

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT
ELECTION OUTCOMES:
CANDIDATES AND BALLOT MEASURES, 2012 ELECTIONS

COUNTY OFFICES AND BALLOT MEASURES

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

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

Valory Logsdon
Research Specialist, Institute for Social Research

Ted Ryan
Graduate Research Assistant, Institute for Social Research

Center for California Studies
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6081
(916) 278-6906 FAX: (916) 278-5199

Institute for Social Research
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6101
(916) 278-5737 FAX: (916) 278-5150

Institute for Social Research Project Staff:

Jimmy Pope

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
2012 County, City and School District Election Dates by County		xv
Trend Table A	Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year	xxvii
Trend Table B	Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction and Year	xx
Trend Table C	Community Service District and County Service Area Measures by County	xxiii
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	xxiv
Trend Table E	Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures, 1998-2012	xxv
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.....	xxvi
Trend Table G	Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Year.....	xxvii
Trend Table H	Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year.....	xxvii
Trend Table I	Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Year.....	xxviii
2012 ELECTION SERIES SUMMARY: ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES AND CANDIDATES		1
Table A	Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2012	3
Table B	Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2012	5
Table C	Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 2012	7

PART 1 VOTE TOTALS, ELECTION OUTCOMES AND TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES 9

Table 1.1 Vote Totals for County Ballot Measures by County, 2012 11

Table 1.2 Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 2012..... 15

Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures
by Type of Measure and County, 2012 21

Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures
by Topic of Measure and County, 2012 23

PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES 25

Table 2.1 Vote Totals for County Office Candidates
by County and Election Date, 2012..... 27

Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2012..... 34

CALIFORNIA ELECTIONS DATA ARCHIVE

INTRODUCTION

The California Elections Data Archive (CEDA) is a joint project of the Center for California Studies and the Institute for Social Research, at the California State University, Sacramento and the office of the California Secretary of State. The purpose of CEDA is to provide researchers, citizens, public agencies and other interested parties with a single repository of local election data. With over 6,000 local jurisdictions in California, the task of monitoring local elections is nearly impossible for individuals. CEDA addresses this problem through the creation of a single, cost-effective and easily accessible source of local election data. CEDA includes candidate and ballot measure results for county, city, community college, and school district elections throughout the State. CEDA thus represents the only comprehensive repository of local election results in California and one of a very few such databases on local elections in the U.S.

How the CEDA Data is Collected and Reported

Election data are collected periodically throughout each calendar year. This enables CEDA to incorporate results from special elections as well as all regularly scheduled elections. Election results from counties, cities, and community college and school districts are entered in the CEDA database from which three standard CEDA reports are generated. These reports include:

- County Elections: Candidates, ballot designations, and vote totals for all elected county offices; vote totals and text for county ballot measures.
- City Elections: Candidates, ballot designations, and vote totals for all elected city offices; vote totals and text for all city ballot measures.
- Community College and School District Elections: Candidates, ballot designations, and vote totals for all elective community college and school district offices; vote totals and text for all district ballot measures.

Ballot measures for all jurisdictions are coded according to type (e.g., charter amendment, taxes, bond measure, initiative, etc.) and to topic (e.g., education, public safety, governance, etc.).

THE CEDA PARTNERSHIP

THE CENTER FOR CALIFORNIA STUDIES

Located at California State University, Sacramento, the Center for California Studies is a public policy, public service and curricular support unit of the California State University. The Center's location in the state Capital and its ability to draw upon the resources of the entire State University system give it a unique capacity for making contributions to public policy development and the public life of California. Center programs cover four broad areas: administration of the nationally known Assembly, Senate, Executive, and Judicial Administration Fellowship Programs; university-state government liaison and applied policy research; civic education and community service through forums, conferences and issue dialogues; and curricular support activity in the interdisciplinary field of California Studies.

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Established in 1989, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is a multidisciplinary institute that is committed to advancing the understanding of the social world through applied research. The Institute offers research expertise and technical assistance serving as a resource to agencies, organizations, the University and the broader community. Services provided by the Institute include research and sampling design, measurement, coding and data entry, computer assisted telephone and field interviewing, mailed and Internet surveys, focus groups, data base management, statistical analysis and report production. ISR has completed numerous projects with more than 50 federal, state and community agencies, several private firms and many administrative units of the university. Faculty affiliates of the Institute offer specific content expertise in a wide variety of disciplines, including the social sciences, health and human services, engineering and education.

CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE

The Secretary of State is, among other duties, California's chief elections officer with the responsibility of administering the provisions of the Elections Code. The Secretary must compile state election returns and issue certificates of election to winning candidates; compile the returns and certify the results of initiative and referendum elections; certify acts delayed by referendum, and prepare and file a statement of vote. Recent legislation permits but does not mandate that the Secretary of State compile local election results.

TRENDS IN LOCAL ELECTIONS: 1995-2012

CEDA now encompasses 18 years of election data, including four gubernatorial election years (1998, 2002, 2006, and 2010), four presidential elections (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012) and nine odd-numbered years devoted to local races. The 2012 election had 530 local ballot measures and 5,208 candidates in races for local offices. This report begins with an overview of some of the multi-year election trends then continues to a discussion of the 2012 contests.

BALLOT MEASURE TRENDS

Each year, California voters are asked to consider a number of governance issues and to choose among candidates vying for public office. Within local elections, there appear to be consistent features at all local election levels across elections over the 18 years of CEDA data collection. Other election characteristics seem to vary considerably from year to year, however. This variation is particularly noticeable between on-year (even-year) and off-year (odd-year) election cycles. The following section summarizes the patterns and trends seen in local elections during the 18 years of CEDA data collection.


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

As noted in previous reports, there is a clear trend with the number of local ballot measures offered to voters “piggy-backing” on state and national elections. On average, there were approximately two and one-half (2 ½) times as many ballot measures in even-years (601) as odd-years (236). The percentage of ballot measures passing increased by five percent compared to the previous even year election in 2010. Passing percent for ballot measures increased from 67 in 2010 to 72 percent in 2012; but the overall percentage of ballot measures passing increased slightly from 63 to 64 percent.

- Among all the various types of ballot measures, *charter amendments* continued to have the largest percentage of measures passed, with more than three-quarters (76%) of *charter amendment* measures passing during the 18-year period. *Recalls* are the second highest percent passing among all measure types at 71 percent. *Recalls* were closely followed by *bond* measures with two-thirds (68%) passing. However, during the past 18 years, *recall* measures only constitute four percent of all measures, whereas *bonds* constitute slightly more than one-quarter (26%) of all measures. After *bonds*, passage rates for the other types of measures were as follows; *ordinances* (61%), *taxes* (56%), and *initiatives* (49%; See Trend Table A).
- Across the three government levels at which data is collected—county, city and school district—cities see the largest average yearly number of ballot measures (204; 50%), followed by the school district (140; 34%) and county (66; 16%). However, following the trend of previous years, school districts had the largest percentage of measures passing (68%), followed by cities (64%) and counties (57%; See Trend Table A).
- Figure 1 displays the trends for ballot measures and the percent of measures passing from 1995-2012. As can be seen in the green trend line representing the number of measures (See Figure 1), the actual number of ballot measures cyclically varies substantially between odd and even years; however, the dashed green trend line in the figure reveals a slight downward trend in the number of measures over the period. By contrast, the orange line representing the percentage of measures passed shows much more stability over time and the dashed trend line reveals a movement toward an increased percentage of measures passed during this

timeframe. Thus, while we're seeing a jagged trend toward slightly fewer measures, we're also witnessing a gradual increase in the percentage of those measures passing.

Figure 1: Number of Measures and Percentage Passing, 1995-2012




During the 18 years of CEDA data collection, the number of ballot measures in even-years peaked in 2004 with 712 measures. The current 2012 election saw 530 measures; an increase over the unusually low number of 482 seen in the last even-year, 2010. Interestingly, the passage rate for the 2012 elections cycle was 72 percent, which is the second highest pass rate in the 18 years of data collection; it is eleven points above the average for odd-year elections and eight points higher than the passage rate of measures overall.

- Among the eight topic areas for local ballot measures, *education* issues continue to be the most common ballot measure area, with slightly more than one-third (34%) of all measures between 1995 and 2012 focused on this topic. Education measures occurred at twice the rate in even versus odd-year election cycles. The number of *education* measures has exceeded the number of measures dealing with other specific topics. (See Trend Table B).
- Earlier years' data have been re-coded to capture *revenue* measures. With this revision, *revenue* represents 13 percent of the total ballot measures in local elections. In the 2009 election cycle *revenue* measures jumped to 29 percent of local election ballot measures, an increase from the mid-teens seen in the previous two years. In 2012, *revenue* represented 21 percent of all measures, rebounding from the low of seven percent seen in 2011 (See Trend Table B).

- In 2012, among all county measures, *revenue* issues accounted for about 24 percent; but among city measures, revenue accounted for about 33 percent of measure topics.
- Between 1995 and 2012, 63 percent of *revenue* measures passed. However, over three-quarters (79%) of *revenue* measures passed in 2012. The 2012 passing rate for *revenue* measures is second only to the 2001 election cycle, where 87 percent of all *revenue* measures passed.

Figure 2 provides an overview of the average (mean) number of local ballot measures and the percent of those measures that passed in each of eight topic areas for the past 18 years (1995-2012). Interestingly, with the exception of *general services* measures, the rank ordering of the most frequent ballot topic areas (*education, governance, revenue, land use, public safety, public facilities, and transportation*) and the rank ordering of the passing rates for ballot measures by topic area (*governance, education, revenue, land use, public safety, transportation, and public facilities*) is nearly parallel. That is, the most frequent topics of measures are also the topics that pass most frequently.

Figure 2: Average Number of Local Ballot Measures per Year and Percent Passing by Topic for the Past 18 Years



- The level of ballot measures also appeared to have little overall impact on the passing rate for various governmental levels. County measures continue to show the lowest passing rate at 57 percent overall, with school district measures having the best passing rate at 68 percent (See Trend Table B).


- As reflected in previous reports, county measures showed the greatest disparity in passing rates between odd and even-year elections, faring much better in odd-year elections. County elections witnessed a 16 percent higher passing rate for *tax* propositions, a 39 percent higher passing rate for *recall* measures, and an 18 percent higher passing rate for *bond* proposals in odd-years versus even-years (See Trend Table A).
- Among the six most common types of county ballot measures identified in the CEDA data, *charter amendments*, *recalls* and *bonds* had the highest pass rates, at 76 percent, 71 percent and 68 percent respectively; *initiatives* and *taxes* had the lowest pass rates, with 50 percent and 44 percent passing (See Trend Table A).

Trends in Bond and Tax Measures

Bonds and *tax* measures each make up slightly more than one-quarter of all measures, at 26 and 29 percent respectively, and a little more than one-half (55%) of all ballot measures over the 18 years of election results tracked by CEDA. *Ordinances* and *charter amendments*, affecting policy shifts in local government, constituted another one-third (34%). *Initiatives* and *recalls* continue to account for only six percent of total local ballot measures (See Trend Table A).

- The overall percentage of local measures devoted to taxes during the past 18 years has been gradually trending upward. However, the percentage of tax measures decreased from 44 percent in 2011 to 34 percent in 2012, 17 percent below its all-time high of 51 percent in 2009 (See Figure 3).

Figure 3: Tax Measures as a Percentage of All Measures, with Trend Line for 1995-2012



- School districts remain responsible for the vast majority of *bonds* placed before voters—about 93 percent over 18 years of data collection. *Bonds* continue to make up slightly less than three-quarters (71%) of the six most common types of measures in school district elections.
- In the 18 years that CEDA has been collecting data, *bond* measures had much higher rates of passage than did *tax* measures. With the 2012 election, the average pass


rate for *bonds* remained unchanged, approximately twelve percent above *taxes* at 68 and 56 percent respectively.

- Another trend observed during 18 years of CEDA data collection is that pass rates for *tax* measures are consistently higher in odd-years than in even-years—an average of 61 percent in odd-years compared with 51 percent for even-years. As noted above with regard to general pass rates, counties saw the biggest differences between pass rates for *taxes* in odd versus even-years, with an average pass rate of 56 percent in odd-years and 40 percent in even years. The discrepancy for odd and even-years decreased slightly for cities with the 2012 election—an average 62 percent pass rate in odd-years and a 55 percent pass rate in even-years. *Tax* measures for school districts also pass at higher rates in odd versus even-years. Through 2012, school districts pass, on average, 53 percent of *tax* measures in even-years and 62 percent in odd-years (See Trend Table A).
- On the other hand, on average, pass rates for *bond* measures appear better in even-years than in odd-years (70% vs. 61% respectively). However, while *bond* measures are considerably more likely to pass in even-years versus odd-years in cities (61% vs. 52%) and in school districts (71% vs. 61%), they are more likely to pass in odd-years rather than even-years in counties (75% vs. 57% respectively; See Trend Table A).

Trends in Community Services Districts and County Service Areas Measures


Community Service Districts (CSDs) and County Service Areas (CSAs) were introduced just before the turn of the new century as an accommodation to the tax restrictions posed by Proposition 13. Portions of a county could form a special district and agree to tax themselves to provide services that the larger county population as a whole might not support. CEDA began tracking community service district ballot measures in 1998. Despite considerable fluctuation in the number of CSD/CSA measures during the subsequent 15-year period, speculation that the number would increase over time has not been supported by the trend data. In fact, the overall trend has been a sizeable decrease in the number of measures between 1998 and 2012 (See the dashed trend line in Figure 4 below).

Figure 4: Number of Measures and Trend Line for CSDs/CSAs, 1998-2012



- As discussed in previous trend summaries, one important question is whether CSD/CSA measures lose effectiveness in terms of their passage rate as they become a larger percentage of all county measures. This year's data provides additional information to consider in this question. First, although the percentage of measures for CSDs/CSAs varied up and down since the 2005 election, the overall trend since 2006 has been downward—essentially these measures are accounting for a smaller and smaller percentage of all county measures. The 2012 percentage of CSD/CSA measures is the lowest percentage seen since 2002, when CSD/CSA measure also represented 18 percent of county measures. The percentage of these measures and their passage rates seem to be synchronized (except for 2003 and 2007; See Figure 5 below).


Figure 5: CSD/CSA Measures as a Percentage of All County Measures and Percentage of CSD/CSA Measures Passing, 1998-2012



- In the 15 years of CEDA data on CSD/CSA elections (1998-2012), 301 ballot measures have presented CSD/CSA issues across all 58 counties. However, use of CSD/CSA measures varied widely among these counties. Eight counties accounted for over two-thirds (70%) of CSD/CSA-related measures—Contra Costa (25), El Dorado (43), Kern (17), Marin (45), Riverside (20), San Diego (20), San Luis Obispo (21) and Siskiyou (13). By contrast, 47 counties have had five or fewer CSD/CSA measures on their ballots during the 15-year period (See Trend Table C).
- In the years since their inception, the principal type of CSD/CSA measure has involved *taxes* (210; 70%). Interestingly, another funding mechanism, *bond* measures, has only appeared as CSD/CSA proposals five times (2% of the total measures). After *taxes*, *ordinances* (31; 10%) and *Gann Limit* issues (29; 9%) comprised a distant second and third in terms of prevalence on the ballot. *Recalls* (21), *bonds* (5) and *advisory* measures (6) together only accounted for about ten percent of the total number of measures during the 15-year period (See Trend Table D).
 - During the 15 years since their inception, CSD/CSA-related *tax* measures were passed slightly less than one-half (47%) of the time. As with other tax related ballot measures, CSD/CSA measures in this area were more apt to pass in the odd-year elections

(59% pass) and more apt to fail in even-years (61% fail). Including this most recent year (2012) of data, CSDs/CSAs have slightly higher passage rates for *tax* measures than counties, 47 and 44 percent respectively. On the other hand, over the same 15 years, cities and school districts have enjoyed greater success with these measures, each with a 61 percent passage rate (See Figure 6).

Figure 6: Tax Measures and Percent Passing for Selected Years (1998-2012)* by Jurisdiction



*CEDA Data for collection for CSDs/CSAs started in 1998. County, City and School Districts tax measure data restricted to the 1998-2012 for the comparison with CSDs/CSAs.

- When CSD/CSA measures are separated out from all county measures, non-CSD/CSA and CSD/CSA measures passed at nearly identical rates of 59 and 58 percent. However, CSDs/CSAs did much better than other county measures when the ballot measure involved *taxes*. Non-CSD/CSA county *tax* measures had a 45 percent pass rate, while CSD/CSA *tax* measures enjoyed a 47 percent passage rate (See Trend Table E).
- *Public safety* remains the most common focus of CSD/CSA measures, comprising slightly less than one-third of all measures (96 of 302 measures; 32%). *Governance* (40) was the second most prevalent focus of CSD/CSA ballot measures, followed by *revenue* (39), *general services* (38), *public facilities* (34), *transportation* (33), *environment* (6), and *land use* (5) measures.
 - It is interesting to note that there were no *governance* measures in the first two years that CSDs/CSAs tracking was initiated (1998-99), but *governance* has appeared as a CSD/CSA issue in every election since then. *Transportation* measures were absent in 2011 for only the third time since 1998, and for the first time since 2003. *Public facilities* measures have appeared in all but five years (1999, 2003, 2008, 2010, and 2011). By contrast, *land use*, which also did not appear as CSD/CSA measures in 1998, has only appeared in three elections, 2000, 2005, and 2012. Similarly, *environment* measures have only appeared on CSD/CSA ballots during two election cycles, and have not appeared since 1999 (See Trend Table F).

CANDIDATE TRENDS


The addition of the 2012 data reinforces previous findings that stable patterns have emerged with regard to the number of candidates seeking offices, and distribution of candidates across the various local offices that are tracked.

- The total number of candidates for local offices (county boards of supervisors, other county offices, city councils, and local school boards) has consistently been more than twice as high in even-numbered as opposed to odd-numbered years (See Trend Table G).
- In the 18 years of CEDA data collection, school district candidates have comprised just under one half (47%) of all candidates for local offices. As might be expected given the raw number of offices at various levels of local government, candidates for city offices comprise 39 percent of the local candidates, while the smallest percentage of local election candidates reflects those seeking county offices (about 14%).
- In the even-year elections, city candidates and school district candidates were fairly similar in terms of the number of candidates. However, with the exception of the 2011 election, school district candidates have the largest number of candidates in the off-year election cycles where they make up more than half of the candidates on the ballot (See Trend Table G).
 - In all prior odd-year elections, the number of candidates for school boards was higher than the number of candidates for city offices. However, in 2011, candidates for school board contests reached their lowest level in the 18 years of CEDA and falling four candidates below the number of city candidates (730 and 734, respectively).
 - On average, the percentage of candidates running for county offices in even-years was approximately three times the percentage of candidates running for county offices in odd-years. County candidates averaged 17 percent of all local election candidates in even-years, but comprised only six percent of the candidates in odd-years (See Trend Table G).
- Over the 18 years of data collection, county candidates made up about 14 percent of all candidates in local elections (See Trend Table H).
 - Among candidates for county offices, 37 percent were running for county supervisor positions, while 23 percent were seeking CSD/CSA seats.
- On average, during the 18 years of CEDA data collection, slightly less than one-third (32%) of all candidates for local offices were incumbents (See Trend Table I).
 - Thirty-four percent (34%) of those seeking school district seats were incumbents.
 - Twenty-six percent (26%) of those seeking city council positions were incumbents.

- Twenty-eight percent (28%) of those seeking county supervisor seats were incumbents. However, with the exception of 1997 (5 races) and 2011 (1 race); there are typically no races for county supervisor in odd-year elections (See Trend Table I).
- During the 18 year period, four out of every five (80%) incumbents running for reelection at the city, county, and school district levels won their respective offices (See Figure 5 and Trend Table I).
 - Eighty-three percent (83%) of incumbent county supervisors¹ won reelection.
 - Seventy-nine percent (79%) of incumbent city council office holders won their elections.
 - Seventy-seven percent (77%) of incumbent school district candidates won their elections (See Trend Table I).
- In local elections, during the past 18 years, a little more than half (53%) of winning candidates were incumbents. This means that the local political arena is seeing a fresh mixture of individuals comprising local elected offices and bodies, with each election cycle. Conversely, this also suggests that fears of control of these institutions by a group of long-term political incumbents may be overstated.
 - Sixty-one percent (61%) of winning candidates for county supervisor positions were incumbents when they were reelected.
 - Forty-nine percent (49%) of winning candidates for city council were incumbents when they were reelected.
 - Fifty-two percent (52%) of winning school district candidates were incumbents when they were reelected (See Trend Table I).

Figure 7: Percent of Local Contests Won and Lost by Incumbent Candidates

¹ This percentage is calculated on those years in which county supervisors were normally up for election. In odd-years there were either no candidates or a very small number running for vacated seats.



*Runoffs are excluded from totals.

2012 ELECTION DATA

2012 BALLOT MEASURES

Californians voted in local elections on eleven different occasions in 2012. In addition to the primary and general statewide elections on June 5th and November 6th, some local entities called additional elections during the year. Voters in the county of Los Angeles were called to the polls the most, with six elections between January and November. Taken together, a total of 530 county, city and school district ballot measures were presented to California voters in 2012. This is somewhat less than the even-year average of 582 measures. Of the 530 ballot measures in 2012, 382 measures (72%) were enacted which is seven percent higher than the average for even-year elections since CEDA began tracking this information in 1994. In fact, 2012 saw the second-highest even-year passage rate since CEDA began.

Tax measures comprised the largest share of all 2012 measures. Of 530 ballot measures, 178 were tax measures, representing 34 percent of all measures. Tax measures passed at a rate of 69 percent, which is the highest even-year pass rate since CEDA began recording this information. Taxes were an especially prominent theme in 2012 due to the presence of a statewide income and sales tax measure on the November ballot. Proposition 30 was a centerpiece of Governor Brown's effort to correct the state's long-term structural budget deficit; and during much of 2012 considerable focus was placed on the merits of tax increases. Proposition 30 passed with 55 percent of the vote.

In the 2012 election cycle, 178 tax measures were presented to California voters in 43 counties. Of these 43 counties, five (Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Mateo, and Santa Barbara) accounted for 57 percent of all tax measures. The number of tax measures does not seem to correlate, positively or negatively, with the number of tax measures passed in each county. For example, among the top five counties each presented voters with ten or more tax measures, and saw passage rates ranging from 90 percent (Santa Barbara) to 43 percent (Alameda). Meanwhile, of the 24 counties with one or two tax measures, 12 had pass rates of 100 percent, six had pass rates of 50 percent, and six had failure rates of 100 percent.

Other types of local measures in the 2012 election cycle included bonds (29% of all measures), ordinances (21%), charter amendments (10%), and recalls (3%). Passage rates for recalls and bonds were especially high at 93 percent and 81 percent, respectively.

The specific measures presented to local voters of course differed by jurisdiction, although there were some themes that characterized the 2012 elections. For example, there were a large number of sales tax measures framed as protecting or restoring local police and emergency services in response to earlier State budget cuts. A number of jurisdictions sought new revenue from new fees and taxes, such as efforts by Richmond and El Monte to tax sugar-sweetened beverages sold in their cities. Medical marijuana was another theme, with some jurisdictions (such as Palo Alto, Imperial Beach, and Solano) seeking to authorize new dispensaries while others (such as Kern County) seeking new restrictions, and still others (such as Needles) seeking to impose a new tax on medical marijuana sales. Other measures were more unique to the particular jurisdiction; such as San Francisco's measure calling for a plan to evaluate how to drain Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and identify replacement power and water sources for the city and county. Another example was Los Angeles County's effort to require adult film producers to require their actors to use condoms and participate in a blood-borne pathogen training course, among other requirements.

County Measures. In 2012 there were a total of 76 county ballot measures across 35 counties. Of the 76 county measures, 48 (63%) passed while 28 (37%) failed. Just over half (39) of the 76 county measures were *tax* measures, and another 20 were ordinances and ten were charter amendments. Only one bond measure, one recall measure, and two initiatives were on county ballots. The most common topic was *governance*, with 19 such measures appearing on county ballots.

City Measures. Voters cast ballots on 248 city measures of which 165 (67%) passed. The majority of city measures dealt with *governance* (89 measures or 47% of measures) and *revenue* (32 measures or 31% of measures). Common types of city measures were *taxes* (93 measures or 38% of all city measures) and *ordinances* (83 measures or 33% of city measures). There were also 12 city recall measures, which continues a trend of double-digit recall measures each of the past three years. The only such measure of the 12 to fail in 2012 was the attempted recall of Mayor John Huerta, Jr., of the city of Greenfield in Monterey County.

School District Measures. The year saw 206 school district ballot measures of which 168 (82%) were approved. This is the highest passage rate for school district measures since CEDA began tracking this figure. The average passage rate of such measures in even-numbered years is 68 percent. *Bond* measures accounted for 150 (73%) of the school district measures, and these had a passage rate of 83 percent. The high passage rate may in part reflect a statewide concern about the adequacy of funding for education, which was a key theme of the statewide Proposition 30 campaign. Interestingly, all of the 19 school district bond measures passed in Los Angeles County, although one of two school-related tax measures failed.

2012 CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

A total of 5,208 Californians ran for local elected office in 2012, which is fairly typical for even-number years since CEDA has been active. Candidate elections took place at all levels of local government: cities, counties, and school districts.

County Races. California counties generally elect their officials in even-numbered years. Counties elect five-member boards of supervisors (their four-year terms are staggered so not all seats are up each year) except the City and County of San Francisco (the boundaries of the City of San Francisco and the County of San Francisco are identical) which has an eleven member board. Counties also elect judges, sheriffs, clerks, district attorneys and members of the governing boards of community service districts (CSD), which are agencies of the county.

In 2012 counties held elections for 321 open seats. The most common of these were County Supervisor seats, accounting for 173 (54 percent) of the 321 contests. Most of the remaining contests were for CSD/CSA Director (105 seats), followed by Superior Court Judges (31) and District Attorneys (2).

Incumbent candidates won 75 percent of the races that they contested. However, less than half (46%) of the winning candidates were incumbents, partly reflecting the fact that many races did not have incumbents running. Moreover, incumbent candidates as a group performed worse than incumbent candidates in most of the earlier years tracked by CEDA.

City Races. California cities elected mayors, council members, treasurers, clerks, and a handful of other officials in 2012. A total of 2,332 candidates ran for all city races, which is the largest number of candidates in 18 years of CEDA data tracking.

By far the most common contests were races for city council, accounting for over three quarters of all races. A total of 1,858 candidates ran in 819 city council contests, including 12 recall contests.

Twenty-five percent (456) of all city council candidates were incumbents and 74 percent of all incumbents won. This ties with 1996 for the lowest incumbent success rate since CEDA tracking began. Incumbent candidates accounted for 41 percent of all winning candidates in city council elections for 2012. Other city contests included city clerk/city assessor, city treasurer, mayor, and city attorney. Of these contests, only 16 of 141 (11%) incumbent candidates lost.

School District Races. The 2012 election cycle included 2,100 candidates for school board elections. Of these, approximately 30 percent were incumbents. Of the 627 incumbents, 446 or 71 percent won, while 603 or 41 percent of non-incumbent candidates won. As a group, incumbents' success rate was the lowest since CEDA began tracking this data. In total, there were 1,049 school board seats filled in 2012. Incumbent candidates accounted for 446 (43 percent) of all winning candidates in school board contests

RECALL ELECTIONS

The California Constitution allows voters the possibility to remove a local elected official if a sufficient number of voters sign a recall petition and a majority approves the recall in a subsequent election. In 2012 Californians voted on 14 recalls: one member of the CSD Mountain House Board of Directors in San Joaquin County; two members of the Orange Cove City Council in Fresno County; the mayor and two members of the San Fernando city council in Los Angeles County; the mayor and two members of the Greenfield city council in Monterey County; three members of the Fullerton city council in Orange County; one member of the Shasta Lake city council in Shasta County; and one member of the Atwater Elementary School District in Merced County. Only the attempted recall of Greenfield Mayor John Huerta, Jr. failed to pass.

2012 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/17	2/07	3/06	3/13	4/10	5/08	6/05	7/10	8/28	10/16	11/06
Alameda		✓					✓				✓
Alpine							✓				✓
Amador							✓				✓
Butte							✓				✓
Calaveras							✓				✓
Colusa							✓				✓
Contra Costa						✓	✓		✓		✓
Del Norte							✓				✓
El Dorado							✓				✓
Fresno							✓				✓
Glenn							✓				✓
Humboldt							✓				✓
Imperial							✓				✓
Inyo							✓				✓
Kern			✓				✓				✓
Kings							✓				✓
Lake							✓				✓
Lassen							✓				✓
Los Angeles	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓				✓
Madera							✓				✓
Marin							✓				✓
Mariposa							✓				✓
Mendocino							✓				✓
Merced							✓			✓	✓
Modoc							✓				✓
Mono							✓				✓
Monterey							✓				✓
Napa							✓				✓
Nevada							✓				✓

2012 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/17	2/07	3/06	3/13	4/10	5/08	6/05	7/10	8/28	10/16	11/06
Orange							✓				✓
Placer							✓				✓
Plumas							✓				✓
Riverside							✓				✓
Sacramento							✓				✓
San Benito							✓				✓
San Bernardino							✓	✓			✓
San Diego							✓				✓
San Francisco							✓				✓
San Joaquin							✓				✓
San Luis Obispo							✓				✓
San Mateo					✓	✓	✓				✓
Santa Barbara							✓				✓
Santa Clara						✓	✓				✓
Santa Cruz							✓				✓
Shasta					✓		✓				✓
Sierra							✓				✓
Siskiyou							✓				✓
Solano						✓	✓				✓
Sonoma							✓				✓
Stanislaus		✓					✓				✓
Sutter							✓				✓
Tehama							✓				✓
Trinity							✓				✓
Tulare							✓				✓
Tuolumne							✓				✓
Ventura							✓				✓
Yolo			✓				✓				✓
Yuba							✓				✓

Trend Table A Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year

	All Measures			Bonds			Taxes			Ordinance			Recalls			Initiatives			Charter Amendment		
	Mean Number of Measures	% of All Measures	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																					
1995-2012	409	100	64	107	26	68	120	29	56	89	22	61	16	4	71	9	2	49	50	12	76
Even Years	601	100	63	157	26	70	176	29	51	137	23	59	19	3	64	13	2	49	72	12	71
Odd Years	236	100	61	57	24	61	73	31	61	45	19	62	15	6	70	5	2	45	31	13	78
County																					
1995-2012	66	16	57	2	3	66	26	40	44	21	32	63	2	3	71	2	3	50	7	10	64
Even Years	104	17	53	3	2	57	43	41	40	34	32	61	2	2	47	4	4	48	12	11	62
Odd Years	30	13	67	2	6	75	11	37	56	9	31	70	2	8	86	0	1	67	2	8	68
City																					
1995-2012	204	50	64	5	3	58	68	33	59	61	30	58	8	4	74	7	3	48	43	21	78
Even Years	304	51	61	8	3	61	103	34	55	95	31	57	11	4	65	10	3	50	60	20	73
Odd Years	115	49	65	3	2	52	37	32	62	30	26	56	5	5	77	4	4	43	29	25	79
School District																					
1995-2012	140	34	68	99	71	68	26	19	61	7	5	80	6	4	66	0	0	50			
Even Years	193	32	68	147	76	71	30	16	53	8	4	78	5	3	69						
Odd Years	92	39	62	53	57	61	25	28	62	6	6	81	7	8	61	0	0	100			

Trend Table A Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year

	All Measures			Bonds			Taxes			Ordinance			Recalls			Initiatives			Charter Amendment			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	
All Measures	1995	253	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	
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	4	80	1	5	100	7	35	71	4	20	75	2	10	100				3	15	67	
2012	76	16	63	1	1	100	39	51	59	20	26	60	1	1	100	2	3	50	10	13	70	

Trend Table A Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year

	All Measures			Bonds			Taxes			Ordinance			Recalls			Initiatives			Charter Amendment			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	
City Measures	1995	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	22	74				37	35	65	23	22	70	10	10	100	2	2	0	28	27	82	
2012	248	51	67	5	2	20	93	38	72	83	33	58	12	5	92				41	17	61	
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	10	64	9	19	78	31	66	68	2	4	100	4	9	0							
2012	206	43	82	150	73	83	46	22	72	9	4	100	1	0	100							

Trend Table B Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction and Year

	All Measures			Education			Governance			Land Use			Public Safety			Public Facilities			General Services			Transportation			Revenue			
	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	10	65	59	12	81	8	2	75	9	2	56	5	1	100	4	1	50	2	0	50	34	7	74	
2012	530	100	72	209	43	82	98	20	71	23	5	57	13	3	38	23	5	57	11	2	73	12	2	50	99	21	79	
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	

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

	ALL CSD/CSA			TAXES			BONDS			ADVISORY			RECALLS			GANN LIMIT			ORDINANCE		
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate
1998	31	25	55	22	18	45									1	1	0	8	6	88	
1999	20	53	60	16	42	56									3	8	100	1	3	0	
2000	40	34	48	28	24	29	1	1	100	3	3	67			6	5	100	2	2	100	
2001	22	59	77	12	32	75	2	5	100				3	8	100	3	8	100	2	5	0
2002	18	18	44	14	14	36									4	4	75				
2003	13	46	38	11	39	27												2	7	100	
2004	30	21	50	24	17	42				1	1	100			2	1	100	3	2	67	
2005	31	54	74	23	40	65	2	4	100				3	5	100	1	2	100	2	4	100
2006	24	25	50	15	16	47							4	4	25	1	1	100	4	4	75
2007	8	28	88	3	10	67							3	10	100	1	3	100	1	3	100
2008	18	20	61	11	12	45				1	1	0			4	4	100	2	2	100	
2009	6	38	83	3	19	67							1	6	100	1	6	100	1	6	100
2010	15	23	40	11	17	36							4	6	50						
2011	10	50	90	4	20	75				1	5	100	2	10	100	2	10	100	1	5	100
2012	14	18	50	11	14	36							1	1	100				2	3	100
1998-2012	302	29	58	210	20	47	5	0	100	6	1	67	21	2	76	29	3	93	31	3	81

TREND TABLE E COMPARISON OF PASS RATES FOR COUNTY-WIDE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT/ COUNTY SERVICE AREA TAX MEASURES, 1998-2012

	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	110	55	30	50	36	47	24	42
2005	57	26	50	31	74	1	100	23	65
2006	95	71	52	24	50	30	37	15	47
2007	29	21	71	8	88	0	0	3	67
2008	90	72	63	18	61	22	0	11	45
2009	16	10	60	6	83	1	0	3	67
2010	64	49	57	15	40	14	57	11	36
2011	20	10	70	10	90	3	67	4	75
2012	76	62	66	14	50	28	68	11	36
1998-2012	1,029	729	59	302	58	221	44	210	47

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	0	4	33			
1998-2012	302	29	58	5	0	0	96	9	16	40	4	10	6	1	1	33	3	6	34	3	6	38	3	6	39	4	8

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
Total	68,522	9,626	26,500	32,396

*Runoffs are excluded 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
TOTAL	68,522	9,626	3,569	37	2,182	23

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

**Runoffs are excluded from totals.

Trend Table I Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Year

	% of All Candidates		% of County Supervisor Candidates	% of City Council Candidates	% of School District Candidates
	Year	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage
Percent of Candidates who are incumbents	1995	27	0	18	30
	1996	27	24	23	28
	1997	30	5	23	33
	1998	32	30	26	32
	1999	30	0	23	32
	2000	30	30	27	32
	2001	30	0	24	32
	2002	34	34	27	36
	2003	31	0	22	35
	2004	33	28	28	37
	2005	31	0	23	36
	2006	35	29	29	36
	2007	31	0	27	33
	2008	34	30	30	38
2009	34	0	26	39	
2010	35	28	29	39	
2011	29	0	24	34	
2012	27	28	25	30	
1995-2012	32	28	26	34	
Percentage of Incumbents Who Win	1995	79	0	79	78
	1996	79	75	74	78
	1997	76	0	79	74
	1998	86	87	82	83
	1999	78	0	81	77
	2000	79	90	80	74
	2001	78	0	80	77
	2002	82	81	79	79
	2003	78	0	72	79
	2004	81	81	81	76
	2005	80	0	80	78
	2006	82	90	78	78
	2007	77	0	79	75
	2008	76	86	80	70
2009	78	0	79	76	
2010	82	83	82	79	
2011	82	0	82	82	
2012	74	78	74	71	
1995-2012	80	83	79	77	
Percentage of Winning Candidates who are incumbents	1995	50	0	41	51
	1996	48	51	41	47
	1997	49	0	45	50
	1998	57	63	48	53
	1999	51	0	45	52
	2000	52	73	51	49
	2001	50	0	51	50
	2002	57	63	50	56
	2003	51	0	40	55
	2004	55	59	51	57
	2005	52	0	50	52
	2006	56	68	51	55
	2007	50	0	54	48
	2008	56	61	55	54
2009	54	0	51	55	
2010	59	61	56	59	
2011	49	0	47	51	
2012	43	58	41	43	
1995-2012	53	61	49	52	

*Runoffs are excluded from totals.

2012 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, 2012

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	6	8	3	1	2	0							1	0	2	4			14	13	27
Alpine															1	0			1	0	1
Amador	3	0					1	0							1	0			5	0	5
Butte	2	0	2	3											2	1	1	0	7	4	11
Calaveras	2	0																	2	0	2
Colusa	1	0																	1	0	1
Contra Costa	9	5	3	2			1	0							1	4	1	0	15	11	26
Del Norte															1	0			1	0	1
El Dorado	1	1	1	0	1	0													3	1	4
Fresno	1	1	7	1	1	1					2	0							11	3	14
Glenn	1	0	0	1															1	1	2
Humboldt	4	0	4	2													1	0	9	2	11
Imperial			2	0											2	0			4	0	4
Kern	2	2	5	1											8	1			15	4	19
Kings			2	1															2	1	3
Lake	0	2													0	1			0	3	3
Lassen	0	1																	0	1	1
Los Angeles	13	8	19	0	3	2	1	1			3	0			4	3			43	14	57
Marin	6	1											1	0	1	0			8	1	9
Mendocino	1	1													0	1	1	0	2	2	4
Merced			2	0							1	0							3	0	3
Monterey	4	1	3	0							2	1			0	1			9	3	12
Napa	1	0	1	0					0	1					4	0			6	1	7
Nevada	1	3			1	0													2	3	5
Orange	2	2	7	2	3	2	1	0			3	0			8	4			24	10	34
Placer	1	1			0	1									1	1			2	3	5
Plumas	0	2																	0	2	2
Riverside	1	1	7	2	3	5							2	0	2	1			15	9	24

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Sacramento	2	1	4	0	0	1									2	0			8	2	10
San Benito	1	0													2	1			3	1	4
San Bernardino	2	3	2	1	2	0													6	4	10
San Diego	2	0	7	6	5	3									5	7			19	16	35
San Francisco	2	0	1	0	2	0			1	0					0	1	2	0	8	1	9
San Joaquin	1	0	4	0							1	0			0	1			6	1	7
San Luis Obispo	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0							2	0			6	2	8
San Mateo	8	3	5	0	1	1									3	1			17	5	22
Santa Barbara	9	1	1	2											3	1			13	4	17
Santa Clara	4	0	9	0	1	0									2	2			16	2	18
Santa Cruz	7	0	3	0	1	0													11	0	11
Shasta			1	0							1	0			0	2			2	2	4
Siskiyou	0	2	0	1											1	1			1	4	5
Solano	7	0	1	0											0	1			8	1	9
Sonoma	8	1	8	0	3	1									2	0			21	2	23
Stanislaus	1	0													0	1			1	1	2
Tehama	0	1																	0	1	1
Trinity			1	0															1	0	1
Tulare	1	1	4	1	3	1									4	0			12	3	15
Tuolumne	0	2	1	1															1	3	4
Ventura	1	0	4	0											3	1			8	1	9
Yolo	3	0	1	0			1	0							1	0			6	0	6
Yuba			1	0											1	1			2	1	3
All Counties	123	55	127	29	32	19	6	1	1	1	13	1	4	0	69	43	6	0	381	149	530

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GAMBLING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		OTHER		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	6	2	1	1			2	3			0	1	0	2					2	2	3	1	0	1	14	13	27
Alpine							1	0																	1	0	1
Amador							1	0											1	0	3	0			5	0	5
Butte	3	3					1	0													2	0	1	1	7	4	11
Calaveras											1	0									1	0			2	0	2
Colusa																					1	0			1	0	1
Contra Costa	5	6					0	4					1	0					1	0	7	1	1	0	15	11	26
Del Norte																							1	0	1	0	1
El Dorado	1	0					1	0					0	1							1	0			3	1	4
Fresno	7	1					3	1					1	0							0	1			11	3	14
Glenn	0	1																			1	0			1	1	2
Humboldt	5	0									0	2									3	0	1	0	9	2	11
Imperial	2	0					2	0																	4	0	4
Kern	5	2	1	0	1	0	7	1													1	1			15	4	19
Kings	2	1																							2	1	3
Lake									0	1	0	1											0	1	0	3	3
Lassen					0	1																			0	1	1
Los Angeles	22	1	1	0	1	2					0	1	0	1	2	0			1	0	11	5	1	0	43	14	57
Marin	3	0			2	1	1	0					1	0							1	0			8	1	9
Mendocino					0	1	0	1													1	0	1	0	2	2	4
Merced	3	0																							3	0	3
Monterey	3	1	0	1			2	1													4	0			9	3	12
Napa	1	0	2	1			1	0			1	0	1	0											6	1	7
Nevada	0	1					1	0			0	1									1	1			2	3	5
Orange	8	2	2	3			8	3							1	0			1	0	3	2	1	0	24	10	34
Placer	1	0			0	1	0	2													1	0			2	3	5
Plumas																					0	2			0	2	2

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GAMBLING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		OTHER		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Riverside	7	2					4	6					1	0					0	1	2	0	1	0	15	9	24
Sacramento	5	0					0	1									1	0	1	0	1	1			8	2	10
San Benito							2	1													1	0			3	1	4
San Bernardino	2	2					2	0													2	2			6	4	10
San Diego	8	6	1	1			8	3							0	1				2	0	0	5	19	16	35	
San Francisco	1	0					1	0					2	1	1	0			1	0	1	0	1	0	8	1	9
San Joaquin	4	0					1	1													1	0			6	1	7
San Luis Obispo	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1		1	0										2	0			6	2	8
San Mateo	9	1			1	0	1	1					2	1							4	2			17	5	22
Santa Barbara	5	2	1	0			1	0		1	0		0	1							5	0	0	1	13	4	17
Santa Clara	12	0					2	0									0	1			1	0	1	1	16	2	18
Santa Cruz	6	0	1	0											1	0					3	0			11	0	11
Shasta	1	0	0	2			1	0																	2	2	4
Siskiyou	0	1											0	2									1	1	1	4	5
Solano	2	0					0	1					2	0							4	0			8	1	9
Sonoma	13	0	1	0			3	1		1	0		0	1							3	0			21	2	23
Stanislaus							0	1					1	0											1	1	2
Tehama																					0	1			0	1	1
Trinity	1	0																							1	0	1
Tulare	5	2					6	1													1	0			12	3	15
Tuolumne	1	1			0	1															0	1			1	3	4
Ventura	6	0	1	0			1	0							0	1									8	1	9
Yolo	3	0					1	0		1	0		1	0											6	0	6
Yuba	2	0	0	1																					2	1	3
All Counties	171	38	13	10	5	8	70	38	0	1	6	6	13	10	5	2	1	1	8	3	78	21	11	11	381	149	530

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2012

		County Supervisor		Director, CSD*		Other County Offices		City Council		Other City Offices		School Board Member		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	78.3	101	65.5	36	90.9	10	73.9	337	88.7	125	71.1	446	74.3	1,055
	Lose	21.7	28	34.5	19	9.1	1	26.1	119	11.3	16	28.9	181	25.7	364
	Total	100.0	129	100.0	55	100.0	11	100.0	456	100.0	141	100.0	627	100.0	1,419
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	21.8	72	47.6	69	31.4	33	34.4	482	36.0	120	40.9	603	36.4	1,379
	Lose	78.2	259	52.4	76	68.6	72	65.6	920	64.0	213	59.1	870	63.6	2,410
	Total	100.0	331	100.0	145	100.0	105	100.0	1,402	100.0	333	100.0	1,473	100.0	3,789
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	58.4	101	34.3	36	23.3	10	41.1	337	51.0	125	42.5	446	43.3	1,055
	Non-Incumbent	41.6	72	65.7	69	76.7	33	58.9	482	49.0	120	57.5	603	56.7	1,379
	Total	100.0	173	100.0	105	100.0	43	100.0	819	100.0	245	100.0	1,049	100.0	2,434
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	9.8	28	20.0	19	1.4	1	11.5	119	7.0	16	17.2	181	13.1	364
	Non-Incumbent	90.2	259	80.0	76	98.6	72	88.5	920	93.0	213	82.8	870	86.9	2,410
	Total	100.0	287	100.0	95	100.0	73	100.0	1,039	100.0	229	100.0	1,051	100.0	2,774
All Candidates	Incumbent	28.0	129	27.5	55	9.5	11	24.5	456	29.7	141	29.9	627	27.2	1,419
	Non-Incumbent	72.0	331	72.5	145	90.5	105	75.5	1,402	70.3	333	70.1	1,473	72.8	3,789
	Total	100.0	460	100.0	200	100.0	116	100.0	1,858	100.0	474	100.0	2,100	100.0	5,208

*Directors of Community Service Districts, and Community Service Areas

**Runoffs are excluded from totals.

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	11/6/2012	Measure A1	Property Tax		Facilities: Zoos	340,933	541,266	63.0%	Fail ^T
		Measure B1	Sales Tax		Transport	350,899	527,403	66.5%	Fail ^T
ALPINE	11/6/2012	Measure M	Ordinance		Governance: Organization	440	615	71.5%	Pass
AMADOR	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Transient Occupancy Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	11,333	16,503	68.7%	Pass
		Measure U	Miscellaneous Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	11,533	16,789	68.7%	Pass ^T
BUTTE	6/5/2012	Measure M	Ordinance		Other	22,722	50,423	45.1%	Fail
	11/6/2012	Measure H	Miscellaneous Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	60,690	82,748	73.3%	Pass ^T
CALAVERAS	11/6/2012	Measure B	Miscellaneous Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	14,517	20,481	70.9%	Pass ^T
		Measure D	Property Tax		Transport: Roads	97	133	72.9%	Pass ^T
COLUSA	No County Measures								
CONTRA COSTA	6/5/2012	Measure R	Property Tax		Facilities: Parks & Recreation	615	909	67.7%	Pass ^T
DEL NORTE	No County Measures								
EL DORADO	6/5/2012	Measure C	Charter Amendment		Governance: Contracting/Bidding/Leasing	23,647	46,090	51.3%	Pass
	11/6/2012	Measure L	Property Tax		Facilities: Libraries	37,745	83,795	45.0%	Fail ^T
FRESNO	11/6/2012	Measure B	Sales Tax		Facilities: Libraries	180,499	246,283	73.3%	Pass ^T
		Measure O	Charter Amendment		Governance: Contracting/Bidding/Leasing	115,411	235,501	49.0%	Fail
GLENN	No County Measures								
HUMBOLDT	6/5/2012	Measure Y	Miscellaneous Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	24,553	30,806	79.7%	Pass ^T
IMPERIAL	No County Measures								
INYO	No County Measures								
KERN	6/5/2012	Measure D	Ordinance		Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	56,968	97,105	58.7%	Pass
		Measure E	Ordinance		Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	62,414	97,090	64.3%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance		Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	65,546	99,404	65.9%	Pass
		Measure G	Ordinance		Land Use: Zoning/Projects	69,530	100,698	69.0%	Pass
KINGS	No County Measures								
LAKE	6/5/2012	Measure D	Ordinance		Other	4,688	13,648	34.3%	Fail
	11/6/2012	Measure E	Sales Tax		Environment	14,165	22,490	63.0%	Fail ^T
LASSEN	11/6/2012	Measure V	Property Tax		Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	66	146	45.2%	Fail ^T
LOS ANGELES	6/5/2012	Measure H	Transient Occupancy Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	522,354	860,642	60.7%	Pass
		Measure L	Business Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	540,260	856,477	63.1%	Pass

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
LOS ANGELES (continued)	11/6/2012	Measure CL	Property Tax		Education	26,631	37,817	70.4%	Pass ^T
		Measure B	Ordinance		Safety: Civil Fines/Criminal Penalties	1,617,866	2,840,547	57.0%	Pass
		Measure J	Sales Tax		Transport	1,893,340	2,863,951	66.1%	Fail ^T
		Measure M	Charter Amendment		Governance: Organization	598,846	2,672,607	22.4%	Fail
MADERA	No County Measures								
MARIN	6/5/2012	Measure E	Property Tax		Safety: Fire	127	146	87.0%	Pass ^T
	11/6/2012	Measure M	Sales Tax		Facilities: Parks & Recreation	92,050	124,324	74.0%	Pass ^T
MARIPOSA	No County Measures								
MENDOCINO	6/5/2012	Measure E	Miscellaneous Tax		Safety: Fire	575	910	63.2%	Fail ^T
	11/6/2012	Measure F	Policy/Position		Other	24,492	32,781	74.7%	Pass
		Measure G	Miscellaneous Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	26,371	33,242	79.3%	Pass
MERCED	No County Measures								
MODOC	No County Measures								
MONO	No County Measures								
MONTEREY	No County Measures								
NAPA	11/6/2012	Measure S	Ordinance		Land Use: Zoning/Projects	39,333	50,662	77.6%	Pass
		Measure T	Sales Tax		Transport: Roads	39,462	52,775	74.8%	Pass ^T
		Measure U	Initiative		Land Use: Zoning/Projects	20,101	50,862	39.5%	Fail
		Measure V	Ordinance		Facilities: Sports Facilities	45,449	51,973	87.4%	Pass
NEVADA	6/5/2012	Measure C	Property Tax		Transport: Roads	41	69	59.4%	Fail ^T
ORANGE	6/5/2012	Measure B	Charter Amendment		Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	273,160	377,417	72.4%	Pass
		Measure M	Ordinance		Governance: Organization	152,135	385,189	39.5%	Fail
PLACER	6/5/2012	Measure D	Development Tax		Safety: Fire	2,450	5,937	41.3%	Fail ^T
PLUMAS	11/6/2012	Measure C	Transient Occupancy Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	3,660	8,973	40.8%	Fail
		Measure D	Sales Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	3,456	9,615	35.9%	Fail
RIVERSIDE	No County Measures								
SACRAMENTO	No County Measures								
SAN BENITO	No County Measures								
SAN BERNARDINO	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Charter Amendment		Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	344,226	511,595	67.3%	Pass
		Measure R	Charter Amendment		Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	326,939	508,846	64.3%	Pass
SAN DIEGO	No County Measures								

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SAN FRANCISCO	6/5/2012	Measure B	Policy/Position		Facilities: Museum/Cultural/Comm. Ctrs.	72,672	136,008	53.4%	Pass
		Measure M	Initiative		General Services: Solid Waste	106,848	139,545	76.6%	Pass
	11/6/2012	Measure B	GO Bond		Facilities: Parks & Recreation	242,404	336,139	72.1%	Pass ^T
		Measure C	Charter Amendment		Housing: Affordable	211,674	324,888	65.2%	Pass
		Measure D	Charter Amendment		Governance: Elections	263,642	316,894	83.2%	Pass
		Measure E	Business Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	223,887	316,464	70.7%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance		Facilities: Public Works	74,885	324,189	23.1%	Fail
Measure G	Policy/Positon		Other	260,595	321,776	81.0%	Pass		
SAN JOAQUIN	11/6/2012	Recall 1	Recall		Governance: Recall	1,654	2,765	59.8%	Pass
		Measure D	Ordinance		Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	78,399	187,876	41.7%	Fail
SAN LUIS OBISPO	11/6/2012	Measure B-12	Ordinance		Land Use: Voter Approval	1,787	2,127	84.0%	Pass
SAN MATEO	6/5/2012	Measure Z	Property Tax		Safety: Fire	762	1,085	70.2%	Pass ^T
		Measure T	Business Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	57,228	114,266	50.1%	Pass
		Measure U	Transient Occupancy Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	53,431	114,142	46.8%	Fail
		Measure X	Business Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	53,616	114,295	46.9%	Fail
SAN MATEO	11/6/2012	Measure B	Charter Amendment		Governance: Organization	142,374	242,488	58.7%	Pass
		Measure C	Charter Amendment		Governance: Organization	96,449	236,839	40.7%	Fail
		Measure M	Sales Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	169,661	259,449	65.4%	Pass
SANTA BARBARA	No County Measures								
SANTA CLARA	6/5/2012	Measure M	Ordinance		Governance: Organization	199,301	256,867	77.6%	Pass
	11/6/2012	Measure M	Sales Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	339,359	599,500	56.6%	Pass
SANTA CRUZ	11/6/2012	Measure N	Transient Occupancy Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	80,990	111,293	72.8%	Pass
SHASTA	6/5/2012	Measure B	Ordinance		Land Use: Voter Approval	12,678	44,076	28.8%	Fail
		Measure M	Ordinance		Land Use: Zoning/Projects	14,991	44,239	33.9%	Fail
SIERRA	No County Measures								
SISKIYOU	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Property Tax		Facilities: Libraries	268	502	53.4%	Fail ^T
SOLANO	6/5/2012	Measure L	Sales Tax		Facilities: Libraries	53,654	66,984	80.1%	Pass ^T
SONOMA	No County Measures								
STANISLAUS	6/5/2012	Measure T	Sales Tax		Facilities: Libraries	55,863	68,187	81.9%	Pass ^T
SUTTER	No County Measures								
TEHAMA	No County Measures								
TRINITY	No County Measures								
TULARE	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Ordinance		Governance: Incorporation/Formation/Annexation	91	120	75.8%	Pass

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
TUOLUMNE	6/5/2012	Measure D	Property Tax		Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	586	1,425	41.1%	Fail
		Measure C	Transient Occupancy Tax		Revenues: Tax Creation/Incr./Contin.	6,262	14,318	43.7%	Fail
VENTURA	No County Measures								
YOLO	11/6/2012	Measure H	Ordinance		Governance: Organization	43,575	66,392	65.6%	Pass
YUBA	11/6/2012	Measure T	Ordinance		Land Use: Open Space	9,262	18,717	49.5%	Fail

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

ALAMEDA	11/6/2012	Measure A1	Fail 2/3 required
To maintain/upgrade humane animal care and basic needs (food, medical, heating, cooling, safe enclosures); retain veterinarians/animal specialists; care for wounded/endangered animals; support wildlife conservation; maintain children's educational, nature/science programs, field trips; and keep entrance fees affordable; shall Alameda County levy a tax of \$12/parcel annually for residential parcels and comparable commercial/industrial rates, with low-income senior exemptions, mandatory audits, and citizens' oversight?			
ALAMEDA	11/6/2012	Measure B1	Fail 2/3 required
Shall a new Transportation Expenditure Plan be implemented to address current and future transportation needs that: 1) Improves transit access to jobs and schools; 2) Fixes roads, improves highways and increases bicycle and pedestrian safety; 3) Reduces traffic congestion and improves air quality; 4) Keeps senior, youth, and disabled fares affordable. Approval extends the existing County sales tax and increases it by 1/2 cent, with independent oversight, local job creation programs. No money can be taken by the state.			
ALPINE	11/6/2012	Measure M	Pass
Shall the County ordinance entitled The Fiscal Office Consolidation Act (consolidating the current elective offices of auditor, controller, treasure, and tax collector into a new appointive county office of director of finance) be approved and enacted?			
AMADOR	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Pass
Shall Ordinance No. 1723, which proposes to amend Amador County Code section 3.16.030 to increase the Transient Occupancy Tax from six percent (6%) to ten percent (10%) to be consistent with the 10% hotel tax collected by the cities of Jackson, Sutter Creek and Lone, be approved?			
AMADOR	11/6/2012	Measure U	Pass 2/3 required
Should the Amador County Vehicle Abatement Program and associated fees (one dollar per vehicle and an additional two dollars for certain commercial vehicles) be renewed for a ten-year term under California Vehicle Code Sections 9250.7 and 22710, or any successor statutes thereto, for purposes of removal and disposal of abandoned and wrecked vehicles?			
BUTTE	6/5/2012	Measure M	Fail
Shall the Medical Marijuana Cultivation Ordinance, Ordinance Number 4029, be adopted?			
BUTTE	11/6/2012	Measure H	Pass 2/3 required
Should the Butte County Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Program and associated fees (one dollar per vehicle and an additional two dollars for certain commercial vehicles) be renewed for a ten year term under California Vehicle Code Sections 9250.7 and 22710, or any successor statutes thereto, for purposes of removal and disposal of abandoned and wrecked vehicles?			
CALAVERAS	11/6/2012	Measure B	Pass 2/3 required
Should the Calaveras County/Cityof Angels Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Program and associated fees (one dollar per vehicle and an additional two dollars for certain commercial vehicles) be renewed for a ten year term (commencing July 1, 2013) under California Vehicle Code Sections 9250.7 and 22710, or any successor statutes thereto, for purposes of removal and disposal of abandoned and wrecked vehicles?			
CALAVERAS	11/6/2012	Measure D	Pass 2/3 required
Shall Resolution No. 12-02 of the Circle XX Community Services District, establishing a special tax for a ten year period (July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2023) in the annual amount of \$400 per parcel of real property (for constructing, opening, widening, extending, straightening, surfacing, or maintaining any street in the District, or for any incidental purposes, including construction and improvements of bridges, culverts, curbs, gutters, and drains) be adopted?			
CONTRA COSTA	6/5/2012	Measure R	Pass 2/3 required
Shall a resolution be adopted which will authorize the Board of Directors to increase the existing \$50 recreation special tax on residential parcels within the Crockett and Port Costa areas for maintenance and operation of the District's park and recreation facilities and services within the District and not to exceed a total of \$110 per parcel per year?			
EL DORADO	6/5/2012	Measure C	Pass
Shall Section 602 of the El Dorado County Charter, which currently requires the procurement of all services to be pursuant to a written contract, be amended to provide the Board of Supervisors with the authority to allow the procurement of services for less than \$10,000.00 without the need for a written contract; provided, that the Board of Supervisors does so by ordinance which specifies alternate procedures for processing and documenting the purchases?			
EL DORADO	11/6/2012	Measure L	Fail 2/3 required
To maintain library services, shall El Dorado County levy a special tax within CSA10, commencing in fiscal year 2013/2014, and expiring after 15 years, at the following rates (with annual increases up to 3%): base tax of \$17.58 per parcel, 80% of the base tax per multi-family residential dwelling unit, 50% of the base tax per mobilehome for parcels containing mobilehome parks, 50% of the base tax for unimproved parcels, and \$1.00 per timeshare?			
FRESNO	11/6/2012	Measure B	Pass 2/3 required
To protect libraries from state budget cuts by preventing library closures and reduced library hours; keeping qualified librarians; improving reading/literacy, job search programs/computer technology; providing neighborhood school-library joint programs, and maintaining services for children, seniors and the blind, shall Fresno County voters continue the voter-approved 1/8-cent sales tax for neighborhood libraries for sixteen years, with audits, citizen's oversight, all funds staying in Fresno County and no tax rate increase?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

FRESNO	11/6/2012	Measure O	Fail
Shall Fresno County Charter, Section 13, be amended to allow the County to employ independent contractors for services performed by County employees by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors and to read: SECTION 13: Notwithstanding Section 44 of this Charter or other provisions of law, the County may employ independent contractors to perform any County service, including service then being performed by County employees, with three affirmative votes of the Board of Supervisors?			
HUMBOLDT	6/5/2012	Measure Y	Pass 2/3 required
Should the Humboldt County Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Program and associated fees (one dollar per vehicle and an additional two dollars for certain commercial vehicles) be renewed for a ten year term under California Vehicle Code Sections 9250.7 and 22710, or any successor statutes thereto, for purposes of removal and disposal of abandoned and wrecked vehicles.			
KERN	6/5/2012	Measure D	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted that increases the number of eligible persons certified for appointment from an eligible list from the three (3) highest eligible persons to the seven (7) highest eligible persons whenever a position in the classified service is sought to be filled through open examination, and allows for an additional two (2) eligible persons to be certified for appointment for each additional position sought to be filled through open examination?			
KERN	6/5/2012	Measure E	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted that authorizes the Civil Service Commission to establish entry level probationary periods of either six (6) or twelve (12) months for appointees depending on job classification, and to establish a twelve (12) month promotional probationary period for promotions between two different job families?			
KERN	6/5/2012	Measure F	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted that extends the period an employee has to appeal a disciplinary action, such as dismissal, suspension, or reduction in rank or compensation, from five (5) business days to ten (10) business days?			
KERN	6/5/2012	Measure G	Pass
Shall a County zoning ordinance be adopted that amends Title 19 of the Ordinance Code to restrict the location of Medical Marijuana Dispensaries to Medium (M-2 PD) and Heavy (M-3 PD) Industrial Districts and to require them to maintain a distance of at least one (1) mile from all schools, daycare centers, parks, churches, and other Medical Marijuana Dispensaries, and to require them to operate in compliance with development and performance standards?			
LAKE	6/5/2012	Measure D	Fail
Shall the ordinance titled "The Lake County Medical Marijuana Cultivation Act of 2012", an ordinance amending Chapter 21 of the Ordinance Code of the County of Lake, adding Article 72A: Regulations for the Cultivation of Medical Marijuana be adopted and become effective?			
LAKE	11/6/2012	Measure E	Fail 2/3 required
Shall Article VI be added to Chapter 18 of the Lake County Code imposing a one-half of one percent (0.50%) transaction and use tax (sales tax) to implement invasive species/weed and algae control/water quality programs for the County of Lake for a maximum period of ten (10) years that cannot be taken by the State, with all revenues dedicated exclusively to these programs and establishing an expenditure plan with citizen oversight for revenues generated?			
LASSEN	11/6/2012	Measure V	Fail 2/3 required
Shall the existing special tax be repealed and replaced by a special property tax for fire suppression, prevention, rescue and emergency medical services within the Spalding Community Services District, as established by resolution 2012-4 be approved?"			
LOS ANGELES	6/5/2012	Measure H	Pass
Shall the existing unincorporated county hotel room tax be readopted to ratify, continue, and update the existing ordinance at the current rate of 12 percent to fund essential County general fund services, such as parks, libraries, senior services, and law enforcement; to continue exempting hotel stays longer than 30 days, to add exemptions for emergency shelter referrals, and for individuals on official government business pursuant to federal law?			
LOS ANGELES	6/5/2012	Measure L	Pass
Shall Los Angeles County's existing tax on landfills be readopted to ratify and continue the existing 10 percent tax on landfill operators' gross receipts from waste disposal in landfills in the unincorporated county, to fund essential general fund services, such as parks, libraries, senior services, and law enforcement; and to update the administrative appeal process, and clarify definitions to ensure the tax is properly calculated?			
LOS ANGELES	11/6/2012	Measure CL	Pass 2/3 required
To protect academic quality in local K-12 schools; maintain math, science, English programs; provide education for students with disabilities/special needs; support computer technology and school security; prepare students for college/careers; retain excellent teachers; shall Local Classrooms Funding Authority levy a special tax of 2¢/square foot of lot for residential property, and 7.5¢/square foot for other property types; requiring citizens oversight, audits, senior exemptions, no money for administrator salaries and all funds staying local?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

LOS ANGELES	11/6/2012	Measure B	Pass
Shall an ordinance be adopted requiring producers of adult films to obtain a County public health permit, to require adult film performers to use condoms while engaged in sex acts, to provide proof of blood borne pathogen training course, to post permit and notices to performers, and making violations of the ordinance subject to civil fines and criminal charges?			
LOS ANGELES	11/6/2012	Measure J	Fail 2/3 required
To advance Los Angeles County's traffic relief, economic/job growth by accelerating light rail/subway construction and airport connections, within five years, not twenty; funding countywide freeway, bridge, safety and traffic flow improvements; fixing potholes; keeping senior, student, disabled fares low; Shall Los Angeles County's voter-approved one-half cent traffic relief sales tax continue without increase for another 30 years or until voters decide to end it, with independent audits and keeping funds local?			
LOS ANGELES	11/6/2012	Measure M	Fail
Do you support seeking to change the California Constitution and the Los Angeles County Charter to make the position of Los Angeles County Assessor an appointed position instead of an elected position?			
MARIN	6/5/2012	Measure E	Pass 2/3 required
Shall Muir Beach CSD Ordinance No. 2012-1, which imposes an annual special tax of two-hundred (\$200.00) dollars for a period of four (4) years, FY 2012-2013, FY 2013-2014, and FY 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, on each parcel within the Muir Beach CSD for fire protection, including fuel abatement and emergency preparedness, be approved and shall the Muir Beach CSD appropriations limit be increased by the amount of this voter-approved tax?			
MARIN	11/6/2012	Measure M	Pass 2/3 required
To preserve quality of life and maintain open space, parks, and farmland, with funds that cannot be taken by the State, shall Marin County: Protect streams, baylands, natural areas, and wildlife habitat; Manage vegetation to preserve biodiversity and reduce wildfire risk; Repair and replace deteriorating park facilities; and Maintain and enhance walking, hiking, biking and equestrian trails; by enacting a one-quarter cent sales tax, with a citizens' oversight committee, annual audits, with all funds spent only in Marin County?			
MENDOCINO	6/5/2012	Measure E	Fail 2/3 required
Shall Ordinance No. 144 of the Brooktrails Township Community Services District, amending Ordinance Nos. 29 and 126 and increasing the Special Tax for Fire Protection and Prevention commencing with the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2012, be approved?			
MENDOCINO	11/6/2012	Measure F	Pass
Should the elected representatives of Mendocino County be instructed to enact resolutions calling for amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that 1) only human beings and not corporations are endowed with constitutional rights, and 2) that money does not constitute speech and therefore political contributions can be regulated?			
MENDOCINO	11/6/2012	Measure G	Pass
Should the Mendocino County Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Program and associated fees (one dollar per vehicle and an additional two dollars for certain commercial vehicles) be renewed for a ten year term for purposes of removal and disposal of abandoned and wrecked vehicles?			
NAPA	11/6/2012	Measure S	Pass
Shall Napa County Ordinance 2012-01 be adopted? (This Ordinance, if approved by the voters, amends the Napa County Code to change the existing requirement that Napa County Airport Runway 18 Right-36 Left be designed and constructed to a maximum dual-wheel load-bearing strength of fifty thousand (50,000) pounds and instead require that Napa County Airport Runway 18 Right-36 Left be designed and constructed in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration standards whenever repair/replacement of the runway is needed).			
NAPA	11/6/2012	Measure T	Pass 2/3 required
Shall Ordinance No. 2012-01 be adopted? (If adopted, revenues will be used exclusively to fix potholes, repair, maintain and improve local streets, roads and sidewalks in Napa, American Canyon, St. Helena, Calistoga, Yountville, and unincorporated areas within Napa County, by extending an expiring one-half percent sales tax for 25 years, resulting in no new increase in existing local sales tax rates. All revenues will be subject to strict, local citizen oversight and annual independent audits).			
NAPA	11/6/2012	Measure U	Fail
(INITIATIVE) Shall the Angwin General Plan Amendment Initiative be adopted? (The Initiative, if approved by the voters, would redesignate certain lands in Angwin from Urban Residential to Agricultural, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) or Public Institutional, permit modernization and expansion of an existing sewage treatment facility west of Howell Mountain Road despite its AWOS designation, and prohibit further subdivision of Public Institutional Lands countywide).			
NAPA	11/6/2012	Measure V	Pass
Shall Resolution No. 2012-086 and Ordinance No. 2012-02 be adopted? (The Resolution and Ordinance, if approved by the voters, would permit the existing restaurant and banquet facilities at the existing Chardonnay golf course to be open to the general public as well as to golf patrons, club members, and their guests).			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

NEVADA	6/5/2012	Measure C	Fail 2/3 required
Shall Ordinance No. 2012-01 of the Mystic Mine Community Services District be adopted to:(i) increase the existing road tax from \$120 to \$200 per parcel per year to pay for road maintenance and improvements, (ii) make other changes to the tax as stated in the Ordinance and (iii) establish a spending limit of \$30,000 in accordance with Article XIII B of the California Constitution?			
ORANGE	6/5/2012	Measure B	Pass
Shall the ordinance amending the County Charter to require that members of the Orange County Board of Supervisors enroll in the minimum pension plan option offered to County employees be adopted?			
ORANGE	6/5/2012	Measure M	Fail
Shall the Ordinance changing the office of Public Administrator for the County of Orange from an elected office to an appointed office be adopted?			
PLACER	6/5/2012	Measure D	Fail 2/3 required
Shall an ordinance be adopted to increase existing direct charges for residential development by \$40 per unit; for mobile home parks by \$20 per unit; for commercial/ industrial development by \$0.046 per square foot for fire protection, emergency medical, prevention services and equipment replacement in North Auburn – Ophir Fire (CSA 28, Zone 193) (Charges approved in this measure are subject to an annual cost of living adjustment not to exceed 3% in any year)?			
PLUMAS	11/6/2012	Measure C	Fail
Shall Ordinance No. 12-1088 be enacted? (The Ordinance would amend section 3-4.03 of the Plumas County Code to change the existing Transient Occupancy Tax in the unincorporated area of the county from nine percent (9%) to eleven percent (11%) effective January 1, 2013, with the proceeds of the tax to be used for general governmental purposes. The Ordinance shall be automatically repealed by its own terms and of no further force or effect on January 1, 2017, causing such tax rate to revert to nine percent (9%) on January 1, 2017).			
PLUMAS	11/6/2012	Measure D	Fail
Shall Plumas County Ordinance No. 12- 1089 be enacted adding Chapter 16 to Title 3 of the Plumas County Code to impose a transactions and use tax at a rate of 0.25% within the incorporated and unincorporated territory of Plumas County and requiring that all funds generated as a result of the tax to be spent for general governmental purposes, with the tax to be operative on April 1, 2013, and the authority to levy the tax to expire January 1, 2017?			
SAN BERNARDINO	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Pass
Shall the Charter of the County of San Bernardino be amended to enact a permanent cap on compensation and mandatory transparency for members of the County Board of Supervisors?			
SAN BERNARDINO	11/6/2012	Measure R	Pass
Shall the County Charter be amended to change the elected office of County Supervisor to a part-time position, eliminate the current Charter provisions relating to salaries of all elected County officials, establish monthly compensation for the office of County Supervisor at \$5,000 plus cola not to exceed 5% annually, establish a total annual budget for each County Supervisor at five times the Supervisor's compensation, and redefine retirement benefits for the position of County Supervisor?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/5/2012	Measure B	Pass
Shall it be City policy to strictly limit commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower, and to use funds from Coit Tower concession operations on the Coit Tower murals, building, and Pioneer Park?			
SAN FRANCISCO	6/5/2012	Measure M	Pass
(INITIATIVE) Shall the City use a competitive bidding process to award five separate agreements for trash and recycling services; require that garbage processing and transfer facilities be owned by the City and located in San Francisco; require the Board of Supervisors to approve maximum rates for garbage services; and allow the Board of Supervisors to make future amendments that advance the purposes of this ordinance without further voter approval?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012	Measure B	Pass 2/3 required
To improve the safety and quality of neighborhood parks across the city and waterfront open spaces, enhance water quality and clean up environmental contamination along the Bay, replace unsafe playgrounds, fix restrooms, improve access for the disabled, and ensure the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$195 million dollars in General Obligation bonds, subject to independent oversight and regular audits?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012	Measure C	Pass
Shall the City amend its Charter to: create a Housing Trust Fund that supports affordable housing for low-income and moderate-income households; and change the affordable housing requirements imposed on some private residential developments?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012	Measure D	Pass
Shall the City amend its Charter to change the election cycle for City Attorney and Treasurer so that these officers would be elected at the same time as the Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012	Measure E	Pass
Shall the City: create a gross receipts tax designed to eliminate or reduce the tax on payroll costs; and increase business registration fees?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012	Measure F	Fail
Shall the City prepare a two-phase plan that evaluates how to drain the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir so that it can be restored by the National Park Service and identifies replacement water and power sources?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012	Measure G	Pass
Shall it be City policy that corporations should not have the same constitutional rights as human beings and should be subject to political spending limits?			
SAN JOAQUIN	11/6/2012	Recall 1	Pass
Shall Jass Singh be recalled (removed) from the Mountain House CSD Board of Directors?			
SAN JOAQUIN	11/6/2012	Measure D	Fail
Shall an ordinance be adopted that limits the number of terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors and Board of Education to three (3) terms of office during his or her lifetime?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	11/6/2012	Measure B-12	Pass
Must an election be held prior to any permanent sale of water to any entity outside the Oceano Community Services District?			
SAN MATEO	6/5/2012	Measure Z	Pass 2/3 required
Shall Resolution No. 071831 of the County of San Mateo continuing the levy of a special tax for four years at a maximum rate of \$65 per parcel per year for extended police and structural fire protection services be approved?			
SAN MATEO	6/5/2012	Measure T	Pass
Shall Chapter 5.150 be added to the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, imposing a business license tax of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of gross receipts on operators of vehicle rental businesses located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County?			
SAN MATEO	6/5/2012	Measure U	Fail
Shall Chapter 5.136 of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code be amended to increase the rate of tax, imposed on occupants of lodging within the unincorporated County who reside in such lodging for thirty consecutive calendar days or less, from ten percent to twelve percent of the rent charged by operators of such lodging?			
SAN MATEO	6/5/2012	Measure X	Fail
Shall Chapter 5.152 be added to the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, imposing a business license tax of eight percent of gross receipts on operators of commercial parking facilities located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County?			
SAN MATEO	11/6/2012	Measure B	Pass
Shall the San Mateo County Charter be amended so that each member of the Board of Supervisors will cease to be elected by an at-large vote of all the voters in the County, but is instead elected only by the voters of his or her district?			
SAN MATEO	11/6/2012	Measure C	Fail
Shall the San Mateo County Charter be amended to change the elected position of Controller to an appointed position?			
SAN MATEO	11/6/2012	Measure M	Pass
To ensure San Mateo County quality of life by retaining critical facilities/services, such as: child abuse prevention, 911 dispatch, fire prevention, after-school, library reading/homework programs; keeping parks open; maintaining seismically safe hospital/emergency rooms which may include substantial funding to replace Seton Hospital/emergency room for low-income children/seniors/disabled; and other County services, shall San Mateo County levy a half-cent sales tax, for ten years, which the State cannot take away, with oversight/independent audits?			
SANTA CLARA	6/5/2012	Measure M	Pass
To provide the Board of Supervisors with flexibility in operating the County jails to ensure continued cost-savings and improvement of efficiencies, shall the Board of Supervisors have the discretion to determine whether the Sheriff, Department of Correction, or any other department or agency, or any combination of them jointly operate the jails?			
SANTA CLARA	11/6/2012	Measure M	Pass
Shall the County of Santa Clara enact a one-eighth cent sales tax, that cannot be taken by the state, for local priorities such as: law enforcement and public safety; trauma and emergency room services; health coverage for low-income children; economic development and job creation; housing for the homeless; and programs to help students stay in school; for a limited period of ten years, with annual public reports to ensure fiscal responsibility?			
SANTA CRUZ	11/6/2012	Measure N	Pass
To protect the quality of life in Santa Cruz County by limiting further cuts to police, fire, emergency services, health services, parks and recreation, economic development, job creation, and other essential county services; shall Santa Cruz County be authorized to levy an additional tax of one and one-half of one percent in the Transient Occupancy Tax on people staying at lodging facilities in the unincorporated areas of the county?			

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2012

SHASTA	6/5/2012	Measure B	Fail
<p>(INITIATIVE) Shall the Chum Creek Bottom Agricultural Lands General Plan Amendment Initiative Be Adopted? Imposes the following restrictions in the Shasta County General Plan that may not be amended except by the voters of Shasta County: (1) until December 31, 2036, prevents changes to the designations of land in the Chum Creek Bottom area designated as agricultural lands (A-C or A-cg) on the General Plan Map, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1984 and in effect at the time of the initiative, with certain limited exceptions; (2) until December 31, 2036, prevents agricultural lands in the Chum Creek Bottom area from being reviewed every five years for possible land use changes; (3) strictly limits commercial development in the Chum Creek Bottom area to those parcels designated as "commercial" (C) and located immediately adjacent to the I-5 interchange/Knighton Road intersection; and (4) exempts from its coverage any project that has obtained a vested right pursuant to state or local law, any project for the construction of public schools or public parks, and any land that, under state or federal law, is beyond the initiative power of local voters.</p>			
SHASTA	6/5/2012	Measure M	Fail
<p>Shall Resolution 2011-091 (General Plan Amendment 08-002) be Adopted; allows development of the Knighton & Chum Creek Commons Retail Center by changing the land use designation in the Shasta County General Plan from Part-Time Agricultural (A-cg) to Commercial (C) on approximately 86 acres in the Chum Creek Bottom area.</p>			
SISKIYOU	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Fail 2/3 required
<p>Shall the McCloud Community Services District levy a special parcel tax of \$12.00 per parcel per year commencing in Fiscal Year 2012-2013 to provide library services, to replace the existing special tax for such services approved by the voters of the district on June 3, 1997.</p>			
SOLANO	6/5/2012	Measure L	Pass 2/3 required
<p>Shall Ordinance No. 2011-1724 to extend the 1998 countywide library retail transactions and use tax at the rate of one-eighth of one percent (0.125%) for a maximum of 16 years, which provides local library funding; prevents library closures; maintains collections of books, databases, and other materials; preserves library hours and children, teen, adult, senior programs, including computer training, homework help, family literacy and children's story times, with all revenues staying in Solano County, be adopted?</p>			
STANISLAUS	6/5/2012	Measure T	Pass 2/3 required
<p>To maintain local library funding the State cannot take, keep branches open, maintain hours, provide programs for children, teens, adults and seniors, children's story times, literacy, homework and job search resources, maintain book, CD, DVD and reference; shall Stanislaus County extend the existing one-eighth of one percent library sales tax for 5 years commencing July 1, 2013 until June 30, 2018, with an independent citizens oversight committee ensuring funds are spent only on Stanislaus County libraries?</p>			
TULARE	11/6/2012	Measure Q	Pass
<p>Shall the order adopted on July 11, 2012 by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Tulare County ordering the formation of the Alpaugh Community Services District be confirmed subject to the terms and conditions specified in the order?</p>			
TUOLUMNE	6/5/2012	Measure D	Fail 2/3 required
<p>Shall the Groveland Community Services District (the "District") be authorized to levy an annual special tax of \$107 per improved parcel and \$53 per unimproved parcel on each non-exempt parcel in the District for ten years, subject to an annual increase of \$3.00 in the amount of the special tax, with the proceeds of the special tax to fund only wages and benefits for the District's fire protection and emergency medical services personnel?</p>			
TUOLUMNE	6/5/2012	Measure C	Fail
<p>Tuolumne County did not provide measure text for Measure C.</p>			
YOLO	11/6/2012	Measure H	Pass
<p>Shall the County of Yolo consolidate the offices of Auditor, Controller, Tax Collector and Treasurer and other countywide fiscal functions under a Department of Finance by establishing an appointed Director of Finance, create an independent finance oversight committee, and require an annual independent audit of the Department of Finance?</p>			
YUBA	11/6/2012	Measure T	Fail
<p>Shall any lands presently designated "natural resources" on the Yuba County Land Use Map, as part of the General Plan adopted June 7, 2011, remain so designated until 2030 unless annexed to or otherwise included within a city or town, or unless said designation is changed to natural resource lands by a vote of the electorate?</p>			

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		INITIATIVE		RECALL		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION STATEMENT		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	0	2													0	2	2
Alpine											1	0			1	0	1
Amador	2	0													2	0	2
Butte	1	0									0	1			1	1	2
Calaveras	2	0													2	0	2
Contra Costa	1	0													1	0	1
El Dorado	0	1			1	0									1	1	2
Fresno	1	0			0	1									1	1	2
Humboldt	1	0													1	0	1
Kern											4	0			4	0	4
Lake	0	1									0	1			0	2	2
Lassen	0	1													0	1	1
Los Angeles	3	1			0	1					1	0			4	2	6
Marin	2	0													2	0	2
Mendocino	1	1											1	0	2	1	3
Napa	1	0					0	1			2	0			3	1	4
Nevada	0	1													0	1	1
Orange					1	0					0	1			1	1	2
Placer	0	1													0	1	1
Plumas	0	2													0	2	2
San Bernardino					2	0									2	0	2
San Francisco	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	0			0	1	2	0	7	1	8
San Joaquin									1	0	0	1			1	1	2
San Luis Obispo											1	0			1	0	1
San Mateo	3	2			1	1									4	3	7
Santa Clara	1	0									1	0			2	0	2

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		INITIATIVE		RECALL		ORDINANCE		POLICY/POSITION STATEMENT		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Santa Cruz	1	0													1	0	1
Shasta											0	2			0	2	2
Siskiyou	0	1													0	1	1
Solano	1	0													1	0	1
Stanislaus	1	0													1	0	1
Tulare											1	0			1	0	1
Tuolumne	0	2													0	2	2
Yolo											1	0			1	0	1
Yuba											0	1			0	1	1
All Counties	23	16	1	0	7	3	1	1	1	0	12	8	3	0	48	28	76

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda											0	1	0	1									0	2	2
Alpine							1	0															1	0	1
Amador																			2	0			2	0	2
Butte																			1	0	0	1	1	1	2
Calaveras											1	0							1	0			2	0	2
Contra Costa													1	0									1	0	1
El Dorado							1	0					0	1									1	1	2
Fresno							0	1					1	0									1	1	2
Humboldt																			1	0			1	0	1
Kern			1	0			3	0															4	0	4
Lake									0	1											0	1	0	2	2
Lassen					0	1																	0	1	1
Los Angeles	1	0			1	0	0	1			0	1							2	0			4	2	6
Marin					1	0							1	0									2	0	2
Mendocino					0	1													1	0	1	0	2	1	3
Napa			1	1							1	0	1	0									3	1	4
Nevada											0	1											0	1	1
Orange							1	1															1	1	2
Placer					0	1																	0	1	1
Plumas																			0	2			0	2	2
San Bernardino							2	0															2	0	2
San Francisco							1	0					2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	7	1	8
San Joaquin							1	1															1	1	2
San Luis Obispo			1	0																			1	0	1
San Mateo					1	0	1	1											2	2			4	3	7
Santa Clara							1	0											1	0			2	0	2

Santa Cruz																1	0			1	0	1
------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	---	---

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2012

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORT		FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Shasta			0	2																			0	2	2
Siskiyou													0	1									0	1	1
Solano													1	0									1	0	1
Stanislaus													1	0									1	0	1
Tulare							1	0															1	0	1
Tuolumne					0	1													0	1			0	2	2
Yolo							1	0															1	0	1
Yuba			0	1																			0	1	1
All Counties	1	0	3	4	3	4	14	5	0	1	2	3	8	4	1	0	1	0	13	5	2	2	48	28	76

PART 2
VOTE TOTALS FOR
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED				
ALAMEDA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Haggerty	Scott P.	Member, Alameda County Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	30,613	31,406	97.5%	Yes				
			4	Full	Miley	Nate	Alameda County Supervisor	Yes	2	32,389	45,263	71.6%	Yes				
					Thomas	Tojo	Deputy Probation Officer	No	2	12,562	45,263	27.8%	No				
			5	Full	Carson	Keith	Board of Supervisors, Alameda County	Yes	1	39,496	40,327	97.9%	Yes				
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	20	Full	Flanagan	Tara M.	Family Law Attorney	No	3	92,496	182,267	50.7%	Yes			
						Wiener	Andrew R.	Attorney, Arbitrator, Mediator	No	3	54,452	182,267	29.9%	No			
						Haley	Catherine	Attorney	No	3	33,922	182,267	18.6%	No			
		11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Short	Valle	Richard	Appointed Alameda County Supervisor District 2	No	4	28,762	79,668	36.1%	Yes			
	Green					Mark	Mayor of Union City	No	4	24,441	79,668	30.7%	No				
	Hayashi					Mary	California State Assemblywoman	No	4	19,258	79,668	24.2%	No				
	Turnquist					Mark A.	Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	4	6,850	79,668	8.6%	No				
		DIRECTOR, Dublin-San Ramon CSD		Full	Duarte	Edward R.	General Engineering Contractor	No	4	7,679	27,931	27.5%	Yes				
					Halket	Rich	Incumbent	Yes	4	7,530	27,931	27.0%	Yes				
					Howard	Dwight L. 'Pat'	Incumbent	Yes	4	6,917	27,931	24.8%	Yes				
					Hayes	Scott	Businessman	No	4	5,734	27,931	20.5%	No				
ALPINE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Hames	Ron	Write-In Candidate	No	4	35	141	24.8%	No				
					Hansen	Scot	Business Owner	No	4	35	141	24.8%	No				
					O'Neal	Earl H.	School Board Incumbent	No	4	27	141	19.1%	No				
					Zellmer	Herman	Write-In Candidate	No	4	22	141	15.6%	No				
		11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Hames	Ron	No Ballot Designation	No	2	90	131	68.7%	Yes			
	Hansen					Scot	Business Owner	No	2	41	131	31.3%	No				
AMADOR	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Plasse	Maurice 'John'	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,688	1,760	95.9%	Yes				
			2	Full	Forster	Richard M.	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	1	1,750	1,807	96.8%	Yes				
			4	Full	Boitano	Louis D.	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,827	1,915	95.4%	Yes				
					SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Hermanson	Steve	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	6,969	11,176	62.4%	Yes	
								Seaton	Jeffrey D.	Attorney/Businessman	No	2	4,169	11,176	37.3%	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 candidates vote is less than the total votes cast.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
BUTTE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Connelly	Bill	County Supervisor	Yes	2	6,520	9,871	66.1%	Yes	
					Gage	Virgle N.	Retired Business Executive	No	2	3,306	9,871	33.5%	No	
			4	Full	Lambert	Steve	Businessman/Rancher	Yes	1	6,808	6,998	97.3%	Yes	
					5	Full	Di Duca	Joe	Businessman/Town Councilmember	No	4	5,040	12,980	38.8%
			Teeter	Doug			Licensed Private Fiduciary	No	4	3,275	12,980	25.2%	No	
			Huffman	Robin			College Anthropology Instructor	No	4	2,450	12,980	18.9%	No	
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Greer	Mike	Special Education Teacher	No	4	2,192	12,980	16.9%	No	
					Teeter	Doug	Small Business Owner	No	2	11,847	19,009	62.3%	Yes	
	CALAVERAS	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Tofanelli	Gary	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,147	2,414	47.5%	Yes
						Edson	Cliff	Local Business Owner	No	3	962	2,414	39.9%	No
Kelly						Joe	Retired	No	3	303	2,414	12.6%	No	
2				Full	Wright	Chris	Non-Profit Manager	No	4	1,211	2,932	41.3%	Yes	
					Randall	Bryce	Small Business Owner	No	4	989	2,932	33.7%	No	
					Dell'Orto	Michael	Small Business Owner	No	4	650	2,932	22.2%	No	
					Swartz	Tom	No Ballot Designation	No	4	80	2,932	2.7%	No	
4				Full	Ponte	Debbie	Business Person	No	3	1,351	2,967	45.5%	Yes	
					Tryon	Tom	County Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	3	929	2,967	31.3%	No	
					Thomas	Russell L.	Self-Employed Consultant	No	3	684	2,967	23.1%	No	
DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Yook	Barbara M.	Appointed Incumbent	No	2	8,361	12,854	65.0%	Yes			
			Singer	David K.	Attorney at Law	No	2	4,466	12,854	34.7%	No			
11/6/2012		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Edson	Cliff	Local Business Owner	No	2	2,089	3,715	56.2%	Yes	
					Tofanelli	Gary	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,615	3,715	43.5%	No	
	2		Full	Wright	Chris	Non-Profit Manager	No	2	2,042	3,952	51.7%	Yes		
				Randall	Bryce	Small Business Owner	No	2	1,907	3,952	48.3%	No		
	4		Full	Ponte	Debbie	Business Person	No	2	2,605	4,335	60.1%	Yes		
				Tryon	Tom	County Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	2	1,713	4,335	39.5%	No		
COLUSA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Indrieri	Thomas	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	3	456	787	57.9%	Yes	
					Reische	Thomas	Business Owner	No	3	239	787	30.4%	No	
					Boewer	Curtis R.	Counselor/Retired Administrator	No	3	92	787	11.7%	No	
			3	Full	Marshall	Mark D.	Incumbent	Yes	2	286	488	58.6%	Yes	
					Plachek-Fulcher	Angela	Small Business Owner	No	2	200	488	41.0%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
COLUSA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Evans	Gary J.	Contractor/County Supervisor	Yes	2	331	621	53.3%	Yes
(continued)					Cohen	Kenneth R.	Firefighter	No	2	289	621	46.5%	No
CONTRA COSTA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Andersen	Candace	Mayor of Danville	No	3	29,203	48,985	59.6%	Yes
					Van de Brooke	Tomi D.	Businesswoman/College Trustee	No	3	13,888	48,985	28.4%	No
					White	Sean	Solar Energy Professor	No	3	5,795	48,985	11.8%	No
			3	Full	Piepho	Mary N.	Contra Costa County Supervisor	Yes	1	21,446	22,580	95.0%	Yes
			5	Full	Glover	Federal	Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	1	20,556	21,627	95.0%	Yes
	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Discovery Bay CSD		Full	Pease	Bill	Retired Business Owner	No	3	2,898	7,372	39.3%	Yes
					Simon	Mark	Small Business Owner	Yes	3	2,803	7,372	38.0%	Yes
					Mattison	Jim	Commercial Real Estate	No	3	1,642	7,372	22.3%	No
				Short	Tetreault	Ray	Retired	No	2	2,703	4,441	60.9%	Yes
					Temby	Michael	Realtor	No	2	1,724	4,441	38.8%	No
		DIRECTOR, Dublin-San Ramon CSD		Full	Duarte	Edward R.	General Engineering Contractor	No	4	6,093	22,993	26.5%	Yes
					Howard	Dwight L. 'Pat'	Incumbent	Yes	4	6,039	22,993	26.3%	Yes
					Halket	Rich	Incumbent	Yes	4	5,998	22,993	26.1%	Yes
					Hayes	Scott	Businessman	No	4	4,812	22,993	20.9%	No
		DIRECTOR, Kensington CSD		Full	Toombs	Charles E.	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,886	5,753	32.8%	Yes
					Gillette	Patricia K.	Labor/Employment Lawyer	No	5	1,875	5,753	32.6%	Yes
					Kosel	Cathie E.	Educator/Small Businesswoman	Yes	5	736	5,753	12.8%	No
					Hausken	Jim	Retired Teacher	No	5	735	5,753	12.8%	No
					Zvik	Kim	IT Consultant	No	5	512	5,753	8.9%	No
DEL NORTE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gitlin	Roger	Educator	No	3	313	714	43.8%	Yes
					McNamer	Leslie	Incumbent	Yes	3	297	714	41.6%	No
					Westfall	Donna A.	Councilwoman Political Activist	No	3	104	714	14.6%	No
			2	Full	McClure	Martha	Incumbent Supervisor/Educator	Yes	2	490	945	51.9%	Yes
					Gray	Bill	Attorney at Law	No	2	455	945	48.1%	No
			5	Full	Finigan	David	Supervisor District 5	No	2	855	1,292	66.2%	Yes
					Childs	Larry	Businessman	No	2	437	1,292	33.8%	No
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gitlin	Roger	Educator	No	2	650	1,237	52.5%	Yes
					McNamer	Leslie	Incumbent	Yes	2	587	1,237	47.5%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
DEL NORTE (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Smith River CSD		Full	Silva	Ernie	Incumbent	Yes	4	305	981	31.1%	Yes
					Reichlin	Tim	Incumbent	Yes	4	272	981	27.7%	Yes
					Flowers	Jim	Registered Nurse/Businessman	No	4	248	981	25.3%	No
					Edwards	Lisa A.	No Ballot Designation	No	4	156	981	15.9%	No
EL DORADO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Mikulaco	Ron 'Mik'	Small Business Owner	No	2	4,981	9,218	54.0%	Yes
					Knight	John R.	Supervisor, El Dorado County	Yes	2	4,237	9,218	46.0%	No
			2	Full	Nutting	Ray	Rancher/County Supervisor	Yes	2	6,916	10,097	68.5%	Yes
					Turnboo	George	Local Business Owner	No	2	3,181	10,097	31.5%	No
			3	Full	Veerkamp	Brian K.	Retired Administrator/Instructor	No	6	3,262	9,956	32.8%	Yes
					Barb	Richard	Small Business Owner	No	6	2,347	9,956	23.6%	No
					Hamilton	A.L.	Senior Citizens Attorney	No	6	2,085	9,956	20.9%	No
					Taylor	Sue	Building Designer	No	6	1,169	9,956	11.7%	No
					Nerwinski	Cathy	Retired Investigator	No	6	884	9,956	8.9%	No
					Amaro	Allen	Retired Businessman	No	6	209	9,956	2.1%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	7	Full	Stracener	Warren	Superior Court Judge	No	3	17,728	41,795	42.4%	Yes
					Hoffman	Joseph	Attorney at Law/Judge Pro Tem	No	3	15,347	41,795	36.7%	No
					Valentine	Steve	Retired Court Commissioner	No	3	8,720	41,795	20.9%	No
		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Veerkamp	Brian K.	Retired Fire Chief	No	2	8,846	16,003	55.3%	Yes
					Barb	Richard	Small Business Owner	No	2	7,157	16,003	44.7%	No
			DIRECTOR, Cameron Park CSD	Full	Neibauer	Vicky	Budget Analyst	No	3	4,804	11,100	43.3%	Yes
					Tucker	Sean	Manager/Appointed Director	No	3	3,440	11,100	31.0%	Yes
					Theusen	Joe	Emergency Dispatch Supervisor	No	3	2,856	11,100	25.7%	No
			DIRECTOR, El Dorado Hills CSD	Full	Mattock	Noelle	Policy/Administrative Analyst	Yes	6	5,390	25,627	21.0%	Yes
					Crumpley	Terry	Small Business Owner	No	6	5,389	25,627	21.0%	Yes
					Hammond	Charles E.	Businessman/Youth Coach	No	6	4,682	25,627	18.3%	No
					Gertsch	Guy	Businessman/Director	Yes	6	3,768	25,627	14.7%	No
					Clark	Don	Systems Engineer	No	6	3,587	25,627	14.0%	No
Tobin	Bill				Data Analyst	No	6	2,811	25,627	11.0%	No		
DIRECTOR, Greenstone Country CSD	Full		Rozman	Rod R.	Retired Engineer	No	4	348	1,133	30.7%	Yes		
			Schmidt	Daniel	Retired Business Owner	No	4	344	1,133	30.4%	Yes		
		Drouin	Bertram C.	Incumbent	Yes	4	305	1,133	26.9%	Yes			
		Huckeba	Aaron	Student/Office Manager	No	4	136	1,133	12.0%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
EL DORADO (continued)	11/6/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE	7	Full	Stracener	Warren	Superior Court Judge	No	2	38,826	73,466	52.8%	Yes	
					Hoffman	Joseph	Attorney at Law	No	2	34,640	73,466	47.2%	No	
FRESNO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Borgeas	Andreas	Councilman/Law Professor	No	3	18,176	35,093	51.8%	Yes	
					Fortune	Larry	Business Owner	No	3	11,106	35,093	31.6%	No	
					Harkness	Deborah	Criminal Sentencing Consultant	No	3	5,709	35,093	16.3%	No	
	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Del Rey CSD			Full	Perea	Henry	Fresno County Supervisor	Yes	1	9,547	10,125	94.3%	Yes
						Poochigian	Debbie	Fresno County Supervisor	Yes	2	24,113	30,545	78.9%	Yes
						Kril	Maria	Social Worker Fractioned	No	2	6,308	30,545	20.7%	No
						Villareal	Walter O.	Firefighter/School Trustee	No	3	127	289	43.9%	Yes
					Diaz	Lionel L.	Retired Manager	No	3	80	289	27.7%	Yes	
					Rodriguez	Eduardo	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	74	289	25.6%	No	
GLENN	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Viegas	John K.	Incumbent	Yes	1	803	803	100.0%	Yes	
					Soeth	Steven	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,128	1,128	100.0%	Yes	
					McDaniel	Leigh W.	Incumbent	Yes	2	601	828	72.6%	Yes	
					Campos	Jesus V.	Retired Teacher	No	2	227	828	27.4%	No	
HUMBOLDT	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bohn	Rex H.	Resource Specialist	No	3	4,790	7,563	63.3%	Yes	
					Seidner	Cheryl A.	Retired	No	3	2,185	7,563	28.9%	No	
					De Modena	Annette	Retired Educator	No	3	560	7,563	7.4%	No	
	2	Full	Fennell	Estelle	Executive Director	No	2	3,655	6,950	52.6%	Yes			
			Clendenen	Clif	Humboldt County 2nd Dist. Supervisor	Yes	2	3,262	6,950	46.9%	No			
			Lovelace	Mark	Humboldt County 3rd Dist. Supervisor	Yes	2	4,109	6,121	67.1%	Yes			
			Brooks	Karen	Business Advisor	No	2	1,979	6,121	32.3%	No			
IMPERIAL	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Terrazas	Jesus 'Jack'	Incumbent	Yes	1	3,295	3,295	100.0%	Yes	
					Kelley	Michael W.	County Supervisor	Yes	1	2,806	2,806	100.0%	Yes	
	4	Full	Kelley	Ryan	Council Member	No	2	2,061	3,832	53.8%	Yes			
			Couchman	Sam	Brawley City Councilman	No	2	1,771	3,832	46.2%	No			
	1	Full	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Ulloa	Juan	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	10,543	16,474	64.0%	Yes	
					Rodriguez	Marco	Attorney	No	2	5,931	16,474	36.0%	No	
					Altamirano	Diane	Judge of the Superior Court	No	2	8,541	16,624	51.4%	Yes	
					Quan	William D.	Attorney at Law	No	2	8,083	16,624	48.6%	No	
4	Full	Anderholt	Brooks	Trial Attorney	No	2	8,705	16,916	51.5%	Yes				
		Montenegro	Ruth B.	Judge of the Superior Court	No	2	8,211	16,916	48.5%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED					
INYO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Griffiths	Jeff	Bishop City Councilmember	Yes	3	434	816	53.2%	Yes					
					Cash	Susan	Second District Supervisor	Yes	3	270			No					
					Aldridge	Russ	Small Business Owner	No	3	112			No					
			4	Full	Fortney	Marty	Fourth District Supervisor	Yes	4	432			1,093	39.5%	Yes			
					Tillemans	Mark	No Ballot Designation	Yes	4	356			1,093	32.6%	No			
					Weisman	Nina	Law Enforcement Officer	No	4	263			1,093	24.1%	No			
					Dangwillo	Christopher	Educator	No	4	42			1,093	3.8%	No			
			5	Full	Kingsley	Matt	Retired Fire Chief	Yes	3	398			856	46.5%	Yes			
					Gentry	Jim	No Ballot Designation	No	3	279					32.6%	No		
	Cervantes	Richard			5th District Supervisor	Yes	3	179	20.9%	No								
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Tillemans	Mark	No Ballot Designation	Yes	2	784	1,558	50.3%	Yes					
					Fortney	Marty	Fourth District Supervisor	Yes	2	774			49.7%	No				
			5	Full	Kingsley	Matt	Retired Fire Chief	Yes	2	658			1,185	55.5%	Yes			
					Gentry	Jim	Mechanic	No	2	527					44.5%	No		
			KERN	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gleason	Mick	Business Development Director			No	8	6,929	22,637	30.6%	Yes
Ashburn								Roy	Board Member	No			8	3,786	16.7%			No
Stephens	Daures	Retire Senior Deputy						No	8	3,142	13.9%	No						
Ramirez	Sam	Teacher/Councilmember/Businessman						No	8	2,551	11.3%	No						
Freeland	Dave	County Commissioner/Consultant						No	8	2,548	11.3%	No						
Holloway	Marshall	Realtor/Businessman						No	8	1,764	7.8%	No						
Escudero	H.C.	Communications Specialist						No	8	1,009	4.5%	No						
Hess	Deborah	Region Manager						No	8	908	4.0%	No						
4	Full	Couch				David	Financial Advisor/Councilmember	No	2	13,191	23,110	57.1%	Yes					
		Pinson				Harley	Petroleum Counsel	No	2	9,919			42.9%	No				
5	Full	Perez				Leticia	Senate District Coordinator	No	3	5,722	10,881	52.6%	Yes					
		Goh				Karen	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	3,954			36.3%	No				
		Tarver				Tim	Mayor, City of Arvin	No	3	1,205			11.1%	No				
		SUPERIOR JUDGE				15	Full	Pritchard	Kenneth G.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	1	77,753	77,753	100.0%			Yes
11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1				Full	Gleason	Mick	Business Development Director	No	2	24,655	41,700	59.1%	Yes			
				Ashburn	Roy		Board Member	No	2	17,045	40.9%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
KERN (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Arvin CSD		Full	Rosales	Roy M.	Mailman	Yes	7	794	2,950	26.9%	Yes	
					Reyna	Aurelio	Teacher/Coach	No	7	721	2,950	24.4%	Yes	
					Ortiz	Jess	Retired Fire Captain	No	7	483	2,950	16.4%	No	
					Alvarez	Maria	Incumbent	Yes	7	415	2,950	14.1%	No	
					Ortiz	Maria G.	Home Maker	No	7	277	2,950	9.4%	No	
					Herd	Richard	Retired Winery Worker	No	7	156	2,950	5.3%	No	
					Villanueva	Alejandro	Sales Representative	No	7	104	2,950	3.5%	No	
					Short	Urueta	Jude A.	Water Distribution Operator	No	2	1,203	1,874	64.2%	Yes
					Kincy	Raymond	Retired District Manager	No	2	671	1,874	35.8%	No	
					DIRECTOR, Bear Valley CSD	Full	Zanutto	Rick	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,320	5,039	26.2%
		Laclaire	Charlene	Retired	No	6	1,223	5,039	24.3%	Yes				
		Miller	Scott	Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	6	891	5,039	17.7%	No				
		Ritchie	Walter	Retired Teacher	No	6	806	5,039	16.0%	No				
		Reed	Chuck	Retired Operator	No	6	447	5,039	8.9%	No				
		McKeehan	John V.	Real Estate Salesman	No	6	352	5,039	7.0%	No				
		DIRECTOR, Golden Hills CSD	Full	Cassil	Kathy	Retired Teacher	Yes	7	1,523	6,631	23.0%	Yes		
		Kennedy	Eldwin 'Ed'	Appointed Incumbent	No	7	1,105	6,631	16.7%	Yes				
		Barrett	Larry	Realtor/Computer Teacher	No	7	1,054	6,631	15.9%	Yes				
		Baumgarten	Allen O.	Board Director	No	7	820	6,631	12.4%	No				
		Cornyn	Phil	Retired Electrician Supervisor	No	7	816	6,631	12.3%	No				
Foster	John	Retired	No	7	745	6,631	11.2%	No						
Oliver	Daulton	City Building Official	No	7	568	6,631	8.6%	No						
DIRECTOR, Rosamond CSD	Full	Glennan	Byron	Educator	Yes	5	1,597	6,850	23.3%	Yes				
Wallis	Alfred E.	Licensed Electrical Contractor	No	5	1,400	6,850	20.4%	Yes						
MackKay	Morrison 'Ed'	Retired Businessman	No	5	1,366	6,850	19.9%	No						
Melchers	Charlene	Appointed Incumbent	No	5	1,306	6,850	19.1%	No						
Melchers	Gene R.	General Contractor	No	5	1,181	6,850	17.2%	No						
DIRECTOR, Stallion Springs CSD	Full	Burt	David L.	Incumbent	Yes	4	751	2,733	27.5%	Yes				
Gunshinan	Irene E.	Incumbent	Yes	4	741	2,733	27.1%	Yes						
Lamkin	Clydell	Retired	No	4	637	2,733	23.3%	Yes						
Martinez	Martel	Engineer	No	4	604	2,733	22.1%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
KINGS	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Valle	Richard	Kings County Supervisor	Yes	5	883	1,996	44.2%	Yes		
					Hoggard	Ron	City Manager	No	5	429	1,996	21.5%	No		
					La Mattino	Brandon	Businessman/Boardmember	No	5	369	1,996	18.5%	No		
					Craighead	Sid	Retired Educator	No	5	167	1,996	8.4%	No		
					Chavez	Donald U.	Retired Businessman	No	5	148	1,996	7.4%	No		
	5	Full	Fagundes	Richard L.	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,606	4,565	57.1%	Yes				
			Felleke	Bezabih 'Buzz'	Businessman	No	2	1,959	4,565	42.9%	No				
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Giuliani	Jennifer Lee	Attorney	No	2	7,249	14,441	50.2%	Yes	
						Orndoff	George L.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	7,192	14,441	49.8%	No	
		11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Valle	Richard	Kings County Supervisor	Yes	2	2,454	3,963	61.9%	Yes	
Hoggard						Ron	City Manager	No	2	1,509	3,963	38.1%	No		
LAKE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Comstock	Jim	Rancher/County Supervisor	Yes	2	1,661	2,684	61.9%	Yes		
					Brandon	Victoria	Retired Writer/Editor	No	2	1,023	2,684	38.1%	No		
					4	Full	Farrington	Anthony W.	County Supervisor	Yes	2	2,241	3,192	70.2%	Yes
							Langston	Fred	Business Owner/Instructor	No	2	945	3,192	29.6%	No
					5	Full	Brown	Rob	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	2,145	3,142	68.3%	Yes
	Moss	Joan	Journalist/Musician	No			2	986	3,142	31.4%	No				
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Lunas	Michael S.	Attorney/Judicial Arbitrator	No	4	4,043	13,151	30.7%	Yes	
						Conard	Judy	Attorney	No	4	3,344	13,151	25.4%	No	
						Friel	Michael H.	Attorney/College Instructor	No	4	3,106	13,151	23.6%	No	
						Krones	Susan	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	2,612	13,151	19.9%	No	
11/6/2012						SUPERIOR JUDGE	Lunas	Michael S.	Attorney/Judicial Arbitrator	No	2	12,271	21,735	56.5%	Yes
	Conard	Judy	Attorney	No	2		9,464	21,735	43.5%	No					
LASSEN	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pyle	Robert F.	Farmer/Supervisor	Yes	2	836	1,650	50.7%	Yes		
					Hodge	Jean	Retired Dental Hygienist	No	2	809	1,650	49.0%	No		
	2	Full	Chapman	Jim	Lassen County Supervisor, District 2	Yes	2	638	1,165	54.8%	Yes				
			Pezzullo	Stephen	Certified Public Accountant	No	2	517	1,165	44.4%	No				
	4	Full	Albaugh	Aaron	Rancher	No	3	787	1,323	59.5%	Yes				
			Bonham	Kurt	Certified Public Accountant	No	3	374	1,323	28.3%	No				
			Spanton	Thomas H.	General Building Contractor	No	3	158	1,323	11.9%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
LASSEN (continued)	6/5/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Burns	Bob	Lassen County District Attorney	No	5	2,336	7,168	32.6%	Yes			
					Nakanishi	Jon A.	Family Court Attorney	No	5	1,961	7,168	27.4%	No			
					Mallery	Tony	Attorney	No	5	1,548	7,168	21.6%	No			
					Talia	Peter M.	Attorney	No	5	715	7,168	10.0%	No			
					King	Stephen	Attorney/Retired CHP	No	5	600	7,168	8.4%	No			
	11/6/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Mallery	Tony	Attorney, Small Businessman	No	2	5,925	10,483	56.5%	Yes			
					Burns	Bob	Lassen County District Attorney	No	2	4,558	10,483	43.5%	No			
	LOS ANGELES	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Ridley-Thomas	Mark	Supervisor, 2nd District	Yes	1	93,943	93,943	100.0%	Yes		
						4	Full	Knabe	Don	Supervisor, 4th District	Yes	1	137,176	137,176	100.0%	Yes
								5	Full	Antonovich	M.D.	Supervisor, Los Angeles County	Yes	2	163,343	205,326
Kahlon						Raj P.	Business Owner			No	2	41,983	205,326	20.4%	No	
DISTRICT ATTORNEY						Full	Lacey	Jackie	Chief Deputy D.A.	No	6	255,831	803,693	31.8%	Yes	
							Jackson	Alan	Gang Homicide Prosecutor	No	6	190,792	803,693	23.7%	No	
							Trutanich	Carmen	Los Angeles City Prosecutor	No	6	179,095	803,693	22.3%	No	
							Meyers	Danette E.	Senior Deputy DA	No	6	108,271	803,693	13.5%	No	
							Grace	Bobby	Deputy District Attorney	No	6	42,009	803,693	5.2%	No	
			Breault III	John L.	Deputy District Attorney		No	6	27,695	803,693	3.4%	No				
SUPERIOR JUDGE			10	Full	Kumar	Sanjay T.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	441,631	726,018	60.8%	Yes			
					Smith	Kim	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	284,387	726,018	39.2%	No			
			11	Full	Harmon	Eric	Gang Homicide Prosecutor	No	3	442,830	725,131	61.1%	Yes			
					Paraseghian	Berj	Environmental Attorney	No	3	147,540	725,131	20.3%	No			
					Brees	Ben M.	Consumer Attorney	No	3	134,761	725,131	18.6%	No			
			3	Full	Coen	Sean D.	Gang Homicide Prosecutor	No	4	380,063	737,409	51.5%	Yes			
					Gold	Craig	Criminal Trial Prosecutor	No	4	139,087	737,409	18.9%	No			
					Escalante	Joe	Attorney/Legal Commentator	No	4	134,784	737,409	18.3%	No			
Kaldor					Laurence N.	Domestic Violence Litigator	No	4	83,475	737,409	11.3%	No				
38			Full	Olson	Lynn D.	Judge of the Superior Court, Office Number 38	Yes	2	477,843	686,700	69.6%	Yes				
				Weitzman	Douglas W.	Consumer Rights Attorney	No	2	208,857	686,700	30.4%	No				
65			Full	Thompson	Andrea C.	Child Molestation Prosecutor	No	3	393,497	712,455	55.2%	Yes				
				Knight	Shannon	Gang Homicide Prosecutor	No	3	177,309	712,455	24.9%	No				
	Schonbrun	Matt		Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	141,649	712,455	19.9%	No						
78	Full	Otto	James D.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	498,986	713,209	70.0%	Yes						
		Hughey	Kenneth R.	Retired Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	214,223	713,209	30.0%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
LOS ANGELES (continued)	11/6/2012	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Lacey	Jackie	Chief Deputy D.A.	No	2	1,503,629	2,730,745	55.1%	Yes			
					Jackson	Alan	Gang Homicide Prosecutor	No	2	1,227,116	2,730,745	44.9%	No			
MADERA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Svanda	Gary L.	Businessman/City Councilman	No	4	1,393	3,611	38.6%	Yes			
					Farinelli	Rick	Self Employed Businessman	No	4	1,036	3,611	28.7%	No			
					Barreras	Isabel	Administrative Assistant/Trustee	No	4	885	3,611	24.5%	No			
					Goodwin	Loraine	Physician/Arbitrator/Teacher	No	4	297	3,611	8.2%	No			
					Rodriguez	Max	Madera County Supervisor	Yes	1	753	753	100.0%	Yes			
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Soldani	Joseph A.	Judge of the Superior Court	No	2	10,747	17,539	61.3%	Yes
					Austin	Brian	Attorney	No	2	6,792	17,539	38.7%	No			
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Farinelli	Rick	Self Employed Businessman	No	2	3,551	7,073	50.2%	Yes			
					Svanda	Gary L.	Businessman/City Councilman	No	2	3,490	7,073	49.3%	No			
MARIN	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Rice	Katie	Marin County Supervisor	No	3	10,321	15,080	68.4%	Yes			
					Weinsoff	David	Fairfax Councilmember/Attorney	No	3	3,174	15,080	21.0%	No			
					Long	Eva	Educator/Administrator	No	3	1,538	15,080	10.2%	No			
					Sears	Katherin	Member, Marin County Board of Supervisors	No	1	10,521	10,784	97.6%	Yes			
					Kinsey	Steve	Incumbent	Yes	2	6,849	10,830	63.2%	Yes			
					Furst	Diane	Corte Madera Vice Mayor	No	2	3,953	10,830	36.5%	No			
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Chou	James	Marin County Superior Court Judge	No	2	47,122	57,642	81.7%	Yes
										Marne	Russell K.	Attorney at Law	No	2	10,322	57,642
MARIPOSA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Jones	Merlin	Businessman	No	6	523	1,024	51.1%	Yes			
					Dalton	Gene	Medical First Responder	No	6	164	1,024	16.0%	No			
					Mueller	Dwight	Retired Police Officer	No	6	129	1,024	12.6%	No			
					Love	Kathleen	Realtor	No	6	87	1,024	8.5%	No			
					Ross	Emery	Rancher	No	6	78	1,024	7.6%	No			
					Willey	Kenneth	Business Owner	No	6	43	1,024	4.2%	No			
					Cann	Kevin	Incumbent	Yes	1	872	872	100.0%	Yes			
					Mee	Ed	Retired Law Enforcement	No	3	573	1,297	44.2%	Yes			
					Carrier	John	Chief, Mobile Equipment	No	3	488	1,297	37.6%	No			
					Loberg	L.P.	Civil Engineer	No	3	236	1,297	18.2%	No			
					11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Carrier	John	Chief, Mobile Equipment	No	2	1,108	1,974	56.1%
Mee	Ed	Retired Law Enforcement	No	2					859	1,974	43.5%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED				
MARIPOSA (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Lake Don Pedro CSD	1	Full	Johnson	Danny	No Ballot Designation	No	5	391	1,394	28.0%	Yes				
					Day	Charles	Army Officer-Planner	No	5	322	1,394	23.1%	Yes				
					Ross	Emery	Rancher	Yes	5	299	1,394	21.4%	Yes				
					Skoien	Mark	Appointed Incumbent	No	5	266	1,394	19.1%	No				
					Kinsella	William 'Bill'	Incumbent	Yes	5	110	1,394	7.9%	No				
MENDOCINO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brown	Carrie	Incumbent	Yes	1	2,602	2,752	94.5%	Yes				
					2	Full	McCowen	John	County Supervisor	Yes	2	2,005	2,996	66.9%	Yes		
							Longoria	Andrea	Substance Abuse Counselor	No	2	975	2,996	32.5%	No		
					4	Full	Gjerde	Dan	Fort Bragg Councilmember	No	1	3,130	3,408	91.8%	Yes		
MERCED	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pedrozo	John	Farmer/County Supervisor	Yes	4	1,393	2,886	48.3%	Yes				
					Pacheco	Jim	Deputy Sheriff Sergeant	No	4	936	2,886	32.4%	No				
					Gioletti	Peggi	Student/Substitute Teacher	No	4	354	2,886	12.3%	No				
					Varela Sr.	Daniel	Dispatch Supervisor	No	4	197	2,886	6.8%	No				
	2	Full	Walsh	Hubert 'Hub'	County Supervisor	Yes	2	4,284	7,050	60.8%	Yes						
			Steed	Casey	Business Owner	No	2	2,724	7,050	38.6%	No						
	4	Full	Kelsey	Deidre F.	Businesswoman/County Supervisor	Yes	1	3,264	3,406	95.8%	Yes						
						No	2	2,973	8,022	37.1%	No						
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pedrozo	John	Farmer/County Supervisor	Yes	2	5,024	8,022	62.6%	Yes				
					Pacheco	Jim	Deputy Sheriff Sargent	No	2	2,973	8,022	37.1%	No				
DIRECTOR, Midway CSD			Full	Weaver	Barbara	Incumbent	Yes	3	74	195	37.9%	Yes					
				Ochoa Jr.	Adolfo	Realtor	No	3	71	195	36.4%	Yes					
				Reese	Larry	Incumbent	Yes	3	48	195	24.6%	No					
MODOC	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Pedersen	John	Retired Civil Engineer	No	2	356	526	67.7%	Yes				
					Bullock	Jeffrey D.	Incumbent	Yes	2	161	526	30.6%	No				
					3	Full	Alves	Kathy	Retired City Treasurer	No	1	432	451	95.8%	Yes		
					4	Full	Wills	James	Retired CHP	No	4	267	547	48.8%	Yes		
							Owens	Pamela J.	Retired Sheriff's Sergeant	No	4	159	547	29.1%	No		
	Crabtree	Loren 'Shorty'	Incumbent	Yes			4	81	547	14.8%	No						
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Naylor	David	Retired Public Works	No	4	38	547	6.9%	No				
					Wills	James	Retired CHP	No	2	391	759	51.5%	Yes				
					Owens	Pamela J.	Small Business Owner	No	2	368	759	48.5%	No				
					MONO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Stump	Fred	Fire Chief	No	2	489	883	55.4%
Hazard										Duane 'Hap'	Incumbent	Yes	2	394	883	44.6%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
MONO (continued)	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Alpers	Timothy P.	Retired Rancher	No	2	454	673	67.5%	Yes
					Bauer	Vikki M.	Incumbent	Yes	2	219	673	32.5%	No
			4	Full	Peters	Bob	Business Owner	No	3	308	716	43.0%	Yes
					Fesko	Tim	Small Business Owner	No	3	281	716	39.2%	No
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Huggans	Jan K.	Business Owner/Rentals	No	3	127	716	17.7%	No
					Fesko	Tim	Business Owner/Contractor	No	2	579	1,079	53.7%	Yes
					Peters	Bob	Business Owner	No	2	500	1,079	46.3%	No
MONTEREY	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Armenta	Fernando	Incumbent	Yes	3	2,246	5,026	44.7%	Yes
					Barrera	Tony	Councilmember/Educator/Businessman	No	3	1,438	5,026	28.6%	No
					Sanchez	Sergio	Councilmember/District Director	No	3	1,342	5,026	26.7%	No
	4	Full	Parker	Jane	Monterey County Supervisor	Yes	2	6,773	11,982	56.5%	Yes		
			Smith	Byrl	Monterey County Board of Education Trustee	No	2	5,209	11,982	43.5%	No		
	5	Full	Del Piero	Marc	Attorney/Federal Bankruptcy Trustee	No	3	9,470	22,285	42.5%	Yes		
			Potter	Dave	Monterey County Supervisor	Yes	3	9,465	22,285	42.5%	No		
			Garcia	Carmelita	Pacific Grove Mayor	No	3	3,350	22,285	15.0%	No		
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Armenta	Fernando	Incumbent	Yes	2	6,726	12,447	54.0%	Yes
					Barrera	Tony	Salinas City Councilmember District 2	No	2	5,721	12,447	46.0%	No
			5	Full	Potter	Dave	Monterey County Supervisor	Yes	2	22,013	40,119	54.9%	Yes
				Del Piero	Marc	Attorney	No	2	18,106	40,119	45.1%	No	
NAPA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Luce	Mark	Napa County Supervisor	Yes	3	2,806	6,573	42.7%	Yes
					Van Gorder	Mark	Napa Vice Mayor	No	3	1,911	6,573	29.1%	No
					Inman	Juliana	City Councilmember/Architect	No	3	1,856	6,573	28.2%	No
	4	Full	Dodd	Bill	Napa County Supervisor	Yes	1	4,051	4,051	100.0%	Yes		
			5	Full	Caldwell	Keith	Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	1	3,417	3,417	100.0%	Yes
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Luce	Mark	Napa County Supervisor	Yes	2	5,829	11,196	52.1%	Yes
					Van Gorder	Mark	Napa Vice Mayor	No	2	5,367	11,196	47.9%	No
NEVADA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Beason	Nate	1st District Supervisor	Yes	4	4,027	6,957	57.9%	Yes
					McGuire	Sue	Business Owner/Attorney	No	4	2,079	6,957	29.9%	No
					Bulf	Alfred 'Al'	Strategic Planner	No	4	718	6,957	10.3%	No
					Meyer	Louis	No Ballot Designation	No	4	133	6,957	1.9%	No
	2	Full	Scofield	Ed	Incumbent	Yes	1	5,141	5,147	99.9%	Yes		
			5	Full	Anderson	Richard	Truckee Council Member	No	2	2,022	3,052	66.3%	Yes
					Rogers	Mike	Local Business Owner	No	2	1,030	3,052	33.7%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
NEVADA (continued)	6/5/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Anderson	Tom	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	16,703	27,001	61.9%	Yes		
					Smyrnos	George J.	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	10,298	27,001	38.1%	No		
ORANGE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Nguyen	Janet	Orange County Supervisor, 1st District	Yes	2	37,106	50,008	74.2%	Yes		
					Rocco	Steve	Retired Educator	No	2	12,902	50,008	25.8%	No		
					Spitzer	Todd	Businessman/Victims Advocate	No	2	53,322	77,437	68.9%	Yes		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Pauly	Deborah	Councilwoman, City of Villa Park	No	2	24,115	77,437	31.1%	No		
					Chuang	Deborah J.	Judge of the Superior Court	No	2	252,740	333,813	75.7%	Yes		
					Jizhak	Eugene	General Practice Attorney	No	2	80,906	333,813	24.2%	No		
PLACER	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Holmes	Jim	Retired Business Owner	Yes	2	8,871	13,565	65.4%	Yes		
					Grigas	Robert	Small Business Owner	No	2	4,626	13,565	34.1%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Uhler	Kirk	Businessman/Placer County Supervisor	Yes	2	9,018	14,906	60.5%	Yes		
					Tobin	Pam	Director, San Juan Water District	No	2	5,845	14,906	39.2%	No		
					Montgomery	Jennifer	Placer County Supervisor	Yes	5	10,123	18,698	54.1%	Yes		
					Johnson	Jerry	Businessman/Police Officer	No	5	3,131	18,698	16.7%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	Johnson	Richard A.	Retired Forest Ranger	No	5	2,603	18,698	13.9%	No		
					Wright	Mark	Software Engineer	No	5	1,448	18,698	7.7%	No		
					Johnson	Gary T.	Retired Peace Officer	No	5	1,340	18,698	7.2%	No		
					Horst	Garen	Deputy District Attorney	No	1	57,944	57,944	100.0%	Yes		
			4	Full	Gazzaniga	Suzanne	Deputy District Attorney	No	1	57,860	57,860	100.0%	Yes		
PLUMAS	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Swofford	Terry	Plumas County Supervisor	Yes	3	530	962	55.1%	Yes		
					Powers	Bill	School Teacher	No	3	242	962	25.2%	No		
					Gault	Michelle	General Manager Restaurant	No	3	189	962	19.6%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Goss	Kevin	Businessman Pharmacy Manager	No	1	1,174	1,177	99.7%	Yes		
					4	Full	Simpson	Lori	Plumas County Supervisor	Yes	3	741	1,183	62.6%	Yes
							Huffman	James	Small Business Owner	No	3	279	1,183	23.6%	No
							Gossett	Barry	Auto Dealer	No	3	160	1,183	13.5%	No
RIVERSIDE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Buster	Bob	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	3	16,335	42,743	38.2%	Yes		
					Jeffries	Kevin	Small Business Owner	No	3	13,540	42,743	31.7%	No		
					Soubirous	Mike	Retired CHP Commander	No	3	12,868	42,743	30.1%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Stone	Jeff	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	29,883	45,158	66.2%	Yes		
					Scarafone	Joe	Retired Border Agent	No	2	15,275	45,158	33.8%	No		
					1	Full	Cameron	Victoria	Superior Court Judge	No	2	126,925	199,776	63.5%	Yes
Eckhardt	Tom	Constitutional Lawyer	No	2			72,851	199,776	36.5%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
RIVERSIDE (continued)	6/5/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE	12	Full	Tranbarger	Gary B.	Judge of the Superior Court	No	2	112,545	195,002	57.7%	Yes
					Nixon	Richard T.	Retired Riverside County Prosecutor	No	2	82,457	195,002	42.3%	No
			2	Full	Cox	James 'Jim'	Superior Court Judge	No	2	112,754	196,813	57.3%	Yes
					Kennedy	Michael J.	Constitutional Defense Attorney	No	2	84,059	196,813	42.7%	No
			9	Full	Reimer	Craig G.	Judge, Riverside Superior Court	No	2	100,997	198,963	50.8%	Yes
					Henry	John A.	Sex Crimes Prosecutor	No	2	97,966	198,963	49.2%	No
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Jeffries	Kevin	Small Business Owner	No	2	53,996	107,242	50.3%	Yes
					Buster	Bob	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	2	53,246	107,242	49.7%	No
			2	Full	Anderson	Betty A.	Incumbent	Yes	2	13,228	21,891	60.4%	Yes
					Gonzales	Arthur I.	No Ballot Designation	No	2	8,663	21,891	39.6%	No
4	Full	Blais	Chad	Water Engineer	No	2	12,027	21,373	56.3%	Yes			
		Bogart	Kathryn	Incumbent	Yes	2	9,346	21,373	43.7%	No			
SACRAMENTO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Peters	Susan	County Supervisor/Businesswoman	Yes	2	30,539	46,865	65.2%	Yes
					Kravitz	Jeff	Constitutional Law Attorney	No	2	16,202	46,865	34.6%	No
			4	Full	MacGlashan	Roberta J.	Sacramento County Supervisor	Yes	3	20,814	41,443	50.2%	Yes
					Sams	Julie	Businesswoman	No	3	11,092	41,443	26.8%	No
					Blenner	Gary N.	Teacher/Educator	No	3	9,436	41,443	22.8%	No
			3	Full	Bogert	Tami	Superior Court Judge	No	2	134,241	189,887	70.7%	Yes
	Star	Keven			Legal Counsel	No	2	55,646	189,887	29.3%	No		
	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Rancho Murieta CSD	Full	Martel	Mike	State Prison Warden	No	3	1,973	4,833	40.8%	Yes	
				Ferraro	Betty	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,642	4,833	34.0%	Yes	
				Mobley	Steven C.	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,218	4,833	25.2%	No	
SAN BENITO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Barrios	Margie	Member Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	975	1,869	52.2%	Yes
					Starritt	Mark	General Building Contractor	No	2	883	1,869	47.2%	No
			2	Full	Botelho	Anthony	Farmer	Yes	2	1,195	2,086	57.3%	Yes
					Medina	Arturo 'Art'	Small Business Owner	No	2	885	2,086	42.4%	No
			5	Full	De La Cruz	Jaime	Member Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	821	1,259	65.2%	Yes
					Flores	Sonny	Property Manager	No	2	429	1,259	34.1%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
SAN BERNARDINO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Lovingood	Robert A.	Business Owner	No	7	7,710	36,376	21.2%	Yes	
					Roelle	Rick	Sheriffs' Lieutenant/Councilman	No	7	7,050	36,376	19.4%	No	
					Henry	Bret L.	Fire Captain	No	7	5,363	36,376	14.7%	No	
					Smith	Bob	Retired Sheriff's Detective	No	7	5,253	36,376	14.4%	No	
					Blewett	Russell E.	Small Businessman/Mayor	No	7	5,222	36,376	14.4%	No	
					Orme	Michael	Businessman	No	7	2,972	36,376	8.2%	No	
					Wright Sr.	Jermaine	Small Business Owner	No	7	2,806	36,376	7.7%	No	
	3	Full	Ramos	James C.	Businessman/College Boardmember	No	3	23,719	50,310	47.1%	Yes			
			Derry	Neil	County Supervisor	No	3	16,551	50,310	32.9%	No			
			Bagley	Jim	Defense Department Employee	No	3	10,040	50,310	20.0%	No			
	5	Full	Gonzales	Josie	San Bernardino County Supervisor 5th District	Yes	3	13,706	21,709	63.1%	Yes			
			Taack	John	Small Business Owner	No	3	5,215	21,709	24.0%	No			
			Marroquin	Silvia J.	Community Organizer	No	3	2,788	21,709	12.8%	No			
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Lovingood	Robert A.	Business Owner	No	2	49,502	96,378	51.4%	Yes	
					Roelle	Rick	Sheriff's Lieutenant/Councilman	No	2	46,876	96,378	48.6%	No	
		3	Full	Ramos	James C.	Businessman/College Boardmember	No	2	67,382	113,951	59.1%	Yes		
				Derry	Neil	County Supervisor	Yes	2	46,569	113,951	40.9%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Big Bear City CSD	Full	Terry	Paul E.	Retired Accountant	Yes	3	2,634	5,942	44.3%	Yes		
				Walsh	Larry	Retired	Yes	3	2,321	5,942	39.1%	Yes		
				McDonald	Marge	Retired	No	3	987	5,942	16.6%	No		
				Short	Oxandaboure	Karyn	Retired Administrative Manager	No	4	1,867	3,770	49.5%	Yes	
Zeigler					Al	Retired Small Businessman	No	4	762	3,770	20.2%	No		
Ybarra					Bob	Inside Salesman	No	4	629	3,770	16.7%	No		
Kelly					Joseph	Retired Commercial Pilot	No	4	512	3,770	13.6%	No		
DIRECTOR, Big River CSD		Full	Hall	Donald J.	Retired	No	6	105	542	19.4%	Yes			
			Wells	Susanne M.	Retired	No	6	96	542	17.7%	Yes			
			Hall	Joan L.	Incumbent	Yes	6	92	542	17.0%	Yes			
			Perez	Steve	Appointed Incumbent	No	6	86	542	15.9%	No			
			Titus	Clayton	Retired	No	6	82	542	15.1%	No			
			Gaffney	Robyn	Incumbent	Yes	6	81	542	14.9%	No			
SAN DIEGO		6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cox	Greg	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	2	41,855	61,509	68.0%	Yes
						Will	Brant	Deputy City Attorney	No	2	19,654	61,509	32.0%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
SAN DIEGO (continued)	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Jacob	Dianne	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	2	87,422	112,308	77.8%	Yes		
					Reyes	Rudy	Reverend/Scientist/Archeologist	No	2	24,886	112,308	22.2%	No		
			3	Full	Danon	Steve	Chief of Staff	No	5	33,093	97,557	33.9%	Yes		
					Roberts	Dave	Deputy Mayor/CEO	No	5	30,718	97,557	31.5%	No		
					Hilliard	Carl	Mayor of Del Mar	No	5	19,276	97,557	19.8%	No		
					Ziegler	Bryan M.	Deputy County Counsel	No	5	8,425	97,557	8.6%	No		
		Pate			Stephen	Transportation Driver Captain	No	5	6,045	97,557	6.2%	No			
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	24	Full	Berry	David	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	239,707	428,303	56.0%	Yes		
					Roberts	Terrie E.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	188,596	428,303	44.0%	No		
			25	Full	Miller	Jim	Attorney/Arbitrator	No	3	160,115	421,420	38.0%	Yes		
		Amador			Robert	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	141,008	421,420	33.5%	No			
		Schaefer			George F.	Deputy City Attorney	No	3	120,297	421,420	28.5%	No			
		34	Full	Kreep	Gary G.	Constitutional Law Attorney	No	2	204,474	407,209	50.2%	Yes			
				Peed	Garland	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	202,735	407,209	49.8%	No			
		SAN DIEGO (continued)	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Roberts	Dave	Deputy Mayor/CEO	No	2	98,513	192,643	51.1%	Yes
Danon	Steve						Chief of Staff	No	2	94,130	192,643	48.9%	No		
DIRECTOR, Whispering Palms CSD	Full			McHenry	Kathy	Incumbent	Yes	4	682	2,327	29.3%	Yes			
				Arckless	Alan	Incumbent	Yes	4	644	2,327	27.7%	Yes			
				McElfresh	Nancy	No Ballot Designation	No	4	518	2,327	22.3%	Yes			
				Keep	Philip	Incumbent	Yes	4	483	2,327	20.8%	No			
SUPERIOR JUDGE	25			Full	Amador	Robert	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	538,854	909,049	59.3%	Yes		
					Miller	Jim	Attorney/Arbitrator	No	2	370,195	909,049	40.7%	No		
SAN FRANCISCO	11/6/2012			COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Mar	Eric	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	3	15,266	28,533	53.5%	Yes
							Lee	David E.	Voting Rights Educator	No	3	11,019	28,533	38.6%	No
		D'Silva	Sherman R.				Operations Manager	No	3	2,152	28,533	7.5%	No		
		3	Full	Chiu	David	President, Board of Supervisors	Yes	4	17,700	23,470	75.4%	Yes			
				Butler	F. Joseph	Architect	No	4	2,685	23,470	11.4%	No			
				Bruno	Marc	Community Volunteer	No	4	1,984	23,470	8.5%	No			
				Pang	Wilma	Professor/Opera Singer	No	4	1,033	23,470	4.4%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SAN FRANCISCO (continued)	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Breed	London	Director, Arts Nonprofit	No	8	9,794	35,137	27.9%	Yes
					Olague	Christina	Appointed Incumbent	No	8	6,939	35,137	19.7%	No
					Rizzo	John	President, Community College Board	No	8	5,667	35,137	16.1%	No
					Davis	Julian	President, Community Center	No	8	5,318	35,137	15.1%	No
					Selby	Thea	Mom/Small Businesswoman	No	8	4,733	35,137	13.5%	No
					Everett	Daniel	Lawyer/Broadcast Journalist	No	8	1,308	35,137	3.7%	No
					Resignato	Andrew 'Ellard'	Nonprofit Director/Musician	No	8	777	35,137	2.2%	No
					Johnson	Hope	Paralegal	No	8	486	35,137	1.4%	No
			7	Full	Yee	Norman	President, School Board	No	9	9,142	31,334	29.2%	Yes
					Crowley	F.X.	Business Manager/Trustee	No	9	7,723	31,334	24.6%	No
					Garcia	Michael	Arbitrator	No	9	5,489	31,334	17.5%	No
					Engardio	Joel	Business Owner/Journalist	No	9	4,163	31,334	13.3%	No
					Squeri	Robert J.	Businessman/Foundation Director	No	9	1,538	31,334	4.9%	No
					Lagos	Julian P.	Retired School Teacher	No	9	1,086	31,334	3.5%	No
					Bley	Andrew	Cartographer/Geographic Analyst	No	9	824	31,334	2.6%	No
					Gavin	Lynn	Writer	No	9	716	31,334	2.3%	No
			Rogers	Glenn	Landscape Architect	No	9	595	31,334	1.9%	No		
			9	Full	Campos	David	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	24,044	25,107	95.8%	Yes
			11	Full	Avalos	John	Incumbent	Yes	1	17,748	18,831	94.2%	Yes
SAN JOAQUIN	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Villapudua	Carlos	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	6,856	10,335	66.3%	Yes
					Stebbins	Mark L.	Businessman	No	2	3,406	10,335	33.0%	No
			3	Full	Bestolarides	Steve	Member, County Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	16,604	17,071	97.3%	Yes
			5	Full	Elliott	Bob	Retired Colonel/Councilmember	No	3	6,892	15,265	45.1%	Yes
					Ransom	Rhodesia R.	Educator/Planning Commissioner	No	3	5,138	15,265	33.7%	No
					Benigno	Tom	Farmer/Business Operator	No	3	3,184	15,265	20.9%	No
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Elliott	Bob	Retired Colonel/Councilmember	No	2	18,798	36,142	52.0%	Yes
					Ransom	Rhodesia R.	Educator/Planning Commissioner	No	2	17,227	36,142	47.7%	No
		DIRECTOR, Mountain House CSD	Full	Su	Andy K.	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,815	6,447	28.2%	Yes	
				Lamb	Jim	Owner/Property Manager	Yes	5	1,291	6,447	20.0%	Yes	
				Tingle	Bernice K.	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,282	6,447	19.9%	Yes	
				Dighe	Rajesh	Engineer/Businessman	No	5	1,109	6,447	17.2%	No	
				Khan	Tariq	Principal Engineer	No	5	897	6,447	13.9%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
SAN JOAQUIN (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Mountain House CSD ^R	1	Short	Gutierrez	Steven	Retired Army Colonel	No	3	1,027	2,252	45.6%	Yes		
					Strock	Corey	Network Engineer/Parent	No	3	646	2,252	28.7%	No		
					Anderson	Joshua L.	Realtor/Father	No	3	551	2,252	24.5%	No		
SAN LUIS OBISPO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Mecham	Frank R.	1st District Supervisor	No	1	2,708	2,778	97.5%	Yes		
					3	Full	Hill	Adam	Third District Supervisor	No	2	2,267	3,844	59.0%	Yes
							Waage	Ed	Councilmember, City of Pismo Beach	No	2	1,559	3,844	40.6%	No
					5	Full	Arnold	Debbie	Businesswoman/Rancher	No	2	2,272	4,263	53.3%	Yes
	Patterson	James R.	County Supervisor, 5th District	Yes			2	1,985	4,263	46.6%	No				
	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, California Valley CSD	Full		Marrone	Lisa	Director	Yes	4	56	229	24.5%	Yes		
					Lambert	Misty	Warehouse Manager	No	4	54	229	23.6%	Yes		
					Webb	Ro	Retired Educator	No	4	54	229	23.6%	Yes		
					Frazier	Prince A.	Retired Attorney	No	4	45	229	19.7%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Cambria CSD	Full		Rice	Amanda	Cambria Businesswoman	No	6	1,619	7,687	21.1%	Yes		
					Robinette	Gail	Appointed Incumbent	No	6	1,577	7,687	20.5%	Yes		
					Clift	Muril	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,561	7,687	20.3%	Yes		
					McLaughlin	Mike	Retired Attorney	No	6	1,359	7,687	17.7%	No		
					Gray	Tom	Writer/Marketing Consultant	No	6	1,080	7,687	14.0%	No		
					McDaniel	Kim	Retired	No	6	255	7,687	3.3%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Heritage Ranch CSD	Full		Foti	Tony	Retired Police Detective	No	4	440	1,594	27.6%	Yes		
					Burgess	Daniel	Incumbent	Yes	4	429	1,594	26.9%	Yes		
					Fretwell	David H.	Small Business Owner	No	4	368	1,594	23.1%	No		
					Gourley	Richard	Retired	Yes	4	343	1,594	21.5%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Independence Ranch CSD	Full		Leezer	Terry	Engineer/Contractor/Rancher	No	5	117	396	29.5%	Yes		
Mulachy					William P.	Carpenter/Machine Operator	No	5	71	396	17.9%	Yes			
Noe	Carol C.				Appointed Board Member	No	5	71	396	17.9%	Yes				
Kalvans	Mary				Legal Assistant	No	5	69	396	17.4%	No				
Tracy	George W.				Incumbent	Yes	5	63	396	15.9%	No				
DIRECTOR, Nipomo CSD	Full		Blair	Robert L. 'Bob'	Retired Pharmacist	No	4	2,158	7,240	29.8%	Yes				
			Armstrong	Craig	Retired Financial Executive	No	4	1,896	7,240	26.2%	Yes				
			Eby	Ed	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,601	7,240	22.1%	No				
			Thompson	Ernie	Retired	No	4	1,566	7,240	21.6%	No				

^RTo be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SAN LUIS OBISPO (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Oceano CSD		Short	White	Karen M.	Appointed Incumbent	No	2	1,006	1,945	51.7%	Yes
					Searcy	Rick	Retired Construction Worker	No	2	927	1,945	47.7%	No
		DIRECTOR, San Miguel CSD		Full	Green	John	Fire Captain	No	7	270	1,210	22.3%	Yes
				Kalvans	Anthony R. 'Bear'	Community Volunteer	No	7	209	1,210	17.3%	Yes	
				Harrison	Richard L.K.	Administrator	Yes	7	155	1,210	12.8%	No	
				Reuck	Larry R.	Small Business Owner	No	7	155	1,210	12.8%	No	
				Belden Sr.	Al	Small Businessman	No	7	141	1,210	11.7%	No	
				Smithen	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	7	139	1,210	11.5%	No	
				Hamblin	Dale E.	Incumbent	Yes	7	137	1,210	11.3%	No	
		DIRECTOR, San Simeon CSD		Full	McAdams Jr.	Ralph N.	Appointed Director SSCSD	No	2	67	103	65.0%	Yes
				Giacoletti	Mary P.	Retired	No	2	36	103	35.0%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Templeton CSD		Full	Dietch	Judy	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,443	6,829	21.1%	Yes
				La Caro	David	Water Quality Scientist	No	7	1,213	6,829	17.8%	Yes	
				English	Geoff	Public Works Manager	No	7	1,202	6,829	17.6%	Yes	
				Gray	Brenda	Local Healthcare Administrator	No	7	1,160	6,829	17.0%	No	
				Petersen	Wayne	Retired Internal Auditor	No	7	915	6,829	13.4%	No	
				Migliazzo	Daniel	Utility Manager	No	7	536	6,829	7.8%	No	
				Beere	Clifford S.	Retired	No	7	331	6,829	4.8%	No	
SAN MATEO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pine	Dave	San Mateo County Supervisor	No	1	84,658	84,658	100.0%	Yes
			4	Full	Slocum	Warren	Retired San Mateo County Clerk	No	7	37,542	97,888	38.4%	Yes
					Masur	Shelly	School Trustee/Mother	No	7	20,989	97,888	21.4%	No
					Keith	Kirsten	Mayor, Menlo Park/Attorney	No	7	14,853	97,888	15.2%	No
					Romero	Carlos	Councilmember/Economic Developer	No	7	8,707	97,888	8.9%	No
					Morantes	Memo	Trustee San Mateo Co. Board of Education	No	7	7,989	97,888	8.2%	No
					Cohen	Andy	Councilmember Menlo Park	No	7	4,723	97,888	4.8%	No
					Schmidt	Ernesto 'Ernie'	Vice-Chairman Planning Commissioner	No	7	3,085	97,888	3.2%	No
			5	Full	Tissier	Adrienne J.	San Mateo County Supervisor	Yes	1	76,925	76,925	100.0%	Yes
		11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Slocum	Warren	Retired San Mateo County Clerk	No	2	131,014	239,386	54.7%
				Masur	Shelly	School Trustee/Mother	No	2	108,372	239,386	45.3%	No	
SANTA BARBARA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cabbajal	Salud	County Supervisor	Yes	2	3,696	4,799	77.0%	Yes
					Lieff	Carole	Economist/Writer	No	2	1,103	4,799	23.0%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SANTA BARBARA (continued)	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Farr	Doreen	Supervisor, Third District	Yes	2	3,512	5,977	58.8%	Yes
					Pappas	Steven	Small Business Owner	No	2	2,465	5,977	41.2%	No
			4	Full	Adam	Peter	Farmer/Businessman	No	3	1,866	4,791	38.9%	Yes
					Gray	Joni	County Supervisor	Yes	3	1,779	4,791	37.1%	No
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Adam	Peter	Farmer/Businessman	No	2	14,398	27,825	51.7%	Yes
					Gray	Joni	County Supervisor	Yes	2	13,427	27,825	48.3%	No
		DIRECTOR, Mission Hills CSD	Full	Naughton	Tim	Aerospace Engineer	No	6	886	3,776	23.5%	Yes	
				Hayes	Danny R.	Electrical Engineer	No	6	774	3,776	20.5%	Yes	
				Fasold	Walter	Chemical Engineer	No	6	730	3,776	19.3%	Yes	
				Nix	G. Bruce	Incumbent	No	6	579	3,776	15.3%	No	
Warnstrom	Susan	Incumbent	No	6	406	3,776	10.8%	No					
Schlottmann	Cathy	Incumbent	No	6	401	3,776	10.6%	No					
SANTA CLARA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Shirakawa	George	County Supervisor	Yes	1	24,950	24,950	100.0%	Yes
					Cortese	Dave	Member, Santa Clara Co. Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	40,360	40,360	100.0%	Yes
			5	Full	Simitian	Joe	State Senator	No	3	39,131	67,152	58.3%	Yes
					Wang	Kris H.	Councilwoman	No	3	15,367	67,152	22.9%	No
					Chang	Barry	Cupertino City Council Member	No	3	12,654	67,152	18.8%	No
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	Colin	Paul	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	124,808	226,650	55.1%
	Cobey	Chris				Workplace Rights Attorney	No	3	64,589	226,650	28.5%	No	
	Cerul	Alexis				Judicial Staff Attorney	No	3	37,253	226,650	16.4%	No	
	Sevely	Cynthia A.				Deputy District Attorney	No	2	168,304	226,302	74.4%	Yes	
	Pogue	Steven R.	Self-Employed Attorney	No	2	57,998	226,302	25.6%	No				
SANTA CRUZ	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Leopold	John	Santa Cruz County Supervisor	No	3	8,555	12,251	69.8%	Yes
					Arnold	Gary R.	Local Businessman	No	3	2,320	12,251	18.9%	No
					Paulden	Charles A.	Health, Environmental Psychologist	No	3	1,301	12,251	10.6%	No
			2	Full	Friend	Zach	Police Spokesman/Analyst	No	5	6,885	12,107	56.9%	Yes
					Beckett	Daniel	Small Business Owner	No	5	2,492	12,107	20.6%	No
					Rivas	Antonio R.	School Counselor/Teacher	No	5	1,040	12,107	8.6%	No
					Deitch	Douglas	Nonprofit Executive Director	No	5	852	12,107	7.0%	No
					McInnis	Rich	Local Tavern Owner	No	5	739	12,107	6.1%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
SANTA CRUZ (continued)	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	McPherson	Bruce	Businessman/Journalist	No	4	7,038	14,268	49.3%	Yes		
					Hammer	Eric	Local Business Owner	No	4	5,414	14,268	37.9%	No		
					Smallman	William H.	Civil Engineer	No	4	924	14,268	6.5%	No		
					Weber	Susan G.	Community Volunteer	No	4	804	14,268	5.6%	No		
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	McPherson	Bruce	Businessman/Journalist	No	2	12,258	24,371	50.3%	Yes		
					Hammer	Eric	Local Business Owner	No	2	12,113	24,371	49.7%	No		
SHASTA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Moty	Leonard	Incumbent	Yes	3	4,311	8,525	50.6%	Yes		
					Swendman	Scott	Businessman	No	3	2,939	8,525	34.5%	No		
					Allen	Steve	No Ballot Designation	No	3	1,211	8,525	14.2%	No		
				3	Full	Giacomini	Pam	Small Business Owner	No	3	4,442	8,830	50.3%	Yes	
						Jones	Patrick H.	Businessman	No	3	3,196	8,830	36.2%	No	
						Ryness	Fred	Forestry Supervisor	No	3	1,155	8,830	13.1%	No	
				4	Full	Beck	Cheri	Retired Office Manager	No	5	2,107	7,803	27.0%	Yes	
						Schappell	Bill	Businessman/Educator	No	5	1,785	7,803	22.9%	No	
						Bird	Catherine	Attorney	No	5	1,442	7,803	18.5%	No	
						Munroe	Dean	College Instructor	No	5	1,284	7,803	16.5%	No	
						Clifford	Cherrill	No Ballot Designation	No	5	1,146	7,803	14.7%	No	
	11/6/2012		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Schappell	Bill	Businessman/Educator	No	2	6,862	12,761	53.8%	Yes	
						Beck	Cheri	Retired Office Manager	No	2	5,829	12,761	45.7%	No	
			DIRECTOR, Fall River Mills CSD		Full	Gooch	Paulette	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	204	516	39.5%	Yes	
						Monath	Jerry	Retired Saw Filer	No	3	172	516	33.3%	Yes	
						Jensen	Sandy	Incumbent	Yes	3	140	516	27.1%	No	
						Short	Ontano	Kathy	Business Woman	No	7	162	734	22.1%	Yes
							Snyder	Sky	Environmental Educator	No	7	148	734	20.2%	Yes
							Briggs	Barbara	Retired Financial Advisor	No	7	116	734	15.8%	Yes
Hall							David	Retired Plant Manager	No	7	113	734	15.4%	No	
Rogers							Diana	Self-Employed Bookkeeper	No	7	92	734	12.5%	No	
						Bentz	Janet	Business Owner	No	7	71	734	9.7%	No	
						Brunner	Sally	Artist	No	7	32	734	4.4%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Shasta CSD	Full	Adams	Tony L.	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	419	1,226	34.2%	Yes				
Knickerbocker			Lee	No Ballot Designation	No	3	403	1,226	32.9%	Yes					
Jones			Richard L.	Construction Inspector	No	3	402	1,226	32.8%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
SHASTA (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Shasta CSD		Short	Hanks	Jan	Retired Business Owner	No	4	437	1,368	31.9%	Yes			
					Heinan	Jane J.	Appointed Incumbent	No	4	358	1,368	26.2%	Yes			
					Rendes	Mark	No Ballot Designation	No	4	303	1,368	22.1%	No			
					Mair	Robin M.	Child Development Specialist	No	4	270	1,368	19.7%	No			
SIERRA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Adams	Lee	County Supervisor, District One	Yes	1	257	275	93.5%	Yes			
			3	Full	Roen	Paul I.	Rancher	No	1	197	226	87.2%	Yes			
			4	Full	Beard	Jim	No Ballot Designation	No	2	132	260	50.8%	Yes			
					Moore	Mike	Deputy Probation Officer	No	2	125	260	48.1%	No			
				SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Kennelly	John P.	Sierra County Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	937	1,294	72.4%	Yes		
						Christian	Sidonie	Attorney at Law	No	2	355	1,294	27.4%	No		
SISKIYOU	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Criss	Brandon	Farmer/Volunteer Firefighter	No	2	1,367	2,154	63.5%	Yes			
					Cook	Jim	Siskiyou County Supervisor, District 1	Yes	2	785	2,154	36.4%	No			
			2	Full	Valenzuela	Ed	Incumbent	No	2	1,834	2,585	70.9%	Yes			
					Dorsey	Dan	Retired Fire Captain	No	2	746	2,585	28.9%	No			
		11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, McCloud CSD	4	Full	Bennett	Grace	Incumbent	No	1	1,821	1,915	95.1%	Yes		
					Ott	Chuck	Pastor/Postal Worker	No	3	425	863	49.2%	Yes			
					Simons	Anne	Incumbent/Business Woman	Yes	3	324	863	37.5%	Yes			
					Stewart	Brian	Incumbent	Yes	3	107	863	12.4%	No			
			Short	Young	Catherine E.	Housewife	No	2	313	491	63.7%	Yes				
				Lowe	Diane	Appointed Incumbent	No	2	177	491	36.0%	No				
SOLANO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Intintoli Jr.	Anthony J.	Retired Teacher/Attorney	No	5	3,127	11,037	28.3%	Yes			
					Hannigan	Erin	Councilwoman/Businesswoman	No	5	2,979	11,037	27.0%	No			
					Miessner	Katy	Finance Manager	No	5	2,751	11,037	24.9%	No			
					Anthony	Susan B.	Businesswoman/Wildlife Conservationist	No	5	1,564	11,037	14.2%	No			
					Simmons	Lee S.	Retired Policymaker/Teacher	No	5	554	11,037	5.0%	No			
			2	Full	Seifert	Linda J.	Supervisor/Board Chair	Yes	2	9,818	14,807	66.3%	Yes			
					Messina	Steve	Businessman/School Trustee	No	2	4,881	14,807	33.0%	No			
			5	Full	Thomson	Skip	No Ballot Designation	No	2	8,290	14,826	55.9%	Yes			
					Reagan	Michael J.	County Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	2	6,452	14,826	43.5%	No			
				11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Hannigan	Erin	Councilwoman/Businesswoman	No	2	14,539	25,863	56.2%	Yes
							Intintoli Jr.	Anthony J.	Retired Teacher/Attorney	No	2	11,171	25,863	43.2%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
SONOMA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gorin	Susan	Councilmember/Neighborhood Advocate	No	6	6,625	27,811	23.8%	Yes		
					Sawyer	John	Vice Mayor/Businessman	No	6	6,439	27,811	23.2%	No		
					Cuclis	Gina	Communications Business Owner	No	6	4,732	27,811	17.0%	No		
					Sanders	Joanne	Mayor, City of Sonoma	No	6	4,402	27,811	15.8%	No		
					Bramfitt	Mark	Energy Efficiency Engineer	No	6	3,914	27,811	14.1%	No		
					McClure	Michael	Teacher	No	6	1,636	27,811	5.9%	No		
	3	Full	Zane	Shirlee	Sonoma County Supervisor, Third District	No	2	10,343	16,455	62.9%	Yes				
			Smith	Tim	Business Owner/Educator	Yes	2	6,028	16,455	36.6%	No				
			5	Full	Carrillo	Efren	Sonoma County Supervisor, 5th District	No	3	13,152	22,516	58.4%	Yes		
	Carpenter	Ernest L.			Government Consultant	No	3	6,374	22,516	28.3%	No				
	Jacobi	Veronica			Small Business Owner/Pro. Mechanical Engineer	No	3	2,941	22,516	13.1%	No				
	11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gorin	Susan	Councilmember/Neighborhood Advocate	No	2	24,033	46,417	51.8%	Yes		
					Sawyer	John	Vice Mayor/Businessman	No	2	22,251	46,417	47.9%	No		
STANISLAUS	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	O'Brien	Bill	Businessman/County Supervisor	Yes	1	12,399	12,726	97.4%	Yes		
					2	Full	Chiesa	Vito	Farmer/County Supervisor	Yes	1	10,431	10,685	97.6%	Yes
					5		Full	De Martini	Jim	Farmer/County Supervisor	Yes	2	5,213	8,493	61.4%
						Padilla		Daniel	Water Resources Engineer	No	2	3,252	8,493	38.3%	No
SUTTER	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Boone	Jeff	Farmer/Businessman	No	6	756	3,317	22.8%	Yes		
					Sullenger	Ron	Farmer/Businessman	No	6	718	3,317	21.6%	No		
					Chima	Lal	Retired Educator	No	6	616	3,317	18.6%	No		
					Klotz	Rob	Small Business Owner	No	6	475	3,317	14.3%	No		
					Ramirez	Rory	Retired Business Owner	No	6	475	3,317	14.3%	No		
					Heredia-Sproul	Maria	Public Health Nurse	No	6	269	3,317	8.1%	No		
				4	Full	Whiteaker	Jim	Educator	Yes	2	1,961	3,421	57.3%	Yes	
						Didbal	Preet	Department Corrections Manager	No	2	1,441	3,421	42.1%	No	
				5	Full	Gallagher	Jamie	Supervisor/Small Businessman	Yes	1	2,573	2,662	96.7%	Yes	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED		
SUTTER (continued)	6/5/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Heckman	Sarah	Attorney At Law	No	9	4,237	15,967	26.5%	Yes		
					Waggoman	Jud	Attorney/Business Owner	No	9	2,315	15,967	14.5%	No		
					Sullinger	Michael J.	Attorney At Law	No	9	2,155	15,967	13.5%	No		
					Johnston	Mike	Attorney at Law	No	9	1,856	15,967	11.6%	No		
					Carrion	Al J.	Attorney	No	9	1,781	15,967	11.2%	No		
					Trezza	Michael	Attorney	No	9	1,617	15,967	10.1%	No		
					Edwards	John M.	Trial Attorney	No	9	672	15,967	4.2%	No		
					Southworth	Nancy A.	Attorney At Law	No	9	642	15,967	4.0%	No		
					Stout	Richard	Deputy County Counsel	No	9	639	15,967	4.0%	No		
						11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Sullenger	Ron	Farmer/Businessman	No	2	2,845
Boone	Jeff	Farmer/Businessman	No	2						2,568	5,439	47.2%	No		
SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Heckman	Sarah			Attorney at Law	No	2	17,529	27,918	62.8%	Yes		
			Waggoman	Jud			Attorney at Law	No	2	10,153	27,918	36.4%	No		
TEHAMA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Chamblin	Steve	Small Business Owner	No	3	1,974	3,089	63.9%	Yes		
					Latourell	Greg	Engineering Technician	No	3	641	3,089	20.8%	No		
					Cox	Roger	Physician/Educator	No	3	408	3,089	13.2%	No		
					2	Full	Russell	George	Incumbent	Yes	1	2,104	2,157	97.5%	Yes
							Bundy	Burton	Farmer/Retired Businessman	No	2	1,352	2,403	56.3%	Yes
		SUPERIOR JUDGE			5	Full	Warner	Ron	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,023	2,403	42.6%	No
							McGlynn	Matthew C.	Attorney at Law	No	1	10,785	11,124	97.0%	Yes
TRINITY	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Morris	Judy	County Supervisor/Entrepreneur	Yes	2	457	842	54.3%	Yes		
					Shriner	Herk	Businessman	No	2	382	842	45.4%	No		
			3	Full	Fisher	Karl	Retired Contractor	No	2	393	717	54.8%	Yes		
					Farmer	Jim	No Ballot Designation	No	2	317	717	44.2%	No		
		5	Full	Fenley	John	No Ballot Designation	No	2	363	657	55.3%	Yes			
				Swanson	Pamela	No Ballot Designation	No	2	253	657	38.5%	No			
		SUPERIOR JUDGE			Full	Johnson	Elizabeth W.	Attorney at Law	No	4	1,791	3,908	45.8%	Yes	
						Heryford	Eric	Attorney	No	4	806	3,908	20.6%	No	
						Angell	Cynthia L.	Attorney	No	4	663	3,908	17.0%	No	
						Ashley	Whit	Attorney	No	4	637	3,908	16.3%	No	
11/6/2012	SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Johnson	Elizabeth W.	Attorney at Law	No	2	3,378	5,494	61.5%	Yes			
				Heryford	Eric	Attorney	No	2	2,082	5,494	37.9%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
TULARE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Ishida	Allen	Incumbent	Yes	1	6,887	7,168	96.1%	Yes
			2	Full	Poel	Pete V.	Tulare County Supervisor	Yes	1	5,858	5,962	98.3%	Yes
			3	Full	Cox	Phillip	Incumbent	Yes	3	5,988	10,810	55.4%	Yes
					McKee	Ruth	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	2,679	10,810	24.8%	No
					Ulmshneider	Charles E.	Visalia Unified School Board Trustee	No	3	2,050	10,810	19.0%	No
			11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Alpaugh CSD	Full	Gregory	Davon G.	Fire Fighter	No	8	81	469	17.3%
	Strickland	Roger				Retired	No	8	72	469	15.4%	Yes	
	Anderson	Benjamin				Retired Truck Driver	No	8	68	469	14.5%	Yes	
	Garcia	Luisa				Preschool Teacher	No	8	60	469	12.8%	Yes	
	Phipps	Mel				Retired	No	8	57	469	12.2%	Yes	
	Molina	Tracy				Office Technician	No	8	56	469	11.9%	No	
	Bontrager	Robert D.				Farmer/Mechanic	No	8	35	469	7.5%	No	
	Jennings	Gary W.	Retired Truck Driver	No	8	31	469	6.6%	No				
TUOLUMNE	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brennan	Sherri	Businesswoman/Rancher	No	5	1,089	2,965	36.7%	Yes
					Bass	Liz	Incumbent	Yes	5	726	2,965	24.5%	No
					Hildreth	Jim	Mediator/Broker/Musician	No	5	689	2,965	23.2%	No
					Garaventa	Jim	Community Volunteer	No	5	359	2,965	12.1%	No
					Cofer	Randy K.	#NULL!	No	5	97	2,965	3.3%	No
			4	Full	Gray	John L.	County Supervisor Fourth District	No	2	2,431	3,302	73.6%	Yes
					Matter	Nolan J.	#NULL!	No	2	850	3,302	25.7%	No
			5	Full	Rodefer	Karl D.	Retired Lt. Colonel	No	5	1,473	2,957	49.8%	Yes
					Torchia	Domenic	Healthcare/Business/Education	No	5	638	2,957	21.6%	No
					O'Neil	Jim	Real Estate Consultant	No	5	386	2,957	13.1%	No
	Frye	Jason R.			Private Investigator/Educator	No	5	228	2,957	7.7%	No		
	Macomber	Mick			Attorney at Law	No	5	224	2,957	7.6%	No		
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Provost	Eleanor	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	11,244	15,153	74.2%	Yes	
				Oliver	Gregory J.	Tuolumne County Counsel	No	2	3,883	15,153	25.6%	No	
				2	Full	Segerstrom	Donald	Superior Court Judge	No	2	11,408	15,160	75.3%
Aretakis						Alex J.	Attorney	No	2	3,714	15,160	24.5%	No
11/6/2012				COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Brennan	Sherri	Businesswoman/Rancher	No	2	2,672	4,476
	Bass	Liz	District 1 Supervisor				Yes	2	1,783	4,476	39.8%	No	
	5	Full	Rodefer		Karl D.	Retired Lt. Colonel	No	2	2,932	4,448	65.9%	Yes	
			Torchia		Domenic	Air Traffic Controller	No	2	1,485	4,448	33.4%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
TUOLUMNE (continued)	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Lake Don Pedro CSD		Full	Johnson	Danny	No Ballot Designation Provided by County	No	5	237	809	29.3%	Yes	
					Ross	Emery	No Ballot Designation Provided by County	Yes	5	182	809	22.5%	Yes	
					Day	Charles	No Ballot Designation Provided by County	No	5	177	809	21.9%	Yes	
					Skoien	Mark	No Ballot Designation Provided by County	Yes	5	140	809	17.3%	No	
					Kinsella	William 'Bill'	No Ballot Designation Provided by County	Yes	5	64	809	7.9%	No	
VENTURA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bennett	Steve	County Supervisor	Yes	4	13,000	29,606	43.9%	Yes	
					Roper	Bob	Ventura County Fire Chief	No	4	8,177	29,606	27.6%	No	
					Weir	Christy	Ventura City Councilmember	No	4	4,472	29,606	15.1%	No	
					Andrews	Neal	Business Executive/Councilman	No	4	3,728	29,606	12.6%	No	
		3	Full	Long	Kathy I.	County Supervisor, Third District	Yes	1	18,331	18,967	96.6%	Yes		
		5	Full	Zaragoza	John C.	Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	1	9,629	10,203	94.4%	Yes		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Walsh	Harry	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	88,652	111,663	79.4%	Yes	
	Bjelke				Bradley G.	Educator/Attorney	No	2	21,986	111,663	19.7%	No		
		11/6/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bennett	Steve	Ventura County Supervisor	Yes	2	33,559	63,841	52.6%	Yes
						Roper	Bob	Ventura County Fire Chief	No	2	29,756	63,841	46.6%	No
		11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Bell Canyon CSD		Full	Levy	Richard	CPA	No	6	496	2,291	21.6%	Yes
						Wolf	Eric	Financial Advisor	No	6	476	2,291	20.8%	Yes
						Tickner	Lana A.	Incumbent	Yes	6	370	2,291	16.2%	Yes
	Bubman					Michael	Attorney	No	6	367	2,291	16.0%	No	
	Koscelnick					John	Retired	No	6	332	2,291	14.5%	No	
	Chandler					Anita	No Ballot Designation	No	6	239	2,291	10.4%	No	
	11/6/2012	DIRECTOR, Channel Islands CSD		Full	Moore	Keith A.	Director, CIBCSD	Yes	3	676	1,705	39.6%	Yes	
					Estomo	Jim	Appointed Incumbent	No	3	571	1,705	33.5%	Yes	
					Wentworth	David	Retired Businessman	No	3	455	1,705	26.7%	No	
YOLO	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McGowan	Mike	Incumbent	Yes	1	4,877	4,877	100.0%	Yes	
					Provenza	Jim	Yolo County Supervisor	Yes	1	7,184	7,184	100.0%	Yes	
					Chamberlain	Duane	Yolo County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	3,280	6,111	53.7%	Yes	
					Pimintel	Art	Mayor of Woodland	No	2	2,831	6,111	46.3%	No	
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	15	Full	Maguire	Dan	Judge, Superior Court	Yes	2	24,086	31,271	77.0%	Yes
	Parish	Clint				Deputy District Attorney	No	2	7,185	31,271	23.0%	No		
YUBA	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Nicoletti	John	Incumbent	Yes	3	964	1,900	50.7%	Yes	
					Billeci	Christina	Vice-Mayor Marysville	No	3	755	1,900	39.7%	No	
					Dias	Richard	No Ballot Designation	No	3	181	1,900	9.5%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2012

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DISTRICT/ OFFICE	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	INCUM- BENT	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	VOTES FOR CANDIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PERCENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
YUBA (continued)	6/5/2012	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Griego	Mary J.	Incumbent	Yes	2	894	1,605	55.7%	Yes
					Ramos	Veronica	Health Safety Instructor	No	2	711	1,605	44.3%	No
			4	Full	Abe	Roger	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,135	1,795	63.2%	Yes
		Dougherty			Ron	Public Policy Analyst	No	2	660	1,795	36.8%	No	
		SUPERIOR JUDGE			1	Full	Wirtshafter	Benjamin	Yuba County Public Defender	Yes	3	5,440	9,533
			McAlister	Courtney			Attorney	No	3	3,193	9,533	33.5%	No
Engel	Julius M.		Attorney/Business Owner	No			3	900	9,533	9.4%	No		

Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2012

		County Supervisor		Director, CSD*		District Attorney		Superior Judge		Total**	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	78.3	101	65.5	36	0.0	0	90.9	10	75.4	147
	Lose	21.7	28	34.5	19	0.0	0	9.1	1	24.6	48
	Total	100.0	129	100.0	55	0.0	0	100.0	11	100.0	195
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	21.8	72	47.6	69	22.2	2	32.3	31	29.9	174
	Lose	78.2	259	52.4	76	77.8	7	67.7	65	70.1	407
	Total	100.0	331	100.0	145	100.0	9	100.0	96	100.0	581
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	58.4	101	34.3	36	0.0	0	24.4	10	45.8	147
	Non-Incumbent	41.6	72	65.7	69	100.0	2	75.6	31	54.2	174
	Total	100.0	173	100.0	105	100.0	2	100.0	41	100.0	321
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	9.8	28	20.0	19	0.0	0	1.5	1	10.5	48
	Non-Incumbent	90.2	259	80.0	76	100.0	7	98.5	65	89.5	407
	Total	100.0	287	100.0	95	100.0	7	100.0	66	100.0	455
All Candidates	Incumbent	28.0	129	27.5	55	0.0	0	10.3	11	25.1	195
	Non-Incumbent	72.0	331	72.5	145	100.0	9	89.7	96	74.9	581
	Total	100.0	460	100.0	200	100.0	9	100.0	107	100.0	776

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

**Runoffs are excluded from totals.

***Percentages may not sum to 100.0 due to rounding.