

# 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

# SCHOOL DISTRICT 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

Intro	ductioni
	2021 County, City and School District Election Dates by Countyiii
	Trend Table A Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year
	Trend Table B Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction and Yearx
	Trend Table C Community Service District and County Service Area Measures by County
	Trend Table D Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Type and Yearxx
	Trend Table E Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures by Yearxxi
	Trend Table F Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic and Yearxxii
	Trend Table G Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Yearxxiii
	Trend Table H Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Yearxxiv
	Trend Table I Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Yearxxv
	Election Series Summary: Election Outcomes for County, City, and School District Ballot asures and Candidates
	Table A Summary of Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Ballot Measures by Type ofMeasure and County, 2021
	Table B Summary of Outcomes for All County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic ofMeasure and County, 2021
	Table C Summary of Election Outcomes for All County, City, and School District Offices, 2021
Part	1 Vote Totals, Election Outcomes, and Text for School District Ballot Measures
	Table 1.1 Vote Totals for School District Ballot Measures by County, 2021
	Table 1.2 Text for School District Ballot Measures by County, 2021
	Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for School District Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2021
Part	2 Vote Totals for School District Office Candidates
	Table 2.1 Vote Totals for School District Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2021
	Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for School District Offices, 2021

# **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.

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

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

iv -

2021 00011	<u>y, eny, an</u>					Daios	by cc	<u>onny</u>							
_	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															

	ALL MEASUR Mean Number of Measures				bonds			TAXES		OF	DINANC	E	F	RECALLS		IN	IITIATIVES	i	CHARTE	ER AMEN	DMENT
	Number of		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			

			MEASU			BONDS	- ,		TAXES			RDINAN			RECALLS			IITIATIVE		,		,
		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
	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
S	2005	295	100	64	57	19	74	111	38	58	59	20	54	11	4	82	7	2	43	35	12	89
E	2006	556	100	62	185	33	59	142	26	56	123	22	63	17	3	29	22	4	36	39	7	82
Measures	2007	179	100	72	22	12	55	61	34	74	40	22	58	13	7	100	1	1	0	38	21	79
e	2008	593	100	75	201	34	82	188	32	67	123	21	65	12	2	58	11	2	91	39	7	90
Σ	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		10	76
	2011	172	100	72	10	6	80	75	44	67	29	17	72	16	9	75		1	0	31	18	81
	2012	530	100	72	156	29	81	178	34	69	112	21	62	14	3	93	2	0	50	-	10	63
	2013	137	100	72	11	8	73	65	47	78	34	25	50	8	6	88	4	3	100		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		2	53	-	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 (C	CONTINUED)
The the trible in the method term of term o	

vi –

	.,	ALL	MEASU			BONDS	oy 1 210		TAXES			RDINAN			RECALLS			VITIATIVE		Ì	R AMENE	
		Number of Measures		Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures		Pass Rate	Number of Measures		Pass Rate	Number of Measures		Pass Rate		% of All Measures F	Pass Rate
	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
County Measures	2005	57	19	63	3	5	67	24	42	67	16	28	56	3	5	100	3	5	67	2	4	50
nst	2006	95	17	52				45	47	40	30	32	60	4		25	2	2	50	6	6	83
lec	2007	29	16	76	1	3	100		10	67	16	55	63	8	28	100						
~ ~	2008	90	15	62	3	3	100		37	42	40	44	65	1	1	100	2	2	100	4	4	100
Jut	2009	16	8	69				4	25	50		38	67	1	6	100				2	13	100
Со	2010	64	13	53	3	5	67	25	39	48	22	34	59	4	6	50		3	50	6	9	50
U	2011	20	12	80	1	5	100	7	35	71	4	20		2		100				3	15	67
	2012	76	14	63	1	1	100	39	51	59	20	26	60	1	1	100		3	50	10	13	70
	2013	12	9	75				5	42	40				1	8	100		25	100	1	8	100
	2014	84	15	57	4	5	100		39	36		23		1	1	0		10	50	12	14	92
	2015	34	28	62	1	3	100	11	32	45	8	24		5	-	100		12	0		3	100
	2016	151	17	59	4	3	100		45	56		25		3	2	100	12	8	25	17	11	59
	2017	14	12	57		_		11	79	55	3	21	67							-		
	2018	102	14	75	3		67	72	71	78		11	82	1	1	100	2	2	0	8	8	75
	2019	16	24	88	1	6	100	10	63	90	3	19	-				_		_	1	6	100
	2020	85	12	66	5	6	80	45	53	56		15					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	MEASU	RES		BONDS			TAXES		OF	RDINANG	CE	F	RECALLS		11	NITIATIVES		CHART	ER AMEN	
		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
	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
S	2005	135	46	61	2	1	0	47	35	55	37	27	51	3	2	33	4	3	25	33	24	91
City Measures	2006	253	46	64	10	4	50	82	32	70	85	34	61	6	2	17	20	8	35	33	13	82
ası	2007	108	60	71	2	2	0	40	37	73	19	18	53	5	5	100	1	1	0	38	35	79
Me	2008	258	44	73	5	2	100	111	43	71	80	31	65	8	3	38	9	3	89	35	14	89
ty I	2009	130	67	61	1	1	0	63	48	68	28	22	61	3	2	33	3	2	33	18	14	56
Ü	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

		ALL	MEASU			BONDS	,		TAXES			RDINANC			RECALLS			INITIA			CHARTE		
		Number of Measures		Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures			Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate			Pass Rate	Number o Measures			ass Rate	Number of Measures		Pass Rate
	1995	117	46	52	87	74	46	13	11	38		5	100		7	88	1	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							
<i>(</i> <b>0</b>	2003	61	34	52	20	33	55	36	59	47	3	5	67	2	3	100							
District Measures	2004	235	33	73	172	73	77	51	22	53	5	2	100	4	2	100							
nsp	2005	103	35	69	52	50	77	40	39	55	6	6	67	5	5	100							
Aed	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										
trio	2008	245	41	80	193	79	81	44	18	75	3	1	67	3	1	100							
Dis	2009	47	24	66	5	11	40	32	68	66	1	2	100	9	19	78							
0	2010	148	31	64	92	62	72	44	30	45	4	3	100	7	5	57	1	1	1	0			_
School	2011	47	27	64	9	19	78	31	66	68	2	4	100	4	9	0							
Sc	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 A NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TYPE, JURISDICTION, AND YEAR (CONTINUED)

	ALL N	<b>NEASU</b>	RES		JCATIC			ERNAN			ND USI			IC SAFI		PUBLIC			G	ENERAL RVICES		TRANS				VENUE	
	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		Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Mean Number of Measures		Percent Passing
All Mec	sures																										
1995-2021	397	100	67	135	34	71	83	21	71	33	8	55	24	6	59	16	4	57	22	6	75	11	3	55	54	14	69
Even Years	624	100	68	209	33	73	128	21	70	52	8	57	38	6	59	26	4	55	36	6	78	17	3	56	85	14	67
Odd Years	186	100	65	66	36	64	41	22	74	15	8	50	11	6	58	7	4	62	9	5	63	5	2	50	25	13	75
County				_						_						_			_			_			_		
1995-2021	63	16	59	0	1	85	16	26	70	7	12	44	8	13	51	6	10	53	4	7	69	7	11	57	8	12	53
Even Years	103	17	57	1	1	78	25	25	67	13	13	45	14	13	49	10	9	47	7	6	70	12	11	56	14	13	53
Odd Years	25	13	67	0	1	100	8	30	78	2	8	41	3	13	59	3	11	74	3	10	69	3	12	63	2	10	56
City																											
1995-2021	200	50	67	1	1	74	66	33	71	25	13	59	16	8	63	10	5	59	17	9	76	4	2	50	46	23	71
Even Years	313	50	67	2	1	78	102	33	71	38	12	62	24	8	64	17	5	59	29	9	79	6	2	58	72	23	69
Odd Years	95	51	66	1	1	63	32	34	72	13	14	52	8	8	58	5	5	57	7	7	62	2	2	26	23	24	78
School [	District																										
1995-2021	135	34	71	132	98	68	1	1	77							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50			
Even Years	208	33	73	203	98	69	1	0	75										0	0	0	0	0	50			
Odd Years	67	36	64	65	98	64	1	2	79							0	0	0									

<u> </u>		ALL	MEASU	RES	EDU	JCATIO	N	GOV	ernan	CE	LA	ND USE		PUBI	IC SAFI	ΞTY	PUBLIC	C FACII	LITIES	GENER	AL SER\	/ICES	TRANS	PORTA	TION	RE	/ENUE	
	-	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures		Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing			Percent Passing	Number of Measures		Percent Passing			Percent Passing
	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		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
S	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
Jre	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
easure	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
Me	2008	593		74	246	41	80	99	17	74	43	7	72	39	(	49	32	5	66	10	2	80	14	2	50	92	16	77
A	2009	193	100 100	63	47	24	66	42	22	64	17	9	47	10	5	60 67	10	4	86	8	4	25	2	1	0 71	56	29	71
	2010 2011	482 172	100	66 72	149 48	31 28	64 65	138 59	29 34	74 81	30 8	6 5	47 75	27 9	6 5	67 56	12 5	2	75 100	9	2	56 50	2	1	71 50	95 34	20 20	65 74
	2011	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
	2012	137	100	72	35	26	80	28	20	71	14	10	50	9	7	67	20		57	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		79		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

1	VIIINC		MEASU	RES	EDU	JCATIO	Л	GOVI	RNAN	CE	LA	ND USE		PUBLI	ic safe	TY	PUBLIC	FACIL	LITIES	GENER	AL SER	VICES	TRANSI	PORTA	TION	RE	VENUE	
	-		% of All Measures	Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing			Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures N		Percent Passing		% of All leasures	Percent Passing			Percent Passing		% of All Aeasures	Percent Passing			Percent Passing
	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
S	2004	140	20	54	3	2	33		23	66	14	10	14	22	16	50	13	9	54	4	3	50	21	15	76	17	12	41
Jre	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
Measures	2006	95	17	52				28	29	54	10	11	70 0	11	12	55	8	8	38	2	2	50	15	16	40	12	13	33
Me	2007 2008	29 90	16 15	76 62	1	1	100	14 25	48 28	93 76	5	17 8	0 86	14	16	43	5 14	17 16	100 50	2	4	100 75	2	8	50 57	11	12	64
₹	2008	16	8	69	1	1	100	7	44	86	3	19	33	14	10	43	3	19	100	4	4	75	1	6	0	2	12	50
ounty	2003	64	13	53				23	36	57	6	9	50	12	19	50	2	3	100	1	2	0	5	8	80	11	17	45
ŭ	2011	20	12	80	1	5	100		50	80	Ŭ	Ū	00	5	25	60	1	5	100		_	Ű	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			

xii —

		ALL	MEASI	JRES	EDU	ICATIC	рN	GOVE	RNAN	ICE	LA	ND US	SE	PUBL	IC SAF	ETY	PUBLIC	C FACI	LITIES		ENERA RVICE		trans	PORTA		RE	VENUE	
		Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Percent Passing		% of All Measures	Percent Passing			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	% of All			% of All Measures	Percent Passing			Percent Passing
	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
Se	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
City Measure	2006	253	46	64				81	32	62	41	16	59	26	10	81	14	6	43	10	4	60	1	3	71	49	19	69
ea	2007	108 258	60	71 73				49 74	45 29	78 73	13 36	12 14	54 69	5 25	5 10	100 52	3	3	67 78	5	5 2	80 82	2	2	0 43	31 81	29 31	68 79
Z	2008 2009	130	44 67	61				35	25	60		14	50	10	8	52 60	18 4	3	75	8	6	83 25	1	1	43	54	42	73
Cit	2003	270	56	71	1	0	100	115	43	77	14		50	15	6	80	10	4	70	8	3	63	2	1	50	84	31	68
U	2011	107	62	75			100	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

			,	MEASU	RES	ED	UCATIC	N	GO	/ERNAN	CE	L	and us	Ε	PUBLIC	C SAFETY	PU	BLIC FA	CILITIES	(	GENER	AL SE	RVICES	TRA	NSPOF	TATION	REVE	NUE	Ī
195    117    46    52    117    100    52    1    1    1    0    1    0    0    0    1    1    0    0    0    0    1    1    0 </td <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>Number of Measures</td> <td>% of All Measures</td> <td></td> <td>Number of Measures</td> <td>% of All Measures</td> <td>Percent Passing</td> <td>Number of Measures</td> <td>% of All Measures</td> <td>Percent Passing</td> <td>Number of Measures</td> <td>% of All Measures</td> <td>Percent Passing</td> <td>Number of % Measures Me</td> <td>of All Percent asures Passing</td> <td>Number ( Measure</td> <td>of % of Al s Measure</td> <td>I Percent s Passing</td> <td>t N</td> <td>lumber of N</td> <td>% of All leasures</td> <td>Percent Passing</td> <td>Number o Measures</td> <td>f % of A Measur</td> <td>l Percent s Passing</td> <td>Number of % of A Measures Measures</td> <td>All Percent es Passing</td> <td>-</td>		-	Number of Measures	% of All Measures		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 Me	of All Percent asures Passing	Number ( Measure	of % of Al s Measure	I Percent s Passing	t N	lumber of N	% of All leasures	Percent Passing	Number o Measures	f % of A Measur	l Percent s Passing	Number of % of A Measures Measures	All Percent es Passing	-
1996    85    15    62    84    99    63    1    1    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0    0    1    0    0    1    1    0   0    0    0		1995		I I	52	117		•		1 1				1		I		1		IVI	edsures		1		<u> </u>			1	l
1997    174    51    62    174    100    62    174    100    62    174    100    62    11    1    1    0      1998    164    29    62    168    96    63    5    3    40      2000    103    44    71    100    97    73    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    0    1    0    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    0    1    1    1    0    1    1    1    0																					1	1	0						
1998    164    29    62    133    96    63    12    9    92      1999    131    46    62    131    9    91    9    92      2000    146    26    63    143    98    62    1    9    92      2001    103    44    71    10    97    73    1    1    0      2002    203    83    73    23    73    1    1    0      2004    235    33    73    23    70    1    1    0      2004    235    33    73    23    70    1    1    0      2004    235    33    73    23    70    1    1    0      2004    235    33    73    23    73    1    1    0      2004    245    11    80    66    1    1    1    0 <td></td> <td>1997</td> <td></td>		1997																											
VI    146    2.6    6.3    14.3    9.8    6.2      200    1.03    4.4    71    100    73    1    1    0    0    1    2    2    0    1    1    0    0    1    1    0 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1 (</td> <td>)</td> <td></td> <td></td>									5	3	40														1	1 (	)		
VI    101    103    VI    100    97    73    1    1    0    0    2    2    0    1    0 <th< td=""><td></td><td>1999</td><td>131</td><td>46</td><td>62</td><td>119</td><td>91</td><td>59</td><td>12</td><td>9</td><td>92</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>		1999	131	46	62	119	91	59	12	9	92																		
VIONE    202    250    38    76    249    100    76      203    61    34    52    61    100    52      204    235    33    73    233    99    73      205    103    35    69    102    99    70    1    1    0      206    208    37    58    208    100    58      207    42    58    100    58      2009    47    24    66    47    100    64      211    47    27    64    47    100    64      211    47    27    64    47    100    64      211    47    27    64    47    100    64      211    47    28    48    100    64    100    100      211    47    28    100    80    100    80      214		2000	146	26	63	143	98	62																					
2003  61  34  52  61  100  52		2001	103	44	71	100	97	73	1	1	0							2	2	0									
2014  235  33  73  233  99  73		2002	250	38	76	249	100	76																· 1	1	0 (	)		
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td></td><td>2003</td><td>61</td><td>34</td><td>52</td><td>61</td><td>100</td><td>52</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		2003	61	34	52	61	100	52																					
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>res</td><td>2004</td><td>235</td><td>33</td><td>73</td><td>233</td><td>99</td><td>73</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>1 100</td><td>)</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	res	2004	235	33	73	233	99	73																2	2	1 100	)		
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>DSD</td><td>2005</td><td>103</td><td>35</td><td>69</td><td>102</td><td>99</td><td>70</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	DSD	2005	103	35	69	102	99	70	1	1	0																		
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>Aed</td><td>2006</td><td>208</td><td>37</td><td>58</td><td>208</td><td>100</td><td>58</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td>į.</td></t<>	Aed	2006	208	37	58	208	100	58												_							_		į.
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>∠ &gt;</td><td>2007</td><td>42</td><td>23</td><td>67</td><td>42</td><td>100</td><td>67</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	∠ >	2007	42	23	67	42	100	67																					
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>itric</td><td>2008</td><td>245</td><td>41</td><td>80</td><td>245</td><td>100</td><td>80</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td>i.</td></t<>	itric	2008	245	41	80	245	100	80																			_		i.
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>Dis</td><td>2009</td><td>47</td><td>24</td><td>66</td><td>47</td><td>100</td><td>66</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Dis	2009	47	24	66	47	100	66																					
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>148</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td>i.</td></t<>	0					148																					_		i.
2013  35  26  80  35  100  80 <t< td=""><td>cho</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>64</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	cho				64																								
2014  208  36  83  208  100  83    2015  32  27  94  32  100  94    2016  328  38  90  328  100  90    2017  18  16  56  18  100  56    2018  211  30  84  203  96  83  7  3  100    2019  10  15  80  10  100  80																													È
2015  32  27  94  32  100  94    2016  328  38  90  328  100  90    2017  18  16  56  18  100  56    2018  211  30  84  203  96  83  7  3  100    2019  10  15  80  10  100  80																													
2016  328  38  90  328  100  90    2017  18  16  56  18  100  56    2018  211  30  84  203  96  83  7  3  100    2019  10  15  80  10  100  80																													È
2017  18  16  56  18  100  56    2018  211  30  84  203  96  83  7  3  100    2019  10  15  80  10  100  80																													
2018  211  30  84  203  96  83  7  3  100    2019  10  15  80  10  100  80																													È
2019 10 15 80 10 100 80										2	400																		1
									/	3	100																		Ē
2020 268 37 51 268 100 51																													
2020 208 37 31 208 100 31																													

		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	0.4	05		00		~~~	40	~ ~	40				40	40	
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

		2003			2004			2005			2006			2007	
	N	%	% Passing	Ν	%	% 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				Ŭ					
Santa Barbara				•		100				1	25	0			
Santa Cruz							1	100	0		20	Ŭ			
Shasta								100	•						
Siskiyou				5	83	0				2	100	0			
Sonoma	1	100	100		00					1	50	0			
Stanislaus		100	100							1	50	0			
Sutter										1	100	0			
Trinity										2	100	100			
Tulare				1	100	100	1	100	100	2	100	100			
Tuolumne					100	100	I	100	100						
Yolo															
Yuba				1	25	0									
Total for					20	0									
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)

xvi –

-		2008			2009			2010			2011			2012	
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	Ν	%	% Passing	Ν	%	% 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	40	00		^		00	45	00	40	40		00		40	50
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						<u>J</u>			1						
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	0	10	00	2	100	100	4	67	100			
Marin	1	11	100	1	25	100	2	22	100		01	100	1	100	0
Mendocino			100		20	100	2		100				· · ·	100	0
Modoc				2	0	0	2	100	0	2	100	100			
Monterey				2	0	0	2	100	0	2	100	100	1	100	0
Nevada				1	50	0							1	100	100
					50	U							1	100	100
Orange Placer															
Plumas			_				4	100	100	4	100	100			
Riverside							4	100	100	1	100	100			
Sacramento		•	0				0	10	•	0	400	07		100	400
San Bernardino	1	9	0	4	400	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			(00			
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
	1	00	57	10	19	30	19	00	12	20	17	00	Э	04	44

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

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

BY COUNTY (C	UNIINU	JED)										
		2018			2019			2020			2021	
	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing	N	%	% Passing
Alpine				1	13	100			<u> </u>			<u> </u>
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
7.41 COOLINE3	10	10	15	U	100	00	11	100	71	U	01	00

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

	Ali	CSD/C	SA		Taxes			Bonds		,	Advisory	,		Recalls		C	Gann Limi	T	(	Ordinanc	)E
	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 MEAS		CSD/CSA	MEASURES	NON-CSD/CSA C MEAS			COUNTY TAX SURES
	Total Number of County Measures	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

	ALI	L CSD/		L	AND L	JSE	PUE	BLIC SA	FETY	GC	VERN	ANCE	ENV	/IRON	MENT	TRANS	PORTA	ATION	PUB	LIC FAG	CILITIES	GENE	RALSE	RVICES	F	REVENU	JE
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures I	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Percent Passing	Number of 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

		NUMBER O	FCANDIDATI	ES
	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

# Trend Table G Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction, and Year

\*We excluded runoffs from totals.

		Number of	COUNTY SI CAND	UPERVISOR IDATES	CSD/CSA C	
	Total Number of Candidates	County 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

Trend Table H Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year

\*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

	PERC	CENT OF CANE INCUM		) ARE	PERCE	NTAGE OF INC	CUMBENTS WI	HO WIN	PERCENTA	GE OF WINN ARE INCI		ATES WHO
	% 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

	TAX	KES	CHA AMENI		INITIA	ATIVE	REC	ALL	GANN	I LIMIT	ORDIN	IANCE	A	ll measur	ES
	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

	EDUC/	ATION	LAND	USE	SAF	ETY	GOVER	NANCE	TRANS	Sport	GEN SERV		REVE	ENUE	AL	L MEASUR	RES
	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 B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2021

		COUNTY SUPERVISOR		CITY COUNCIL		school board		DIRECTOR, CSD <sup>1</sup>		OTHER COUNTY OFFICES		OTHER CITY OFFICES		TOTAL <sup>2,3</sup>	
		Percent	Ν	Percent	Ν	Percent	Ν	Percent	Ν	Percent	Ν	Percent	Ν	Percent	Ν
	Win			91.7	11	50.0	2	50.0	3			71.4	5	72.4	21
Incumbent Candidates	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-	Win	20.0	1	25.3	24	42.4	14	55.6	5	50.0	1	16.7	5	28.7	50
Incumbent	Lose	80.0	4	74.7	71	57.6	19	44.4	4	50.0	1	83.3	25	71.3	124
Candidates	Total	100.0	5	100.0	95	100.0	33	100.0	9	100.0	2	100.0	30	100.0	174
	Incumbent	0.0	0	31.4	11	12.5	2	37.5	3	0.0	0	50.0	5	29.6	21
Winning Candidates	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
	Incumbent	0.0	0	1.4	1	9.5	2	42.9	3	0.0	0	7.4	2	6.1	8
Losing Candidates	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
A 11	Incumbent	0.0	0	11.2	12	10.8	4	40.0	6	0.0	0	18.9	7	14.3	29
All Candidates	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

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

<sup>1</sup>Includes Directors of Community Service Districts and County Service Areas.

<sup>2</sup>Percent may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

<sup>3</sup>We exclude runoffs from totals.

Part 1 Vote Totals, Election Outcomes, And Text For School District Ballot Measures

### TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

COUNTY	DATE	SCHOOL DISTRICT	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEAS	URE TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	total Vote	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL*
ALAMEDA	No School [	District Measures							
ALPINE	No School [	District Measures							
AMADOR	No School [	District Measures							
BUTTE	No School [	District Measures							
CALAVERAS	No School [	District Measures							
COLUSA	No School [	District Measures							
CONTRA COSTA	No School [	District Measures							
DEL NORTE	No School [	District Measures							
EL DORADO	No School [	District Measures							
FRESNO	No School [	District Measures							
GLENN	No School [	District Measures							
HUMBOLDT	No School [	District Measures							
IMPERIAL	No School [	District Measures							
INYO	No School [	District Measures							
KERN	No School [	District Measures							
KINGS	No School [	District Measures							
LAKE	No School [	District Measures							
LASSSEN	No School [	District Measures							
LOS ANGELES	3/2/2021	San Marino Unified	Measure E	Property Tax	Education	2,192	3,477	63.0%	Fail⊺
		Wiseburn Unified	Measure A	Ordinance	Education: Districts	351	370	94.9%	Pass
	6/29/2021	San Marino Unified	Measure E	Property Tax	Education	3,530	4,787	73.7%	Pass⊺
MADERA	No School [	District Measures							
MARIN	5/4/2021	San Rafael City Elementary	Measure H	Property Tax	Education	6,626	9,691	68.4%	Pass <sup>⊤</sup>
		San Rafael City High	Measure G	Property Tax	Education	10,775	15,492	69.6%	Pass⊺
MARIPOSA	No School [	District Measures							
MENDOCINO	No School [	District Measures							
MERCED	No School [	District Measures							
MODOC	No School [	District Measures							
MONO	No School [	District Measures							
MONTEREY	No School [	District Measures							
NAPA	No School [	District Measures							
NEVADA	No School [	District Measures							

\*Pass or Fail results based on multi-county outcomes.

<sup>T</sup> Indicates measure required two-thirds of the vote to pass. F Indicates measure required fifty-five percent of the vote to pass. All other school district measures required a majority vote.

COUNTY	DATE	SCHOOL DISTRICT	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEAS	URE TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	total Vote	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL*
ORANGE	No School [	District Measures							
PLACER	No School [	District Measures							
PLUMAS	No School [	District Measures							
RIVERSIDE	No School [	District Measures							
SACRAMENTO	No School [	District Measures							
SAN BENITO	No School [	District Measures							
SAN BERNARDINO	No School [	District Measures							
SAN DIEGO	No School [	District Measures							
SAN FRANCISCO	No School [	District Measures							
SAN JOAQUIN	No School [	District Measures							
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No School [	District Measures							
SAN MATEO	5/4/2021	Portola Valley Elementary	Measure S	Property Tax	Education	1,972	2,625	75.1%	Pass <sup>⊤</sup>
	11/2/2021	Menlo Park City Elementary	Measure B	Property Tax	Education	6,022	8,097	74.4%	Pass <sup>⊤</sup>
SANTA BARBARA	No School [	District Measures							
SANTA CLARA	5/4/2021	Cupertino Union Elementary	Measure A	Property Tax	Education	15,129	25,492	59.3%	Fail⊺
	11/2/2021	Berryessa Union Elementary	Measure A	Property Tax	Education	6,498	9,176	70.8%	Pass <sup>⊤</sup>
		Los Gatos Union Elementary	Measure B	Property Tax	Education	6,532	8,597	76.0%	Pass <sup>⊤</sup>
SANTA CRUZ	No School [	District Measures							
SHASTA	No School [	District Measures							
SIERRA	No School [	District Measures							
SISKIYOU	No School [	District Measures							
SOLANO	No School [	District Measures							
SONOMA	3/2/2021	West Sonoma County Union High	Measure A	Property Tax	Education	9,395	16,121	58.3%	Fail⊺
STANISLAUS	No School [	District Measures							
SUTTER	No School [	District Measures							
TEHAMA	No School [	District Measures							
TRINITY	No School [	District Measures							
TULARE	No School [	District Measures							
TUOLUNNE	No School [	District Measures							
VENTURA	No School [	District Measures							
YOLO	No School [	District Measures							
YUBA	No School [	District Measures							

### TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2021

LOS ANGELES 3/2/2021 San Marino Unified Measure F Fail 2/3rds required) To continue San Marino's tradition of community support for local schools, to retain outstanding classroom teachers and continue advanced programs in math, science, engineering, technology, provide honors and advanced placement classes, and to minimize class size increases, shall San Marino Unified School District continue to levy a \$968 education parcel tax, with exemptions for seniors, raising approximately \$4 million annually, to be assessed in each fiscal year with annual inflation adjustments until ended by voters? LOS ANGELES 3/2/2021 Wiseburn Unified Measure A Pass Shall a proposal transferring certain territory (see attached map) from the Lawndale School District and the Centinela Valley Union High School District to the Wiseburn Unified School District, be adopted? This proposal constitutes a reorganization of these three school districts pursuant to Education Code § 35762 and Elections Code § 13319. 6/29/2021 San Marino Unified LOS ANGELES Measure E Pass 2/3rds required)

To protect the quality of education and continue San Marino's tradition of community support for local schools, by retaining highly qualified teachers, continue funding advanced programs in math, science, engineering, technology, provide honors and advanced placement classes, and maintain class sizes, shall the San Marino Unified School District measure to renew its expiring \$968 education parcel tax for six years be adopted, raising approximately \$4 million annually, with annual inflation adjustments, exemptions for seniors and all funds staying local?

MARIN 5/4/2021 San Rafael City Elementary Measure H Pass 2/3rds required) To protect quality education at all San Rafael elementary and middle schools by maintaining stable local funding the State can't take away, including: enhancing core academic programs like math, science, technology, music and art; maintaining small class sizes; and attracting/retaining high quality teachers, shall the San Rafael City Elementary School District measure renewing funding at the current \$287 rate and adding \$36 per parcel, be adopted, providing \$5,000,000 annually for 8 years with senior exemptions, annual adjustments and independent oversight?

MARIN5/4/2021San Rafael City HighMeasure GPass 2/3rds required)To protect quality education at San Rafael high schools by maintaining stable local funding the State can't take away, including: enhancing core<br/>academic programs like math, science, technology, music/art; maintaining small class sizes; prepare students for college/careers; and<br/>attracting/retaining high quality teachers, shall the San Rafael City High School District measure renewing funding at the current \$196 rate and adding<br/>\$36 per parcel, be adopted, providing \$5,400,000 annually for 8 years with senior exemptions, annual adjustments/independent oversight?

SAN MATEO 5/4/2021 Portola Valley Elementary Measure S Pass 2/3rds required) To maintain excellent local schools, shall Portola Valley School District protect enhanced science, math, reading/writing instruction, retain qualified/experienced teachers, support music and arts programs, maintain small class sizes and school library services by renewing and reducing the current annual per parcel tax to \$471, raising approximately \$997,000 annually, for 8 years, with senior exemptions, annual audits, independent citizen oversight, no money for administrator salaries, no funds for Sacramento, and all funds supporting Portola Valley School District students?

SAN MATEO 11/2/2021 Menlo Park City Elementary Measure B Pass 2/3rds required) Shall the measure to: protect outstanding public schools; attract and retain high quality teachers; support core academic and enrichment programs; and ensure reasonable class size at Encinal, Laurel, Oak Knoll, and Hillview schools by renewing the expiring Menlo Park City School District parcel tax at a new rate of \$598 per parcel, expiring after 12 years, providing \$4,600,000 annually, with senior exemptions, annual adjustments, independent oversight, and all funds staying local, be adopted?

SANTA CLARA 5/4/2021 Cupertino Union Elementary Measure A Fail 2/3rds required) To retain our high quality teachers and staff with competitive compensation, help keep schools open, ensure fiscal solvency, and provide programs to support students' social and emotional wellness, shall the Cupertino Union School District measure replacing its current parcel tax with a new \$398 measure raising approximately \$14,000,000 annually for eight years, be adopted, with independent community oversight, no funds for administrator salaries, exemptions for seniors, and all funds benefiting local schools?

SANTA CLARA11/2/2021Berryessa Union ElementaryMeasure APass 2/3rds required)To renew, without increasing taxes, expiring local elementary and middle school funding that cannot be taken by the State; maintain core academic<br/>programs in science, technology, math, reading and writing; attract and retain quality teachers; provide learning technology; keep school libraries<br/>open; shall the Berryessa Union School District measure be adopted renewing its existing \$79 annual parcel tax, providing \$1,800,000 annually for 8<br/>years, with citizen oversight, senior exemptions, no funds for administrator salaries, all funds staying local?Pass 2/3rds required)

SANTA CLARA 11/2/2021 Los Gatos Union Elementary Measure B Pass 2/3rds required) To retain highly qualified teachers, maintain and protect core academic programs, and improve programs in science, technology, engineering, arts, music and math for elementary and middle school students; shall the Los Gatos Union School District measure renewing funding at the current \$290 rate and adding \$45 per parcel be adopted, providing \$3.2 million annually for eight years that cannot be taken by the State, with senior exemptions, annual adjustments, independent oversight and no funds for administrator salaries?

SONOMA 3/2/2021 West Sonoma County Union High Measure A Fail 2/3rds required) To renew and provide stable funding at Analy, El Molino and Laguna High Schools that the State cannot take away; protect music, art, dance, shop, culinary and other career technical programs; retain teachers/staff; keep class sizes low; shall the West Sonoma County Union High School District measure to levy \$48.00 per parcel annually for three years be adopted, raising \$1,150,000 annually, have no funds for administrators' salaries, provide a senior citizens' exemption and have all funds stay local?

# Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for School District Ballot Measures by Type\* of Measure and County, 2021

	TAΣ	(ES	ORDIN	ANCE	ALL SCHOOL MEASURES				
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL		
Los Angeles	1	1	1	0	2	1	3		
Marin	2	0			2	0	2		
San Mateo	2	0			2	0	2		
Santa Clara	2	1			2	1	3		
Sonoma	0	1			0	1	1		
All Counties	7	3	1	0	8	3	11		

\*Since the topic of all school district measures is Education, a table for school district measures by topic is not included

Part 2 Vote Totals for School District Office Candidates

### TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

		DISTRICT/	Term Of	CANDIDATE'S	CANDIDATE'S		IN- CUM-	NUMBER OF CANDI-	VOTES FOR CAN-	Total Votes	Percent	ELEC-
COUNTY	DATE OFFICE	Seat	OFFICE	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	BENT	DATES	DIDATES	CAST <sup>1</sup>	OF VOTE	TED
ALAMEDA	No School District Contests											
ALPINE	No School District Contests											
AMADOR	No School District Contests											
BUTTE	No School District Contests											
CALAVERAS	No School District Contests											
COLUSA	No School District Contests											
CONTRA COSTA	No School District Contests											
DEL NORTE	No School District Contests											
EL DORADO	No School District Contests											
FRESNO	11/2/2021 West Park Elementary		Short	Vivenzi	Kimberly	Parent	No	3	74	136	54.4%	Yes
				Lopez	Araceli	No Ballot Designation	No	3	48	136	35.3%	No
				Castillo	Cristy Gomez	Mother	No	3	14	136	10.3%	No
GLENN	No School District Contests											
HUMBOLDT	No School District Contests											
IMPERIAL	11/2/2021 Meadows Union Elementary		Full	Goff	Liza Cardenas	School Administrator/Mother	No	4	77	249	30.9%	Yes
				Pinedo	Ernesto D.	Incumbent	Yes	4	69	249	27.7%	Yes
				Rodriguez	Beatriz Barajas	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	54	249	21.7%	Yes
				Rolfe	Rochelle	Incumbent	Yes	4	49	249	19.7%	No
INYO	No School District Contests											
KERN	No School District Contests											
KINGS	No School District Contests											
LAKE	No School District Contests											
LASSEN	9/14/2021 Lassen Community College <sup>3</sup>	1	Short	Hanson	Robin	Small Business Owner	No	2	3,280	6,069	54.0%	Yes
				Hardy	Robert	Self Employed	No	2	2,672	6,069	44.0%	No
LOS ANGELES	3/2/2021 Redondo Beach Unified		Full	Nemeth	Rachel Silverman	Attorney	No	8	5,328	33,237	16.0%	Yes
				Elder	Dan	Engineer	No	8	5,320	33,237	16.0%	Yes
				Strutzenberg	Rolf Curtis	Retired Aerospace Engineer	No	8	4,864	33,237	14.6%	Yes
				Chang	Jerome	Architect/Business Owner	No	8	4,770	33,237	14.4%	No
				Isaacs	Kimberlee H.	Accountant/Parent	No	8	4,262	33,237	12.8%	No
				Cull	Karen Ford	Parent/Community Organizer	No	8	4,237	33,237	12.7%	No
				Trone	Margo	Non-Profit Ceo	No	8	3,657	33,237	11.0%	No
				Arnold	Keith	Writer/Businessman	No	8	799	33,237	2.4%	No

<sup>1</sup> Write-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.

<sup>2</sup> We reported all candidate information separately by county, except for multi-county school districts, where the elected outcome reflects the multi-county result.

<sup>3</sup> Multi-county school district. We reported votes for Modoc county separately.

### TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

COUNTY	Date OFFICE	DISTRICT		Candidate's Last Name	Candidate's First Name	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDI- DATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	Total Votes Cast <sup>1</sup>	Percent of Vote	ELEC- TED <sup>2</sup>
LOS ANGELES	3/2/2021 Rio Hondo Community College	1	Short	Diaz	Anais Medina	Public Health Educator	No	3	903	2,217	40.7%	Yes
(continued)				Siegrist	David	School Boardmember/Educator	No	3	884	2,217	39.9%	No
				Somilleda	Alfonso	Education Policy Director	No	3	430	2,217	19.4%	No
	7/20/2021 Norwalk-La Mirada Unified		Short	Brasov	Narcis	Teacher/Father	No	5	2,927	9,149	32.0%	Yes
				Cancio	Roberto "Rob"	Educator/Doctor	No	5	2,737	9,149	29.9%	Yes
				Legaspi	Richard	Businessman/Parent	No	5	1,437	9,149	15.7%	No
				Urquidi	Jesus "Jesse"	Businessman/Parent	Yes	5	1,032	9,149	11.3%	No
				Martinez	Janet	Businesswoman/Mother	No	5	1,016	9,149	11.1%	No
MADERA	No School District Contests											
MARIN	No School District Contests											
MARIPOSA	No School District Contests											
MENDOCINO	No School District Contests											
MERCED	8/31/2021 Merced City Elementary	3	Full	Brooks	Allen	Business Owner/Parent	No	2	624	1,032	60.5%	Yes
				Cox	Adam	Analyst	No	2	404	1,032	39.1%	No
	11/2/2021 Los Banos Unified	1	Full	Lieb	Gene	Journalist/Business Owner	No	2	225	436	51.6%	Yes
				Fabian	Alma	Teacher	No	2	208	436	47.7%	No
MODOC	9/14/2021 Lassen Community College <sup>4</sup>	1	Short	Hanson	Robin	Small Business Owner	No	2	85	144	59.0%	Yes
				Hardy	Robert	Self Employed	No	2	59	144	41.0%	No
MONO	No School District Contests											
MONTEREY	No School District Contests											
NAPA	No School District Contests											
NEVADA	No School District Contests											
ORANGE	No School District Contests											
PLACER	No School District Contests											
PLUMAS	No School District Contests											
RIVERSIDE	11/2/2021 Moreno Valley Unified	4	Short	Clark	Brandy	Education Administrator/Parent	No	3	1,678	2,654	63.2%	Yes
				Elizalde	Viridiana	Parent/Services Educator	No	3	756	2,654	28.5%	No
				Alexander	Robert Patrick	No Ballot Designation	No	3	220	2,654	8.3%	No
SACRAMENTO	No School District Contests											
SAN BENITO	No School District Contests											
SAN BERNARDIN	IO No School District Contests											
SAN DIEGO	11/2/2021 San Dieguito Union High	5	Short	Bronstein	Julie	Education Board Member/Parent	No	3	3,804	6,447	59.0%	Yes
				Humes	Ту	Executive/Chairman/Volunteer	No	3	1,496	6,447	23.2%	No
				Wolf	Lea	Advocate/Author/Entrepreneur	No	3	1,147	6,447	17.8%	No
SAN FRANCISCO	No School District Contests					· ·						

SAN FRANCISCO No School District Contests

<sup>4</sup> Multi-county school district. We reported votes for Lassen county separately.

### TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2021

COUNTY	DATE OFFICE	DISTRICT/ SEAT	Term Of Candidate's Office Last Name	Candidate's First Name	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDI- DATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATES	Total Votes Cast <sup>1</sup>	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELEC- TED <sup>2</sup>
SAN JOAQUIN	No School District Contests										
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No School District Contests										
SAN MATEO	No School District Contests										
SANTA BARBARA	No School District Contests										
SANTA CLARA	No School District Contests										
SANTA CRUZ	No School District Contests										
SHASTA	No School District Contests										
SIERRA	No School District Contests										
SISKIYOU	No School District Contests										
SOLANO	No School District Contests										
SONOMA	No School District Contests										
STANISLAUS	No School District Contests										
SUTTER	No School District Contests										
TEHAMA	No School District Contests										
TRINITY	No School District Contests										
TULARE	No School District Contests										
TUOLUMNE	No School District Contests										
VENTURA	No School District Contests										
YOLO	No School District Contests										
YUBA	No School District Contests										

		Percent <sup>1</sup>	N <sup>2</sup>
	Win	50.0	2
Incumbent Candidates	Lose	50.0	2
	Total	100.0	4
	Win	42.4	14
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Lose	57.6	19
Canaldatoo	Total	100.0	33
	Incumbent	12.5	2
Winning Candidates	Non-Incumbent	87.5	14
	Total	100.0	16
	Incumbent	9.5	2
Losing Candidates	Non-Incumbent	90.5	19
	Total	100.0	21
	Incumbent	10.8	4
All Candidates	Non-Incumbent	89.2	33
	Total	100.0	37

# TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER, 2021

<sup>1</sup>Percent may not sum up to 100 due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup>We excluded runoffs from totals.