2021 County, City, and School District Election Dates by County

	2/2	3/2	3/9	4/13	4/20	5/4	5/11	6/1	6/8	6/29	7/20	8/31	9/14	11/2	12/7
Alameda						●								●	
Calaveras						●									
Contra Costa						●									
El Dorado														●	
Fresno									●					●	
Imperial														●	
Kern														●	
Lassen													●		
Los Angeles		●		●	●		●	●		●	●		●	●	
Madera														●	
Marin		●				●								●	
Merced												●		●	
Modoc													●		
Orange			●												
Placer														●	
Plumas														●	
Riverside		●							●					●	
Sacramento														●	
San Benito														●	
San Bernardino												●			
San Diego														●	
San Mateo						●								●	
Santa Barbara													●	●	
Santa Clara						●								●	
Santa Cruz														●	●
Siskiyou														●	
Solano						●								●	
Sonoma		●				●							●	●	

2021 County, City, and School District Election Dates by County

	2/2	3/2	3/9	4/13	4/20	5/4	5/11	6/1	6/8	6/29	7/20	8/31	9/14	11/2	12/7
Stanislaus	●											●			
Sutter															●
Ventura														●	
Yolo													●		

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

	ALL MEASURES			BONDS			TAXES			ORDINANCE			RECALLS			INITIATIVES			CHARTER AMENDMENT		
	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing
All Measures																					
1995-2021	397	100	67	105	27	71	129	33	63	78	20	63	13	3	73	10	2	47	45	11	77
Even Years	624	100	68	177	28	73	198	32	62	125	20	63	14	2	72	15	2	48	69	11	77
Odd Years	186	100	63	39	21	61	65	35	65	35	19	62	12	6	73	5	2	42	22	12	78
County																					
1995-2021	63	16	59	2	3	73	27	44	50	18	28	65	2	3	76	3	4	41	7	10	68
Even Years	103	17	57	3	3	71	46	44	48	29	28	64	2	2	59	4	4	40	12	11	68
Odd Years	25	13	67	1	5	78	10	41	58	7	28	70	2	8	89	1	3	50	2	7	72
City																					
1995-2021	200	50	67	5	2	60	77	39	67	56	28	60	6	3	72	7	4	51	38	19	79
Even Years	291	50	67	7	2	63	124	40	67	89	28	61	8	3	72	10	3	52	57	18	79
Odd Years	102	51	65	2	2	50	35	36	66	24	26	57	4	4	73	4	4	46	21	22	78
School District																					
1995-2021	135	34	71	99	73	71	24	18	66	5	4	81	5	4	72	0	0	50	0	0	100
Even Years	208	33	73	166	80	73	29	14	66	7	3	84	4	2	79	0	0	0	0	0	100
Odd Years	76	41	57	36	47	61	21	27	66	4	5	77	6	7	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	
2020	722	100	63	223	31	49	283	39	68	107	15	66	11	2	73	15	2	53	64	9	81	
2021	44	100	68				30	68	67	4	9	75	5	11	40	1	2	100	3	7	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	
2020	85	12	66	5	6	80	45	53	56	13	15	77				3	4	0	13	15	85	
2021	9	20	67				8	89	75	1	11	0										

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

	ALL MEASURES			BONDS			TAXES			ORDINANCE			RECALLS			INITIATIVES			CHARTER AMENDMENT			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	
City Measures	1995	119	47	71	4	3	75	7	6	29	38	32	58				7	6	43	49	41	94
	1996	374	65	60	10	3	30	100	27	43	115	31	59	24	6	79	11	3	55	98	26	78
	1997	144	42	58	2	1	50	70	49	50	28	19	54	9	6	22	7	5	71	27	19	89
	1998	283	49	60	9	3	78	99	35	47	78	28	53	7	2	43	5	2	80	69	24	77
	1999	114	40	54	4	4	75	22	19	55	48	42	48	8	7	100	10	9	40	16	14	38
	2000	297	53	60	11	4	82	65	22	45	113	38	56	6	2	100	13	4	54	71	24	70
	2001	93	40	69	8	9	63	31	33	74	18	19	61	3	3	100	1	1	100	24	26	63
	2002	309	47	60	12	4	83	102	33	58	94	30	48	5	2	60	8	3	38	70	23	77
	2003	89	50	67	2	2	50	14	16	71	29	33	55	6	7	100	5	6	40	24	27	75
	2004	337	47	59	7	2	43	147	44	46	92	27	63	6	2	67	10	3	30	54	16	87
	2005	135	46	61	2	1	0	47	35	55	37	27	51	3	2	33	4	3	25	33	24	91
	2006	253	46	64	10	4	50	82	32	70	85	34	61	6	2	17	20	8	35	33	13	82
	2007	108	60	71	2	2	0	40	37	73	19	18	53	5	5	100	1	1	0	38	35	79
	2008	258	44	73	5	2	100	111	43	71	80	31	65	8	3	38	9	3	89	35	14	89
	2009	130	67	61	1	1	0	63	48	68	28	22	61	3	2	33	3	2	33	18	14	56
	2010	270	56	71	2	1	0	95	35	69	91	34	67	16	6	94	8	3	63	44	16	80
	2011	105	61	74				37	35	65	23	22	70	10	10	100	2	2	0	28	27	82
	2012	248	47	67	5	2	20	93	38	72	83	33	58	12	5	92				41	17	61
	2013	90	66	68				44	49	77	30	33	53	3	3	67	1	1	100	10	11	70
	2014	285	49	71	5	2	100	121	42	72	60	21	70	5	2	60	6	2	67	60	21	73
	2015	54	45	70	2	4	0	23	43	87	12	22	67				5	9	40	10	19	60
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	2	50	50	62	66	17	21	65	1	1	100	3	4	0	7	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				
2020	369	51	71	2	1	50	194	53	73	88	24	63	9	2	67	12	3	67	51	14	80	
2021	24	55	67				12	50	58	2	8	100	5	21	40	1	4	100	3	13	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	1	100	6	2	83								
2017	18	16	56	6	33	33	12	67	67														
2018	211	30	84	170	81	82	31	15	87	3	1	100	3	1	100						4	2	100
2019	10	15	80	1	10	100	9	90	78														
2020	268	37	51	216	81	48	44	16	59	6	2	100	2	1	100								
2021	11	25	73				10	91	70	1	9	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			REVENUE			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
All Measures	1995	253	100	61	121	48	54	63	25	84	16	6	63	12	5	50	14	6	50				2	1	0	5	2	60
	1996	573	100	57	87	15	64	214	37	66	54	9	56	39	7	51	38	7	37	10	2	40	8	1	50	87	15	46
	1997	342	100	60	175	51	62	43	13	67	19	6	68	12	4	42	15	4	40	38	11	61	4	1	50	10	3	70
	1998	572	100	60	158	28	63	131	23	64	46	8	70	41	7	49	32	6	56	28	5	82	23	4	70	75	13	43
	1999	283	100	59	119	42	59	62	22	63	29	10	41	14	5	57	4	1	75	14	5	57	8	3	88	23	8	65
	2000	559	100	59	151	27	63	141	25	64	73	13	55	32	6	50	39	7	67	20	4	55	21	4	43	5	1	20
	2001	233	100	70	105	45	71	46	20	67	7	3	71	11	5	73	19	8	58	7	3	71	4	2	25	31	13	87
	2002	657	100	65	250	38	76	144	22	66	44	7	43	42	6	57	35	5	49	20	3	60	10	2	40	85	13	62
	2003	178	100	62	61	34	52	52	29	73	15	8	60	12	7	50	5	3	60	6	3	100	8	4	38	13	7	62
	2004	712	100	62	238	33	72	139	20	73	58	8	52	55	8	47	37	5	38	23	3	70	25	4	76	110	15	47
	2005	295	100	64	102	35	70	61	21	70	28	9	39	18	6	44	14	5	64	18	6	67	13	4	62	33	11	70
	2006	556	100	60	208	37	58	109	20	60	51	9	61	37	7	73	22	4	41	12	2	58	22	4	50	61	11	62
	2007	179	100	71	42	23	67	63	35	81	18	10	39	5	3	100	8	4	88	7	4	86	4	2	25	31	17	68
	2008	593	100	74	246	41	80	99	17	74	43	7	72	39	7	49	32	5	66	10	2	80	14	2	50	92	16	77
	2009	193	100	63	47	24	66	42	22	64	17	9	47	10	5	60	7	4	86	8	4	25	2	1	0	56	29	71
	2010	482	100	66	149	31	64	138	29	74	30	6	47	27	6	67	12	2	75	9	2	56	7	1	71	95	20	65
	2011	172	100	72	48	28	65	59	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	
2020	722	100	63	272	38	52	107	15	79	54	7	52	42	6	60	8	1	75	162	22	80	12	2	33	44	6	64	
2021	44	100	68	12	27	75	7	16	43	2	5	100	8	18	75				11	25	64	3	7	67	1	2	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			REVENUE			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
County Measures	1995	17	7	53			7	41	71	3	18	33			3	18	67			1	6	0	3	18	33			
	1996	114	20	44	1	1	100	44	39	59	12	11	33	8	7	38	16	14	13	1	1	100	4	4	75	16	14	31
	1997	24	7	63	1	4	100	5	21	60	3	13	100	2	8	0	5	21	40	5	21	80	1	4	100	1	4	0
	1998	125	22	59				25	20	76	13	10	62	14	11	36	12	10	33	18	14	72	16	13	75	12	10	25
	1999	38	13	63				5	13	80				3	8	33	3	8	67	7	18	29	8	21	88	7	18	86
	2000	116	21	49	1	1	100	22	19	64	17	15	35	14	12	36	16	14	44	8	7	63	16	14	44	3	3	33
	2001	37	16	73	2	5	100	12	32	58	1	3	100	7	19	100	6	16	67	4	11	75	1	3	0	4	11	75
	2002	98	15	56				34	35	71	7	7	71	15	15	33	11	11	36	7	7	57	5	5	40	12	12	67
	2003	28	16	64				10	36	90				5	18	40				2	7	100	2	7	50	6	21	17
	2004	140	20	54	3	2	33	32	23	66	14	10	14	22	16	50	13	9	54	4	3	50	21	15	76	17	12	41
	2005	57	19	63				12	21	67	6	11	33	6	11	33	8	14	75	9	16	78	9	16	78	4	7	50
	2006	95	17	52				28	29	54	10	11	70	11	12	55	8	8	38	2	2	50	15	16	40	12	13	33
	2007	29	16	76				14	48	93	5	17	0				5	17	100	2	7	100	2	7	50			
	2008	90	15	62	1	1	100	25	28	76	7	8	86	14	16	43	14	16	50	4	4	75	7	8	57	11	12	64
	2009	16	8	69				7	44	86	3	19	33				3	19	100				1	6	0	2	13	50
	2010	64	13	53				23	36	57	6	9	50	12	19	50	2	3	100	1	2	0	5	8	80	11	17	45
	2011	20	12	80	1	5	100	10	50	80				5	25	60	1	5	100				1	5	100	2	10	100
	2012	76	14	63	1	1	100	19	25	74	7	9	43	7	9	43	12	16	67	1	1	100	5	7	40	18	24	72
	2013	12	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	34	28	62				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	14	12	57				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	100	1	6	100	
2020	85	12	66	1	1	100	15	18	80	7	8	29	19	22	68	1	1	100	11	13	91	10	12	30	16	19	63	
2021	9	20	67				1	11	0				3	33	100				2	22	50	3	33	67				

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

	ALL MEASURES			EDUCATION			GOVERNANCE			LAND USE			PUBLIC SAFETY			PUBLIC FACILITIES			GENERAL SERVICES			TRANSPORTATION			REVENUE			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	
City Measures	1995	119	47	71	4	3	100	56	47	86	13	11	69	12	10	50	11	9	45				1	1	0	2	2	100
	1996	374	65	60	2	1	100	170	45	68	42	11	62	31	8	55	22	6	55	8	2	38	4	1	25	71	19	49
	1997	144	42	58				38	26	68	16	11	63	10	7	50	10	7	40	33	23	58	3	2	33	9	6	78
	1998	283	49	60				101	36	62	33	12	73	27	10	56	20	7	70	10	4	100	7	2	57	62	22	47
	1999	114	40	54				45	39	53	29	25	41	11	10	64	1	1	100	7	6	86				16	14	56
	2000	297	53	60	7	2	71	119	40	64	56	19	61	18	6	61	23	8	83	12	4	50	5	2	40	2	1	0
	2001	93	40	69	3	3	0	33	35	73	6	6	67	4	4	25	11	12	64	3	3	67	3	3	33	27	29	89
	2002	309	47	60	1	0	0	110	36	65	37	12	38	27	9	70	24	8	54	13	4	62	5	2	40	72	23	63
	2003	89	50	67				42	47	69	15	17	60	7	8	57	5	6	60	4	4	100	6	7	33	7	8	100
	2004	337	47	59	2	1	100	107	32	75	44	13	64	33	10	45	24	7	29	19	6	74	4	1	75	91	27	47
	2005	135	46	61				48	36	73	22	16	41	12	9	50	6	4	50	9	7	56	4	3	25	29	21	72
	2006	253	46	64				81	32	62	41	16	59	26	10	81	14	6	43	10	4	60	7	3	71	49	19	69
	2007	108	60	71				49	45	78	13	12	54	5	5	100	3	3	67	5	5	80	2	2	0	31	29	68
	2008	258	44	73				74	29	73	36	14	69	25	10	52	18	7	78	6	2	83	7	3	43	81	31	79
	2009	130	67	61				35	27	60	14	11	50	10	8	60	4	3	75	8	6	25	1	1	0	54	42	72
	2010	270	56	71	1	0	100	115	43	77				15	6	80	10	4	70	8	3	63	2	1	50	84	31	68
	2011	107	62	75				51	48	82	8	7	75	4	4	50	4	4	100	4	4	50	1	1	0	32	30	72
	2012	248	47	67	2	1	100	89	36	63	16	6	63	6	2	33	11	4	45	10	4	70	7	3	57	81	33	80
	2013	90	66	68				24	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	54	45	70				11	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				10	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	
2020	369	51	71	3	1	100	92	25	78	47	13	55	23	6	52	7	2	71	151	41	79	2	1	50	28	8	64	
2021	24	55	67	1	4	100	6	25	50	2	8	100	5	21	60				9	38	67				1	4	100	

TREND TABLE B 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			2020			2021		
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Alpine				1	13	100						
Butte												
Calaveras				1	13	100				1	100	100
Colusa												
Contra Costa	3	5	67	1	13	100	2	12	100	1	100	100
El Dorado	6	14	83				6	35	17	1	50	100
Fresno												
Humboldt												
Imperial				2	25	50						
Inyo												
Kern												
Lake	1	3	100									
Lassen												
Los Angeles							1	6	100			
Marin	1	3	100				2	12	100			
Mendocino												
Modoc												
Monterey												
Nevada												
Orange												
Placer										1	100	100
Plumas				1	13	100				1	100	100
Riverside												
Sacramento												
San Bernardino							1	6	0	1	100	0
San Diego	2	6	50				1	6	0			
San Joaquin												
San Luis Obispo	1	3	0	1	13	100	1	6	0			
San Mateo							1	6	100			
Santa Barbara												
Santa Cruz												
Shasta												
Siskiyou							2	12	50			
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	17	100	47	6	67	83

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	6	88
1999	20	53	60	16	42	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	100	1	3	0
2000	40	34	48	28	24	29	1	1	100	3	3	67	0	0	0	6	5	100	2	2	100
2001	22	59	77	12	32	75	2	5	100	0	0	0	3	8	100	3	8	100	2	5	0
2002	18	18	44	14	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	75	0	0	0
2003	13	46	38	11	39	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	100
2004	30	21	50	24	17	42	0	0	0	1	1	100	0	0	0	2	1	100	3	2	67
2005	31	54	74	23	40	65	2	4	100	0	0	0	3	5	100	1	2	100	2	4	100
2006	24	25	50	15	16	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	25	1	1	100	4	4	75
2007	8	28	88	3	10	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	100	1	3	100	1	3	100
2008	18	20	61	11	12	45	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	100	2	2	100
2009	6	38	83	3	19	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	100	1	6	100	1	6	100
2010	15	23	40	11	17	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
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			
2020	17	20	47	12	14	33										4	5	100	1	1	0
2021	6	67	83	5	56	100													5	56	0
1998-2021	425	28	58	298	19	48	7	0	100	10	1	50	28	2	82	39	3	92	47	3	70

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

	NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE MEASURES		CSD/CSA MEASURES		NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE TAX MEASURES		CSD/CSA COUNTY TAX MEASURES		
	Total Number of County Measures	Number of Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	Percent Passing
1998	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	109	54	31	52	35	46	25	44
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			3	67
2008	90	72	63	18	61	22	0	11	45
2009	16	9	67	7	86	1	0	4	75
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	76	16	75	58	79	14	71
2019	16	8	88	8	88	3	100	7	86
2020	85	68	71	17	47	33	64	12	33
2021	9	3	33	6	83	3	33	5	100
1998-2021	1,536	1,111	61	425	58	395	53	298	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				3	2	67	2	2	50	1	1	0	8	6	88	4	3	25
1999	20	53	60				2	5	50				3	8	0	5	13	100				5	13	40	5	13	80
2000	40	34	48	2	2	0	10	9	30	2	2	100				6	5	17	5	4	40	5	4	60	1	1	100
2001	22	59	77				6	16	100	4	11	75				1	3	0	5	14	60	4	11	75	2	5	100
2002	18	18	44				11	11	45	3	3	67							3	3	33	1	1	0			
2003	13	46	38				5	18	40	2	7	100													6	21	17
2004	30	21	50				17	12	47	1	1	0				4	3	50	4	3	50	1	1	0	2	1	100
2005	31	54	74	2	4	0	1	2	100	3	5	100				6	11	100	6	11	67	9	16	78	4	7	50
2006	24	25	50				7	7	71	7	7	43				2	2	50	3	3	0	2	2	50	3	3	67
2007	8	28	88							4	14	100				1	3	0	1	3	100	2	7	100			
2008	18	20	61				8	9	50	2	2	100				2	2	50				1	1	0	5	6	80
2009	6	38	83							2	13	100				1	6	0	2	13	100				1	6	100
2010	15	23	40				7	11	43	4	6	50				1	2	0							3	5	33
2011	10	50	90				4	20	75	4	20	100													2	10	100
2012	14	18	50	1	1	100	6	8	33	2	3	100				2	3	50	3	4	33						
2013	7	58	57				2	17	50	2	17	100				3	25	33									
2014	16	19	38				7	8	29	2	2	100				3	4	0	2	2	100				2	2	0
2015	19	56	63	1	3	0	4	12	50	7	21	86				3	9	33	2	6	50	1	3	100	1	3	100
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									
2020	17	20	47				6	7	67	1	1	0				7	8	14	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
2021	6	67	83				3	33	100	1	11	0				2	22	100									
1998-2021	425	28	59	7	0	14	140	9	54	64	4	80	6	0	33	65	4	46	40	3	55	42	3	67	50	3	58

TREND TABLE G NUMBER OF CANDIDATES BY JURISDICTION,
AND YEAR

	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES			
	ALL CANDIDATES	COUNTY CANDIDATES	CITY CANDIDATES	SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES
1995	2,354	0	732	1,622
1996	5,330	667	2,141	2,522
1997	2,476	23	736	1,717
1998	5,354	1,037	1,893	2,424
1999	2,274	135	724	1,415
2000	5,012	796	2,166	2,050
2001	2,505	189	688	1,628
2002	5,896	1,266	2,188	2,442
2003	2,086	205	566	1,315
2004	5,035	782	2,212	2,041
2005	2,546	167	979	1,400
2006	5,498	1,136	2,132	2,230
2007	2,021	207	811	1,003
2008	5,237	782	2,282	2,173
2009	2,066	143	863	1,060
2010	6,022	1,177	2,321	2,524
2011	1,602	138	734	730
2012	5,208	776	2,332	2,100
2013	1,688	152	818	768
2014	5,675	1,204	2,172	2,299
2015	1,321	114	607	600
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
2020	6,675	761	3,181	2,733
2021	203	22	144	37
Total	96,795	13,899	39,170	43,776

*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
2020	6,675	761	423	56	206	27
2021	203	22	5	23	15	68
Total	96,795	13,899	5,099	37	3,322	24

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

**We excluded runoffs from totals.

TREND TABLE | 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
2020	30	83	25	32	71	83	73	64	47	60	45	44
2021	14	0	11	11	72	--	92	50	30	0	31	13
1995-2021	32	30	26	34	78	83	78	75	52	61	48	51

*We excluded runoffs from totals.

2021 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, 2021

	TAXES		CHARTER AMENDMENT		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Calaveras	1	0											1	0	1
Contra Costa	1	0											1	0	1
El Dorado	1	1											1	1	2
Fresno	1	2											1	2	3
Imperial	1	0											1	0	1
Kern	1	0											1	0	1
Los Angeles	1	4	1	0			2	2			1	0	5	6	11
Marin	3	0											3	0	3
Placer	1	0											1	0	1
Plumas	1	0											1	0	1
Riverside	2	0	1	0					1	0	1	0	5	0	5
Sacramento	1	0											1	0	1
San Bernardino											0	1	0	1	1
San Mateo	2	0			1	0							3	0	3
Santa Barbara	1	0											1	0	1
Santa Clara	2	1											2	1	3
Santa Cruz			1	0									1	0	1
Sonoma	0	2					0	1			1	0	1	3	4
All Counties	20	10	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	0	3	1	30	14	44

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2021

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORT		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Calaveras									1	0					1	0	1
Contra Costa					1	0									1	0	1
El Dorado									1	1					1	1	2
Fresno					1	1					0	1			1	2	3
Imperial											1	0			1	0	1
Kern											1	0			1	0	1
Los Angeles	3	1			0	1	2	2			0	2			5	6	11
Marin	2	0									1	0			3	0	3
Placer					1	0									1	0	1
Plumas					1	0									1	0	1
Riverside			1	0			1	0			3	0			5	0	5
Sacramento					1	0									1	0	1
San Bernardino							0	1							0	1	1
San Mateo	2	0	1	0											3	0	3
Santa Barbara													1	0	1	0	1
Santa Clara	2	1													2	1	3
Santa Cruz											1	0			1	0	1
Sonoma	0	1			1	0	0	1			0	1			1	3	4
All Counties	9	3	2	0	6	2	3	4	2	1	7	4	1	0	30	14	44

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2021

		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			91.7	11	50.0	2	50.0	3			71.4	5	72.4	21
	Lose			8.3	1	50.0	2	50.0	3			28.6	2	27.6	8
	Total			100.0	12	100.0	4	100.0	6			100.0	7	100.0	29
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	20.0	1	25.3	24	42.4	14	55.6	5	50.0	1	16.7	5	28.7	50
	Lose	80.0	4	74.7	71	57.6	19	44.4	4	50.0	1	83.3	25	71.3	124
	Total	100.0	5	100.0	95	100.0	33	100.0	9	100.0	2	100.0	30	100.0	174
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	31.4	11	12.5	2	37.5	3	0.0	0	50.0	5	29.6	21
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	68.6	24	87.5	14	62.5	5	100.0	1	50.0	5	70.4	50
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	35	100.0	16	100.0	8	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0	71
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	1.4	1	9.5	2	42.9	3	0.0	0	7.4	2	6.1	8
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	4	98.6	71	90.5	19	57.1	4	100.0	1	92.6	25	93.9	124
	Total	100.0	4	100.0	72	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	27	100.0	132
All Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	11.2	12	10.8	4	40.0	6	0.0	0	18.9	7	14.3	29
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	5	88.8	95	89.2	33	60.0	9	100.0	2	81.1	30	85.7	174
	Total	100.0	5	100.0	107	100.0	37	100.0	15	100.0	2	100.0	37	100.0	203

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

²Percent may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

³We exclude runoffs 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, 2021

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	No City Measures								
ALPINE	No City Measures								
AMADOR	No City Measures								
BUTTE	No City Measures								
CLAVERAS	No City Measures								
COLUSA	No City Measures								
CONTRA COSTA	No City Measures								
DEL NORTE	No City Measures								
EL DORADO	No City Measures								
FRESNO	3/2/2021	Orange Cove	Measure S	Property Tax	Safety: Police	190	308	61.7%	Fail ^T
	6/8/2021	Parlier	Measure Q	Property Tax	Safety: Police	341	496	68.8%	Pass ^T
	11/2/2021	Orange Cove	Measure U	Utility Tax	General Services	157	494	31.8%	Fail
GLENN	No City Measures								
HUMBOLDT	No City Measures								
IMPERIAL	11/2/2021	Brawley	Measure U	Utility Tax	General Services	1,339	2,445	54.8%	Pass
INYO	No City Measures								
KERN	11/2/2021	Taft	Measure A	Sales Tax	General Services	623	812	76.7%	Pass
KINGS	No City Measures								
LAKE	No City Measures								
LASSEN	No City Measures								
LOS ANGELES	6/1/2021	Vernon	Recall 1	Recall	Governance: Recall	56	81	69.1%	Pass
			Recall 2	Recall	Governance: Recall	59	81	72.8%	Pass
	9/14/2021	Vernon	Recall 1	Recall	Governance: Recall	15	74	20.3%	Fail
			Recall 2	Recall	Governance: Recall	19	75	25.3%	Fail
	11/2/2021	Alhambra	Measure G	Charter Amendment	Education	5,905	7,195	82.1%	Pass
		Commerce	Measure PS	Property Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	578	984	58.7%	Fail ^T
		Inglewood	Measure H	Transient Occupancy Tax	General Services	6,192	9,951	62.2%	Fail ^T
			Measure I	Business Tax	General Services	4,736	9,968	47.5%	Fail
MADERA	No City Measures								
MARIN	No City Measures								
MARIPOSA	No City Measures								
MENDOCINO	No City Measures								
MERCED	No City Measures								

^T Indicates measure required two-thirds of the vote to pass. ^F Indicates measure required fifty-five percent of the vote to pass. All other city measures required a majority vote.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

COUNTY	DATE	CITY	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
MODOC	No City Measures								
MONO	No City Measures								
MONTEREY	No City Measures								
NAPA	No City Measures								
NEVADA	No City Measures								
ORANGE	No City Measures								
PLACER	No City Measures								
PLUMAS	No City Measures								
RIVERSIDE	3/2/2021	Cathedral City	Measure B	Ordinance	Land Use	5,006	7,946	63.0%	Pass
		Eastvale	Measure A	Gann Limit	Governance: Budget Processes	4,453	5,447	81.8%	Pass
	11/2/2021	Indio	Measure E	Sales Tax	General Services	6,890	9,648	71.4%	Pass
		Moreno Valley	Measure G	Sales Tax	General Services	7,471	13,869	53.9%	Pass
		Riverside	Measure C	Charter Amendment	General Services	16,127	29,582	54.5%	Pass
SACRAMENTO	11/2/2021	Isleton	Measure B	Sales Tax	Safety: Fire	89	122	73.0%	Pass ^T
SAN BENITO	No City Measures								
SAN BERNARDINO	No City Measures								
SAN DIEGO	No City Measures								
SAN FRANCISCO	City and County Measures included in County Report								
SAN JOAQUIN	No City Measures								
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No City Measures								
SAN MATEO	11/2/2021	Woodside	Measure A	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	1,160	2,315	50.1%	Pass
SANTA BARBARA	9/14/2021	Lompoc	Measure Q	Business Tax	Revenues	7,434	9,950	74.7%	Pass
SANTA CLARA	No City Measures								
SANTA CRUZ	11/2/2021	Santa Cruz	Measure A	Charter Amendment	General Services: Social/Welfare	9,090	10,986	82.7%	Pass
SHASTA	No City Measures								
SIERRA	No City Measures								
SISKIYOU	No City Measures								
SOLANO	No City Measures								
SONOMA	9/14/2021	Rohnert Park	Measure D	Ordinance	Safety	8,312	16,301	51.0%	Pass
		Sonoma	Recall 1	Recall	Governance: Recall	45,249	189,768	23.8%	Fail
STANISLAUS	No City Measures								
SUTTER	No City Measures								
TEHAMA	No City Measures								

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

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

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

FRESNO	3/2/2021	Orange Cove	Measure S	Fail (2/3rds required)
Shall the measure be adopted to improve local police/fire services, emergency response times; maintain the number of police officers; fight crime/gangs/drugs, provide firefighting equipment; establish an annual special tax, as follows: \$36 parcel tax for each single-family residential and agricultural parcel; \$25 each multifamily unit; \$180 each commercial parcel; \$275 each industrial parcel, raising about \$98,000 annually for four years, with independent Citizen Oversight?				
FRESNO	6/8/2021	Parlier	Measure Q	Pass (2/3rds required)
Shall the Sunset Clause or expiration date set by Section 3.25.070 of the Parlier Municipal Code enacting a Parcel Tax to pay only for the operations of the Parlier Police Department in providing necessary public safety services for the City of Parlier be repealed so that the Parcel Tax adopted by the voters is extended?				
FRESNO	11/2/2021	Orange Cove	Measure U	Fail
Shall the Orange Cove's measure increasing the utility users tax on gas, electricity, and telephone from seven to ten percent and initiating a use tax on water use at ten percent to raise an estimated \$346,832 annually in perpetuity, with citizen oversight, to maintain and not have to cut or lose general city services like police officers, park facilities, job creation, job training, recreational activities, and other city services be adopted?				
IMPERIAL	11/2/2021	Brawley	Measure U	Pass
Shall the City of Brawley ("City") adopt an ordinance extending the Utility Users' Tax until otherwise repealed by voters at a rate of 4%, which is less than surrounding municipalities, upon the use of telecommunications services, natural gas, water, sewer, and solid waste to maintain city services, including, but not limited to, police, fire, City administration services, library, parks, recreation, and senior center, which is projected to raise approximately \$2.5 million per year?				
KERN	11/2/2021	Taft	Measure A	Pass
To protect Taft's long-term financial stability; maintain police/fire/ emergency response times; number of police officers/firefighters; repair streets/potholes; keep public areas clean/ safe; help address homelessness; retain local businesses/jobs, other general City services; shall the measure be adopted establishing a 10 sales tax providing approximately \$ 1,600,000 annually until ended by voters; requiring public disclosure of spending, audits, all revenues benefiting Taft residents/ no money for Sacramento?				
LOS ANGELES	6/1/2021	Vernon	Recall 1	Pass
Shall Diana Gonzales be recalled (removed) from the office of City of Vernon Council Member?				
LOS ANGELES	6/1/2021	Vernon	Recall 2	Pass
Shall Carol Menke be recalled (removed) from the office of City of Vernon Council Member?				
LOS ANGELES	9/14/2021	Vernon	Recall 1	Fail
Shall William Davis be recalled (removed) from the office of City of Vernon Council Member?				
LOS ANGELES	9/14/2021	Vernon	Recall 2	Fail
Shall Melissa Ybarra be recalled (removed) from the office of City of Vernon Council Member?				
LOS ANGELES	11/2/2021	Alhambra	Measure G	Pass
Shall an Ordinance be adopted that proposes to amend the Alhambra City Charter to remove all reference to the Alhambra Unified School District ("AUSD") from the Charter so that AUSD elections may be conducted consistent with the requirements of the State Education Code and State Elections Code?				
LOS ANGELES	11/2/2021	Commerce	Measure PS	Fail (2/3rds required)
To protect vital public safety emergency services, including police, paramedic and fire protection to maintain 9-1-1 response times and the number of firefighters and police officers, shall the City of Commerce enact a parcel tax on industrial property at a maximum rate of \$0.3321 per square foot providing approximately \$12,000,000 annually until ended by voters; with committee oversight? All funds will remain in Commerce.				

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

LOS ANGELES	11/2/2021	Inglewood	Measure H	Fail (2/3rds required)
To maintain essential community services, keep public areas safe/clean, retain local businesses/jobs, address traffic near sports/entertainment facilities, increase affordable housing, maintain youth/anti-gang programs, senior services, and other general City services, shall the measure increasing the transient occupancy tax paid only by hotel/motel guests from 14% to 15.5% providing an estimated \$730,000 annually until ended by voters, requiring public spending disclosure, audits, be adopted?				
LOS ANGELES	11/2/2021	Inglewood	Measure I	Fail
Shall the measure to maintain emergency response, paramedics, fire protection, public safety/health, address homelessness, ease traffic, provide general services by increasing the tax on sales of real estate to 4.5% on amounts over \$10,000,000, 3.5% on amounts between \$2,500,000.01-\$10,000,000, 1.75% on amounts between \$1,100,000.01-\$2,500,000, keeping the existing 0.055% rate for sales under \$1,100,000.01 providing \$3,500,000 annually until ended by voters, with required public disclosure, audits, be adopted?				
RIVERSIDE	3/2/2021	Cathedral City	Measure B	Pass
Shall Sections 1 and 3 of Ordinance 842, adopted unanimously by the City Council to address residents' concerns such as community safety, neighborhood character, noise, criminal activity, and other impacts caused by short-term vacation rentals operating in Cathedral City, by establishing additional regulations on short-term vacation rentals, and phasing out short-term vacation rentals except where approved by local homeowners associations, become law?				
RIVERSIDE	3/2/2021	Eastvale	Measure A	Pass
Shall the measure adjusting the City of Eastvale's appropriations limit be adopted to allow increased budgeting of City revenues for general governmental purposes, including COVID response, fire/emergency medical protection, law enforcement, and street safety/repair for four years (This measure doesn't increase taxes or impose a new tax.)?				
RIVERSIDE	11/2/2021	Indio	Measure E	Pass
Shall an ordinance to preserve paramedic and fire protection, 911 response; police gang/drug enforcement programs/neighborhood patrols; address homelessness, protect water quality/delivery; fix streets/potholes; other city services by extending the City's existing 1¢ sales tax until ended by voters, without increasing the tax, providing approximately \$12,000,000 annually, continuing citizens' oversight, annual audits, prohibiting state government from taking funds raised be adopted?				
RIVERSIDE	11/2/2021	Moreno Valley	Measure G	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted to maintain 9-1-1 emergency response times, robbery/burglary prevention, neighborhood police patrols/fire engine service levels; address homelessness, repair potholes/streets; keep public areas safe/clean; help retain local businesses; maintain senior services, youth/afterschool programs, other general services by establishing a 1¢ sales tax, generating approximately \$20,000,000 annually until ended by voters, with independent financial audits, public review of expenditures, all funds used locally?				
RIVERSIDE	11/2/2021	Riverside	Measure C	Pass
To maintain such general city services as 911 response, fire, paramedic, police, street repairs, parks, senior services; address homelessness; shall the measure amending City of Riverside's Charter to continue collecting in electric rates and maintain the voter-approved fund transfer (established 1968), limited to 11.5% of gross revenue, providing approximately \$ 40,000,000 annually to City of Riverside's General Fund not increasing tax or utility rates, until ended by voters, requiring audits/ all funds controlled locally, be adopted?				
SACRAMENTO	11/2/2021	Isleton	Measure B	Pass (2/3rds required)
Shall the measure to support the operation of the City of Isleton's fire protection needs, by establishing a one-half (½) percent transactions and use tax for a period of five (5) years commencing on April 1, 2022, that is projected to provide between \$83,726.06 and \$106,858.02 of revenue annually, be adopted?				
SAN MATEO	11/2/2021	Woodside	Measure A	Pass
(INITIATIVE) Shall an initiative in support of parking and community gathering spots on residentially zoned parcels within and adjacent to the Town Center be adopted?				

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

SANTA BARBARA	9/14/2021	Lompoc	Measure Q	Pass
Shall a measure, (i) imposing a graduated tax ranging from 0.5 cents per dollar to 2.5 cents per dollar, at half-cent increments, on five levels of Lompoc cannabis manufacturing/distribution operators' annual revenues ranging from \$10,000,000 or less to over \$55,000,000, with no sunset clause, estimated to collect \$1,200,000 annually based on currently established operations, (ii) excluding sales/excise taxes from City cannabis tax calculations and (iii) allowing receipts to show those taxes, be adopted?				
SANTA CRUZ	11/2/2021	Santa Cruz	Measure A	Pass
To solidify the City of Santa Cruz's commitment to prioritizing funding for children and youth programs and services, shall the Santa Cruz City Charter be amended to allocate 20 percent of revenue generated by the Cannabis Business Tax to youth and early childhood development programs and services?				
SONOMA	9/14/2021	Rohnert Park	Measure D	Pass
Shall Ordinance No. 954, An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Rohnert Park Repealing and Replacing Chapter 9.49 of the Rohnert Park Municipal Code to Prohibit the Sale and Use of Fireworks, be adopted?				
SONOMA	9/14/2021	Sonoma	Recall 1	Fail
Shall Jill Ravitch be recalled (removed) from the office of District Attorney?				

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2021

	TAXES		CHARTER AMENDMENT		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Fresno	1	2											1	2	3
Imperial	1	0											1	0	1
Kern	1	0											1	0	1
Los Angeles	0	3	1	0			2	2					3	5	8
Riverside	2	0	1	0					1	0	1	0	5	0	5
Sacramento	1	0											1	0	1
San Mateo					1	0							1	0	1
Santa Barbara	1	0											1	0	1
Santa Cruz			1	0									1	0	1
Sonoma							0	1			1	0	1	1	2
All Counties	7	5	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	16	8	24

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2021

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		ALL CITY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Fresno					1	1			0	1			1	2	3
Imperial									1	0			1	0	1
Kern									1	0			1	0	1
Los Angeles	1	0			0	1	2	2	0	2			3	5	8
Riverside			1	0			1	0	3	0			5	0	5
Sacramento					1	0							1	0	1
San Mateo			1	0									1	0	1
Santa Barbara											1	0	1	0	1
Santa Cruz									1	0			1	0	1
Sonoma					1	0	0	1					1	1	2
All Counties	1	0	2	0	3	2	3	3	6	3	1	0	16	8	24

PART 2
VOTE TOTALS FOR
CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

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 ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
ALAMEDA	11/2/2021	Emeryville	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Welch	Courtney	Policy Director	No	2	1,033	1,738	59.4%	Yes
						Danielsson-Chang	Charlotte	Attorney	No	2	705	1,738	40.6%	No
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	3/2/2021	Clovis	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Mouanoutoua	Vong	Incumbent	Yes	5	9,164	28,588	32.1%	Yes
						Ashbeck	Lynne	Councilmember/Hospital Vice-President	Yes	5	8,994	28,588	31.5%	Yes
						Pearce	Diane	Business Owner	No	5	6,089	28,588	21.3%	No
						Elbaz	Noha	Businesswoman/Educator	No	5	3,446	28,588	12.1%	No
						Nagra	Herman	Business Owner	No	5	895	28,588	3.1%	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	3/2/2021	Redondo Beach	CITY ATTORNEY		Full	Webb	Michael W.	Redondo Beach City Attorney	Yes	2	7,739	13,265	58.3%	Yes
						Sooper	Harden	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	5,526	13,265	41.7%	No
			CITY COUNCIL	1	Full	Nehrenheim	Nils	Councilmember, City of Redondo Beach	Yes	2	1,937	3,170	61.1%	Yes
						Waller	Brad	Businessowner/RBUSD Trustee	No	2	1,233	3,170	38.9%	No
			2	Full	Loewenstein	Todd	Councilmember, City of Redondo Beach	Yes	3	2,067	2,943	70.2%	Yes	
					Robinson	Erika Snow	Operations Director/Artist	No	3	601	2,943	20.4%	No	
					Moses	Paul David	Property Manager	No	3	275	2,943	9.3%	No	
			4	Full	Obagi, Jr.	Zein	Business Owner/Attorney	No	2	1,314	2,595	50.6%	Yes	
Gran	John F.	City Councilmember/Businessman			Yes	2	1,281	2,595	49.4%	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, 2021

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 ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
LOS ANGELES (continued)	3/2/2021	Redondo Beach	MAYOR		Full	Brand	Bill	Redondo Beach Mayor	Yes	4	9,305	13,707	67.9%	Yes		
						Voisey	Chris	Chief Technology Officer	No	4	2,808	13,707	20.5%	No		
						Sachs	Michael Ian	Retired Environmental Technician	No	4	1,105	13,707	8.1%	No		
						Hartman	Shayne T.	Northrop Grumman Analyst	No	4	489	13,707	3.6%	No		
	4/13/2021	Vernon	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Lopez	Leticia	Incumbent	Yes	2	61	104	58.7%	Yes		
Tovar, Jr.						Rafael Alvarez	Student	No	2	43	104	41.3%	No			
	4/20/2021	Compton	CITY ATTORNEY		Full	Brown	Damon	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	1	5,746	5,746	100.0%	Yes		
CITY CLERK				Full	Godwin	Alita L.	Compton City Clerk	Yes	2	3,731	7,102	52.5%	Yes			
					Boone	Lynne	Community Educator	No	2	3,371	7,102	47.5%	No			
CITY COUNCIL			2	Full	Spicer	Andre "Hubcitydre"	Business Owner/Entrepreneur	No	5	531	1,459	36.4%	Runoff			
					Galvan	Isaac	Councilman/Business Owner	Yes	5	375	1,459	25.7%	Runoff			
					Fisher	Skyy	Small Business Owner	No	5	205	1,459	14.1%	No			
					Hamade	Alin	Businessman	No	5	175	1,459	12.0%	No			
					Dawson	Jace	Mental Health Professional	No	5	173	1,459	11.9%	No			
						3	Full	McCoy	Tana L.	Compton City Councilmember	Yes	6	726	2,253	32.2%	Runoff
								Bowers	Jonathan	Fire Captain Educator	No	6	575	2,253	25.5%	Runoff
								Carlos	Tomas	Architectural Engineering Associate	No	6	409	2,253	18.2%	No
								Flores	Jennifer	Operations Supervisor/Mother	No	6	349	2,253	15.5%	No
								Robinson-Blue	Harrieth	No Ballot Designation	No	6	141	2,253	6.3%	No
								Smith	Renard	Business Owner	No	6	53	2,253	2.4%	No
					CITY TREASURER		Full	Mims	Brandon	Public Finance Manager	No	3	3,102	7,439	41.7%	Runoff
						Zurita	Satra	School Boardmember/Businesswoman	No	3	2,721	7,439	36.6%	Runoff		
						Sanders	Douglas	Compton City Treasurer	Yes	3	1,616	7,439	21.7%	No		
			MAYOR		Full	Reynaga	Cristian	City Commissioner/Businessman	No	10	2,300	7,420	31.0%	Runoff		
						Sharif	Emma	Councilwoman	No	10	1,432	7,420	19.3%	Runoff		
						Hays	James	Member, Democratic Central Committee	No	10	1,352	7,420	18.2%	No		
						Willis	Lamar	Senior Housing Developer	No	10	978	7,420	13.2%	No		
						Jimenez	Amy	Financial Coach	No	10	331	7,420	4.5%	No		
						Willie	Mike	Professional Football Player	No	10	311	7,420	4.2%	No		
						Perry	Anthony	Businessman/Educator	No	10	240	7,420	3.2%	No		
						Ortega	Janet Lopez	Entrepreneur/Realtor	No	10	232	7,420	3.1%	No		
						Lister	Rodney	Public Policy Analyst	No	10	201	7,420	2.7%	No		
						Acevedo	Elias "Elijah"	Small Business Owner	No	10	43	7,420	0.6%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

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 ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED				
LOS ANGELES (continued)	5/11/2021	Hermosa Beach	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Jackson	Raymond A.	Retired Colonel, Army	No	5	1,576	4,461	35.3%	Yes				
						Balik	Randy	Contractor/Business Owner	No	5	1,118	4,461	25.1%	No				
						Francois	Dean	Retired Budget Director	No	5	838	4,461	18.8%	No				
						Rittenhouse	Daniel	Renewable Energy Executive	No	5	671	4,461	15.0%	No				
						Stabile	Tara McNamara	Mom/Film Journalist	No	5	258	4,461	5.8%	No				
	6/1/2021	Compton	CITY COUNCIL	2	Full	Galvan	Isaac	Councilman/Business Owner	No	2	855	1,709	50.0%	Yes				
						Spicer	Andre "Hubcitydre"	Business Owner/Entrepreneur	No	2	854	1,709	50.0%	No				
						3	Bowers	Jonathan	Fire Captain Educator	No	2	1,569	2,558	61.3%	Yes			
							McCoy	Tana L.	Compton City Councilmember	No	2	989	2,558	38.7%	No			
						CITY TREASURER	Full	Mims	Brandon	Public Finance Manager	No	2	4,929	8,449	58.3%	Yes		
								Zurita	Satra	School Boardmember/Businesswoman	No	2	3,520	8,449	41.7%	No		
						MAYOR	Full	Sharif	Emma	Councilwoman	No	2	4,339	8,460	51.3%	Yes		
								Reynaga	Cristian	City Commissioner/Businessman	No	2	4,121	8,460	48.7%	No		
						Vernon	CITY COUNCIL ^R	1	Short	Merlo	Judith	No Ballot Designation	No	1	53	53	100.0%	Yes
										2	Larios	Crystal	No Ballot Designation	No	1	55	55	100.0%
	9/14/2021	Vernon	CITY COUNCIL ^R	1	Short	Gonzales	Diana	No Ballot Designation	No	1	18	18	100.0%	Yes				
						2	Menke	Carol	No Ballot Designation	No	1	20	20	100.0%	Yes			
	11/2/2021	Carson	CITY CLERK		Short	Rahman	Myla	District Director	No	5	2,686	9,385	28.6%	Yes				
						Gavino	Monette "Maria"	Public School Teacher	No	5	2,355	9,385	25.1%	No				
						Dewitt	Vera Robles	Clerk Legal Assistant	No	5	1,965	9,385	20.9%	No				
Meni						Falea'ana Arieta	Buyer/Union Representative	No	5	1,348	9,385	14.4%	No					
Caballero						Jeffry H.	Attorney/Educator	No	5	1,031	9,385	11.0%	No					
CITY COUNCIL			4	Short	Rojas	Arleen	Law Enforcement Officer	No	5	886	2,549	34.8%	Yes					
					Gomez	Freddie	Director Supervising Counselors	No	5	627	2,549	24.6%	No					
					Henderson	Sharma	Nonprofit Executive/Consultant	No	5	377	2,549	14.8%	No					
					Mitoma	Michael "Mike"	Business Owner/Commissioner	No	5	338	2,549	13.3%	No					
					Pulido	Isaias "Isa" Jesus	City of Carson Council Aide	No	5	321	2,549	12.6%	No					
MADERA	11/2/2021	Madera	CITY COUNCIL	5	Short	Mejia	Elsa	Communications Specialist	No	2	383	624	61.4%	Yes				
						Villafan	Matilda	Mother	No	2	241	624	38.6%	No				
MARIN	11/2/2021	Tiburon	CITY COUNCIL		Full	Griffin	Noah	Public Affairs Consultant	No	4	1,249	2,611	47.8%	Yes				
						Defever	Kathleen M.	Insurance Attorney/Writer	No	4	716	2,611	27.4%	No				
						Noguez	Leonor "Nora"	Retired Attorney	No	4	342	2,611	13.1%	No				
						McCullough	Brian Joseph	Business Owner	No	4	304	2,611	11.6%	No				

^R Candidate to be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

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 ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
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	No City Contests													
PLACER	No City Contests													
PLUMAS	No City Contests													
RIVERSIDE	6/8/2021	Riverside	CITY COUNCIL	2	Full	Cervantes	Clarissa	Businesswoman/Researcher/Parent	No	6	2,627	5,046	52.1%	Yes
						Paredes	Joe	Business Owner	No	6	1,293	5,046	25.6%	No
						Ayra	Aram	Non-Profit Director	No	6	656	5,046	13.0%	No
						Tyson	Anthony	Realtor	No	6	302	5,046	6.0%	No
						Huerta	Jose "Tony"	Educator/Athletics Coach	No	6	125	5,046	2.5%	No
						Skipper	Austin D.	Consultant	No	6	43	5,046	0.9%	No
	4	Full	Conder	Chuck	Riverside City Councilmember	Yes	2	3,625	6,426	56.4%	Yes			
			Mabon	Monrow	Pastor/Attorney	No	2	2,801	6,426	43.6%	No			
	6	Full	Perry	Jim	Councilman Ward 6	Yes	1	1,932	1,932	100.0%	Yes			
	11/2/2021	Hemet	CITY COUNCIL	4	Short	Males	Joe S.	Retired Business Owner	No	2	1,300	2,443	53.2%	Yes
						Searl	Marc	Hemet Business Owner	No	2	1,143	2,443	46.8%	No
	11/2/2021	Moreno Valley	CITY COUNCIL	2	Short	Delgado	Ed	Riverside County Assistant Sheriff	No	6	2,645	5,921	44.7%	Yes
						Then	Keri A.	Educator/Telecommunications Engineer	No	6	1,806	5,921	30.5%	No
Lopez-Ramirez						Angel	Customer Service Representative	No	6	504	5,921	8.5%	No	
Brown						Patsy D.	Pastor/Professor/Dean	No	6	452	5,921	7.6%	No	
Chen						Matthew	Cemetery Representative	No	6	400	5,921	6.8%	No	
Fox						Angelia	No Ballot Designation	No	6	114	5,921	1.9%	No	
SACRAMENTO	No City Contests													
SAN BENITO	11/2/2021	Hollister	CITY COUNCIL	3	Short	Morales	Dolores Hernandez	Program Manager	No	5	485	1,144	42.4%	Yes
						Avina	Lauretta	Guidance Technician	No	5	379	1,144	33.1%	No
						Quintero	Silas M.	Business Manager	No	5	146	1,144	12.8%	No
						McPhail	Scott	Business Owner	No	5	111	1,144	9.7%	No
						Rojas	Matthew	Talent Acquisition	No	5	23	1,144	2.0%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

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 ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED				
SAN BERNARDINO No City Contests																		
SAN DIEGO	11/2/2021	La Mesa	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Lothian	Laura	Realtor/La Mesa Businesswoman	No	6	4,474	11,643	38.4%	Yes				
						Afshan	Mejgan	Civil Rights Advocate	No	6	2,523	11,643	21.7%	No				
						Dillard	Patricia N.	Local Businesswoman	No	6	2,370	11,643	20.4%	No				
						Stieringer	Jim	Retired Treasurer, City of La Mesa	No	6	1,275	11,643	11.0%	No				
						Brand	Kathleen	Community Services Commissioner	No	6	796	11,643	6.8%	No				
						Louden	Michelle	Behavior Analyst	No	6	205	11,643	1.8%	No				
SAN FRANCISCO City and County Contests included in County Report																		
SAN JOAQUIN No City Contests																		
SAN LUIS OBISPO No City Contests																		
SAN MATEO No City Contests																		
SANTA BARBARA	11/2/2021	Santa Barbara	CITY COUNCIL	4	Full	Sneddon	Kristen W.	Councilmember/Professor/Scientist	Yes	2	4,196	6,823	61.5%	Yes				
						Reed	Barrett	Planning Commissioner/Businessperson	No	2	2,612	6,823	38.3%	No				
				5	Full	Friedman	Eric	Councilmember/Grocery Worker	Yes	1	3,479	3,626	95.9%	Yes				
						6	Full	Harmon	Meagan	City Councilmember	Yes	4	1,921	3,587	53.6%	Yes		
								Johnson	Nina	Local Government Manager	No	4	1,208	3,587	33.7%	No		
						Carlton	Jason	Electrician/Business Owner	No	4	347	3,587	9.7%	No				
						Pike	Zachary	Soil Technician/Musician	No	4	95	3,587	2.6%	No				
				MAYOR					Full	Rowse	Randy	Downtown Business Owner	No	6	10,086	26,131	38.6%	Yes
										Joyce, III	James	Small Business Owner	No	6	7,170	26,131	27.4%	No
										Murillo	Cathy	Mayor	Yes	6	6,576	26,131	25.2%	No
										Schwartz	Deborah L.	City Planning Commissioner	No	6	1,664	26,131	6.4%	No
										Whitehurst	Mark M.	Publisher	No	6	404	26,131	1.5%	No
										Kilrain	Matt	Small Businessman	No	6	178	26,131	0.7%	No
				SANTA CLARA No City Contests														
SANTA CRUZ	12/7/2021	Watsonville	CITY COUNCIL	2	Short	Quiroz-Carter	Vanessa	Adjunct Professor	No	2	216	371	58.2%	Yes				
						Barba	Francisco	Medical Transport Worker	No	2	151	371	40.7%	No				
SHASTA No City Contests																		
SIERRA No City Contests																		
SISKIYOU No City Contests																		
SOLANO	5/4/2021	Vacaville	CITY COUNCIL	2	Full	Ritchie, II	Gregory	Small Business Owner	No	3	1,454	3,318	43.8%	Yes				
						Desmarais	Joe	Director, Emergency Management	No	3	1,017	3,318	30.7%	No				
						Hunt	Curtis	Retired Public Administrator	No	3	847	3,318	25.5%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR CITY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

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 ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SOLANO (continued)	11/2/2021	Dixon	CITY CLERK		Full	Janisch	Kristin M.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	1,401	2,303	60.8%	Yes
						Ceremello	Michael	Entrepreneur/Business Owner	No	2	902	2,303	39.2%	No
SONOMA	5/4/2021	Windsor	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Reynoza	Rosa	Mother/Business Owner	No	5	3,253	6,859	47.4%	Yes
						Chavez	Oscar	Human Services Executive	No	5	1,226	6,859	17.9%	No
						Leasure	Jeffrey	Insurance Agency Owner	No	5	1,204	6,859	17.6%	No
						Donoho	Julia	Architect/Business Owner	No	5	1,049	6,859	15.3%	No
						Wilson	Cody	Biomedical Equipment Technician	No	5	127	6,859	1.9%	No
	11/2/2021	Sonoma	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Lowe	Sandra M.	Non-Profit Executive Director	No	3	2,278	3,804	59.9%	Yes
						Nugent	Michael J.	Business Owner	No	3	1,175	3,804	30.9%	No
Cribb						James K.	Small Business Owner	No	3	351	3,804	9.2%	No	
STANISLAUS	2/2/2021	Modesto	MAYOR		Full	Zwahlen	Sue	Registered Nurse	No	2	19,423	33,760	57.5%	Yes
						Ridenour	Doug	Modesto City Councilmember	No	2	14,337	33,760	42.5%	No
	8/31/2021	Ceres	CITY COUNCIL	1	Short	Casey	James	Ceres Business Owner	No	3	549	1,330	41.3%	Yes
						Smith	Laurie	Planning Commissioner	No	3	402	1,330	30.2%	No
Vasquez						Connie L.	Childcare Provider	No	3	379	1,330	28.5%	No	
SUTTER	12/7/2021	Live Oak	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Chapdelaine	Jeremy	City Construction Manager	No	4	420	995	42.2%	Yes
						Mora	Cruz	Healthcare Worker	No	4	277	995	27.8%	No
						Tica	Aleks	Farmer/Restaurant Manager	No	4	257	995	25.8%	No
						Dais	Rick	No Ballot Designation	No	4	41	995	4.1%	No
TEHAMA	No City Contests													
TRINITY	No City Contests													
TULARE	No City Contests													
TUOLUMNE	No City Contests													
VENTURA	11/2/2021	Oxnard	CITY COUNCIL	2	Short	Teran	Gabriel	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	1,232	2,217	55.6%	Yes
						Hartley	Tai	Community Volunteer	No	3	828	2,217	37.3%	No
						Huerta	Eduardo Q.	Consultant	No	3	157	2,217	7.1%	No
YOLO	9/14/2021	West Sacramento	CITY COUNCIL		Short	Early	Dawnté	Health Commission Chief	No	2	8,104	13,429	60.3%	Yes
						Wilson	Duane	Small Business Owner	No	2	5,325	13,429	39.7%	No
YUBA	No City Contests													

Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Offices, 2021

		CITY ATTORNEY		CITY CLERK		CITY COUNCIL		CITY TREASURER		MAYOR		TOTAL ^{1,2}	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	100.0	2	100.0	2	91.7	11	0.0	0	50.0	1	84.2	16
	Lose	0.0	0	0.0	0	8.3	1	100.0	1	50.0	1	15.8	3
	Total	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	12	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	19
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	0.0	0	14.3	1	25.3	24	50.0	1	15.0	3	23.2	29
	Lose	100.0	1	85.7	6	74.7	71	50.0	1	85.0	17	76.8	96
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	7	100.0	95	100.0	2	100.0	20	100.0	125
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	100.0	2	66.7	2	31.4	11	0.0	0	25.0	1	36.5	16
	Non-Incumbent	0.0	0	33.3	1	68.6	24	100.0	1	75.0	3	64.4	29
	Total	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0	35	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0	45
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.4	1	50.0	1	5.6	1	3.0	3
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	100.0	6	98.6	71	50.0	1	94.4	17	97.0	96
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	6	100.0	72	100.0	2	100.0	18	100.0	99
All Candidates	Incumbent	66.7	2	22.2	2	11.2	12	33.3	1	9.1	2	13.2	19
	Non-Incumbent	33.3	1	77.8	7	88.8	95	66.7	2	90.9	20	86.8	125
	Total	100.0	3	100.0	9	100.0	107	100.0	3	100.0	22	100.0	144

¹We exclude runoffs from totals.

²Percent may not sum to 100 due to rounding.