

# CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

*1996 ELECTIONS*

---

---

## County Offices and Ballot Measures

---

---



Institute for Social Research  
Center For California Studies  
California State University, Sacramento





CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT  
ELECTION OUTCOMES:  
CANDIDATES AND BALLOT MEASURES, 1996 ELECTIONS

COUNTY OFFICES AND BALLOT MEASURES

Timothy A. Hodson, Ph.D.,  
Director, Center for California Studies

Carole Barnes, Ph.D.,  
Director, 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



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	i
1996 County, City and School District Election Dates by County .....	viii
1996 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, 1996 .....	3
Table B    Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 1996 .....	5
Table C    Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 1996 .....	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, 1996 .....	11
Table 1.2  Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 1996.....	14
Table 1.3  Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 1996 .....	17
Table 1.4  Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 1996 .....	17
PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES .....	19
Table 2.1  Vote Totals for County Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 1996.....	21
Table 2.2  Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 1996.....	26





## CALIFORNIA ELECTION 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, both of California State University, Sacramento. 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 both 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.

Election data are collected periodically throughout the 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 into the CEDA data base 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 all 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 for all district ballot measures.

Ballot measures for all jurisdictions are coded according to type (e.g., charter amendment, bond measure, initiative, etc.) and topic (e.g., taxes, education, public safety, governance). Tables summarizing the appropriate ballot measure results by type, topic and county are included with each report. In addition, each report contains a set of tables summarizing outcomes for ballot measures by type, topic and county independent of jurisdiction and for candidates by type of office and incumbency status. These tables are accompanied by the brief description of results discussed below.

### Center for California Studies

The Center for California Studies, located at California State University, Sacramento, is a public policy, public service and curricular support unit of the California State University. The Center's location in the state Capital and ability to draw upon the resources of the entire State University system give it a unique capacity for making contributions to the development of public policies and the public life of California. Center programs cover four broad areas: administration of the nationally known Assembly, Senate and Executive 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



The CSUS Institute for Social Research is an interdisciplinary center offering research services to state, federal and community agencies, non-profit corporations and the university. These services include research and sampling design, measurement, coding and data entry, computer assisted telephone and field interviewing, data base management, statistical analysis and report production. Now in its tenth year, ISR has completed contracts with over 40 state and community agencies, several private firms and numerous administrative units of the university. Four federal projects are in process. Off-campus contracts have varied in size from \$15,000 to \$593,000, totaling more than \$1.5 million in the last five years. Faculty affiliates of the Institute offer expertise in a wide variety of disciplines, including the social sciences, health and human services, engineering and education.

## 1996 ELECTION DATA

### Ballot Measures

In 1996, the popularity of local ballot measures continued to flourish as California voters were presented with 573 county, city, school and community college district proposals. As expected, cities led the pack with an impressive 371 measures while counties and school/community college districts were well behind with 115 and 87, respectively. As usual, subject matters ranged widely from the seemingly mundane governmental organization issues to hotly contested tax matters and recall measures. Out of the 573 total measures, 57 percent (327) were successful. New or amended ordinances constituted the plurality of local measures with a total of 176. There were also 141 tax proposals, 115 charter amendments, and 33 recalls.

The city of Oakland led all local jurisdictions with a total of 12 measures. Among other things, Oakland's voters were asked whether the city council should annually designate an official city newspaper and whether to impose a special tax to provide services to the elderly. Both of those measures failed but eight others were successful, including the establishment of a Public Ethics Commission and a \$45 million general obligation bond for libraries, museums and other cultural and recreational facilities. Other notables included the city of San Luis Obispo with a total of 10 measures, the city of San Diego with 9, the city of Los Angeles with 7, and the Northern California college town of Chico with 6.

County measures had more difficulty at the ballot box than their city and school counterparts. Out of 115 total county measures only 59 (51 percent) were approved by the voters. Tax measures fared the worst with only 10 of 35 (29 percent) passing while 54 percent of proposed ordinances and 65 percent of proposed charter amendments were approved. There were only four county bond measures on the 1996 ballot with two passing. Although recalls are targeted at officeholders, they are nonetheless considered ballot measures. While there were only four county recalls statewide (one in Alpine and three in Tehama), all were successful in removing county supervisors from office. Some of the more interesting measures on county ballots included passage of campaign contribution limits for candidates running in Los Angeles County and rejection of a measure asking voters if they wanted a state prison to be constructed in Lake County.

Orange County voters, perhaps still reeling from their recent fiscal crises, rejected a proposal to expand the board of supervisors from five to nine seats and approved a measure imposing term limits on the same body. Additionally, eight separate Orange County cities voted to impose term limits on their city councils and mayors, including Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Dana Point, Garden Grove, Laguna Niguel, La Palma, Orange, and Yorba Linda.

Of the 371 total city ballot measures, 215 or 58 percent were successful. Tax measures and charter amendments were the most common types of measures on the city ballots. Of the 92

charter amendments, an impressive 75 percent (69) enjoyed success while of the 98 tax measures, only 43 percent (42) passed. Additionally, a mere 3 out of 10 city bond measures were approved.

In 1996, attempts were made to recall 24 city mayors or councilmembers; all but five succeeded. The diverse cities involved ranged from the scenic north coast town of Arcata to the central valley's Chowchilla to the Los Angeles suburb of Hawaiian Gardens. Others on the list included Adelanto, Antioch, Colfax, Colton, Dana Point, Farmersville, Grover Beach, Isleton, and Perris. In this election year, recalls of city officials were clearly a small town phenomenon -- with small defined as a city of less than 50,000 population. Under state law, a recall election is triggered when a certain percentage of voters sign recall petitions. The number of signatures varies according to the number of registered voters in the jurisdiction. For example, in a city with less than 1,000 registered voters, 35 percent of those voters must sign a petition; but in a city of 100,000 voters, only 10 percent is necessary. Despite the sliding scale, it is functionally easier to obtain 350 than 1,000 signatures. Thus, structurally, recalls are easier in smaller cities. However, an additional factor may well be the closer proximity of politics and government in small towns and cities.

Ballot measures in school and community college districts fared best of all with 53 of 87 or 61 percent gaining passage. Revenue generating proposals (bonds and taxes) accounted for two-thirds of these measures. Bond measures alone numbered 50 with a surprising success rate of 66 percent.

### Candidate Elections

It is interesting and perhaps more than a bit odd that voters in 1996 were supportive of both term limits and incumbents. This was especially apparent in Orange County where voters in eight cities imposed term limits on elective city officials while re-electing 10 of 13 incumbents seeking reelection. The 77 percent success rate enjoyed by city council members in these eight cities was, in fact, higher than the statewide reelection rates of county supervisors (69 percent) and city council members (75 percent). Of course, it could be argued that voter behavior in Orange County and elsewhere supporting both incumbents and term limits is, in fact, a rational calculus that voters like individual incumbents but feel that no incumbent should stay in office indefinitely. Alternatively, scholarly literature indicates that many voters feel antipathy toward political institutions and office holders in general while being favorably disposed toward individual politicians. The results in Orange County may simply be a reflection of this "hate Congress but love your Congressman" mentality.

The reelection rates of incumbent county supervisor candidates (69 percent) showed a marked increase over 1994 when less than half of supervisorial incumbents were reelected. Incumbent candidates seeking reelection to other county offices fared even better. Incumbent Superior Court Judges were reelected at a rate of over 76 percent, Municipal Court Judges at over 85 percent, and all of the incumbents running for Sheriff, District Attorney, and Tax Collector were victorious. Tiny Alpine County proved to be one exception to this trend when voters there rejected the bids of all three incumbent supervisors seeking reelection.

Incumbents seeking reelection to city offices fared as well or better than those in the counties. Almost 75 percent, or 303 of the 405 incumbents who ran, were reelected to city councils and incumbent mayors were successful at an 87 percent rate, with 41 of 47 incumbents being reelected. Fifty-three of the 55 incumbent city treasurers were reelected, or 96 percent, while those incumbents seeking other city offices failed to lose any of their races.

The incumbent reelection statistics for the various school offices were similar to the cities' experience. Over 78 percent, or 555 of the 708 incumbents seeking reelection to these offices,

were victorious. No school or community college district sought to impose term limits on their board members in 1966.

### Short Term Trends

The relatively recent introduction of CEDA in 1994 limits any discussion of trends. In addition, comparisons of a non-gubernatorial year election (1996) with one coinciding with major statewide races can suggest misleading conclusions. However, with more history behind it, CEDA will eventually highlight real shifts in electoral habits. In the short term, similarities between the two elections may be evidence of an established pattern -- assuming a sufficient number of cases in both years -- while differences between the two may reflect more the peculiarities of non-gubernatorial year elections rather than change over time.

The most obvious difference between the two years is the large number of ballot measures floated during the non-gubernatorial year election: 1996 ballots contained over twice as many measures as those facing voters in the gubernatorial year, 1994. Initiatives, recalls and tax measures were particularly numerous in the non-gubernatorial year election. Proponents of these measures may assume that it is easier to attract the voters' attention when there are fewer statewide personalities on the ballot. But, in general, more attention does not seem to affect the outcome: pass rates were only marginally lower in 1996 than they had been in 1994 (57% vs 61%).

Some types of measures, however, did better in 1996 than they had in 1994. Losing propositions in 1994, bonds were more apt to win in 1996. In contrast, taxes and initiatives were more apt to lose. Education issues drew more support in 1996 while voters were being less enthusiastic about land use and public facilities. Public safety issues were a toss-up in both election years.

Cities and counties use a non-gubernatorial year election to vote on local offices. Counties particularly concentrate supervisory races and those for other county posts in years with fewer statewide races. On the other hand, the number of school board members on the ballot was virtually the same in both years.

The introduction of term limits at the state level and in many local jurisdictions, and the general anti-government sentiments noted by observers in both California and the nation, may be responsible for the unexpectedly low number of incumbents seeking reelection in 1994 and 1996. The forced retirement of many state legislators significantly increased the electoral opportunities for many local officials. As county supervisors and city council members set their sights on Sacramento, the ripple effect was felt in local elections with the increased frequency of open races. Moreover, as noted in the 1994 CEDA reports, the number of incumbent local officials declining to seek reelection may be a reflection of a national trend of official "burnout:" i.e., elected officials simply deciding that the manifold costs of holding office are too much. The conventional wisdom of incumbent invulnerability at all levels must be modified in light of these data; but it is also reinforced by the fact that those incumbents who did opt to run again were generally successful. Although incumbent reelection rates for all county, city and school board positions were higher in 1996 than 1994, rates in excess of 70 percent were typical in both years.



1996 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/9	2/6	2/27	3/26	4/9	5/14	6/4	8/27	9/17	11/5	12/17
Alameda				T			T			T	
Alpine				T						T	
Amador										T	
Butte				T						T	
Calaveras				T						T	
Colusa										T	
Contra Costa				T						T	
Del Norte				T						T	
El Dorado				T						T	
Fresno				T						T	
Glenn				T			T			T	
Humboldt				T	T					T	
Imperial				T			T			T	
Inyo				T						T	
Kern				T						T	
Kings				T						T	
Lake				T						T	
Lassen				T						T	
Los Angeles				T			T			T	T
Madera				T						T	
Marin				T			T			T	
Mariposa				T						T	
Mendocino				T						T	
Merced				T						T	
Modoc				T	T					T	
Mono				T						T	
Monterey				T	T		T			T	
Napa				T			T			T	
Nevada				T						T	

## 1996 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/9	2/6	2/27	3/26	4/9	5/14	6/4	8/27	9/17	11/5	12/17
Orange				T						T	
Placer				T					T	T	
Plumas				T						T	
Riverside	T			T			T			T	
Sacramento				T						T	
San Benito				T						T	
San Bernardino				T						T	
San Diego			T	T	T		T			T	
San Francisco				T						T	
San Joaquin				T						T	
San Luis Obispo				T						T	
San Mateo				T	T	T	T			T	
Santa Barbara				T						T	
Santa Clara				T			T			T	
Santa Cruz				T						T	
Shasta				T			T			T	
Sierra				T						T	
Siskiyou				T	T			T		T	
Solano				T						T	
Sonoma				T			T			T	
Stanislaus				T			T			T	
Sutter										T	
Tehama		T		T						T	
Trinity				T						T	
Tulare				T						T	
Tuolumne				T						T	
Ventura										T	
Yolo				T						T	
Yuba				T						T	



---

1996 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, 1996

	GO BOND		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		TAXES		RECALL		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	5		12	8			2				11	2	3	3			33	13	46
Alpine															1		1	0	1
Amador						1					1						1	1	2
Butte			4	5				2			2		1	2			7	9	16
Calaveras		1									1			2			1	4	5
Contra Costa		1		1	1	1					1	1	5	4	1	1	8	9	17
El Dorado												1		1			0	2	2
Fresno	1		10		1						2		4	1			18	1	19
Glenn		1									3					1	3	2	5
Humboldt			1													1	1	1	2
Imperial												3	2	3			2	6	8
Inyo											1	1					1	1	2
Kern			3									1		3			3	4	7
Kings		1									3						3	1	4
Lake						1						1					0	2	2
Lassen	2																2	0	2
Los Angeles	4	5	13	1	1	1		1			3	5	8	6	2	2	31	21	52
Madera		1									2	1			3		5	2	7
Marin									4			1	2	3			6	4	10
Mariposa											1		1				2	0	2
Mendocino											1	2		4			1	6	7
Modoc					1												1	0	1
Mono								1			1		1				2	1	3
Monterey			1								3	1	1				5	2	7
Napa	1		1	5				1			1	1					3	7	10
Nevada			1		1						2	1					4	1	5
Orange		1	2	3		2	1	2			12	7	3	3		2	18	20	38
Placer											1	6		7	4		5	13	18
Riverside	1	7	1		1						3	5	2	5	1		9	17	26
Sacramento		3	4	1				1			1	1	5	3	1		12	8	20

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	GO BOND		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		TAXES		RECALL		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
San Benito														3			0	3	3
San Bernardino		1	1								2	3	1	4	4		8	8	16
San Diego	3		3	3		1		2			8	5	2	3		3	16	17	33
San Francisco	1	1	1	2							3	4					5	7	12
San Joaquin											1	2					1	2	3
San Luis Obispo			8		1						6		4		1		20	0	20
San Mateo	5						1				3	2	2				11	2	13
Santa Barbara	3	1									1		2	9			6	10	16
Santa Clara	4		10		2	1	1		1		5	1	1	3			24	5	29
Santa Cruz					1												1	0	1
Shasta		2								1							1	3	4
Sierra													1				1	0	1
Siskiyou											3	3					3	3	6
Solano											2		2	1			4	1	5
Sonoma	4		3	1			1				8	2		2			16	5	21
Stanislaus	2												1	1			3	1	4
Sutter											1	3		1			1	4	5
Tehama			1			1						2			3		4	3	7
Trinity													1	2			1	2	3
Tulare			3	1								1			2		5	2	7
Tuolumne												1					0	1	1
Ventura	1		1								1	3	2	2			5	5	10
Yolo	1						1				1	1					2	2	4
Yuba														3			0	3	3
All Counties	38	26	84	31	10	10	7	11	5	1	102	74	57	84	23	10	326	247	573

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC		HOUSING		GENERAL SVCS.		WATER USE/SVC.		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	TOTAL
Alameda	5	1	5		4	1	12	6					3	3	1		1				2	2	33	13	46
Alpine							1																1	0	1
Amador	1							1															1	1	2
Butte				1	1	2	3	1		1		1					1	2	1	1	1		7	9	16
Calaveras		1		1		1	1														1		1	4	5
Contra Costa	1	1		1		1	3	2		2			4								2		8	9	17
El Dorado				1																		1	0	2	2
Fresno	2				3		10										1				2	1	18	1	19
Glenn	1	1					2	1															3	2	5
Humboldt							1															1	1	1	2
Imperial								2					1	1			1	3					2	6	8
Inyo							1	1															1	1	2
Kern					1	2	2	1						1									3	4	7
Kings		1					2														1		3	1	4
Lake						1																1	0	2	2
Lassen	2																						2	0	2
Los Angeles	6	5		2	1	2	14	5	2								7	5			1	2	31	21	52
Madera						1	5	1															5	2	7
Marin	2	1			1		3			1				1				1					6	4	10
Mariposa					1												1						2	0	2
Mendocino		1	1					2						1								2	1	6	7
Modoc							1																1	0	1
Mono				1											1		1						2	1	3
Monterey	3		1	2													1						5	2	7
Napa	1		1	2			1	5															3	7	10
Nevada	1			1							1										2		4	1	5
Orange				1			13	12	1	2				1			2	1		2	2	1	18	20	38
Placer				1			5	5										7					5	13	18
Riverside	1	5	2	1	1		3	4		2							2	5					9	17	26
Sacramento		2			1	1	5	1	1	2				2			4				1		12	8	20
San Benito																		3					0	3	3

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC		HOUSING		GENERAL SVCS.		WATER USE/SVC.		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	TOTAL	
San Bernardino	1	3	1	1		1	5				1						1	1				1	8	8	16	
San Diego	3		4	3			5	8					1	3	1	1	2	1				1	16	17	33	
San Francisco			1			1	3	3				1		2	1								5	7	12	
San Joaquin	1			1																		1	1	2	3	
San Luis Obispo	2		1		1		10						1				3		1		1		20	0	20	
San Mateo	4		1	1	1		1	1		1			1				1			1			11	2	13	
Santa Barbara	3	1	1										1	8			1					1	6	10	16	
Santa Clara	5		3	1	1		11		1		1		2					3			1		24	5	29	
Santa Cruz	1																						1	0	1	
Shasta	1	2				1																	1	3	4	
Sierra																	1						1	0	1	
Siskiyou					2	1		2														1		3	3	6
Solano			1														2				1	1	4	1	5	
Sonoma	4	1	6			1	5	2						1	1								16	5	21	
Stanislaus	2				1	1																	3	1	4	
Sutter							1	2							1			1					1	4	5	
Tehama		1					3	1		1											1		4	3	7	
Trinity																	1	1				1	1	2	3	
Tulare	1	1					4	1															5	2	7	
Tuolumne															1								0	1	1	
Ventura	1		1	1		1	1	3									2						5	5	10	
Yolo	1			1					1	1													2	2	4	
Yuba										1								1		1			0	3	3	
All Counties	56	28	30	24	20	19	137	73	6	13	3	3	14	24	5	3	36	35	2	4	17	21	326	247	573	

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 1996

		County Supervisor		Other County Offices		City Council		Other City Offices		School Board Member		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	69.3	95	84.1	37	74.8	303	94.4	153	78.4	555	78.5	1,143
	Lose	30.7	42	15.9	7	25.2	102	5.6	9	21.6	153	21.5	313
	Total	100.0	137	100.0	44	100.0	405	100.0	162	100.0	708	100.0	1,456
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	29.1	127	30.4	62	31.0	427	29.8	64	33.5	617	31.8	1,297
	Lose	70.9	310	69.6	142	69.0	951	70.2	151	66.5	1,223	68.2	2,777
	Total	100.0	437	100.0	204	100.0	1,378	100.0	215	100.0	1,840	100.0	4,074
Winning Candidates	Incumbents	42.8	95	37.4	37	41.5	303	70.5	153	47.4	555	46.8	1,143
	Non-Incumbents	57.2	127	62.6	62	58.5	427	29.5	64	52.6	617	53.2	1,297
	Total	100.0	222	100.0	99	100.0	730	100.0	217	100.0	1,172	100.0	2,440
Losing Candidates	Incumbents	11.9	42	4.7	7	9.7	102	5.6	9	11.1	153	10.1	313
	Non-Incumbents	88.1	310	95.3	142	90.3	951	94.4	151	88.9	1,223	89.9	2,777
	Total	100.0	352	100.0	149	100.0	1,053	100.0	160	100.0	1,376	100.0	3,090
All Candidates	Incumbent	23.9	137	17.7	44	22.7	405	43.0	162	27.8	708	26.3	1,456
	Non-Incumbents	76.1	437	82.3	204	77.3	1,378	57.0	215	72.2	1,840	73.7	4,074
	Total	100.0	574	100.0	248	100.0	1,783	100.0	377	100.0	2,548	100.0	5,530





---

---

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

---

---



TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	11/5/96	Measure C	Charter Amendment	Safety: Police	234,964	350,400	67.1%	Pass	
		Measure D	Utility Tax	General Services	242,259	357,845	67.7%	Pass	
		Measure E	Charter Amendment	Facilities: Health	181,082	367,272	49.3%	Fail	
ALPINE	3/26/96	Recall	Recall	Governance: Elections	114	152	75.0%	Pass	
AMADOR	11/5/96	Measure R	Advisory	Governance: Organization	5,211	13,279	39.2%	Fail	
BUTTE	3/26/96	Measure A	Utility Tax	General Services	16,906	31,076	54.4%	Pass	
	11/5/96	Measure C	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	11,451	70,331	16.3%	Fail	
		Measure D	Charter Amendment	Safety	21,553	68,423	31.5%	Fail	
		Measure E	Charter Amendment	Safety	15,761	68,398	23.0%	Fail	
		Measure F	Initiative	Water Usage/Service	18,574	69,967	26.5%	Fail	
CALAVERAS	3/26/96	Measure G	Ordinance	Water Usage/Service	37,185	69,657	53.4%	Pass	
		Measure A	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	3,648	4,734	77.1%	Pass	
		Measure B	Business Tax	Other	3,964	12,216	32.4%	Fail*	
COLUSA	No County Measures								
CONTRA COSTA	11/5/96	Measure A	Advisory	Governance	206,289	304,980	67.6%	Pass	
DEL NORTE	No County Measures								
EL DORADO	11/5/96	Measure J	Business Tax	Other	27,767	58,289	47.6%	Fail	
		Measure K	Ordinance	Land Use: Private Projects	29,488	60,522	48.7%	Fail	
FRESNO	No County Measures								
GLENN	3/26/96	Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	3,505	5,592	62.7%	Pass	
		Measure D	Ordinance	Education: Districts	1,560	2,581	60.4%	Pass	
	11/5/96	Recall	Recall	Governance: Elections	3,579	8,508	42.1%	Fail	
HUMBOLDT	No County Measures								
IMPERIAL	11/5/96	Measure G	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	6,731	23,721	28.4%	Fail	
		Measure H	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	6,675	23,727	28.1%	Fail	
INYO	11/5/96	Measure A	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	1,752	7,177	24.4%	Fail	
		Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	4,536	7,009	64.7%	Pass	
KERN	11/5/96	Measure L	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	63,420	143,764	44.1%	Fail	
KINGS	11/5/96	Measure G	Ordinance	Other	13,695	24,142	56.7%	Pass	
LAKE	3/26/96	Measure S	Advisory	Safety: Jails	7,952	16,839	47.2%	Fail	
LASSEN	No County Measures								

\* Measure required a two-thirds vote to pass. All other county measures required a majority vote.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
LOS ANGELES	11/5/96	Measure A	Property Tax	Property Tax	Environment: Parks/Recreation	1,439,597	2,212,380	65.1%	Pass
		Measure B	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform	1,544,685	2,044,040	75.6%	Pass
		Measure C	Charter Amendment	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Offices	837,680	1,867,590	44.9%	Fail
MADERA	11/5/96	Measure J	GO Bond	GO Bond	Safety: Jails	18,568	29,433	63.1%	Fail*
		Measure K	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	12,321	27,657	44.5%	Fail
		Measure L	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	13,609	27,217	50.0%	Pass
		Measure M	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	20,873	28,400	73.5%	Pass
MARIN	11/5/96	Measure A	Sales Tax	Sales Tax	Environment: Parks/Recreation	62,254	107,962	57.7%	Fail*
		Measure G	Gann Limit	Gann Limit	Governance	618	794	77.8%	Pass
		Measure H	Gann Limit	Gann Limit	Governance	114	140	81.4%	Pass
MARIPOSA	3/26/96	Measure A	Ordinance	Ordinance	Safety: Police	3,779	5,479	69.0%	Pass
		Measure B	Business Tax	Business Tax	General Services	3,514	5,489	64.0%	Pass
MENDOCINO	3/26/96	Measure C	Sales Tax	Sales Tax	Other	8,309	21,687	38.3%	Fail*
	11/5/96	Measure A	Business Tax	Business Tax	Other	15,151	30,516	49.6%	Fail*
MERCED	No County Measures								
MODOC	3/26/96	Measure A	Advisory	Advisory	Governance: Political Reform	2,606	3,420	76.2%	Pass
MONO	No County Measures								
MONTEREY	11/5/96	Measure E	Initiative	Initiative	Land Use: Open Space	43,658	100,868	43.3%	Fail
		Measure M	Ordinance	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	46,556	103,764	44.9%	Fail
NAPA	3/26/96	Measure W	Ordinance	Ordinance	Land Use: Growth Cap	6,053	36,755	16.5%	Fail
		Measure X	Initiative	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	5,244	36,819	14.2%	Fail
	11/5/96	Measure Z	Ordinance	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	25,184	46,020	54.7%	Pass
NEVADA	3/26/96	Measure B	Advisory	Advisory	Other	23,478	28,775	81.6%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Ordinance	Transport: Roads	17,735	29,921	59.3%	Pass
ORANGE	3/26/96	Initiative S	Initiative	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	195,223	482,653	40.4%	Fail
		Measure T	Charter Amendment	Charter Amendment	Governance: Organization	168,545	427,506	39.4%	Fail
		Measure U	Property Tax	Property Tax	Governance: Organization	111,279	450,535	24.7%	Fail
	11/5/96	Measure A	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Term Limits	591,981	747,607	79.2%	Pass
PLACER	11/5/96	Measure A	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	35,533	73,946	48.1%	Fail
		Measure B	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	25,910	72,910	35.5%	Fail
		Measure C	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	42,670	73,596	58.0%	Pass
		Measure D	Ordinance	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Offices	32,284	72,464	44.6%	Fail
		Measure L	Business Tax	Business Tax	General Services	11,361	32,116	35.4%	Fail

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL	
PLUMAS	No County Measures								
RIVERSIDE	No County Measures								
SACRAMENTO	11/5/96	Measure C	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Offices	177,459	317,120	56.0%	Pass	
		Measure D	Property Tax	Facilities: Libraries	135,188	231,186	58.5%	Fail*	
SAN BENITO	3/26/96	Measure D	Business Tax	General Services	2,732	8,379	32.6%	Fail	
	11/5/96	Measure E	Business Tax	General Services	4,991	12,806	39.0%	Fail	
SAN BERNARDINO	3/26/96	Measure L	Ordinance	Land Use: Private Projects	103,758	219,752	47.2%	Fail	
		Measure M	Business Tax	General Services	88,764	213,900	41.5%	Fail	
SAN DIEGO	3/26/96	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Offices	139,661	479,606	29.1%	Fail	
	11/5/96	Measure A	Sales Tax	Facilities: Libraries	486,432	823,290	59.1%	Fail*	
		Measure B	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Offices	423,213	725,571	58.3%	Pass	
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure A	Bond	Housing: Affordable	176,599	261,845	67.4%	Pass*	
		Measure B	GO Bond	Facilities	166,923	266,639	62.6%	Fail*	
		Measure E	Charter Amendment	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	71,114	259,681	27.4%	Fail	
		Measure F	Ordinance	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	96,036	262,123	36.6%	Fail	
		Measure G	Charter Amendment	Governance: Elections	142,163	250,541	56.7%	Pass	
		Measure H	Ordinance	Governance: Elections	103,787	238,050	43.6%	Fail	
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures								
SAN LUIS OBISPO	3/26/96	Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	46,578	62,394	74.7%	Pass	
	11/5/96	Measure H	Ordinance	Facilities: Health	66,629	91,233	73.0%	Pass	
SAN MATEO	3/26/96	Measure A	Property Tax	Safety: Police and Fire	1,118	1,401	79.8%	Pass	
	11/5/96	Measure T	Initiative	Transport: Roads	170,148	230,589	73.8%	Pass	
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure A96	Ordinance	Land Use: Private Projects	46,412	86,558	53.6%	Pass	
		Measure B96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	109	396	27.5%	Fail	
		Measure C96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	199	522	38.1%	Fail	
		Measure D96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	1,532	3,866	39.6%	Fail	
		Measure E96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	101	346	29.2%	Fail	
		Measure F96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	3,443	10,965	31.4%	Fail	
		Measure G96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	3,587	8,808	40.7%	Fail	
		Measure H96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	3,356	8,182	41.0%	Fail	
		Measure I96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	2,054	6,177	33.3%	Fail	
		Measure J96	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	24,424	48,234	50.6%	Pass	

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE	TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SANTA CLARA	3/26/96	Measure	A	Charter Amendment	Environment: Parks/Recreation	219,874	274,082	80.2%	Pass
	11/5/96	Measure	A	Sales Tax	Transport: Mass Transit/Roads	366,387	471,938	77.6%	Pass*
		Measure	B	Sales Tax	General Services	240,610	464,289	51.8%	Fail*
		Measure	C	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Offices	291,841	426,349	68.5%	Pass
SANTA CRUZ	No County Measures								
SHASTA	No County Measures								
SIERRA	3/26/96	Measure	A	Business Tax	General Services	852	1,417	60.1%	Pass
SISKIYOU	No County Measures								
SOLANO	No County Measures								
SONOMA	11/5/96	Measure	D	Ordinance	Land Use: Growth Cap	111,423	158,959	70.1%	Pass
		Measure	E	Ordinance	Facilities: Health	62,537	157,562	39.7%	Fail
STANISLAUS	No County Measures								
SUTTER	11/5/96	Measure	BB	Ordinance	Housing: Affordable	9,502	23,190	41.0%	Fail
TEHAMA	2/6/96	Recall	Dist. 2	Recall	Governance: Elections	8,265	12,409	66.6%	Pass
		Recall	Dist. 4	Recall	Governance: Elections	7,714	12,303	62.7%	Pass
		Recall	Dist. 5	Recall	Governance: Elections	8,422	12,291	68.5%	Pass
	3/26/96	Measure	A	Charter Amendment	Other	9,096	13,062	69.6%	Pass
TRINITY	3/26/96	Measure	A	Utility Tax	Other	459	4,555	10.1%	Fail*
		Measure	B	Business Tax	General Services	1,051	4,517	23.3%	Fail
		Measure	C	Business Tax	General Services	2,405	4,482	53.7%	Pass
TUOLUMNE	3/26/96	Measure	G	Ordinance	Housing: Rent Control	5,414	15,477	35.0%	Fail
VENTURA	No County Measures								
YOLO	11/5/96	Measure	C	Initiative	Environment: Regulation	20,217	50,942	39.7%	Fail
		Measure	D	Ordinance	Environment: Regulation	31,463	51,381	61.2%	Pass
YUBA	3/26/96	Measure	I	Business Tax	General Services	4,334	10,307	42.0%	Fail
		Measure	J	Business Tax	Environment: Regulation	5,190	11,337	45.8%	Fail

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

ALAMEDA	11/5/96	Measure C	Pass
Shall the Charter of the County of Alameda be amended to provide that not to exceed two persons serving as Assistant Sheriff shall be included in the unclassified service of the County?			
ALAMEDA	11/5/96	Measure D	Pass
Shall County ordinances be approved in order to approve and continue until June 30, 2001 the existing 5.5% Utility Users Tax which is collected only in the unincorporated areas of the County (e.g. Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo, Sunol) and DOES NOT APPLY in the cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, or Union City, the proceeds of which are used to fund general county services to the unincorporated areas, including, but not limited to, Sheriff=s Department services, County library services, and County planning services?			
ALAMEDA	11/5/96	Measure E	Fail
Shall the Charter of the County of Alameda be amended to restrict generally the powers of the Board of Supervisors to change County health care services; including a specific restriction on the powers of the Board to (1) reduce the level of medical services provided at the Alameda County Medical Center, (2) close, lease, sell or transfer Alameda County Medical Center assets and (3) transfer the management or change the governance of the Alameda County Medical Center, be approved?			
ALPINE	3/26/96	Recall	Pass
Shall WARREN JANG be recalled (removed) from the office of Supervisor, 4th District of Alpine County?			
AMADOR	11/5/96	Measure R	Fail
Should the Amador County Board of Supervisors seek from the California Legislature an amendment to Section 95-7.1 of the Amador Water Agency Act to change the governing body of the Amador Water Agency from an independently elected board of directors to the Amador County Board of Supervisors? This is an advisory vote only. The Board of Supervisors has not taken a position on the merits of this matter.			
BUTTE	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass
In order to maintain the current level of County services, including fire protection, law enforcement, criminal prosecution and library services, shall the Utility User Tax levied in the unincorporated area of Butte County by Ordinance Number 3229 be approved, thereby continuing the tax at its current rate until the year 20, at which time the tax shall expire?			
BUTTE	11/5/96	Measure C	Fail
Shall the "Initiative Ordinance Amending Butte County General Plan and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance; Repealing Agricultural Protection Zone; and Rezoning U (Unclassified) Zones" be adopted?			
BUTTE	11/5/96	Measure D	Fail
Shall the initiative County Charter amendment entitled "Public Safety Priority", requiring that the annual budget of each County "Public Safety Agency" be at least as great as the "Base Year Budget", be adopted? "Base Year Budget" for each such agency is defined as the greater of (1) the total spending authorizations approved for the prior fiscal year, plus inflationary increases, or (2) the amount approved as the 1995-96 budget, plus later approved augmentations and cumulative annual "inflationary increases." "Base Year Budget" includes certain revenues beyond County control, such as State and Federal grants and reimbursements, but excludes funding for capital projects.			
BUTTE	11/5/96	Measure E	Fail
Shall the County Charter amendment entitled "Public Protection Priority", requiring that the annual budget of each County "Public Safety Agency" be at least as great as the "Base Year Budget" be adopted? "Base Year Budget" is defined as the amount approved as the FY 1995-96 budget, plus approved augmentations to that budget. "Base Year Budget" excludes certain revenues beyond County control, such as State and Federal grants and reimbursements, one-time spending authorizations, and funding for capital outlay urposes.			
BUTTE	11/5/96	Measure F	Fail
Shall the initiative ordinance regarding "Regulation of the Extraction of Groundwater within the Butte Groundwater Basin" be adopted, which ordinance would establish a County Water Department and, with specified exceptions, require permits for the extraction of groundwater, said permits to be issued only in compliance with specified standards and with a Water Management plan to be prepared?			
BUTTE	11/5/96	Measure G	Pass
Shall the ordinance entitled "An Ordinance to Protect the Groundwater Resources in Butte County" be adopted, which ordinance would, with specified exceptions, require permits for the extraction of groundwater for use 1) outside the County or 2) to substitute for surface water normally used within the County but transferred or proposed to be transferred for use outside the County?			
CALAVERAS	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass
Shall the "Calaveras Municipal Utility District" be created and established as a Countywide district with the intent to seek approval to provide electric service?			
CALAVERAS	3/26/96	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

Shall the County-wide Transient Occupancy Tax be raised from six percent (6%) to eight percent (8%), with an amount equal to thirty-one percent (31%) of the total Transient Occupancy Tax received by the County to be used to promote tourism in the County?

CONTRA COSTA            11/5/96            Measure A            Pass  
 ADVISORY MEASURE. Shall the Board of Supervisors establish a Citizens Commission on Local Government Efficiency, the majority of whom shall be from outside government, to examine issues related to local government for the purpose of making government in Contra Costa more cost efficient and effective, to draft and present a County Charter to the Board of Supervisors for possible submission to local voters at a subsequent election?

EL DORADO            11/5/96            Measure J            Fail  
 Shall the action of the Board of Supervisors increasing the transient occupancy tax from 8% to 10% be ratified?

EL DORADO            11/5/96            Measure K            Fail  
 Shall Measure K be adopted, establishing: (a) traffic generation standards for approving residential subdivisions of five or more parcels, more restrictive than certain standards in El Dorado County's General Plan; and, (b) standards for use by County in determining whether adequate water supplies are available prior to approval of residential subdivisions within El Dorado Irrigation District's service area, including water allocations for current EID users, for nonresidential uses, and for existing or approved, but undeveloped, residential parcels?

GLENN            3/26/96            Measure C            Pass  
 Shall the Board of Supervisors establish the consolidated office of Director of Finance, to perform the duties of Auditor-Controller and Treasurer-Tax Collector for Glenn County?

GLENN            3/26/96            Measure D            Pass  
 Shall a unified school district be formed between Orland Joint Union High School and the Orland Joint Union School District excluding the school districts of Lake and Plaza?

GLENN            11/5/96            Recall            Fail  
 Shall LEWIS K. DONNELLEY be recalled (removed) from the office of Sheriff-Coroner for the County of Glenn?

IMPERIAL            11/5/96            Measure G            Fail  
 Do you approve of changing the office of Imperial County Auditor/Controller from an elective position to an appointive position effective January 1, 1999?

IMPERIAL            11/5/96            Measure H            Fail  
 Do you approve of changing the office of Imperial County Public Administrator/Guardian/Conservator from and Elective position to an appointive position effective January 1, 1999?

INYO            11/5/96            Measure A            Fail  
 Shall the Board of Supervisors establish the consolidated office of the Director of Finance to perform the duties of Auditor-Controller and Treasurer-Tax Collector for Into County?

INYO            11/5/96            Measure B            Pass  
 If the offices of County Auditor-Controller and County Treasurer-Tax Collector are to be consolidated into a single office of County Director of Finance, shall the Board of Supervisors establish the position of County Director of Finance as an elective office?

KERN            11/5/96            Measure L            Fail  
 Shall the Kern County Civil Service Ordinance (Chapter 3.04) be amended to provide: (1) that department heads and other appointees of the Board of Supervisors are exempt from the civil service system; (2) that the Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Human Resources Administrator who shall manage the system and implement the rules adopted by the Civil service Commission and the Board of Supervisors; (3) that employees appealing a disciplinary action have the option of a hearing before either an arbitrator or the Civil Service Commission; and (4) that the language of the Ordinance be made consistent with current federal and state law?

KINGS            11/5/96            Measure G            Pass  
 Shall the Board of Supervisors be prohibited from arranging for solid waste collection, from selecting waste haulers for the collection of solid waste, and from requiring mandatory collection of solid waste within the unincorporated territory of Kings County?

LAKE            3/26/96            Measure S            Fail  
 We the people of the County of Lake support the sitting of a State Prison in the County of Lake.

LOS ANGELES            11/5/96            Measure A            Pass  
 NEIGHBORHOOD AND REGIONAL PARK, RECREATION AND RELATED IMPROVEMENTS; FUNDING. To improve the safety of neighborhood and regional





## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

MODOC	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass
Shall the Legislature place on the statewide ballot a proposed amendment to the California Constitution to give local government jurisdictions the legal authority to (a) decline to implement a program mandated by the State or Federal government without the full funding necessary to perform the mandated service, or (b) discontinue a program mandated by the State or Federal government when all funds provided by the State or Federal government for such a mandate have been expended?			
MONTEREY	11/5/96	Measure E	Fail
Shall the Agricultural Land and Resource Conservation Initiative be approved?			
MONTEREY	11/5/96	Measure M	Fail
Shall Ordinance No. 03857 approving rezoning of portions of the Santa Lucia Preserve subdivision (also known as Rancho San Carlos) be approved?			
NAPA	3/26/96	Measure W	Fail
Should Napa County Ordinance No. 96-1 (Controlled Growth Initiative) be adopted?			
NAPA	3/26/96	Measure X	Fail
Should Napa County Ordinance No. 96-2 (Suscol Creek Balanced Planning Initiative) be adopted?			
NAPA	11/5/96	Measure Z	Pass
Should Ordinance No. 96-3 be adopted? (if the ordinance is adopted, the land use regulations of the County will be changed to create a new zoning district and include a single parcel located at 3100 Golden Gate Drive, south of the City of Napa, within that zoning district. Existing roadside stand operations located on parcels that are included within the new zoning district will be permitted to (i) sell agricultural produce, fruits, vegetables and Christmas trees which are grown on or off the parcel on which the roadside stand is located, (ii) sell related non-agricultural items, (iii) conduct certain limited commercial activities involving the recreational/educational use of animals, such as petting zoos and pony rides, and (iv) construct such structures as are needed to enable such sales and commercial activities to occur. Only parcels designated on the Napa County General Plan as Agriculture Watershed and Open Space are eligible to be included within this zoning district).			
NEVADA	3/26/96	Measure B	Pass
Shall the electorate of the County of Nevada request and direct the California State Legislature to propose an amendment to the California Constitution opposing unfunded Federal and State mandates imposed on local governments and giving local government the legal authority to (a) decline to implement a program mandated by the State or Federal government without the full funding necessary to perform the mandated service, or (b) discontinue a program mandated by the State or Federal government when all funds provided by the State or Federal government for such a mandate have been expended?			
NEVADA	3/26/96	Measure F	Pass
Shall the County of Nevada be required to expend at least one-half of the motor vehicle in lieu taxes received by the County on the maintenance, repair, circulation, enhancement, general road safety and fire access of the public roads, ways, and highways within the County of Nevada?			
ORANGE	3/26/96	Initiative S	Fail
INITIATIVE TO AMEND GENERAL PLAN MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO. Shall the initiative measure entitled "The El Toro Responsible Economic Development Initiative," which would repeal Measure A, abolish the El Toro Airport Citizens Advisory Commission, and which states the highest and best civilian use for Marine Corps Air Station El Toro is not a civilian airport, be approved?			
ORANGE	3/26/96	Measure T	Fail
MEASURE TO ADOPT ORANGE COUNTY PROPOSED CHARTER. Shall the measure entitled "Orange County Proposed Charter" which would result in Orange County becoming a charter county be adopted?			
ORANGE	3/26/96	Measure U	Fail
MEASURE TO AMEND THE ORANGE COUNTY PROPOSED CHARTER TO INCREASE MEMBERS OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FROM FIVE TO NINE. Shall the measure entitled "proposed Amendment to Orange County Proposed Charter to Increase Members of Board of Supervisors From Five to Nine" be adopted?			
ORANGE	11/5/96	Measure A	Pass
Shall Section 1-2-9, which would establish a consecutive term limitation of two(2) consecutive four(4) year terms for the office of member of the Board of Supervisors, be added to the Codified Ordinances of Orange County?			
PLACER	11/5/96	Measure A	Fail
LIMIT THE ROLE OF COUNTY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION. Shall Placer County Ordinance 501-B, now codified within Placer County Code, Chapter 14, governing the civil service system for employees of the County be amended to eliminate all duties and responsibilities of the Civil Service Commission, with the exception of its duties and responsibilities as a hearing body for employee grievances, disciplinary appeals and such other matters for which a hearing is provided?			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

PLACER	11/5/96	Measure B	Fail
APPOINTMENT OF COUNTY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS. Shall Sections 14.101 and 14.102 of County Ordinance 501-B, now codified as Placer County Code Sections 14.1010 and 14.1020 be amended to require that the appointment of the five (5) member Civil Service Commission be by supervisorial district by the supervisor representing that district and that the term of appointment shall be the same as the County Supervisor making the appointment?			
PLACER	11/5/96	Measure C	Pass
MEETINGS OF COUNTY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION. Shall Section 14.103 of County Ordinance 501-B, now codified as Placer County Code Section 14.1030, be amended to allow the Civil Service Commission to decide the need and frequency to hold its meetings, rather than the current requirement of meetings once a month regardless of the amount or absence of business to conduct?			
PLACER	11/5/96	Measure D	Fail
APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL. Shall Section 14.104 of County Ordinance 501-B, now codified as Placer County Code Section 14.1050 be amended to require the appointment of the Director of Personnel by the County Executive Officer, rather than the Civil Service Commission as under current law, and that the position be placed in the unclassified service consistent with other Department Heads of the County?			
PLACER	11/5/96	Measure L	Fail
Shall Placer County Code, Chapter 21, Section 21.3 be amended to impose a general tax under the provisions of Government Code Section 53723, which would increase the rate of Transient Occupancy Tax from EIGHT (8%) PERCENT TO ten (10%) percent for that area legally described as the "Western Slope Transient Occupancy Tax Area," to read as set forth in Exhibit "A" of Resolution 96-177 adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors on June 25, 1996 and on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors?			
SACRAMENTO	11/5/96	Measure A	Fail
CHARTER AMENDMENT RELATING TO CIVIL SERVICE EXEMPTION. Section 71-D of the Sacramento County Charter excludes from Civil Service specifically identified personnel by position, including department head, one assistant to each County Supervisor, and the chief deputy to each elective officer. Shall Section 71-D be amended to expand designated positions to include all assistants to each Supervisor, secretaries to each Supervisor, the secretary to the County Executive, all assistant or deputy department heads and to additionally exclude from Civil Service positions designated as 'Management'; provided the total number of exempt positions does not exceed 5% of the total number of permanent County positions?			
SACRAMENTO	11/5/96	Measure B	Pass
CHARTER AMENDMENT RELATING TO CONTRACTING FOR COUNTY SERVICES. The Sacramento County Charter restricts the ability of the County to contract for the provision of services traditionally provided by civil service personnel. Shall Section 71-J be added to the Charter to permit contracting for such services for reasons of economy and efficiency provided there is no displacement of existing civil service employees, obligations to meet and confer with employee organizations are met and the contract is publicly and competitively awarded?			
SACRAMENTO	11/5/96	Measure C	Pass
CHARTER AMENDMENT RELATING TO DIRECTOR OF FINANCE. Section 24 and 27 of the Sacramento County Charter require the election of an Auditor of the County of Sacramento and the appointment of a Treasurer. Shall Sections 24 and 27 be amended to allow the consolidation of these offices into the appointive position of Director of Finance.			
SACRAMENTO	11/5/96	Measure D	Fail (2/3 required)
COUNTY LIBRARY TAX. To restore open hours, funding for new books and updated technology in all branch libraries shall a service charge-benefit assessment be imposed for no more than ten (10) years within a community facilities district encompassing the unincorporated area of Sacramento County to be imposed at the initial rate of \$22.00 per year for single family dwellings and all other properties at specified proportional amounts, with adjustments not exceeding 3% annually or more than \$7.00 for single family residence during the duration of the tax, exempting common areas, agricultural property and public agencies.			
SAN BENITO	3/26/96	Measure D	Fail
Shall the amended business license tax ordinance increasing the business tax of mining operations be approved?			
SAN BENITO	11/5/96	Measure E	Fail
Shall an ordinance establishing a business license tax on mineral depletion businesses be approved?			
SAN BERNARDINO	3/26/96	Measure L	Fail
Shall an ordinance of the County of San Bernardino be adopted which would prohibit, in the unincorporated portion of the County, large solid waste landfills which overlie or are located within 10 miles from the point of extraction of a significant water resource, unless the large solid waste landfill was fully permitted, constructed and had commenced operations as of March 14, 1995?			
SAN BERNARDINO	3/26/96	Measure M	Fail
Shall the levy of a business license tax on permitted operators of solid waste disposal sites located within the unincorporated territory of the County, as provided in sections 43.031 through 43.037 of the San Bernardino County Code, be approved?			
SAN DIEGO	3/26/96	Measure A	Fail

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER. Shall the San Diego County Charter be amended to change the Treasurer/Tax Collector from an elective to an appointive officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer?

SAN DIEGO	11/5/96	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
County Community and Branch Library Improvement Ordinance - 1/4 cent transactions and use tax for library purposes.			
SAN DIEGO	11/5/96	Measure B	Pass
Charter Amendment. Would change the positions of County Counsel and the principal assistants from Classified to Unclassified Service.			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
AFFORDABLE HOUSING BONDS, 1996. To incur bonded indebtedness of \$100,000,000 for the financing of (1) the development of housing affordable to low-income households in the City and County of San Francisco and (2) down-payment assistance to low- and moderate-income first-time home buyers, and all other costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)
DE YOUNG MUSEUM REPLACEMENT BONDS, 1996. To incur bonded indebtedness of \$73,300,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of a new museum facility to replace the de Young Museum and all other works, property, and structures necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure E	Fail
Shall the Board of Supervisors, rather than the voters, approve changes in City employee retirement and health benefits and other Charter rules governing City employment?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure F	Fail
Shall the salary paid to members of the Board of Supervisors be increased from \$23,924 to \$50,000, and shall Board members be permitted to receive City Retirement benefits?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure G	Pass
Shall the Board of Supervisors be elected by district, and shall there be district run-off elections if no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast in a district?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	Measure H	Fail
Shall the Board of Supervisors be elected using preference voting?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	3/26/96	Measure B	Pass
Shall limitations be established on the compensation for members of the County Board of Supervisors by: (1) Rescinding San Luis Obispo County Ordinance No. 2695, adopted October 11, 1994, which established the current compensation for members of the Board of Supervisors; and (2) amending San Luis Obispo County Code Section 2.48.095 by deleting certain provisions for establishing compensation for members of the Board of Supervisors based upon a salary survey of six comparable counties, and replacing those provisions with a requirement that salary increases for members of the Board of Supervisors shall be approved by a majority vote of the people?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	11/5/96	Measure H	Pass
Shall San Luis Obispo County General Hospital be established by ordinance in order to require that any decision to close, sell or lease the hospital would need to be approved by a vote of the people?			
SAN MATEO	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Resolution No. 59915 of the County of San Mateo imposing an annual special tax for fire protection and extended police services according to the schedule therein be approved?			
SAN MATEO	11/5/96	Measure T	Pass
Shall the initiative ordinance changing the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program to substitute a tunnel alternative at Devil's Slide in place of a bypass on Route 1 be adopted?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure A96	Pass
VOTER APPROVAL OF SOUTH COAST ONSHORE OIL AND GAS SUPPORT FACILITIES OUTSIDE OF EXISTING CONSOLIDATED PROCESSING SITES. Shall an ordinance be adopted that required voter approval, for a period of 25 years, of any legislative approval made by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors that authorizes or allows the development, construction, installation or expansion of any onshore use, installation or activity on the South Coast of the County of Santa Barbara (from Point Arguello to Venture County border) that proposed to effectuate or support the exploration, development, production, storage, processing or other activities related to offshore energy resources?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure B96	Fail
BRADLEY FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the Bradley Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure C96	Fail
GUADALUPE FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

on real property in the Guadalupe Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?

SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure D96	Fail
LOMPOC VALLEY FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the Lompc Valley Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure E96	Fail
LOS ALAMOS FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the Los Alamos Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure F96	Fail
ORCUTT FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the Orcutt Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure G96	Fail
SANTA MARIA FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the Santa Maria Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure H96	Fail
SANTA MARIA RIVER LEVEE FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the Santa Maria River Levee Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure I96	Fail
SANTA YNEZ FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the , as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	Measure J96	Pass
SOUTH COAST FLOOD ZONE. Shall the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District be authorized to levy increased benefit assessments on real property in the South Coast Flood Zone, as proposed in its 1995 Flood Control Benefit Assessment Ordinance, adopted December 5, 1995?			
SANTA CLARA	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass
AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA. Shall the Santa Clara County Charter be extended to provide for the acquisition, development, maintenance, and operation of parks, without increasing taxes, by continuing the annual transfer from the general fund of an amount estimated to equal one and one-half cents (\$0.015 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation of all real and personal property for five years and \$0.01425 per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation thereafter for seven years?			
SANTA CLARA	11/5/96	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
THIS MEASURE DOES NOT INCREASE TAXES. Shall any new voter-approved sales tax fund these transportation improvements? Fix streets, potholes; link to BART; synchronize all expressways; build Tasman, Capitol, Vasona Light Rails; widen Highways 880, 101, 87, 17; increase Caltrain service; upgrade 237/880, 85/101, 85/87 interchanges; improve safety: Pacheco Pass, Highway 85; expand bicycle routes; improve senior, disabled transit service.			
SANTA CLARA	11/5/96	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Board of Supervisors enact a 1/2 cent sales tax for general county purposes with the following mandatory restrictions? The sales tax must expire after nine years; a Citizens Watchdog committee, selected independently with direction from the County Grand Jury and the League of Women voters, will conduct yearly audits of all sales tax expenditures; these yearly sales tax expenditure audits must be reported to the public and published in local newspapers.			
SANTA CLARA	11/5/96	Measure C	Pass
Shall Section 203 of the Santa Clara County Charter, which currently provides that a vacancy in the office of supervisor be filled only by appointment, be amended to provide that a vacancy be filled by election or appointment?			
SIERRA	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass
Shall the Transient Occupancy Tax currently levied on the occupying of lodging accommodations, including the imposition of such tax on rented reserved outdoor space (recreational vehicle parks, campgrounds, or parking areas) and increasing such tax from 6% to 10% effective January 1993, be ratified and shall the reimposition of the same transient occupancy tax levy adopted by the Sierra County Board of Supervisors by Ordinance No. 835 be approved?			
SONOMA	11/5/96	Measure D	Pass
Shall a county ordinance be adopted requiring county voter approval of changes to a community separator adjacent to a city, where the voters of that city have approved an urban growth boundary effective for 20 years?			
SONOMA	11/5/96	Measure E	Fail
Shall the Community Hospital Management Ordinance, which (a) shifts management of Hospital to Board of Trustees; (b) invalidates any closure, lease, sale or transfer of management of Hospital made prior to election; (c) requires voter approval for subsequent closure, lease, sale or transfer of management of Hospital;			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1996

(d) requires approval of Trustees or voters before any reduction of Hospital services; and (e) requires preservation of labor agreements and Civil Service rules at Hospital, be adopted?

SUTTER	11/5/96	Measure BB	Fail
To approve low rent housing in unincorporated areas to comply with state requirements.			
TEHAMA	2/6/96	Recall 2	Pass
Recall of Supervisor, District Two - Shirley M. Marelli.			
TEHAMA	2/6/96	Recall 4	Pass
Recall of Supervisor, District Four - Joann Landingham.			
TEHAMA	2/6/96	Recall 5	Pass
Recall of Supervisor, District Five - Kathleen Rowen.			
TEHAMA	3/26/96	Measure A	Pass
Shall the Charter of Tehama County be amended by adding Article VI, sections 1 and 2 as ordered by the Board of Supervisors on December 19, 1995 to be placed before the electorate, be adopted and added to the Charter of Tehama County?			
TRINITY	3/26/96	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 1201 adopted by the Trinity County Board of Supervisors establishing a 3% utility tax on electricity and telephone charges be confirmed?			
TRINITY	3/26/96	Measure B	Fail
Shall the Transient Occupancy Tax provided for in Chapter 3.28 of the Trinity County Code be increased to 10%?			
TRINITY	3/26/96	Measure C	Pass
If the Transient Occupancy Tax in increased to 10%, should 4% still be dedicated to the promotion and advertisement of Trinity County, as provided for in Chapter 3.28 of the Trinity County Code?			
TUOLUMNE	3/26/96	Measure G	Fail
Shall the County ordinance allowing for the control of rents in mobile home parks be repealed?			
YOLO	11/5/96	Measure C	Fail
Shall the Initiative Regulating Commercial Mining, which amends the Yolo County General Plan, allows limited commercial sand and gravel mining above the groundwater table outside of Cache Cree, while prohibiting sand and in-channel mining in Cache Creek, other than mining rights vested by law, be adopted? This measure also requires an approved reclamation plan, surety bonds, and a five year permit review, as required by existing law.			
YOLO	11/5/96	Measure D	Pass
Shall the resolution amending the Yolo County General Plan, which limits gravel extraction in Cache Creek to stream maintenance, regulates all other commercial gravel mining in the Cache Creek area, required commercial mining interests to fund water quality protection, protects agricultural land, and restores riparian habitat along Cache Creek, be adopted? This resolution affirms enactment of the Cache Creek Area Plan, comprised of the Off-Channel Mining Plan and the Cache Creek Resources Management Plan.			
YUBA	3/26/96	Measure I	Fail
Shall an eight (8) percent transient occupancy tax be imposed upon those businesses providing campgrounds and recreational vehicle parks within the unincorporated area of Yuba County? The tax shall be collected from every transient and shall be reported by each operator and paid by each operator on or before the last day of the month following each calendar quarter as prescribed from time to time by the Yuba County Treasurer/Tax Collector.			
YUBA	3/26/96	Measure J	Fail
Shall an eight cent per ton mineral depletion special purpose tax on mined minerals be imposed on those businesses engaged in the mining of minerals from land repair, maintenance and reconstruction of county streets and roads?			

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	GO BOND		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		TAXES		RECALL		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda			1	1									1				2	1	3
Alpine															1		1	0	1
Amador						1											0	1	1
Butte				2				2			1		1				2	4	6
Calaveras											1			1			1	1	2
Contra Costa					1												1	0	1
El Dorado												1		1			0	2	2
Fresno	1		7								1		1				10	0	10
Glenn											1						1	0	1
Imperial												2					0	2	2
Inyo											1	1					1	1	2
Kings											1						1	0	1
Lake						1											0	1	1
Los Angeles				1							1		1				2	1	3
Madera		1									2	1					2	2	4
Marin									2					1			2	1	3
Mariposa											1		1				2	0	2
Mendocino														2			0	2	2
Modoc					1												1	0	1
Monterey								1				1					0	2	2
Napa								1			1	1					1	2	3
Nevada					1						1						2	0	2
Orange				1				1			1			1			1	3	4
Placer											1	3		1			1	4	5

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	GO BOND		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		TAXES		RECALL		ALL MEASURES			
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL	
Sacramento			2	1										1				2	2	4
San Benito														2				0	2	2
San Bernardino											1			1				0	2	2
San Diego			1	1										1				1	2	3
San Francisco	1	1	1	1							2							2	4	6
San Luis Obispo											2							2	0	2
San Mateo							1						1					2	0	2
Santa Barbara											1		1	8				2	8	10
Santa Clara			2										1	1				3	1	4
Sierra													1					1	0	1
Sonoma											1	1						1	1	2
Sutter												1						0	1	1
Tehama			1													3		4	0	4
Trinity													1	2				1	2	3
Tuolumne												1						0	1	1
Yolo								1			1							1	1	2
Yuba														2				0	2	2
All Counties	2	2	15	8	3	2	1	6	2	0	19	16	10	25	4	0	56	59	115	



TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SVCS.		WATER USE/SVC.		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	TOTAL
Alameda					1								1				1						2	1	3
Alpine							1																1	0	1
Amador								1															0	1	1
Butte				1		2											1		1	1			2	4	6
Calaveras							1														1		1	1	2
Contra Costa							1																1	0	1
El Dorado				1																	1		0	2	2
Fresno	1				1		7													1		10	0	10	
Glenn							1																1	0	1
Imperial								2															0	2	2
Inyo							1	1															1	1	2
Kings																				1			1	0	1
Lake						1																	0	1	1
Los Angeles							1	1	1														2	1	3
Madera						1	2	1															2	2	4
Marin							2			1													2	1	3
Mariposa					1												1						2	0	2
Mendocino																					2		0	2	2
Modoc							1																1	0	1
Monterey				2																			0	2	2
Napa			1	2																			1	2	3
Nevada											1									1			2	0	2
Orange				1			1	2															1	3	4
Placer							1	3									1						1	4	5

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1996

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SVCS.		WATER USE/SVC.		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	TOTAL	
Sacramento							2	1						1										2	2	4
San Benito																		2						0	2	2
San Bernardino				1														1						0	2	2
San Diego							1	1						1										1	2	3
San Francisco							1	3						1	1									2	4	6
San Luis Obispo							1						1											2	0	2
San Mateo					1						1													2	0	2
Santa Barbara			1										1	8										2	8	10
Santa Clara							1		1		1							1						3	1	4
Sierra																		1						1	0	1
Sonoma			1										1											1	1	2
Sutter																1								0	1	1
Tehama							3														1			4	0	4
Trinity																		1	1			1		1	2	3
Tuolumne																1								0	1	1
Yolo									1	1														1	1	2
Yuba										1								1						0	2	2
All Counties	1	0	3	8	4	4	29	16	3	3	3	0	2	13	1	2	5	7	1	1	4	5	56	59	11	



---

PART 2

VOTE TOTALS FOR  
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

---



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
ALAMEDA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Mercer	Ken	Businessman	No	5	17,315	52,856	32.8%	Yes	
					Haggerty	Scott	Businessman, Planning Commissioner	No	5	16,191	52,856	30.6%	No	
					Pico, Jr.	Thomas P.	Certified Public Accountant	No	5	13,167	52,856	24.9%	No	
					Torchia	Domenic	Healthcare Foundation Chair	No	5	4,117	52,856	7.8%	No	
					Rollisson	Tim	County Water Director	No	5	2,066	52,856	3.9%	No	
			4	Full	King	Mary V.	Alameda County Supervisor	Yes	2	30,516	49,534	61.6%	Yes	
					Morrison	Brian A.	Small Business Owner	No	2	19,018	49,534	38.4%	No	
			5	Full	Carson	Keith	Incumbent	Yes	2	36,368	54,838	66.3%	Yes	
					Smith	Sandra A.	Lawyer	No	2	18,470	54,838	33.7%	No	
			MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Brosnahan	Carol	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	18,187	28,968	62.8%	Yes
						De Leon	Anna	Attorney and Educator	No	2	10,781	28,968	37.2%	No
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Hurley	Joseph	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	144,452	207,144	69.7%	Yes
						Dixon	Kate	Attorney	No	2	62,692	207,144	30.3%	No
			3	Full	Miller	Barbara J.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	122,634	208,785	58.7%	Yes	
Iglehart	Dick	Criminal Prosecutor			No	2	86,151	208,785	41.3%	No				
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Haggerty	Scott	Chair, Fremont Plan. Comm./Businessman	No	2	52,872	91,810	57.6%	Yes		
				Mercer	Kenneth	Businessman	No	2	38,938	91,810	42.4%	No		
ALPINE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Zellmer	Herman F.	Retired School Administrator	No	2	61	113	54.0%	Yes	
					Craik	Cameron "Cam"	Incumbent	Yes	2	52	113	46.0%	No	
			3	Full	Rakow	Katherine	Resource/Referral Specialist	No	3	28	62	45.2%	Yes	
					Wade	C. Ann	Incumbent	Yes	3	19	62	30.6%	No	
					Gutierrez	Caroline S.	Foster Care Provider	No	3	15	62	24.2%	No	
			5	Full	Gansberg, Jr.	Chris H.	Rancher	No	3	98	124	79.0%	Yes	
					Watts	Carrol Lloyd	Building Contractor	No	3	22	124	17.7%	No	
					Blum	Pierre "Pete"	Incumbent	Yes	3	4	124	3.2%	No	
			COUNTY SUPERVISOR <sup>1</sup>	4	Full	Jung	Eric V.	Real Estate Broker	No	2	80	145	55.2%	Yes
						Newell, Jr.	Bernard A.	Attorney	No	2	65	145	44.8%	No
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Rakow	Katherine	Resource/Referral Specialist	No	2	34	59	57.6%	Yes		
				Wade	C. Ann	Incumbent	Yes	2	25	59	42.4%	No		
AMADOR	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Escamilla	Richard F.	Self-Employed Businessman	No	2	1,733	2,846	60.9%	Yes	
					Lewis	Marilyn L.	City Council	No	2	1,104	2,846	38.8%	No	
			2	Full	Bamert	Tom	Rancher/County Supervisor	Yes	2	1,207	2,376	50.8%	Yes	
					Terhune	C. A. "Cal"	Mayor/Retired	No	2	1,166	2,376	49.1%	No	
4	Full	Boitano	Louis D. "Gigi"	Supervisor	Yes	2	1,583	3,111	50.9%	Yes				
		Carlin	Leroy	General Engineering Contractor	No	2	1,526	3,111	49.1%	No				
BUTTE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Beeler	R. J. "Bob"	Retired	Yes	2	5,390	10,283	52.4%	Yes	
					Meyer	Vivian R.	Incumbent	Yes	2	4,869	10,283	47.4%	No	
			4	Full	Josiassen	Curt	Farmer/Businessman	Yes	3	5,564	10,158	54.8%	Yes	
					Arens	Michael J.	Agricultural Businessman	No	3	2,541	10,158	25.0%	No	
				Davis	Jane	Business Owner	No	3	2,030	10,158	20.0%	No		

<sup>1</sup> To be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
BUTTE (continued)	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Thomas	Gordon	Incumbent	Yes	3	6,775	13,817	49.0%	Yes
					Davis	Fred C.	Retired	Yes	3	5,154	13,817	37.3%	No
					Illa	Don	General Contractor	No	3	1,849	13,817	13.4%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Davis	Fred C.	Retired	Yes	2	9,714	17,608	55.2%	Yes
					Thomas	Gordon	County Supervisor	No	2	7,850	17,608	44.6%	No
			1	Full	Gerard	Fred	Insurance, Securities Representative	No	6	598	2,655	22.5%	Yes
					Thein	Lucille	Small Business Owner	No	6	521	2,655	19.6%	No
					Dell Orto	Michael	County Supervisor	Yes	6	510	2,655	19.2%	No
					Anderson	Edward	Retired	No	6	468	2,655	17.6%	No
					Conway	Geraldine	Human Resources Consultant	No	6	464	2,655	17.5%	No
					Miller	Fredda	Businesswoman	No	6	94	2,655	3.5%	No
			2	Full	Faulkner	Rosemary	Retired Educator, Rancher	No	5	977	2,527	38.7%	Yes
					Stein	Paul	Aquaculturist, Financial Planner	No	5	935	2,527	37.0%	No
					Curtis	Sherry	Taxpayer's Investigator, Consultant	No	5	348	2,527	13.8%	No
					Neal	George	Retired Federal Agent	No	5	148	2,527	5.9%	No
					Swartz	Thomas	Businessman	No	5	119	2,527	4.7%	No
			4	Full	Tryon	Tom	County Supervisor, Rancher	Yes	3	1,448	3,074	47.1%	Yes
					Tyrrell	Anthony	Grant Writing Consultant	No	3	1,254	3,074	40.8%	No
					De Graef	Joel	Deputy Sheriff, Businessman	No	3	372	3,074	12.1%	No
			MUNICIPAL JUDGE	Full	Mewhinney	Douglas	Judge of the Municipal Court	Yes	2	8,526	13,573	62.8%	Yes
Test	E. Allen	Attorney			No	2	5,047	13,573	37.2%	No			
SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Martin	John	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	8,351	13,695	61.0%	Yes			
		Borad	Bruce	Attorney, Arbitrator, Instructor	No	2	5,344	13,695	39.0%	No			
COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Thein	Lucille	Small Business Owner	No	2	1,817	3,076	59.1%	Yes		
			Gerard	Fred	Insurance/Securities Representative	No	2	1,259	3,076	40.9%	No		
	2	Full	Stein	Paul	Aquaculturist, Financial Planner	No	2	1,692	2,897	58.4%	Yes		
			Faulkner	Rosemary	Retired Educator, Rancher	No	2	1,205	2,897	41.6%	No		
	4	Full	Tryon	Thomas	County Supervisor, Rancher	Yes	2	1,940	3,534	54.9%	Yes		
			Tyrrell	Anthony	Grant Writing Consultant	No	2	1,594	3,534	45.1%	No		
COLUSA	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	White	Douglas	Insurance Agency	No	2	711	1,269	56.0%	Yes
					Dana	Dave	Retired Teacher	No	2	553	1,269	43.6%	No
			4	Full	Waite	William R.	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	2	683	1,183	57.7%	Yes
					Evans	Gary J.	Logging Contractor	No	2	492	1,183	41.6%	No
CONTRA COSTA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Uilkema	Gayle B.	City Councilmember/Professor	No	5	13,002	41,841	31.1%	Yes
					Radke	Kathy	Health Care Specialist	No	5	10,716	41,841	25.6%	No
					Algeria	Maria	Mayor	No	5	8,452	41,841	20.2%	No
					Mariotti	Gretchen W.	Businesswoman/Nurse	No	5	7,258	41,841	17.3%	No
					McClain	Patti Parks	Museum Director/Businesswoman	No	5	2,413	41,841	5.8%	No
			3	Full	Kinney	Curt	Businessman/Retired Policeman	No	3	20,091	51,725	38.8%	Yes
					Gerber	Donna	Nurses' Education Coordinator	No	3	17,596	51,725	34.0%	No
					Bishop	Gayle	County Supervisor	Yes	3	14,038	51,725	27.1%	No
			5	Full	Canciamilla	Joe	Mayor/Businessowner	Yes	2	19,781	34,310	57.7%	Yes
					Freitas	Don	Clean Water Management	No	2	14,529	34,310	42.3%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	PER- CENT ELECTED			
CONTRA COSTA (continued)	3/26/96	SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Rivera	Maria	Legal Counsel	No	5	48,279	176,826	27.3%	Yes			
					Quatman	John R. (Jack)	Prosecutor	No	5	43,590	176,826	24.7%	No			
					Houghton	Steve F.	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	5	40,076	176,826	22.7%	No			
					Cram	Joyce Marie	Mediator/Trial Attorney	No	5	32,592	176,826	18.4%	No			
					Zellis	Bruce	Attorney/Businessman	No	5	12,289	176,826	7.0%	No			
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Uilkema	Gayle B.	City Councilmember/Professor	No	2	34,721	64,637	53.7%	Yes			
					Radke	Kathy	Health Care Specialist	No	2	29,916	64,637	46.3%	No			
			3	Full	Gerber	Donna C.	Nurses' Education Coordinator	No	2	41,459	79,627	52.1%	Yes			
					Kinney	Curt	Businessman/Retired Policeman	No	2	38,168	79,627	47.9%	No			
					SUPERIOR JUDGE		2	Full	Rivera	Maria	Legal Counsel	No	2	172,448	298,054	57.9%
		2	Full	Quatman	John R. (Jack)	Prosecutor	No	2	125,606	298,054	42.1%	No				
DEL NORTE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Reese	Jack B.	Supervisor District One	Yes	2	371	708	52.4%	Yes			
					Smith	Ray C.	Crescent City Councilman	No	2	337	708	47.6%	No			
			2	Full	McClure	Martha	Teacher	No	3	449	893	50.3%	Yes			
					Norenberg-Nelson	Janet	Travel Agent	No	3	384	893	43.0%	No			
					Easton	Thomas "Tom" Dewey	Lawyer	No	3	60	893	6.7%	No			
			5	Full	Finigan	David	Businessman	No	3	859	1,675	51.3%	Yes			
					Masten	Susan	Businesswoman	No	3	667	1,675	39.8%	No			
					Hendrick	Kevin	Solid Waste Director	No	3	149	1,675	8.9%	No			
			EL DORADO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bradley	William "Sam"	Supervisor/Educator	Yes	2	5,770	9,547	60.4%	Yes
								McGinness	John	Sheriff's Sergeant	No	2	3,777	9,547	39.6%	No
2	Full	Nutting				Ray	Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	2	6,484	10,091	64.3%	Yes			
		Emigh				Tom	Law Enforcement	No	2	3,607	10,091	35.7%	No			
3	Full	Nielsen				J. Mark	Supervisor District III	Yes	3	3,809	8,971	42.5%	Yes			
		Louis				Carol	Businesswoman	No	3	3,260	8,971	36.3%	No			
		Delmer				Fred	Mediator/Attorney/Businessman	No	3	1,902	8,971	21.2%	No			
MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE		2				Full	Smith	Thomas A.	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	25,535	39,333	64.9%	Yes	
							Hayward	Scott B.	Attorney at Law	No	2	13,798	39,333	35.1%	No	
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE		1				Full	Riley	Patrick J. Pat"	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	31,983	40,797	78.4%	Yes	
							Woll	Andrew D.	Attorney at Law	No	2	8,814	40,797	21.6%	No	
2	Full	Keller				Eddie T.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	28,439	39,980	71.1%	Yes			
		Steffan				Laurence H.	Attorney at Law	No	2	11,541	39,980	28.9%	No			
3	Full	Kingsbury				Suzanne N.	Attorney/Law Professor	No	7	9,609	40,140	23.9%	Yes			
		Gorman				Steve	Consumer Attorney/Pilot	No	7	9,030	40,140	22.5%	No			
		Clark				James S.	Attorney at Law	No	7	5,147	40,140	12.8%	No			
		Gaffaney				Bill	Attorney at Law	No	7	4,963	40,140	12.4%	No			
		Drossel	Robert J.	Assistant District Attorney	No	7	4,879	40,140	12.2%	No						
		Sare	Dale L.	Attorney at Law	No	7	4,304	40,140	10.7%	No						
		Neasham	William "Sam"	El Dorado County Counsel	No	7	2,208	40,140	5.5%	No						
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Nielsen	Mark	Supervisor District III	Yes	2	6,058	11,997	50.5%	Yes				
				Louis	Carol	Businesswoman	No	2	5,939	11,997	49.5%	No				
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE		3	Full	Kingsbury	Suzanne N.	Attorney/Law Instructor	No	2	33,683	58,774	57.3%	Yes				



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	PER- CENT ELECTED
					Gorman	Steve	Consumer Attorney/Pilot	No	2	25,091	58,774	42.7%	No
FRESNO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Levy	Sharon	Incumbent	Yes	3	29,645	42,695	69.4%	Yes
					Attoian	Kirk	Businessman	No	3	6,538	42,695	15.3%	No
					Fiorentino	Jack	Chairman, Taxpayer Organization	No	3	6,508	42,695	15.2%	No
			3	Full	Arambula	Juan	School Board Member	No	2	10,503	17,168	61.2%	Yes
					Vagim	Doug	Businessman/County Supervisor	Yes	2	6,658	17,168	38.8%	No
			5	Full	Oken	Stan	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	3	16,194	32,895	49.2%	Yes
					Waterston	Bob	Fire Captain	No	3	13,889	32,895	42.2%	No
					Scott	Robert	Air Traffic Controller	No	3	2,806	32,895	8.5%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE		Full	Dupras	Fred John	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	3,601	6,739	53.4%	Yes
					Kaprielian	Jim	Attorney/Business Owner	No	2	3,137	6,739	46.6%	No
			4	Full	Kazanjian	Debra	Attorney	No	5	28,857	103,961	27.8%	Yes
					Olmos	Jane	Deputy Attorney General	No	5	26,948	103,961	25.9%	No
					Fain	Gregory Thomas	Deputy District Attorney	No	5	21,167	103,961	20.4%	No
					Altounian	Gregory L.	Attorney	No	5	13,799	103,961	13.3%	No
					Wapner	Terry A.	Attorney	No	5	13,172	103,961	12.7%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Oken	Stan	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	26,650	46,618	57.2%	Yes
					Waterson	Bob	Fire Captain	No	2	19,959	46,618	42.8%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE		Full	Olmos	Jane	Deputy Attorney General	No	2	78,299	148,593	52.7%	Yes
					Kazanjian	Debra	Attorney	No	2	70,284	148,593	47.3%	No
GLENN	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Harris, Sr.	Charles "Chuck"	Incumbent	Yes	2	763	1,285	59.4%	Yes
					Megorden	Winston S.	College Professor	No	2	514	1,285	40.0%	No
			3	Full	Mudd	Dick	Incumbent	Yes	4	868	1,531	56.7%	Yes
					Heyrend	Paul W.	Businessman	No	4	353	1,531	23.1%	No
					Millsaps	Clinton A.	Admission Clerk	No	4	209	1,531	13.7%	No
					Chittenden	Donna L.	Business Owner	No	4	101	1,531	6.6%	No
			5	Full	Hansen	Keith	Incumbent	Yes	1	563	576	97.7%	Yes
	11/5/96	COUNTY SHERIFF-CORONER		Short	Jacobs	James W. "Jake"	Supervising Fraud Investigator	No	6	2,256	5,447	41.4%	Yes
					White	Robert D. "Bob"	State Supervising Investigator	No	6	770	5,447	14.1%	No
					Bailey	Steve	Police Sergeant/Farmer	No	6	743	5,447	13.6%	No
					Quenzer	Richard F.	Police Sergeant	No	6	711	5,447	13.1%	No
					Padula	Glenn L.	Sheriff's Lieutenant	No	6	702	5,447	12.9%	No
					Duty	Nathan "Nate"	Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	6	180	5,447	3.3%	No
HUMBOLDT	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Dixon	Stan	Incumbent	Yes	2	5,312	7,124	74.6%	Yes
					Lee	Richard	Businessman	No	2	1,787	7,124	25.1%	No
			2	Full	Rodoni	Roger	Rancher/Teacher	No	4	2,951	7,445	39.6%	Yes
					Heider	Roy A.	Incumbent	Yes	4	2,730	7,445	36.7%	No
					Carter	Timothy	Businessman	No	4	1,591	7,445	21.4%	No
					Willis	Kenny	Counselor/Liaison	No	4	149	7,445	2.0%	No
			3	Full	Woolley	John	Community Development	No	3	5,181	8,245	62.8%	Yes
					Pennisi	Sam	Innkeeper	No	3	1,832	8,245	22.2%	No
					Pellatz	Carl	Insurance Agent/Broker	No	3	1,194	8,245	14.5%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Rodoni	Roger	Rancher/Teacher	No	2	5,533	10,864	50.9%	Yes
					Heider	Roy A.	Incumbent	Yes	2	5,242	10,864	48.3%	No
HUMBOLDT (continued)	11/5/96	JUDGE-North Humboldt Judicial Dist.		Full	Miles	Marilyn	Attorney at Law	No	3	10,050	20,718	48.5%	Yes
					Hinrichs	Joyce	Attorney	No	3	5,502	20,718	26.6%	No
					Wade	Rob	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	5,127	20,718	24.7%	No
IMPERIAL	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Cole	William "Bill"	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,201	3,662	60.1%	Yes
					Kuiper	Hank	Businessman	No	2	1,461	3,662	39.9%	No
			3	Full	Shores	Dean A.	Supervisor, District 3	Yes	1	3,317	3,317	100.0%	Yes
			4	Full	Veysey	Tom	Farmer	No	6	1,524	4,780	31.9%	Yes
					Seabolt	Abe F.	Businessman	No	6	1,206	4,780	25.2%	No
					Mendoza	Stella A.	Realtor	No	6	678	4,780	14.2%	No
					Stiff	Omer L.	Businessman	No	6	493	4,780	10.3%	No
					Gonzales	Juan	Retired Auditor	No	6	472	4,780	9.9%	No
					Paramo	Daniel	Mayor of Brawley	No	6	407	4,780	8.5%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Yeager	Christopher W.	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	12,621	18,248	69.2%	Yes
					Cress	Walter	Assistant Imperial County Counsel	No	2	5,627	18,248	30.8%	No
			2	Full	Donnelly	Donal B.	Juvenile Court Referee	No	3	7,002	18,594	37.7%	Yes
					Macklin	William F.	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	3	6,274	18,594	33.7%	No
					Rood	Michael	City Attorney/Educator	No	3	5,318	18,594	28.6%	No
			3	Full	Cota	Raymond A.	Attorney - Private Practice	No	3	8,466	18,429	45.9%	Yes
					Storey	Thomas W.	Attorney	No	3	5,787	18,429	31.4%	No
					Van Decker	Stephan	Deputy Public Defender	No	3	4,176	18,429	22.7%	No
	11/5/96	MUNICIPAL JUDGE	2	Full	Donnelly	Donal B.	Juvenile Court Referee	No	2	15,016	26,179	57.4%	Yes
					Macklin	William F.	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	11,163	26,179	42.6%	No
			3	Full	Cota	Raymond A.	Attorney - Private Practice	No	2	15,734	25,473	61.8%	Yes
					Storey	Thomas W.	Attorney	No	2	9,739	25,473	38.2%	No
INYO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Bear	Julie K.	Incumbent	Yes	1	790	811	97.4%	Yes
			4	Full	Hambleton	Butch	Big Pine Businessman	No	2	776	1,184	65.5%	Yes
					Gracey	Robert W.	Incumbent	Yes	2	351	1,184	29.6%	No
			5	Full	Dorame	Michael A.	Telecommunications Technician	No	2	580	1,029	56.4%	Yes
					Farlander	Patricia	Retired Chamber Executive	No	2	442	1,029	43.0%	No
		MARSHALL		Full	Lynch	Don B.	Incumbent	Yes	2	3,628	5,200	69.8%	Yes
					Kane	Gerald O.	Retired	No	2	1,544	5,200	29.7%	No
KERN	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Addison	Bob	Forester/Administrator	No	5	6,795	22,287	30.5%	Yes
					McQuiston	Jon	Airspace Manager	Yes	5	6,548	22,287	29.4%	No
					Corlett	Kevin S.	Management Information Analyst	No	5	3,316	22,287	14.9%	No
					Armendariz	Art	Council Member, City of Delano	No	5	3,308	22,287	14.8%	No
					Patrick	Roy "Pat"	Businessman	No	5	2,320	22,287	10.4%	No
			4	Full	Peterson	Ken	Incumbent	Yes	2	15,044	21,061	71.4%	Yes
					Gelman	Ruth	Business-Public Administrator	No	2	6,017	21,061	28.6%	No
			5	Full	Gutierrez	Al	Retired Law Enforcement	No	6	4,056	8,818	46.0%	Yes
					Parra	Pete H.	Job Training Director	Yes	6	1,835	8,818	20.8%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	PER- CENT ELECTED		
KERN (continued)	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Anthony	Ralph W.	Minister/Businessman	No	6	1,347	8,818	15.3%	No		
					Williams	Hal T.	Retired Navy Chief	No	6	878	8,818	10.0%	No		
					Rivera	Juan	School Board Trustee	No	6	385	8,818	4.4%	No		
					Manzano	Tony H.	News Editor/Businessowner	No	6	317	8,818	3.6%	No		
					McQuiston	Jon	Airspace Manager	Yes	2	16,990	33,544	50.7%	Yes		
					Addison	Bob	Forest Ranger/Administrator	No	2	16,554	33,544	49.4%	No		
KINGS	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Rachford	Jon	Professional Engineer	No	2	1,180	2,165	54.5%	Yes		
					Palmerian	Sidonio "Sid"	School Board Trustee	No	2	963	2,165	44.5%	No		
					5	Full	Madill	Brent	Optometrist	No	6	898	3,871	23.2%	Yes
							Taylor	Alene	Farmer/Housewife	No	6	701	3,871	18.1%	No
							Dias	Tony L.	Retired Farmer	No	6	682	3,871	17.6%	No
							Araujo	Tony	Local Businessman	No	6	648	3,871	16.7%	No
Folley	Vern L.	Public Administrator	No	6	548	3,871	14.2%	No							
Martin	Doug	Farmer	No	6	374	3,871	9.7%	No							
LAKE	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Taylor	Alene	Farmer/Housewife	No	2	3,114	5,582	55.8%	Yes		
					Madill	Brent	Appointed Incumbent	No	2	2,226	5,582	39.9%	No		
					1	Full	Dawson	Chris	Small Business Owner	No	3	1,716	3,545	48.4%	Yes
							Robey, Jr.	Ed	Computer Consultant/Educator	No	3	1,473	3,545	41.6%	No
							Paskaly	John	Businessman	No	3	339	3,545	9.6%	No
					4	Full	Mackey	Karan	County Supervisor	Yes	2	2,024	3,510	57.7%	Yes
Bruns	Buzz	Merchant	No	2			1,483	3,510	42.3%	No					
5	Full	Merriman	D. W. "Bill"	Mbr., Lake County Brd. of Sup. Dist. 5			Yes	2	2,055	3,448	59.6%	Yes			
		Linnell	Mike	Local Businessman	No	2	1,381	3,448	40.1%	No					
LASSEN	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Robey, Jr.	Ed	Computer Consultant/Educator	No	2	2,410	4,540	53.1%	Yes		
					Dawson	Chris	Small Business Owner	No	2	2,130	4,540	46.9%	No		
					2	Full	Neely	Claud	Incumbent	Yes	3	992	1,687	58.8%	Yes
							Graf	Bill	Social Worker	No	3	523	1,687	31.0%	No
							Tezak	Wayne	Retired - Business Manager	No	3	172	1,687	10.2%	No
					4	Full	Chapman	Jim	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	2	802	1,228	65.3%	Yes
Spalding	Nelmer P.	Retired	No	2			426	1,228	34.7%	No					
Dahle	Brian	Farmer/Rancher	No	3			718	1,224	58.7%	Yes					
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	Full	Wutzke	Russ	Farmer/Rancher	No	3	300	1,224	24.5%	No					
		Kingston	John	Retired Educator	No	3	206	1,224	16.8%	No					
LOS ANGELES	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Lazard	Ridgley L.	District Attorney	Yes	1	5,739	5,739	100.0%	Yes		
					BRADBURY	Full	Bradbury	Stephen Douglas	Municipal Court Judge	No	1	5,850	5,850	100.0%	Yes
					4	Full	Burke	Yvonne B.	Supervisor, 2nd District	Yes	1	142,819	142,819	100.0%	Yes
							Knabe	Don	Supervisor's Chief Deputy	No	6	109,829	272,340	40.3%	Yes
							Swanson	Gordana M.	Businesswoman	No	6	71,024	272,340	26.1%	No
							Drummond	Doug	Vice-Mayor, City of Long Beach	No	6	52,779	272,340	19.4%	No
Lubin	Joel	Licensed Industrial Engineer	No	6			16,008	272,340	5.9%	No					
Amjadi	Norm	Environmental Health Specialist	No	6	14,765	272,340	5.4%	No							

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
					Markowski	Richard	Deputy Assessor/Businessman	No	6	7,935	272,340	2.9%	No
			5	Full	Antonovich	Michael	Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	2	225,662	303,166	74.4%	Yes
					Kumaus	D. C. (Dan)	Deputy Assessor	No	2	77,504	303,166	25.6%	No
LOS ANGELES (continued)	3/26/96	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Garcetti	Gil	Los Angeles County District Attorney	Yes	6	436,240	1,167,724	37.4%	Yes
					Lynch	John F.	Head Deputy DA	No	6	251,590	1,167,724	21.5%	No
					Jordan	Malcolm	Prosecutor	No	6	196,488	1,167,724	16.8%	No
					Greenberg	Harold	Law Professor/Attorney	No	6	172,591	1,167,724	14.8%	No
					Norris	Sterling E.	Deputy District Attorney	No	6	83,220	1,167,724	7.1%	No
					Zand	Steve S.	Attorney	No	6	27,595	1,167,724	2.4%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE, Alhambra Dist.	2	Full	Kanner	Michael A.	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	14,716	26,448	55.6%	Yes
					Orfirer	Dennis M.	Attorney at Law	No	2	11,732	26,448	44.4%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE, Antelope Dist.	2	Full	McKay	Chesley N.	Judge, Antelope Municipal Court	Yes	2	23,298	35,836	65.0%	Yes
					Layton	Larry	Dean/Professor/Attorney	No	2	12,538	35,836	35.0%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE, Citrus Dist.	1	Full	Brinkis-Alex	Nida	Trial Attorney	No	7	10,600	49,196	21.5%	Yes
					Falls	Thomas	Criminal Prosecutor	No	7	10,419	49,196	21.2%	No
					Espinoza	Richard A.	Attorney	No	7	8,637	49,196	17.6%	No
					Larson	Larry	Criminal Prosecutor	No	7	6,969	49,196	14.2%	No
					Alexander	Stephen J.	Mayor of the City of Azusa	No	7	6,566	49,196	13.3%	No
					Annis	Allen D.	Attorney	No	7	3,987	49,196	8.1%	No
					Peters	Mark	Attorney	No	7	2,018	49,196	4.1%	No
			2	Full	Minto	R. Bruce	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	31,603	44,700	70.7%	Yes
					Harrold	John J.	Prosecutor	No	2	13,097	44,700	29.3%	No
			3	Full	Treu	Rolf Michael	Judge, Municipal Court, Citrus Dist.	Yes	3	29,137	48,048	60.6%	Yes
					McFadden	Bredley J.	Councilman, Businessman, Attorney	No	3	11,464	48,048	23.9%	No
					Monohan	John C.	Attorney/Businessman	No	3	7,447	48,048	15.5%	No
			4	Full	Duggan	Michael	Judge/Law Professor	Yes	3	26,878	44,474	60.4%	Yes
					Harrold	Laurie R.	Trial Attorney	No	3	8,944	44,474	20.1%	No
					Espinoza	Rodney J.	Attorney at Law	No	3	8,652	44,474	19.5%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE, East L.A. Dist.	1	Full	Kwan	Ruth A.	Judge, Mun. Court, East L.A. Dist.	Yes	2	9,213	15,536	59.3%	Yes
					Casas Jr.	Juventino	Attorney at Law	No	2	6,323	15,536	40.7%	No
			2	Full	Sanchez-Gordon	Teresa	Attorney/Law Professor	No	3	6,006	15,809	38.0%	Yes
					Luna	Tony	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	3	5,825	15,809	36.8%	No
					Moreno	Armando V.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	3,978	15,809	25.2%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE, Los Cerritos Dist.	1	Full	Mackenzie	Lyle	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	1	23,366	23,366	100.0%	Yes
			2	Full	Tipton	Leland H.	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	2	21,214	27,754	76.4%	Yes
					Haddix	Lance	Attorney	No	2	6,540	27,754	23.6%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE, Pasadena Dist.		Full	Rotenberg	Fred	Attorney/Businessman	No	2	23,581	46,033	51.2%	Yes
					Mitchell	Elvira R.	Judge, Pasadena Municipal Court	Yes	2	22,452	46,033	48.8%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Wapner	Frederick J.	Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court	Yes	1	837,867	837,867	100.0%	Yes
			18	Full	Sohigian	Ronald M.	Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court	Yes	3	511,425	927,595	55.1%	Yes
					Smith	Ronald S.	Attorney at Law	No	3	236,040	927,595	25.4%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED					
LOS ANGELES (continued)	3/26/96	SUPERIOR JUDGE			Lindner	Charles L.	Attorney/News Commentator	No	3	180,130	927,595	19.4%	No					
			25	Full	Luros	Michael S.	Judge of the L. A. Municipal Court	No	2	632,506	857,535	73.8%	Yes					
					Mooney, Jr.	F. G.	Attorney	No	2	225,029	857,535	26.2%	No					
			38	Full	Duffy-Lewis	Maureen	Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court	Yes	1	629,810	629,810	100.0%	Yes					
			39	Full	Dunn	Reginald A.	Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court	Yes	2	602,170	850,889	70.8%	Yes					
					Griffin	Kenneth G.	Attorney at Law	No	2	248,719	850,889	29.2%	No					
			58	Full	Murphy	Pat	Judge, Law Professor	No	3	314,687	858,128	36.7%	Yes					
					Jaeger	Karl W.	Judge of the L. A. Municipal Court	No	3	275,933	858,128	32.2%	No					
					Marcus	Stephen	Los Angeles Municipal Court Judge	No	3	267,508	858,128	31.2%	No					
			11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Knabe	Don	Supervisor's Chief Deputy	No	2	309,598	500,457	61.9%	Yes			
					Swanson	Gordana Marie	Businesswoman	No	2	190,859	500,457	38.1%	No					
				DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Garcetti	Gil	Los Angeles County District Attorney	Yes	2	1,124,631	2,244,496	50.1%	Yes			
							Lynch	John F.	Head Deputy DA	No	2	1,119,865	2,244,496	49.9%	No			
				MUNICIPAL JUDGE, Citrus Dist.	1	Full	Falls	Thomas	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	56,713	100,083	56.7%	Yes			
							Alex	Nida Brinkis	Trial Attorney	No	2	43,370	100,083	43.3%	No			
				MUNICIPAL JUDGE, East L.A. Dist.	2	Full	Sanchez-Gordon	Teresa	Attorney/Law Professor	No	2	19,399	35,671	54.4%	Yes			
							Luna	Tony	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	2	16,272	35,671	45.6%	No			
				SUPERIOR JUDGE	58	Full	Jaeger	Karl W.	Judge of the L. A. Municipal Court	No	2	1,042,662	1,969,540	52.9%	Yes			
				Murphy	Pat	Judge, Law Professor	No	2	926,878	1,969,540	47.1%	No						
MADERA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Logoluso	Patty	Businesswoman	No	6	2,241	5,120	43.8%	Yes					
					Bell	William	Newspaper Editor	No	6	956	5,120	18.7%	No					
					Wilcox	Clint	Paralegal/Engineer	No	6	791	5,120	15.4%	No					
					Bigelow	Franklin E.	Businessman/Rancher	No	6	669	5,120	13.1%	No					
					Reynolds	John E.	Civil Engineer	No	6	285	5,120	5.6%	No					
					Snow	Bill	Businessman	No	6	178	5,120	3.5%	No					
					3	Full	McIntyre	Gail Hannart	Incumbent/Business Owner	Yes	2	2,029	3,311	61.3%	Yes			
							O'Rourke	Patrick M.	Field Services Coordinator	No	2	1,282	3,311	38.7%	No			
					4	Full	Silva	John V.	Local Businessman	No	2	887	1,680	52.8%	Yes			
					Lopez	Jess	Incumbent	Yes	2	793	1,680	47.2%	No					
			11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Short	Logoluso	Patty	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	4,847	7,206	67.3%	Yes			
					Bell	William	Newspaper Editor	No	2	2,359	7,206	32.7%	No					
			MARIN	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Brown, Jr.	Harold C.	Marin County Supervisor	Yes	2	10,991	13,834	79.4%	Yes		
								Madsen, Jr.	Arthur C.	No ballot designation	No	2	2,843	13,834	20.6%	No		
								3	Full	Rose	Annette	Marin County Supervisor	Yes	2	8,447	14,402	58.7%	Yes
										Dykstra	George	Health Director/Conservationist	No	2	5,955	14,402	41.3%	No
								4	Full	Le Mieux	Dotty	Environmental Attorney/Consultant	No	4	4,851	12,935	37.5%	Yes
										Kinsey	Steve	Architectural Designer	No	4	4,300	12,935	33.2%	No
		Hess				John	Policy Advisor/Writer	No	4	2,365	12,935	18.3%	No					
		Arnold				Judy	Small Businesswoman	No	4	1,419	12,935	11.0%	No					
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1				Full	Boren	Terrence R.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	1	46,897	46,897	100.0%	Yes			
		3				Full	Smith	Vernon	Municipal Court Judge	No	2	41,664	58,720	71.0%	Yes			
							Barnett	Robert	Administrative Law Judge	No	2	17,056	58,720	29.0%	No			
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4				Full	Kinsey	Steve	Environmental Home Designer	No	2	10,409	19,368	53.7%	Yes			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
MARIPOSA	3/26/96	CONSTABLE/MARSHALL COUNTY SUPERVISOR		Full	Hibpshman	William "Bill"	Incumbent	No	2	8,959	19,368	46.3%	No
			2	Full	Balman	Doug	Incumbent	Yes	1	832	832	100.0%	Yes
			4	Full	Parker	Garry R.	Incumbent	Yes	1	853	853	100.0%	Yes
			5	Full	Pickard	Robert "Bob" A.	Businessman	No	3	920	1,403	65.6%	Yes
					Singh	Gil	Retired Businessman	No	3	202	1,403	14.4%	No
		Jennrich	Jeff	Retired Military	No	3	281	1,403	20.0%	No			
MENDOCINO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Delbar	Michael M.	Rancher-Executive Director	No	2	2,631	4,390	59.9%	Yes
					Sugawara	Seiji	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,759	4,390	40.1%	No
			2	Full	Shoemaker	Richard	Independent Business Owner	No	2	2,308	4,111	56.1%	Yes
					McMichael	Frank	Mendocino County Supervisor	Yes	2	1,803	4,111	43.9%	No
			4	Full	Campbell	Patricia A. "Patti"	Mayor	No	3	2,169	4,743	45.7%	Yes
					Galli	Darrell	Teacher-Councilmember-Trucker	Yes	3	1,323	4,743	27.9%	No
					Peters	Lindy	Councilmember/Radio Announcer	Yes	3	1,251	4,743	26.4%	No
			1	Full	Cox	Conrad L.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	12,094	21,495	56.3%	Yes
					Combest	Ronald R.	Judge, Round Valley Municipal Court	No	2	9,401	21,495	43.7%	No
			2	Full	Brown	Ronald	Public Defender/Educator	No	2	12,817	21,872	58.6%	Yes
Massini	Susan	District Attorney			No	2	9,055	21,872	41.4%	No			
3	Full	Nelson	Henry K.	Municipal Court Judge	No	2	11,235	21,352	52.6%	Yes			
		King	James F.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	10,117	21,352	47.4%	No			
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Campbell	Patricia	Mayor	No	2	3,665	6,599	55.5%	Yes	
				Galli	Darrell	Teacher-Councilmember-Trucker	No	2	2,934	6,599	44.5%	No	
MERCED	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Keene	Gloria Cortez	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,762	1,762	100.0%	Yes
			2	Full	Crookham	Kathleen M.	Rancher/Retired Educator	No	3	3,539	6,736	52.5%	Yes
					Gabriault	Bruce J.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	1,954	6,736	29.0%	No
			4	Full	Pia , Sr.	Joe	Businessman	No	3	1,243	6,736	18.5%	No
Kelsey	Deidre	Appointed Incumbent			Yes	2	3,198	5,266	60.7%	Yes			
		Bledsoe	James (Jim)	Analyst	No	2	2,068	5,266	39.3%	No			
MODOC	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Cantrall	Patricia D.	Postal Clerk/Waitress	No	2	497	752	66.1%	Yes
					Dederick	John Essex	Cabinet Maker	No	2	255	752	33.9%	No
MONO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Rowan	Paul B.	Incumbent	Yes	2	419	724	57.9%	Yes
					Distler	Jimmy L. (Jim)	Volunteer Fire Chief	No	2	305	724	42.1%	No
			3	Full	Ronci	Joann	Businesswoman/Resort Owner	No	3	335	741	45.2%	Yes
					Rake	Donald L.	Retired	No	3	206	741	27.8%	No
					Waggoner	Robert F.	No ballot designation	No	3	200	741	27.0%	No
			4	Full	Inwood	Edward J.	School Administrator/Business Manager	No	3	291	657	44.3%	Yes
					de Botari	Lou	Business Owner	No	3	194	657	29.5%	No
					Mason	James	Attorney at Law	No	3	172	657	26.2%	No
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Ronci	Joann	Businesswoman/Resort Owner	No	2	565	927	60.9%	Yes	
				Rake	Donald L.	Retired	No	2	362	927	39.1%	No	
4	Full	Inwood	Edward J.	School Administrator/Businessman	No	2	472	831	56.8%	Yes			
		de Bottari	Lou	Business Owner	No	2	359	831	43.2%	No			
MONTEREY	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Salinas	Simon	Monterey County Supervisor	Yes	2	2,879	5,731	50.2%	Yes

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
					James	J.T. "Jesse"	Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	2	2,852	5,731	49.8%	No
			4	Full	Johnson	Edith	Monterey County Supervisor District 4	Yes	1	5,671	5,671	100.0%	Yes
			5	Full	Davi	Jeff	Realtor/Small Businessowner	No	3	9,533	22,426	42.5%	Yes
					Potter	Dave	Small Businessman/Councilman	Yes	3	8,498	22,426	37.9%	No
					Henson	Alexander "Zan"	Environmental Attorney	No	3	4,395	22,426	19.6%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Potter	Dave	Small Businessowner/Councilman	Yes	2	19,106	34,756	55.0%	Yes
					Davi	Jeff	Realtor/Small Businessowner	No	2	15,650	34,756	45.0%	No
NAPA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Martin	Harry V.	Councilman, Publisher, Businessman	Yes	4	3,392	8,992	37.7%	Yes
					Luce	Mark	Environmental Engineer	No	4	2,051	8,992	22.8%	No
					Jefferson	Louis	Writer/Council Member	Yes	4	2,002	8,992	22.3%	No
					Morse	Charles G. "Chuck"	Businessman/Engineer/Attorney	No	4	1,547	8,992	17.2%	No
			4	Full	Winter	Kathryn	Transportation Administrator/Teacher	No	3	3,622	6,900	52.5%	Yes
					Scott	Donald	Retired Police Officer	No	3	2,245	6,900	32.5%	No
					Schulz	Edward	Dairyman/Vinyardist	No	3	1,033	6,900	15.0%	No
			5	Full	Rippey	Mike	Ranch Manager	No	3	4,515	6,660	67.8%	Yes
					Mahanay	Rick	American Canyon Mayor	No	3	1,341	6,660	20.1%	No
					Mickelsen	Joseph	No ballot designation	No	3	804	6,660	12.1%	No
NEVADA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Van Zant	Peter	Electronics Engineer/Businessman	No	2	4,088	7,237	56.5%	Yes
					Foster	Christine (Wilcox)	Local Businesswoman	No	2	3,136	7,237	43.3%	No
			2	Full	Knecht	Karen	Supervisor/Business Owner	Yes	3	3,356	6,375	52.6%	Yes
					Callaghan	Jim	Businessperson/Accountant	No	3	2,170	6,375	34.0%	No
					Ellis	Steven Paul	Legal Service Owner	No	3	832	6,375	13.1%	No
			5	Full	Dardick	Sam	5th District Supervisor	Yes	2	3,409	5,234	65.1%	Yes
					Mecorney	Bill	Businessman/Cabinetmaker	No	2	1,800	5,234	34.4%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Butz	Kathleen	Attorney, Arbitrator, Mediator	No	10	11,263	30,587	36.8%	Yes
					Litchfield	Robert L. (Bob)	Attorney	No	10	4,253	30,587	13.9%	No
					Ferguson	Michael	District Attorney	No	10	3,684	30,587	12.0%	No
					Curtis	James	Nevada County Council	No	10	3,619	30,587	11.8%	No
					Chandler	James	Grass Valley Attorney	No	10	2,591	30,587	8.5%	No
					French	Robert F. "Bob"	Arbitrator/Attorney	No	10	2,563	30,587	8.4%	No
					Minch	Janet A.	Attorney	No	10	1,163	30,587	3.8%	No
					Lange	Ronald A.	Attorney	No	10	631	30,587	2.1%	No
					Merritt	John J.	Attorney	No	10	540	30,587	1.8%	No
					Montgomery	Larry	Lawyer	No	10	216	30,587	0.7%	No
	11/5/96	SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Butz	Kathleen	Attorney at Law	No	2	24,407	41,399	59.0%	Yes
					Litchfield	Robert L. (Bb)	Attorney, Arbitrator, Mediator	No	2	16,867	41,399	40.7%	No
ORANGE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Charles V.	Mayor of Westminster	No	5	13,144	45,137	29.1%	Yes
					Leyes	Mark	City Councilman/Businessman	No	5	12,332	45,137	27.3%	No
					Scott	George B.	Small Businessman-Councilman	No	5	11,210	45,137	24.8%	No
					Copeland	Gary D.	Information System Designer	No	5	4,533	45,137	10.0%	No
					Banuelos	Robert John	Manager	No	5	3,918	45,137	8.7%	No
			3	Full	Conroy	Mickey	Assemblyman/Businessman	No	8	23,867	100,473	23.8%	Yes
					Spitzer	Todd	Deputy District Attorney	No	8	18,425	100,473	18.3%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
					Withdraw	Susan	Councilmember, City of Mission Viejo	No	8	14,925	100,473	14.9%	No
					Wilson	Helen	Councilmember/Businesswoman	No	8	11,112	100,473	11.1%	No
					Dougherty	William A.	Retired Marine Colonel	No	8	10,125	100,473	10.1%	No
					Whitaker	Bruce W.	Financial Controller	No	8	9,863	100,473	9.8%	No
					Maddox	Charles W. "Pete"	Mbr., Gov. Bd., Rancho Santiago CCD	No	8	8,215	100,473	8.2%	No
					Middlebrook	Ron	Historian/Author	No	8	3,941	100,473	3.9%	No
ORANGE (continued)	3/26/96	MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Biggs	Carl	Deputy District Attorney	No	6	35,801	96,436	37.1%	Yes
					Nestor	Paul J.	Attorney/Community Volunteer	No	6	15,523	96,436	16.1%	No
					Robertson	Lyle J.	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	6	13,891	96,436	14.4%	No
					Corris	Steve	Attorney/Writer	No	6	12,688	96,436	13.2%	No
					de Leima	Max	Private Attorney	No	6	10,941	96,436	11.3%	No
					Roll	Thomas R.	Corporate Counsel	No	6	7,592	96,436	7.9%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Schumann	Barbara	Orange County Judge	Yes	3	233,291	405,292	57.6%	Yes
					McNames	William	Superior Court Attorney	No	3	137,790	405,292	34.0%	No
					Dutcher	Daniel Charles	Lawyer	No	3	34,211	405,292	8.4%	No
			17	Full	Pollard	Nancy A.	Attorney at Law	No	3	145,475	395,160	36.8%	Yes
					Brooks	Jim	Judge	Yes	3	133,353	395,160	33.7%	No
					Haynes	Clancy	Trial Court Commissioner	No	3	116,332	395,160	29.4%	No
			22	Full	Singer	Carla M.	Judge of the Municipal Court	No	3	142,517	391,424	36.4%	Yes
					Dunn	Tom	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	135,818	391,424	34.7%	No
					Stanford, Jr.	Richard W.	Judge, Central Orange Cnty. Mun.. Ct.	No	3	113,089	391,424	28.9%	No
		TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR		Short	Moorlach	John M. W.	Appointed Treasurer-Tax Collector	Yes	1	347,260	347,260	100.0%	Yes
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Charles V. "Chuck"	Mayor of Westminster	No	2	45,129	88,160	51.2%	Yes
					Leyes	Mark	City Councilman/Businessman	Yes	2	43,031	88,160	48.8%	No
			3	Full	Spitzer	Todd	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	101,723	176,156	57.7%	Yes
					Conroy	Mickey	Assemblyman/Businessman	No	2	74,433	176,156	42.3%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Biggs	Carl	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	97,432	155,413	62.7%	Yes
					Nestor	Paul J.	Attorney/Community Volunteer	No	2	57,981	155,413	37.3%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	17	Full	Pollard	Nancy A.	Attorney at Law	No	2	352,646	701,587	50.3%	Yes
					Brooks	Jim	Judge, Central Orange Municipal Court	No	2	348,941	701,587	49.7%	No
			22	Full	Singer	Carla M.	Judge of the Municipal Court	Yes	2	396,295	690,015	57.4%	Yes
					Dunn	Tom	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	293,720	690,015	42.6%	No
PLACER	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	White	Harriet	Local Business Owner	No	2	5,604	10,714	52.3%	Yes
					Lichau	Ron	Businessman/Supervisor/Architect	Yes	2	5,060	10,714	47.2%	No
			4	Full	Hineline	Hazel	Town of Loomis Treasurer/Businesswoman	No	5	2,675	10,598	25.2%	Yes
					Lee	Bruce	Mayor/Business Manager	No	5	2,626	10,598	24.8%	No
					Williams	Jim	Architect, Business Owner	No	5	2,547	10,598	24.0%	No
					Byouk	John M.	Independent Businessperson/Trustee	No	5	2,266	10,598	21.4%	No
					Gieck	Bob	No ballot designation	No	5	457	10,598	4.3%	No
			5	Full	Bloomfield	Rex	Teacher/County Supervisor	Yes	2	5,684	10,057	56.5%	Yes
					Percival	Gerda	Conservation District Member	No	2	4,331	10,057	43.1%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Williams	Jim	Architect, Business Owner	No	2	10,332	18,164	56.9%	Yes



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
					Hineline	Hazel	Town of Loomis Treasurer/Businesswoman	No	2	7,832	18,164	43.1%	No
PLUMAS	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Roudebush	Fran	Incumbent	Yes	4	720	1,341	53.7%	Yes
					Dyzynske	Fred	Retired Businessman	No	4	262	1,341	19.5%	No
					Kennedy	Bill	Retired	No	4	210	1,341	15.7%	No
					Woods	Verlin	No ballot designation	No	4	146	1,341	10.9%	No
			2	Full	Meacher	Robert A.	Incumbent	Yes	3	817	1,312	62.3%	Yes
					Eppender	Larry	Business Owner	No	3	294	1,312	22.4%	No
					Alexander	La Veta M.	Administrative Assistant	No	3	183	1,312	13.9%	No
PLUMAS (continued)	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Dennison	Bill	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	1,327	1,766	75.1%	Yes
					Withrow	Richard (Dick)	Retired Nurseryman	No	2	434	1,766	24.6%	No
			4	Full	Bresciani	Phillip A.	Incumbent	Yes	1	977	1,085	90.0%	Yes
RIVERSIDE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Buster	Bob	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	2	22,567	43,236	52.2%	Yes
					Bell	John	Businessman	No	2	20,669	43,236	47.8%	No
			3	Full	Venable	Jim	Businessman/City Councilmember	Yes	4	26,641	59,930	44.5%	Yes
					Leja	Jan	Mayor	No	4	19,584	59,930	32.7%	No
					Hyatt	James O. (Jim)	Manager, Nonprofit School	No	4	9,234	59,930	15.4%	No
					Hickman	Gene "Codes"	Engineer, Educator, Businessman	No	4	4,471	59,930	7.5%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Venable	Jim	Businessman/City Councilmember	No	2	44,166	88,120	50.1%	Yes
					Leja	Jan	Mayor	No	2	43,954	88,120	49.9%	No
SACRAMENTO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Johnson	Muriel P.	Sacramento County Supervisor	Yes	1	45,435	45,435	100.0%	Yes
			4	Full	Cox	Dave	Businessman/County Supervisor	Yes	1	44,733	44,733	100.0%	Yes
SAN BENITO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Scagliotti	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,474	1,527	96.5%	Yes
			2	Full	Kesler	Ruth	Incumbent	Yes	3	874	1,949	44.8%	Yes
					Place	Richard	Businessman	No	3	681	1,949	34.9%	No
					Thoeny	Ted	Civil Engineer	No	3	383	1,949	19.7%	No
			5	Full	Cruz	Bob	Plant Supervisor	No	3	611	1,350	45.3%	Yes
					Huston	Marci	Food Bank Director	No	3	480	1,350	35.6%	No
					Hallberg	Dean	Health Administrator	No	3	253	1,350	18.7%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Place	Richard	Businessman	No	2	1,404	2,748	51.1%	Yes
					Kesler	Ruth	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,344	2,748	48.9%	No
			5	Full	Cruz	Bob	Plant Supervisor	No	2	1,134	2,249	50.4%	Yes
					Huston	Marci	Food Bank Director	No	2	1,115	2,249	49.6%	No
SAN BERNARDINO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Davis	Kathy A.	Councilmember, Apple Valley	No	4	25,827	51,672	50.0%	Yes
					Turoci	Marsha	Mbr. Board of Supervisors, 1st Dist.	Yes	4	16,549	51,672	32.0%	No
					Haggard	John W.	Retired Businessman	No	4	5,355	51,672	10.4%	No
					Hall	R. "Sarge"	Retired Noncommissioned Officer	No	4	3,941	51,672	7.6%	No
			3	Full	Lemann	Bill	Attorney/Police Commissioner	No	4	19,896	59,924	33.2%	Yes
					Hansberger	Dennis L.	Small Businessman	No	4	15,559	59,924	26.0%	No
					Kwapenberg	Theresa W.	Retired Administrator	No	4	12,916	59,924	21.6%	No
					Smith	Chris	San Bernardino County Sheriff Deputy	No	4	11,553	59,924	19.3%	No
			5	Full	Eaves	Jerry	Mbr. Board of Supervisors, 5th Dist.	Yes	1	21,749	21,780	99.9%	Yes
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE	3	Full	Fawke	W. Robert	Judge of the Municipal Court	No	2	20,754	32,031	64.8%	Yes
					Bartleman	Allen	Attorney at Law	No	2	11,277	32,031	35.2%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
SAN BERNARDINO (continued)		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Tomberlin	John M.	Deputy District Attorney	No	5	72,429	190,850	38.0%	Yes	
					Daniel	Deborah	Attorney at Law	No	5	48,721	190,850	25.5%	No	
					Taggart	Tim	Supervising Trial Attorney	No	5	44,218	190,850	23.2%	No	
					Bristoll	B. Gene	Attorney/Businessman	No	5	19,087	190,850	10.0%	No	
					Waitman	Gregory K.	Attorney at Law	No	5	6,395	190,850	3.4%	No	
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Davis	Kathy	Councilmember, Apple Valley	No	2	58,870	81,085	72.6%	Yes	
					Turoci	Marsha	Mbr., Bd. of Supervisors, 1st District	Yes	2	22,215	81,085	27.4%	No	
			3	Full	Hansberger	Dennis L.	Small Business Owner	No	2	49,136	96,959	50.7%	Yes	
					Lemann	Bill	Attorney/Police Commissioner	No	2	47,823	96,959	49.3%	No	
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Tomberlin	John M.	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	207,455	351,570	59.0%	Yes		
				Daniel	Deborah	Attorney/Business Owner	No	2	144,115	351,570	41.0%	No		
SAN DIEGO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cox	Greg	San Diego County Supervisor, 1st Dist.	Yes	1	40,376	40,376	100.0%	Yes	
					2	Full	Jacob	Dianne	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	5	58,345	104,190	56.0%
			Kibbee	Bonnie			Businesswoman/Rancher	No	5	18,876	104,190	18.1%	No	
			McMillan	Dan			Dir., Padre Dam Munic. Water Dist.	No	5	16,032	104,190	15.4%	No	
			Pavin	John M.			Businessman/Educator	No	5	6,100	104,190	5.9%	No	
			La Madrid	Thomas F.			County Equipment Operator	No	5	4,837	104,190	4.6%	No	
			3	Full	Slater	Pam	County Supervisor - 3rd District	Yes	2	84,695	113,368	74.7%	Yes	
					Bourke	Ken	Engineer/Teacher/Realtor	No	2	28,673	113,368	25.3%	No	
			MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Patrick	Charles L.	Judge, Municipal Court	Yes	2	126,617	169,958	74.5%	Yes
						Garleb, Jr.	Bill	Attorney/Business Owner	No	2	43,341	169,958	25.5%	No
						5	Full	Cassery	Tim	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	66,989	115,594
			Brandenburg	Anthony J.	Municipal Court Commissioner			No	2	48,605	115,594	42.0%	No	
			SAN FRANCISCO	3/26/96	MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Rothschild	Matthew	Deputy City Attorney	No	3	44,993	124,834
Tsenin	Kay	Attorney Arbitrator Mediator						No	3	43,888	124,834	35.2%	No	
Albers	Ron	Trial Attorney						No	3	35,953	124,834	28.8%	No	
SUPERIOR JUDGE	7	Full			Sing	Lillian K.	Judge, Municipal Court	No	1	98,578	98,578	100.0%	Yes	
					11	Full	McCarthy	Kevin	Attorney/Law Professor	No	2	90,784	129,817	69.9%
Moore, Jr.	Douglas M.	Incumbent					Yes	2	39,033	129,817	30.1%	No		
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	Full			Kaufman	Barbara	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	28	124,716	1,199,077	10.4%	Yes	
					Bierman	Sue	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	28	117,560	1,199,077	9.8%	Yes	
					Yee	Leland	Educator/Education Commissioner	No	28	103,413	1,199,077	8.6%	Yes	
			Katz	Leslie R.	Appointed Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	28	100,890	1,199,077	8.4%	Yes			
			Yaki	Michael	Appointed Mbr., SF Bd. of Supervisors	Yes	28	94,272	1,199,077	7.9%	Yes			
			Medina	Jose	Mediator/Police Commissioner	No	28	92,977	1,199,077	7.8%	Yes			
			St. James	Margo	Human Rights Organizer	No	28	78,669	1,199,077	6.6%	No			
			Marquez	Victor	Civil Rights Attorney	No	28	62,646	1,199,077	5.2%	No			
			Marks	Carolene	National Healthcare Advisor	No	28	56,206	1,199,077	4.7%	No			
			Casey	Donna	Non-profit Business Consultant	No	28	44,176	1,199,077	3.7%	No			
			Hoogasian	Harold M.	Business Owner (Florist)	No	28	40,321	1,199,077	3.4%	No			
			Rosales	Manuel A. "Manny"	Owner, Small Business	No	28	38,413	1,199,077	3.2%	No			
			Clark	Andy	Assistant District Attorney	No	28	30,005	1,199,077	2.5%	No			
			Jackson	Arthur M.	Small Business Owner	No	28	29,930	1,199,077	2.5%	No			
			Martinez	Maria	Child Support Investigator	No	28	24,312	1,199,077	2.0%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS- TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	PER- CENT ELECTED				
SAN FRANCISCO	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR (continued next page) (continued)		Full	Quan, Jr.	Bruce	Civil Rights Attorney	No	28	23,073	1,199,077	1.9%	No				
					Squeri	Robert J.	Small Business Owner	No	28	17,624	1,199,077	1.5%	No				
					Petroni	Carlos	Immigrants/Labor Organizer	No	28	17,293	1,199,077	1.4%	No				
					Durcanin	Scott	Bank Investment Principal	No	28	16,070	1,199,077	1.3%	No				
					Bermudez	Lucrecia	Non-Profit Financial Advisor	No	28	12,079	1,199,077	1.0%	No				
					Rosemond	Lorin Scott	Writer	No	28	11,544	1,199,077	1.0%	No				
					Coleman	Robert	Police Advisor/Attorney	No	28	11,017	1,199,077	0.9%	No				
					Pettigrew	Len	Special Ed. Teacher	No	28	10,293	1,199,077	0.9%	No				
					Williams	Teresita	Criminal Counselor	No	28	10,065	1,199,077	0.8%	No				
					Konopka	Joe	No ballot designation	No	28	8,731	1,199,077	0.7%	No				
					O'Hearn	Shawn	No ballot designation	No	28	8,533	1,199,077	0.7%	No				
					Zarate	Susan C.	Oil Refinery Operator	No	28	7,768	1,199,077	0.6%	No				
					Keyes	Ellis	No ballot designation	No	28	6,481	1,199,077	0.5%	No				
					MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Tsenin	Kay	Attorney Arbitrator Mediator	No	2	129,617	217,859	59.5%	Yes	
					Rothschild	Matthew	Deputy City Attorney	No	2	88,242	217,859	40.5%	No				
SAN JOAQUIN	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gutierrez	Steve	Senior Legislative Analyst	No	4	5,287	12,077	43.8%	Yes				
					Weaver	Floyd H.	Vice-Mayor/Educator	No	4	4,096	12,077	33.9%	No				
					Ross	William (Bill)	No ballot designation	No	4	2,071	12,077	17.1%	No				
					White	Ralph Lee	No ballot designation	No	4	623	12,077	5.2%	No				
					3	Full	Simas	Ed	Businessman, County Supervisor	No	3	9,884	16,722	59.1%	Yes		
					Jester	Karin Y.	Business Person	No	3	3,571	16,722	21.4%	No				
					Flores	Wayne	Peace Officer	No	3	3,267	16,722	19.5%	No				
					5	Full	Cabral	Robert	No ballot designation	No	2	14,311	19,068	75.1%	Yes		
					Bedell-Miller	Elenore	No ballot designation	No	2	4,757	19,068	24.9%	No				
					11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gutierrez	Steve	Senior Legislative Assistant	No	2	10,153	19,537	52.0%	Yes
					Weaver	Floyd H.	Vice-Mayor/Educator	No	2	9,384	19,537	48.0%	No				
					SAN LUIS OBISPO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Ovitt, III	Harry L.	First District Supervisor	Yes	3	6,850	12,742	53.8%
Ferravanti	Nicholas	Businessman/Planning Commissioner	No	3						3,929	12,742	30.8%	No				
Shotke	Tom	School Board Trustee	No	3						1,895	12,742	14.9%	No				
3	Full	Pinard	Peg	San Luis Obispo Retired Mayor						No	5	3,799	12,834	29.6%	Yes		
Freberg	Roger M.	Businessman/Educator	No	5						2,785	12,834	21.7%	No				
Ewan	John R.	Businessman	No	5						2,170	12,834	16.9%	No				
Henlin	Terry	Community Volunteer	No	5						2,064	12,834	16.1%	No				
Munroe	Fred R.	Small Business Person	No	5						1,978	12,834	15.4%	No				
5	Full	Blakely	David	Teacher/County Supervisor						Yes	6	4,256	10,786	39.5%	Yes		
Ryan	Mike	Rancher/Businessman	No	6			2,977	10,786	27.6%	No							
Galvan	George	Peace Officer	No	6			1,656	10,786	15.4%	No							
Kelly	Joseph C.	Businessman	No	6			747	10,786	6.9%	No							
Netz	James B.	Business Owner	No	6			692	10,786	6.4%	No							
Kudlac	Marty	Sales/Development Consultant	No	6			422	10,786	3.9%	No							
1	Full	Mullaney	Teresa E.	Municipal Court Judge			No	6	18,627	61,207	30.4%	Yes					
La Barbera	Barry T.	District Attorney	No	6			17,531	61,207	28.6%	No							
Phillips	Paul M.	Attorney at Law	No	6			8,885	61,207	14.5%	No							
O'Farrell	Terrence	Attorney at Law	No	6			8,030	61,207	13.1%	No							

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Jenkins	Stew	Family Law Specialist	No	6	4,874	61,207	8.0%	No			
					Katz	Arthur Stanley	Legal Scholar/Mediator	No	6	2,874	61,207	4.7%	No			
			5	Full	Pinard	Peg	San Luis Obispo Retired Mayor	No	2	10,338	18,382	56.2%	Yes			
					Freberg	Robert M.	Businessman/Educator	No	2	7,964	18,382	43.3%	No			
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Ryan	Mike	Rancher/Businessman	No	2	8,685	16,998	51.1%	Yes		
						Blakely	David	Teacher/County Supervisor	Yes	2	8,242	16,998	48.5%	No		
						1	Full	Mullaney	Teresa E.	Municipal Court Judge	No	2	48,336	93,120	51.9%	Yes
								La Barbera	Barry T.	District Attorney	No	2	44,333	93,120	47.6%	No
SAN MATEO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Griffin	Mary	County Supervisor	Yes	2	73,394	124,898	58.8%	Yes			
					Fogarty	Janet	Land Use Attorney	No	2	51,504	124,898	41.2%	No			
			4	Full	Barrales	Ruben	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	82,105	115,196	71.3%	Yes			
					Buetens	Stan	Educator, Businessman	No	2	33,091	115,196	28.7%	No			
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	Nevin	Mike	County Supervisor	Yes	1	97,887	97,887	100.0%	Yes		
						1	Full	Runde	John W.	Municipal Court Judge	No	1	91,137	91,137	100.0%	Yes
						9	Full	Parsons	Craig L.	Judge, Municipal Court	No	1	90,387	90,387	100.0%	Yes
								Bergeron	Joseph E.	Attorney	No	1	89,123	89,123	100.0%	Yes
						11	Full	Gemello	Linda	Attorney	No	1	91,762	91,762	100.0%	Yes
			SANTA BARBARA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Schwartz	Naomi L.	County Supervisor, First District	Yes	2	12,008	17,576	68.3%	Yes
Armendartz	Joseph A.	Business Owner						No	2	5,568	17,576	31.7%	No			
3	Full	Chamberlin				Willy	Cattleman/Small Businessman	No	4	9,570	19,210	49.8%	Yes			
		Marshall				Gail	Retail Nursery Co-Owner	No	4	5,456	19,210	28.4%	No			
		Florez				Grace	School Board Member	No	4	2,253	19,210	11.7%	No			
		Anders				Carol	Registered Nurse	No	4	1,931	19,210	10.1%	No			
4	Full	Staffel				Timothy J.	Fourth District Supervisor	Yes	2	12,534	18,948	66.1%	Yes			
		Howerton				Joyce	Mayor/Education Coordinator	No	2	6,414	18,948	33.9%	No			
SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full				Beck	Barbara J.	Municipal Court Judge	No	6	24,169	87,806	27.5%	Yes		
						Ochoa	Frank J.	Judge, Santa Barbara Municipal Court	No	6	23,730	87,806	27.0%	No		
						Dozer	Hilary M.	Deputy District Attorney	No	6	15,958	87,806	18.2%	No		
						Smith	Craig	Superior Court Commissioner	No	6	11,891	87,806	13.5%	No		
						Brown	Rick	Municipal Court Judge	No	6	11,098	87,806	12.6%	No		
						Courtney	Alan Weatherford	Appellate Court Lawyer	No	6	960	87,806	1.1%	No		
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3				Full	Marshall	Gail	Retail Nursery Co-Owner	No	2	18,297	31,847	57.5%	Yes	
			Chamberlin	Willy	Cattleman/Small Businessman		No	2	13,550	31,847	42.5%	No				
SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Ochoa	Frank J.	Judge, Santa Barbara Municipal Court	No	2	76,563	139,672	54.8%	Yes					
			Beck	Barbara J.	Municipal Court Judge	No	2	63,109	139,672	45.2%	No					
SANTA CLARA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Alvarado	Blanca	Appointed - Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	16,647	31,951	52.1%	Yes			
					Mathieson	Scott	Registered Geologist	No	2	15,304	31,951	47.9%	No			
			3	Full	McHugh	Pete	Businessman/Milpitas Mayor	No	4	20,788	45,412	45.8%	Yes			
					Sausedo	Patricia	Business Owner	No	4	14,938	45,412	32.9%	No			
					Canova	Jim	Businessman/School Trustee	No	4	4,926	45,412	10.8%	No			
					Brunner	Brian Timothy	Engineer	No	4	4,760	45,412	10.5%	No			
			5	Full	Koppel	Barbara	Retired Cupertino Councilmember	No	3	32,353	69,629	46.5%	Yes			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	PER- CENT ELECTED							
SANTA CLARA (continued)	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Simitian	Joe	Lawyer/City Councilmember	Yes	3	27,795	69,629	39.9%	No							
					O'Connor	Mark J.	Healthcare Provider/Businessman	No	3	9,481	69,629	13.6%	No							
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	11	Full	Hyman	Gene	Judge of the Municipal Court	No	3	103,912	238,581	43.6%	Yes				
								Spector	Barbara	Trial Attorney	No	3	93,945	238,581	39.4%	No				
								Allen	Douglas B.	Attorney at Law	No	3	40,724	238,581	17.1%	No				
					14	Full	Grilli	Mary Ann	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	173,174	228,633	75.7%	Yes					
							Spielbauer	Thomas	Attorney at Law	No	2	55,459	228,633	24.3%	No					
					23	Full	Lee	Edward F.	Municipal Court Judge	No	3	108,207	225,693	47.9%	Yes					
							Makano	Steven H.	Attorney at Law	No	3	77,459	225,693	34.3%	No					
							Saldivar	Gregory H.	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	3	40,027	225,693	17.7%	No					
					SANTA CLARA (continued)	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	McHugh	Pete	Businessman/Milpitas Mayor	No	2	43,874	86,025	51.0%	Yes		
										Sausedo	Patricia	Business Owner	No	2	42,151	86,025	49.0%	No		
										5	Full	Simitian	Joe	City Councilmember	No	2	64,878	113,250	57.3%	Yes
												Koppel	Barbara	Retired Cupertino Councilmember	No	2	48,372	113,250	42.7%	No
										SUPERIOR JUDGE	11	Full	Hyman	Gene	Judge of the Municipal Court	No	2	233,561	420,410	55.6%
Spector	Barbara	Trial Attorney	No	2									186,849	420,410	44.4%	No				
23	Full	Lee	Edward F.	Municipal Court Judge						No	2	240,890	404,905	59.5%	Yes					
		Nakano	Steven H.	Attorney at Law						No	2	164,015	404,905	40.5%	No					
SANTA CRUZ	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full						Beautz	Janet K.	First District Supervisor	Yes	3	8,378	13,909	60.2%	Yes		
										Busenhart	Carolyn	Businesswoman	No	3	4,747	13,909	34.1%	No		
					Duffy	Michael Stuart	Artist	No	3	784	13,909	5.6%	No							
					2	Full	Symons	Walt	Second District Supervisor	Yes	4	6,448	13,519	47.7%	Yes					
							Elerick	Paul	Manager, Information Technology	No	4	3,645	13,519	27.0%	No					
							Hurst	Lowell	Teacher/Councilman/Commissioner	No	4	1,949	13,519	14.4%	No					
							Deitch	Douglas	Businessman/Property Manager	No	4	1,477	13,519	10.9%	No					
					5	Full	Almquist	Jeff	Attorney/School Trustee	No	3	8,459	14,694	57.6%	Yes					
							Lopez	Peggie	Lopez	No	3	5,329	14,694	36.3%	No					
							Black	Doug	Registered Nurse/Realtor	No	3	906	14,694	6.2%	No					
					MUNICIPAL JUDGE	1	Full	Kelly	Thomas E.	Munic. Court Judge, Santa Cruz County	Yes	2	48,344	57,765	83.7%	Yes				
								Watts	Phillip M.	Retired Judicial Officer	No	2	9,421	57,765	16.3%	No				
					11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Symons	Walt	Second District Supervisor	Yes	2	11,360	20,110	56.5%	Yes			
Elerick	Paul	Manager, Information Technology	No	2					8,750	20,110	43.5%	No								
SHASTA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Fust, Jr.	Irwin W.	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	5,069	7,578	66.9%	Yes							
					Anderson	Andy	Farmer	No	2	2,509	7,578	33.1%	No							
					3	Full	Hawes	Glenn	Rancher/Busienssman	No	2	4,390	8,895	49.4%	Yes					
							Sullivan	Francis	Incumbent	Yes	2	4,180	8,895	47.0%	No					
					4	Full	Wilson	Molly	Supervisor/Businesswoman	Yes	1	6,412	6,412	100.0%	Yes					
SIERRA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gutman	Arnold "Arnie"	Retired Research Associate	No	2	192	298	64.4%	Yes							
					Batcheller	Donnie	Miner/Hoistman	No	2	99	298	33.2%	No							
					3	Full	Nunes	Bill	Lodge Owner	No	2	266	327	81.3%	Yes					
							McCaffrey	Jerome L. "Jerry"	Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	2	59	327	18.0%	No					
					4	Full	Mitchell	Brooks	Self-Employed Contractor	No	2	168	288	58.3%	Yes					
							Bowling	Donald E.	Incumbent	Yes	2	120	288	41.7%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
SISKIYOU	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Joan	Cattle Ranching	No	3	1,490	2,836	52.5%	Yes			
					Dutra	Clancy	Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	3	744	2,836	26.2%	No			
					Covington	J. K. (Knapp)	Retired Engineering Manager	No	3	575	2,836	20.3%	No			
			2	Full	Erickson	Lavada	Businesswoman	No	5	1,453	3,379	43.0%	Yes			
					Smith	Vernon	Self-employed Businessman	No	5	926	3,379	27.4%	No			
					Ayer	Jim	Real Estate Broker	No	5	711	3,379	21.0%	No			
					Clark	Maurine	Retired Office Manager	No	5	206	3,379	6.1%	No			
					Miller	Phillip L.	Mortgage Banker	No	5	78	3,379	2.3%	No			
			4	Full	Giardino	Jerry	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,637	2,995	54.7%	Yes			
					Osborn	Jan	No ballot designation	No	2	1,327	2,995	44.3%	No			
			SISKIYOU (continued)	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Erickson	Lavada	Businesswoman	No	2	2,151	4,035	53.3%	Yes
								Smith	Vernon	Self-employed Businessman	No	2	1,884	4,035	46.7%	No
SOLANO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Kondylis	Barbara R.	County Supervisor	Yes	2	6,037	10,894	55.4%	Yes			
					Higgins	Jack	Businessman/Community Leader	No	2	4,857	10,894	44.6%	No			
			2	Full	Silva	John F.	Council Member	No	4	6,432	14,437	44.6%	Yes			
					Lowe	Doris	Retired Union Administrator	No	4	3,563	14,437	24.7%	No			
					Tarr	Sara	Business Consultant	No	4	2,819	14,437	19.5%	No			
					Celones	Serafin "Apin" D.	Business Owner	No	4	1,623	14,437	11.2%	No			
			5	Full	Thomson	Skip	Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	2	9,629	14,676	65.6%	Yes			
					Rubier	Jerry L.	Businessman	No	2	5,047	14,676	34.4%	No			
			MARSHALL, Vallejo/Benecia Jud. Dist.	Full	Davis	Rodger L.	Police Administrator	No	3	8,596	23,749	36.2%	Yes			
					Bailey, Jr.	Fred	Deputy Marshal	No	3	8,525	23,749	35.9%	No			
					Brisbin	Gary	Deputy Marshal Supervisor	No	3	6,628	23,749	27.9%	No			
			MUNICIPAL JUDGE	Full	Garrett	Ramona	Municipal Court Judge	Yes	2	24,858	38,902	63.9%	Yes			
					Urquhart	C. Richard	Attorney at Law	No	2	14,044	38,902	36.1%	No			
			11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Silva	John F.	Retired, City Manager	No	2	12,617	22,620	55.8%	Yes	
							Lowe	Doris E.	Retired Labor Administrator	No	2	10,003	22,620	44.2%	No	
MARSHALL, Vallejo-Benecia Jud. Dist.	Full	Bailey, Jr.					Fred	Dep. Marshal	No	2	24,575	40,722	60.3%	Yes		
		Davis	Rodger L.	Police Administrator	No	2	16,147	40,722	39.7%	No						
SONOMA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cale	Mike	Supervisor and Vintner	Yes	2	19,979	26,622	75.0%	Yes			
					Williams	Roger	Retired Businessman	No	2	6,570	26,622	24.7%	No			
			2	Full	Smith	Tim	Sonoma County Supervisor, 3rd District	No	2	12,344	19,632	62.9%	Yes			
					Casey	Maureen	Community Volunteer	No	2	7,288	19,632	37.1%	No			
			5	Full	Koenigshofer	Eric	Environmentalist/Attorney/Businessman	No	7	6,629	23,167	28.6%	Yes			
					Reilley	Mike	Community Services Director	No	7	5,503	23,167	23.8%	No			
					Dowd	Bill	Businessman	No	7	4,658	23,167	20.1%	No			
					Furze	Shela A.	Small Businesswoman/Teacher	No	7	2,425	23,167	10.5%	No			
					Hirshfield	Madlyn "Maddy"	Registered Occupational Therapist	No	7	1,792	23,167	7.7%	No			
					Sterling	Laurence G.	Vintner/Grower, Businessman	No	7	1,129	23,167	4.9%	No			
					Gustafson	Holly	School Board Trustee	No	7	1,031	23,167	4.5%	No			
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Tansil	Mark	Municipal Court Judge	No	3	72,452	106,442	68.1%	Yes	
			Buchanan	Lawrence C.			Family Law Attorney	No	3	22,598	106,442	21.2%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED					
STANISLAUS	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Kocalis	Don	Attorney/Radio Commentator	No	3	11,392	106,442	10.7%	No					
					Reilly	Mike	Community Services Director	No	2	17,247	32,573	52.9%	Yes					
					Koenigshofer	Eric J.	No ballot designation	No	2	15,209	32,573	46.7%	No					
	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Paul	Pat	No ballot designation	No	1	12,653	12,653	100.0%	Yes					
					Mayfield	Tom	Farmer	No	1	11,937	11,937	100.0%	Yes					
Caruso					Paul	County Supervisor-Businessman	Yes	1	8,097	8,097	100.0%	Yes						
SUTTER	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Kroon	Casey	Industrial Technology Instructor	No	2	2,266	3,928	57.7%	Yes					
					Montra	Larry L.	Businessman	No	2	1,662	3,928	42.3%	No					
TEHAMA	2/6/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR <sup>2</sup>	2	Full	Russell	George P.	Retired School Superintendent	No	3	4,630	9,653	48.0%	Yes					
					Mooneyham	Billy J.	Retired Firefighter	No	3	2,059	9,653	21.3%	No					
					Wagner	Randy	Business Owner	No	3	2,964	9,653	30.7%	No					
					Turner	Ross M.	Agriculturalist, Tr. Manager	No	1	8,141	8,141	100.0%	Yes					
					Borror	Bill	Rancher	No	1	9,062	9,062	100.0%	Yes					
	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Mclver	Barbara G.	Incumbent	Yes	2	7,377	13,976	52.8%	Yes					
					Rollins	Roxana	Customer Service Representative	No	2	6,536	13,976	46.8%	No					
					Russell	George P.	Retired School Superintendent	No	4	5,959	14,039	42.4%	Yes					
					Mooneyham	Billy J.	Retired Firefighter	No	4	3,273	13,992	23.4%	No					
					Wagner	Randy	Business Owner	No	4	2,929	14,039	20.9%	No					
					Marelli	Shirley M.	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,809	13,992	12.9%	No					
	5	Full	Borror	Bill	Rancher	No	2	10,665	14,010	76.1%	Yes							
			Rowen	Kathleen	Incumbent	Yes	2	3,276	14,010	23.4%	No							
11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Russell	George P.	Retired School Superintendent	No	2	10,605	19,215	55.2%	Yes						
				Mooneyham	Billy J.	Retired Firefighter	No	2	8,520	19,215	44.3%	No						
TRINITY	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Fackrell	Paul E.	No ballot designation	No	4	449	973	46.1%	Yes					
					Baxter	Joann M.	Substitute Teacher	No	4	267	973	27.4%	No					
					Huddleston	Robert	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	4	211	973	21.7%	No					
					Clement	Randall C.	No ballot designation	No	4	46	973	4.7%	No					
					3	Full	Modine	Ralph R.	No ballot designation	No	3	398	813	49.0%	Yes			
							Chandler	Cliff	No ballot designation	No	3	271	813	33.3%	No			
							Yates	Homer L.	Insurance Broker	No	3	144	813	17.7%	No			
					5	Full	Reiss	Robert "Bob"	Businessman/Reserve Deputy	No	4	241	833	28.9%	Yes			
							Stewart	Marvin R.	Retired School Superintendent	No	4	213	833	25.6%	No			
							Onwiler	Mary	Bookkeeping, Notary, Taxation	No	4	195	833	23.4%	No			
							Arey	Mark K.	No ballot designation	No	4	184	833	22.1%	No			
							Holub	Rudolph M.	No ballot designation	No	1	3,594	3,594	100.0%	Yes			
					MARSHALL	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Fackrell	Paul E.	No ballot designation	No	2	738	1,239	59.6%	Yes
										Baxter	Joann M.	Substitute Teacher	No	2	501	1,239	40.4%	No
										3	Full	Modine	Ralph R.	No ballot designation	No	2	604	995
Chandler	Cliff	No ballot designation	No	2	391	995	39.3%	No										

<sup>1</sup>To be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS- TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
TULARE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Reiss	Robert "Bob"	Businessman/Reserve Deputy	No	2	533	1,034	51.5%	Yes			
					Stewart	Marvin R.	Retired School Superintendent	No	2	501	1,034	48.5%	No			
			1	Full	Sanders	Bill	Farmer/Businessman	No	2	8,166	10,900	74.9%	Yes			
					Wells	Dan	Investigator/College Instructor	No	2	2,734	10,900	25.1%	No			
					2	Full	Richmond	Mel	Incumbent	Yes	1	6,794	6,794	100.0%	Yes	
3	Full	Maze	Bill	Supervisor District 3	Yes	1	10,440	10,440	100.0%	Yes						
TUOLUMNE	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Rotelli	Larry A.	Truck Driver/Supervisor	Yes	2	1,638	2,931	55.9%	Yes			
					Smart	Frank M.	Veterans' Activist	No	2	1,259	2,931	43.0%	No			
			4	Full	Debernardi	Michael "Mickey"	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,298	3,451	37.6%	Yes			
					Thornton	Mark V.	Historian	No	3	1,145	3,451	33.2%	No			
					Corralls	R. "Chuck"	Community Service Advocate	No	3	999	3,451	28.9%	No			
	5	Full	Pland	Richard	Natural Resource Coordinator	No	5	1,368	3,492	39.2%	Yes					
			Coane	Robert T.	Retired Sheriff/Coroner	No	5	783	3,492	22.4%	No					
			Blake	Martin S.	Teacher, Small Businessman	No	5	561	3,492	16.1%	No					
			Nichols	Raymond	Retired Business Executive	No	5	426	3,492	12.2%	No					
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Thornton	Mark V.	Historian	No	2	2,442	4,626	52.8%	Yes			
Debernardi					Michael "Mickey"	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,184	4,626	47.2%	No				
5			Full	Pland	Richard	Natural Resource Coordinator	No	2	2,396	4,331	55.3%	Yes				
				Coane	Robert T.	Retired Sheriff/Coroner	No	2	1,935	4,331	44.7%	No				
				VENTURA	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Long	Kathy	Businesswoman/Supervisor's Rep.	No	2	27,009	50,688	53.3%
Morgan	Mike	City of Camarillo Council Member	No	2	23,527	50,688	46.4%	No								
YOLO	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McGowan	Mike	Yolo County Supervisor	Yes	1	4,404	4,404	100.0%	Yes			
			4	Full	Rosenberg	Dave	Mayor	No	2	5,018	9,574	52.4%	Yes			
					Elkholm	Ian	Public Asset Manager	No	2	4,556	9,574	47.6%	No			
5	Full	Pollock	Lynnell	Farmer	No	1	5,553	5,553	100.0%	Yes						
YUBA	3/26/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Simmons	Bill	Director, Career Center	No	4	1,001	2,659	37.6%	Yes			
					Palmquist	B. Jay	Incumbent	Yes	4	929	2,659	34.9%	No			
					Gless	Ronald W.	Electronic Technician	No	4	521	2,659	19.6%	No			
					Motell	Lisa Marie	No ballot designation	No	4	203	2,659	7.6%	No			
			3	Full	Hastey	Brent W.	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,067	2,143	49.8%	Yes			
					Bluett	A. R. Mike	Printer	No	2	1,055	2,143	49.2%	No			
			4	Full	Schrader	Don	Instructor/Business Owner	No	2	610	1,111	54.9%	Yes			
					Barber	Bob	Retired	No	2	492	1,111	44.3%	No			
			SUPERIOR JUDGE			1	Full	Mathews	Thomas F.	Incumbent	Yes	2	5,535	11,111	49.8%	Yes
								Lenhard	Robert C.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	5,501	11,111	49.5%	No
2	Full	Curry				James L.	Attorney	No	4	4,163	10,750	38.7%	Yes			
		Lesser				Stephen	Attorney	No	4	2,862	10,750	26.6%	No			
			Johnston	G. Michael	Attorney	No	4	2,239	10,750	20.8%	No					



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1998

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS- TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
					Braccia	Jeff	Public Defender	No	4	1,426	10,750	13.3%	No
	11/5/96	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Simmons	Bill	Director, Career Center	No	2	1,816	3,472	52.3%	Yes
					Palmquist	B. Jay	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,645	3,472	47.4%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Curry	James L.	Attorney	No	2	8,592	14,775	58.2%	Yes
					Lesser	Stephen	Attorney	No	2	6,057	14,775	41.0%	No



TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY OFFICES, 1996

		County Supervisor		Superior Judge		Municipal Judge		Sheriff/Marshall		District Attorney		Tax Collector		Total	
		Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>
Incumbent Candidates	Win	69.3	95	76.5	13	85.7	18	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0	1	72.9	132
	Lose	30.7	42	23.5	4	14.3	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	27.1	49
	Total	100.0	137	100.0	17	100.0	21	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0	181
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	29.1	127	33.3	38	28.2	20	30.8	4	0.0	0	--	--	29.5	189
	Lose	70.9	310	66.7	76	71.8	51	69.2	9	100.0	6	--	--	70.5	452
	Total	100.0	437	100.0	141	100.0	71	100.0	13	100.0	6	--	--	100.0	641
Winning Candidates	Incumbents	42.8	95	25.5	13	47.4	18	33.3	2	100.0	3	100.0	1	41.1	132
	Non-Incumbents	57.2	127	74.5	38	52.6	20	66.7	4	0.0	0	0.0	0	58.9	189
	Total	100.0	222	100.0	51	100.0	38	100.0	6	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0	321
Losing Candidates	Incumbents	11.9	42	5.0	4	5.6	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	--	--	9.8	49
	Non-Incumbents	88.1	310	95.0	76	94.4	51	100.0	9	100.0	6	--	--	90.2	452
	Total	100.0	352	100.0	80	100.0	54	100.0	9	100.0	6	--	--	100.0	501
All Candidates	Incumbent	23.9	137	13.0	17	22.8	21	13.3	2	33.3	3	100.0	1	22.0	181
	Non-Incumbents	76.1	437	87.0	114	77.2	71	86.7	13	66.7	6	0.0	0	78.0	641
	Total	100.0	574	100.0	131	100.0	92	100.0	15	100.0	9	100.0	1	100.0	822