

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

1999 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, 1999 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
1999 County, City and School District Election Dates by County	viii
1999 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, 1999	3
Table B Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 1999	5
Table C Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 1999	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, 1999	11
Table 1.2 Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 1999.....	14
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 1999	17
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 1999	17
PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES	19
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for County Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 1999.....	21
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 1999.....	26

CALIFORNIA ELECTIONS DATA ARCHIVE

INTRODUCTION

The California Elections Data Archive (CEDA) is a joint project of the Center for California Studies and the Institute for Social Research, both of California State University, Sacramento and the office of the California Secretary of State. The purpose of CEDA is to provide researchers, citizens, public agencies and other interested parties with a single repository of local election data. With over 6,000 local jurisdictions in California, the task of monitoring local elections is nearly impossible for individuals. CEDA addresses this problem through the creation of a single, cost-effective and easily accessible source of local election data. CEDA includes 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 in the CEDA database from which three standard CEDA reports are generated. These reports include:

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

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

THE CENTER FOR CALIFORNIA STUDIES

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

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Established in 1989, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is an interdisciplinary center serving the research needs of federal, state and local government agencies, non-profit organizations and university administration, faculty and students. These services include research and sampling design, measurement, coding and data entry, computer assisted telephone and field interviewing, mailed surveys, focus groups, data base management, statistical analysis and report production. ISR has completed numerous contracts with over 40 state and community agencies, several private firms and many administrative units of the university. Faculty affiliates of the Institute offer expertise in a wide variety of disciplines, including the social sciences, health and human services, engineering and education.

CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE

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

1999 ELECTION DATA

The year 1999 was the sesquicentennial year of state elections in California. In 1849, General Bennett Riley, the military commander of American forces in California and, with the cession of California from Mexico to the United States, the acting governor, called a convention to draft a constitution for the state of California. That convention, whose forty-eight delegates included Mariano Vallejo and seven other Californios, produced a document that was approved by the voters in November 1849. The election to ratify the new constitution was also the election to elect a Governor, 36 members of the Assembly and 16 of the Senate as well as other constitutional officers.

No such elections for state officers were held in 1999, but the California Republic again demonstrated its vitality by choosing among 2,293 candidates to elect 1,039 county supervisors, city council members, school board trustees and other local government officials. Although the initiative did not become part of the state constitution until 1910, the spirit was there in the judgment of General Riley and the Monterey Convention that the voters should decide, directly and at the polls, whether the new constitution would be ratified. That spirit of direct democracy was alive and well in 1999 with California voters passing judgement on 283 ballot measures.

BALLOT MEASURES

The 283 measures on California ballots in 1999 included 33 county ballot measures, 119 city measures and 131 school district measures. The total number of ballot measures was less than half the number voted on in 1998, which is not surprisingly given that 1999 was an "off" year with no state or federal elections and the long trend of local jurisdictions consolidating their elections with

state elections in even-numbered years. Moreover, of the 282 measures in 1999, only about ten percent were placed on the ballot by action of the people (i.e., through the initiative, referendum or recall). The bulk of the measures were on the ballot by action of a county board, city council or school board.

More than half of 1999's local ballot measures were bonds (108 or 38.1 percent) or tax measures (54 or 19.0 percent). Bond measures were generally successful with a 59.2 percent approval rate. The 64 bonds which passed equaled over \$2 billion (\$2,180,673,000). Another \$1,842,448,000 in bonds were defeated. Tax measures were only slightly less successful with 31 such measures passing (59.2 percent) and 23 being rejected by the voters (42.6 percent).

Education was the most popular subject of ballot measures with 119 or 42.0 percent of all local ballot measures falling in this category. The 29 land use measures represented 10.2 percent of all measures and one of the less successful records with only 41.3 percent passing and 58.6 percent failing.

County Measures. 1999 saw a comparatively small total of 33 county ballot measures. There were no elections of any type in 13 counties and of the 45 that did have elections at some level, only 12 had county ballot measures. Bay Area counties accounted for nearly half (16 or 48.4 percent) of all county measures (i.e. Marin, Napa and the city and county of San Francisco (which CEDA treats as a county). The success rate of all county measures was significant with two-thirds gaining voter approval (the Bay Area approval rate was 87.5 percent).

Only one county bond was offered in 1999 and that was passed (\$299 million in San Francisco for replacement of Laguna Honda Hospital). Far more common were tax measures (16 or 48.4 percent or which exactly half passed and half failed); ordinances (8 or 24.2 percent with 5 passing); and charter amendments (4 or 12.1 percent; all in San Francisco and all successful). The tax measures typically asked for increases of special taxes in improvement zones (e.g., Measure J-99 in San Luis Obispo County, which raised taxes for road improvements in the Harvey Street Road Improvement Zone) or for taxes supporting paramedic and fire services. Voters in Imperial County reject a county sales tax increase.

Among the most interesting county measures were Proposition F in San Francisco which passed, prohibited ATM fees; Proposition S in Trinity County which passed advising the Board of Supervisors that new sales tax revenues should be allocated to crime and fire prevention; and Measure K in San Francisco, which passed, setting voluntary campaign spending limits on candidates for the Board of Supervisors.

City Measures. Voters in 66 California cities passed judgment on 119 separate ballot measures. Of these, 63 or 52.9 percent were approved and 56 or 47.0 percent failed. Thus municipal measures fared considerably poorer than county measures. City bond measures enjoyed marked success with 3 of 4 being adopted, including Measure C, a \$8 million bond for the construction of a new police station, Arcadia in Los Angeles County. The only failed city bond was a \$36.7 million bond for construction of new police facility in Santa Barbara. In contrast, the 27 municipal measures dealing with taxes, 14 or 51.8 percent passed while 13 or 48.1 percent failed.

Less than ten percent of all city measures were placed on the ballot through the initiative process (10 or 8.4 percent of the total). Moreover, the measures were less successful with only 4 being approved by the voters, for a 40 percent pass rate.

The two most common subjects for city measures were governance issues (45 or 37.8 percent of all city measures) and land use issues (29 or 24.3 percent). Governance issues ranged from cutting the salaries of the mayor and city council members in Inglewood (passed) to a \$400 a month pay raise for the mayor of Modesto (failed) to term limits on the Council members in Apple Valley (failed) to three measures in Redondo Beach seeking to change elective offices into appointed ones (all failed). Governance issues also included eight recall elections, all of which were successful (three Council members in Apple Valley; two in Montague, two in San Jacinto and one in Weed).

Land use issues involved numerous efforts to make rezoning and growth decisions subject to voter approval. Ten measures directly addressing growth issues, of which 6 passed and 4 were defeated. Of particular interest were 5 measures (3 passed, 2 failed) which sought to make various land use decisions subject to voter approval. For example, with the passage of Measure U in Chino Hills, any increase in the number of housing units permitted under the city's general plan and any conversion of non-residential zoning to residential now requires voter approval. Under Measure A in Napa, any change to the city's rural urban limit line now must be approved by the voters or a fourth-fifths vote of the city council. In Agoura Hills, with the passage of Measure B, any change to land currently designated as open space now requires a two-thirds vote of the voters. On the other hand, Measure F in San Ramon, which would have made various land use decisions subject to voter approval, failed as did Measure D in Pleasanton which would have required voter approval for any project involving ten or more residential units.

School Measures. In 1999, as in previous years, school district measures mean bond measures. School district voters faced a total of 131 ballot measures of which 103 or 78.6 percent were bond measures. Of those bond measures, 60 were approved and 43 rejected by the voters for a pass rate of 58.2 percent. Thus voters approved more than \$1.8 billion dollars in school bonds. Successful bonds ranged from \$248 million in the Foothill-De Anza Community College District in the heart of the Silicon Valley to \$700,000 in Merced River Union Elementary School District in Merced County. The largest bond measure that failed was a \$150 million effort by Livermore Valley joint Unified School District in Contra Costa County.

School district measures also included six recall efforts, four of which were unsuccessful (all in Farmersville Unified in Tulare County) and two successful (one in Willows Unified in Glenn County and Chualar Union Elementary in Monterey County). All recall efforts were in comparatively smaller school districts.

Other governance issues, which accounted for 9.1 percent of all school ballot measures, included annexation, consolidation, creation and/or unification measures (6 measures of which four were approved); increasing the size of district boards (2 measures, both passed) and providing that board members be elected from trustee areas (4, both passed)

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

A total of 2,293 Californians presented themselves to the judgment of their fellow citizens by running for one of the 1,039 elective county, city or school district positions. Of the 1,039 elected to office, 511 were non-incumbents and 528 were incumbent office-holders successful in their efforts to be reelected. Thus, of all the people elected to local government positions in 1999, 52.8 percent were incumbents and 49.2 percent were non-incumbents. Thus incumbents seeking reelection

were quite successful with a 76.7 percent reelection rate (528 of 688). The difference between a 76.7 percent reelection rate and the 52.8 percent of successful candidates who were incumbents is a function of both the 160 incumbents who were defeated and the number of incumbents who chose not to or were prohibited from running again.

County races. Elections for county offices are held in even-numbered years, with the exception of the city-county of San Francisco. Thus there was little electoral activity at the county level and of that, the most interesting was the continued emergence of county-based Community Service Districts (CSD) and the election of CSD Directors.

In 1999, 109 candidates vied for 61 CSD director positions. Of the 109, 42 or 38.5 percent were incumbents. Of the incumbents running for reelection, 32 won giving incumbents a 76.2 percent reelection rate. Overall, however, of the 61 winners, the 32 incumbents represent only 52.5 percent.

City races. California voters faced in 1999 the task of electing 244 city council members, 22 mayors, 18 city clerks, 18 city treasurers and 2 city attorneys. A total of 738 candidates vied for these 304 positions. Overall, incumbents did well with a reelection rate of 80.6 percent (186 incumbents ran for reelection, 150 won and 36 lost). However, of the 304 positions filled at the ballot, only 49.3 percent were incumbents while 154 or 50.7 percent were non-incumbents.

Incumbent city treasurers and city attorneys were especially successful with 100 percent reelection rates. Incumbent city clerks fared somewhat less well with 14 of 15 being reelected (93.3 percent). Mayoral incumbents had a reelection rate of 63.2 with 12 of 19 incumbent returned to office by the voters. Incumbent members of city councils enjoyed a reelection rate of 79.6 percent with 109 out of 137 incumbents being successful in their bids for reelection. Non-incumbents were most successful in city councils races with 55.3 percent of council winners being new to office.

School District Races. School district offices equaled 64.2 percent of all local elected positions so it is not surprising that 61.7 percent of all local government candidates in 1999 ran for school board. The 1,417 candidates running for 668 school positions included 455 incumbent school board members seeking reelection. Of these 341 or 74.9 percent were successful. This reelection rate is below both the overall incumbent reelection rate of 76.7 percent and the reelection rate of 80.6 for city incumbents candidates. Once again, however, it is important to note that incumbent reelection rates do not automatically equate to incumbent domination of school boards as of the 688 candidates elected only 341 or 51.0 percent were incumbent trustees.

TRENDS

With five full years of reporting beginning in 1995, the reduced numbers of ballot measures and candidates in odd-numbered years begins to look like a dependable trend. There are roughly half as many measures and candidates in 1995, 97 and 99 as there are in 1996 and 1998 -- between 252 and 343 ballot measures in the former, 572 and 573 in the latter; and between 2293 and 2498 candidates in the odd-numbered years compared with 5530 and 5502 in the even-numbered years. Overall pass rates for the ballot measures remain steady at 59% in 1999, varying between 57 and 61% for the five-year period. The proportion of incumbents in 1999 (30%) was consistent with the figures for 1997 and 1998 (30 and 32% respectively), showing a marked increase over 1995 and 1996 (27 and 26% respectively).

BALLOT MEASURES

The proportion of bonds among ballot measures has remained relatively constant in the three odd-numbered years, varying between 36 and 38%, declining noticeably during the even-numbered years (to 11% and 26% in 1996 and 1998). Pass rates for bonds, however, have remained extremely consistent for the past four years, at 58 to 59%. Tax measures were more common during 1996 through 1998, making up 25 to 29% of the ballot measures during those years. They were only 10% of all measures in 1995 and dropped to 19% of all measures in 1999, with pass rates noticeably higher in the past three years (48 to 57% compared with 35 to 40% in 1995 and 1996). Ordinances and charter amendments are other frequently occurring types of measures, their proportions varying widely from year to year with no apparent pattern. In 1997, there was only 1 ordinance on the ballot, while there were 176 in the preceding year and 68 in 1999. Tax measures made up a fifth of the ballot measures in 1995 and 1996, but only 9 and 7% in 1997 and 1999. Pass rates for both have been pretty constant, with ordinances passing 57 – 61% of the time and charter amendments, with the exception of 1999, passing at least three-fourths of the time.

Education continues to dominate as the topic of ballot measures, particularly in odd-numbered years. Governance issues over-shadowed education in 1996 (210 measures to 94) and came closer to parity in 1998 (125 to 164 for education) than the more typical two to one ratio, or better, in the other three years. Pass ratios for Education measures have stabilized in the 59 – 67% range for the past four years, with governance issues in a similar range for the same time period (63 – 67%).

Though much less frequent, land use issues have ranked third as a topic of ballot measures for each of the five years. They are more common in years with statewide elections and, until 1999, have enjoyed healthy pass rates, varying between 56 and 70%. This year, only 41% of the 29 land use measures passed. Like land use, public safety issues are also more common in years with statewide elections. There were 39 and 37 in 1996 and 1998, but only 12 in 1995 and 1997 and 14 in 1999. Pass rates for public safety measures are generally lower than for education, governance and land use.

School districts and cities account for most of the ballot measures each year. School district measures account for roughly half (46 to 51%) of the ballot measures in the odd-numbered years, while city measures account for half or more during the even-numbered years (50 to 65%). County measures make up 20% or less of all ballot measures, with more in the years with statewide elections (1996 and 1998) and as few as 7% in the odd-numbered years (7% in 1995 and 1997). As odd-numbered years go, 1999's 17% was uncharacteristically high. A total of 33 measures appeared on 1999 county ballots. The increase can be explained by the increase in community service districts (CSDs). CSDs are typically created to provide services to a particular area within a county and thus allow parcel tax, bonds and other such measures to be voted upon only by the people directed affected, as opposed to the entire county. A third of the 1999 county measures were CSD measures (e.g., Measure G in Marin, Measure G in Riverside and all five measures in San Luis Obispo County). Without those CSD measures, the number of county would have been a normal 7.7% of the total number of measures in 1999.

County measures. Consistent with the other odd-numbered years, there were few charter amendments in 1999 (4). The fact that all passed is consistent with generally high pass rates for this type of measure. Tax measures and ordinances are the most common types of county ballot measures. They occur in larger numbers in the years with statewide elections, but there were an unusual number of both in 1999 for an odd-numbered election year (16 and 8 respectively, when there are typically a half dozen or less). Pass rates for the ordinances were typical – 63% vs. 54

and 72 in 1996 and 1998 – while they were a little high for the tax measures (50% vs. 29 and 38% in 1996 and 1998, when there were a sufficient number to percentage). The 50% cannot be seen as unusual since there were only 16 tax measures in 1999.

City measures. Most city measures are ordinances (40%), tax issues (23%) or charter amendments (13%). Cities, like counties, offer more of these types of measures in the even-numbered years. Pass rates for charter amendments were very high in four of the five years (between 75 and 94%), but uncharacteristically low (38%) in 1999. This may be an artifact of the unusually small number of charter amendments (16) in 1999. Pass rates for ordinances and tax measures have been consistently lower (in the 40 – 50% range). Governance issues dominated in all five years with land use or general services a distant second.

School district measures. While cities and counties crowd the ballot with their measures during the even-numbered years when statewide elections are held, school districts account for roughly half of all ballot measures in the odd-numbered ones. Bonds are by far the most common with tax issues a distant second and ordinances and recalls third. Pass rates on bonds have held steady the past three years at 57 – 59% while taxes have enjoyed healthy pass rates for the past four, varying between 63 and 100%. Ordinances and recalls have generally high pass rates, but the numbers are small and therefore unreliable.

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

While county elective offices are largely determined in the even-numbered years – with 93% of all candidates on the ballot in 1996 and 1998 -- not quite two-thirds of all candidates for city offices (64%) run during those years and only half (51%) of those running for school boards. The proportion of incumbents running is consistently highest for school boards (between 28 and 33%), somewhat lower for city offices (18 – 26%) and lowest for county office holders (0 – 27%). The proportion of incumbents running for school boards has been higher the past three years (32 – 33%) and for city offices, the last four (23 – 26%). Very few or no incumbents run for county offices during the odd-numbered years when few candidate elections are held.

1999 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	No ELECTIONS	1/12	2/2	2/23	3/2	3/9	3/16	3/23	4/6	4/13	4/20	4/27	5/4	5/11	5/18	6/8	7/13	7/20	7/27	8/10	8/17	8/24	9/14	9/21	9/28	10/5	10/19	11/2	11/9	12/7	12/14	
Orange					3							3				3												3	3			
Placer					3																											
Plumas	3																															
Riverside		3														3	3					3		3					3			
Sacramento			3		3							3				3											3		3			
San Benito	3																															
San Bernardino					3							3			3								3						3			
San Diego					3		3									3						3		3						3		
San Francisco																													3		3	
San Joaquin											3	3				3							3		3				3			
San Luis Obispo					3																								3			
San Mateo					3							3			3														3			
Santa Barbara																3													3			
Santa Clara														3		3													3			
Santa Cruz					3											3						3							3			
Shasta					3						3											3							3			
Sierra	3																															
Siskiyou																																
Solano								3																					3			
Sonoma					3											3							3		3				3			
Stanislaus																3													3		3	
Sutter																													3			
Tehama	3																															
Trinity																													3			
Tulare		3			3							3																	3			
Tuolumne																													3			
Ventura		3														3													3			
Yolo																													3			
Yuba	3																															

1999 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, 1999

	BONDS		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	2	0	1	0			0	1			1	3	2	0			6	4	10
Butte	0	3															0	3	3
Contra Costa	0	1	0	1			1	1			2	0	2	0			5	3	8
El Dorado	1	1															1	1	2
Fresno											1	0	2	0			3	0	3
Glenn	1	0													1	0	2	0	2
Humboldt	3	1									0	1					3	2	5
Imperial	0	1									0	1	0	2			0	4	4
Inyo	1	0															1	0	1
Kern	2	2									1	0					3	2	5
Kings	1	1															1	1	2
Lake	1	0															1	0	1
Lassen	0	1															0	1	1
Los Angeles	6	5	0	3							2	4	0	2			8	14	22
Madera	2	0															2	0	2
Marin	6	1							3	0			4	1			13	2	15
Mendocino	1	1											0	1			1	2	3
Merced	2	0															2	0	2
Monterey	3	1											1	0	1	0	5	1	6
Napa			2	0					1	0	1	1	1	1			5	2	7
Nevada	1	0															1	0	1
Orange	3	1									4	2	0	1			7	4	11
Placer	3	0															3	0	3
Riverside	1	0			0	1	1	0			5	2	5	7	2	0	14	10	24
Sacramento	1	4															1	4	5
San Bernardino	3	3	1	0			0	1			6	4	1	0	3	0	14	8	22
San Diego	0	2					0	1			1	2	1	2			2	7	9

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1999

	BONDS		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 Francisco	1	0	4	0							5	1					10	1	11
San Joaquin	0	5									2	0					2	5	7
San Luis Obispo	1	2											5	0			6	2	8
San Mateo	3	2									2	2	4	2			9	6	15
Santa Barbara	1	3					0	1									1	4	5
Santa Clara	6	0			1	0					2	1	0	1			9	2	11
Santa Cruz							1	0			0	2					1	2	3
Shasta	0	1							1	0							1	1	2
Siskiyou															3	0	3	0	3
Solano							0	1			1	0	0	1			1	2	3
Sonoma	2	0									1	0	1	0			4	0	4
Stanislaus			2	6	2	0							1	0			5	6	11
Sutter	1	0									0	1					1	1	2
Trinity					1	0							0	1			1	1	2
Tulare	1	2									1	0			0	4	2	6	8
Tuolumne													0	1			0	1	1
Ventura	1	0					1	0			1	2					3	2	5
Yolo	2	0											1	0			3	0	3
All Counties	63	44	10	10	4	1	4	6	5	0	39	29	31	23	10	4	166	117	283

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1999

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		HOUSING		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	TOTAL
Alameda	3	0	0	4			2	0										1	0	6	4	10	
Butte	0	3																		0	3	3	
Contra Costa	2	1	0	1			3	1												5	3	8	
El Dorado	1	1																		1	1	2	
Fresno					2	0												1	0	3	0	3	
Glenn	2	0																		2	0	2	
Humboldt	3	1	0	1																3	2	5	
Imperial	0	1			0	1	0	1						0	1					0	4	4	
Inyo	1	0																		1	0	1	
Kern	2	2					1	0												3	2	5	
Kings	1	1																		1	1	2	
Lake	1	0																		1	0	1	
Lassen	0	1																		0	1	1	
Los Angeles	5	5	1	0	1	1	1	6										0	2	8	14	22	
Madera	2	0																		2	0	2	
Marin	7	1			1	0			0	1				1	0			4	0	13	2	15	
Mendocino	1	1			0	1														1	2	3	
Merced	2	0																		2	0	2	
Monterey	4	1			1	0														5	1	6	
Napa			2	0	0	1	1	1										2	0	5	2	7	
Nevada	1	0																		1	0	1	
Orange	3	2	2	0			2	1										0	1	7	4	11	
Placer	3	0																		3	0	3	
Riverside	1	0			2	1	6	2	1	2				3	3			1	2	14	10	24	
Sacramento	1	4																		1	4	5	
San Bernardino	3	3	2	3			8	1										1	1	14	8	22	
San Diego	1	2	0	1			1	3					0	1						2	7	9	

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1999

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		HOUSING		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	TOTAL
San Francisco							4	0			2	1	1	0					3	0	10	1	11
San Joaquin	0	5					2	0													2	5	7
San Luis Obispo	1	2									5	0									6	2	8
San Mateo	3	3	1	1			1	1	1	0			1	0					2	1	9	6	15
Santa Barbara	1	2	0	1	0	1															1	4	5
Santa Clara	6	0	1				1	1							1	0			0	1	9	2	11
Santa Cruz			0	2													1	0			1	2	3
Shasta	0	1																	1	0	1	1	2
Siskiyou							3	0													3	0	3
Solano			0	1	1	0													0	1	1	2	3
Sonoma	3	0	1	0																	4	0	4
Stanislaus							2	5					1	0	2	0			0	1	5	6	11
Sutter	1	0													0	1					1	1	2
Trinity															0	1			1	0	1	1	2
Tulare	1	6					1	0													2	6	8
Tuolumne									0	1												1	1
Ventura	1	0	2	2																	3	2	5
Yolo	3	0																			3	0	3
All Counties	70	49	12	17	8	6	39	23	2	4	7	1	3	1	7	6	1	0	17	10	166	117	283

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 1999

		County Supervisor		Other County Offices ¹		City Council		Other City Offices		School Board Member		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>
		Incumbent Candidates	Win	0.0	0	78.7	37	79.6	109	83.7	41	74.9	341
	Lose	0.0	0	21.3	10	20.4	28	16.3	8	25.1	114	23.3	160
	Total	100.0	0	100.0	47	100.0	137	100.0	49	100.0	455	100.0	688
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	20.0	1	33.7	29	29.0	135	22.1	19	34.0	327	31.8	511
	Lose	80.0	4	66.3	57	71.0	331	77.9	67	66.0	635	68.2	1,094
	Total	100.0	5	100.0	86	100.0	466	100.0	86	100.0	962	100.0	1,605
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	56.1	37	44.7	109	68.3	41	51.0	341	50.8	528
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	43.9	29	55.3	135	31.7	19	49.0	327	49.2	511
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	66	100.0	244	100.0	60	100.0	668	100.0	1,039
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	14.9	10	7.8	28	10.7	8	15.2	114	12.8	160
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	4	85.1	57	92.2	331	89.3	67	84.8	635	87.2	1,094
	Total	100.0	4	100.0	67	100.0	359	100.0	75	100.0	749	100.0	1,254
All Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	35.3	47	22.7	137	36.3	49	32.1	455	30.0	688
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	5	64.7	86	77.3	466	63.7	86	67.9	962	70.0	1,605
	Total	100.0	5	100.0	133	100.0	603	100.0	135	100.0	1,417	100.0	2,293

¹ Includes outcomes for San Francisco County/City Attorney and Mayor.

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1999

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	No County Measures							
ALPINE	No County Measures							
AMADOR	No County Measures							
BUTTE	No County Measures							
CALAVERAS	No County Measures							
COLUSA	No County Measures							
CONTRA COSTA	No County Measures							
DEL NORTE	No County Measures							
EL DORADO	No County Measures							
FRESNO	No County Measures							
GLENN	No County Measures							
HUMBOLDT	No County Measures							
IMPERIAL	11/2/99	Measure W	Ordinance	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	5,340	13,244	40.3%	Fail
		Measure X	Sales Tax	General Services	2,231	12,979	17.2%	Fail
INYO	No County Measures							
KERN	No County Measures							
KINGS	No County Measures							
LAKE	No County Measures							
LASSEN	No County Measures							
LOS ANGELES	No County Measures							
MADERA	No County Measures							
MARIN	3/2/99	Measure F	Property Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	653	768	85.0%	Pass ^T
		Measure G	Gann Limit	Other: Appropriation Limit Increase	633	765	82.7%	Pass
	11/2/99	Measure L	Gann Limit	Other: Appropriation Limit Increase	417	437	95.4%	Pass
		Measure M	Gann Limit	Other: Appropriation Limit Increase	1,886	2,311	81.6%	Pass
MARIPOSA	No County Measures							
MENDOCINO	11/2/99	Measure C	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	376	712	52.8%	Fail ^T
MERCED	No County Measures							
MODOC	No County Measures							
MONO	No County Measures							

^T Indicates that the 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, 1999

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
MONTEREY	No County Measures							
NAPA	6/8/99	Measure F	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	2,530	4,338	58.3%	Fail ^T
NEVADA	No County Measures							
ORANGE	No County Measures							
PLACER	No County Measures							
PLUMAS	No County Measures							
RIVERSIDE	7/13/99	Measure F	Property Tax	Environment: Parks/Recreation	167	284	58.8%	Fail ^T
		Measure G	Property Tax	Safety: Police	260	326	79.8%	Pass ^T
	9/21/99	Measure I	Property Tax	Environment: Parks/Recreation	413	811	50.9%	Fail ^T
SACRAMENTO	No County Measures							
SAN BENITO	No County Measures							
SAN BERNARDINO	No County Measures							
SAN DIEGO	3/16/99	Measure L	Sales Tax	Facilities: Libraries	167,110	332,692	50.2%	Fail ^T
SAN FRANCISCO	11/2/99	Measure A	GO Bond	Facilities: Health Facilities	139,210	190,019	73.3%	Pass ^T
		Measure B	Charter Amendment	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	127,897	179,080	71.4%	Pass
		Measure C	Charter Amendment	Governance: Organization	123,196	171,459	71.9%	Pass
		Measure D	Charter Amendment	Governance: Benefits/Compensation	138,672	182,918	75.8%	Pass
		Measure E	Charter Amendment	Transport: Agencies	110,079	180,192	61.1%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Other	124,615	187,593	66.4%	Pass
		Measure G	Ordinance	Other	97,156	166,242	58.4%	Pass
		Measure H	Ordinance	Transport: Mass Transit	123,623	178,374	69.3%	Pass
		Measure I	Ordinance	Other: Revenue Use/Limits	97,386	179,209	54.3%	Pass
		Measure J	Ordinance	Transport: Mass Transit	86,236	182,067	47.4%	Fail
		Measure K	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	140,882	176,537	79.8%	Pass
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures							
SAN LUIS OBISPO	11/2/99	Measure J-99	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	15	15	100.0%	Pass ^T
		Measure H-99	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	8	9	88.9%	Pass ^T
		Measure G-99	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	2	2	100.0%	Pass ^T
		Measure I-99	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	9	10	90.0%	Pass ^T
		Measure F-99	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	6	6	100.0%	Pass ^T
SAN MATEO	No County Measures							

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1999

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SANTA BARBARA	No County Measures							
SANTA CLARA	No County Measures							
SANTA CRUZ	No County Measures							
SHASTA	No County Measures							
SIERRA	No County Measures							
SISKIYOU	No County Measures							
SOLANO	No County Measures							
SONOMA	No County Measures							
STANISLAUS	6/8/99	Measure B	Sales Tax	Facilities: Libraries	25,872	31,906	81.1%	Pass ^T
SUTTER	11/2/99	Measure TT	Ordinance	General Services: Various Services/Maintenance	143	428	33.4%	Fail
TEHAMA	No County Measures							
TRINITY	11/2/99	Measure S	Advisory	Other: Revenue Use/Limits	1,658	3,079	53.8%	Pass
		Measure T	Sales Tax	General Services	1,013	3,099	32.7%	Fail
TULARE	No County Measures							
TUOLUMNE	11/2/99	Measure S	Property Tax	Environment: Parks/Recreation	276	418	66.0%	Fail ^T
VENTURA	No County Measures							
YOLO	No County Measures							
YUBA	No County Measures							

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1999

IMPERIAL	11/2/99	Measure W	Fail
Shall the Imperial County Fair Pay for Public Safety Act of 1999, which requires Imperial County, every year in October, commencing in 1999, to conduct wage comparison surveys of 12 other public agencies and to pay certain Imperial County public safety employees not less than 95% of the comparable-position survey average, be adopted? Any survey-based pay adjustments take effect the January following each survey, except the first adjustment, which is paid over 3 years.			
IMPERIAL	11/2/99	Measure X	Fail
Shall Imperial County Ordinance No. 1300, which imposes a transactions and use tax (i.e. sales tax) of 0.5 percent (0.5%), upon retail transactions within the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County of Imperial, be adopted? The proceeds of the tax shall be used for general county governmental purposes.			
MARIN	3/2/99	Measure F	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 13 be amended increasing the special tax for paramedic services effective July 1, 1999 in an amount not to exceed \$53.00 per year for each living unit, and a maximum of seven cents per square foot with a flat tax limit of \$500.00 per one cent levied for each non-residential structure?			
MARIN	3/2/99	Measure G	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit for Marinwood Community Services District be increased in the amount of the special tax for fiscal years beginning July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2003?			
MARIN	11/2/99	Measure L	Pass
Shall the increase in appropriations limit equal to the proceeds of the special tax authorized by the voters on June 4, 1985 continue in effect for fiscal years 2000-2001 through and including 2003-2004?			
MARIN	11/2/99	Measure M	Pass
Shall the increase in appropriations limit equal to the proceeds of the special tax authorized by the voters on November 1995 continue in effect for fiscal years 2000-2001 through and including 2003-2004?			
MENDOCINO	11/2/99	Measure C	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 110 of the Brooktrails Township Community Services District increasing the Special Tax for Fire Protection and Prevention, including ambulance service, commencing within the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2000, be approved?			
NAPA	6/8/99	Measure F	Fail (2/3 required)
Should Napa County Ordinance 1149 be approved which will establish and impose a special tax on certain real property in the unincorporated areas of Napa County, the proceeds of which shall only be used to continue providing fire engines and related types of fire equipment?			
RIVERSIDE	7/13/99	Measure F	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the County of Riverside be authorized to establish a Special Tax of \$35.00 per parcel per year, plus a one time charge of \$5.00 for the cost of this election, on all parcels within Zone "B" (Pine Cover, Mountain Center and Stone Creek areas) of CSA 153 to finance Recreation Services?			
RIVERSIDE	7/13/99	Measure G	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Santa Rosa Community Services District be authorized to levy a Special Tax not to exceed \$13.50 per acre for fiscal year 1999-2000 and to increase this tax by an amount not to exceed 10% for fiscal years 2000-12001 and 2001-2002 only to pay for extended sheriff services to the District?			
RIVERSIDE	9/21/99	Measure I	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the County of Riverside be authorized to levy a new Special Tax of \$30.00 per parcel per year on all parcels within CSA 143 Vail Ranch to finance the operations and maintenance of a new Swim and Tennis Club?			
SAN DIEGO	3/16/99	Measure L	Fail (2/3 required)
To improve community and branch libraries: build and repair local libraries; purchase books and materials; extend service hours; modernize with computers and new technology; expand youth reading and homework programs; enhance literacy and senior services, shall an ordinance be approved to (1) adopt for five years only a 1/4 of 1% sales tax exclusively for the purposes stated herein, and (2) establish a strictly audited appropriations limit for library purposes only?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/2/99	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the City and County incur bonded debt and/or other evidences of indebtedness and/or undertake lease financing, in an aggregate principal amount not exceeding \$299,000,000, for the acquisition, improvement, construction and/or reconstruction of a new health care, assisted living and/or other type of continuing care facility or facilities to replace Laguna Honda Hospital, and reduce the property tax impact by requiring the application of available tobacco settlement revenues received by the City and County that are required to be used to fund these facilities, (a) to finance the acquisition, improvement, construction and/or reconstruction costs of such facilities, and (b) to pay the principal and redemption price of, interest on, reserve fund deposits, if any, and/or financing costs for the obligations authorized thereby?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/2/99	Measure B	Pass
Shall firefighters and police officers who transferred to the Tier 2 retirement plan in 1981 receive improvement retirement benefits given other Tier 2 members since then if they meet certain repayment conditions?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/2/99	Measure C	Pass

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1999

Shall the City make changes in how it defines the districts that will be used to elect members of the Board of Supervisors?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure D Pass
 Shall City employees be allowed to donate sick leave or vacation credits to a pool for City employees who are catastrophically ill, and to donate vacation credits to be used by City employees to care for catastrophically ill spouses, domestic partners, and dependents?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure E Pass
 Shall the City create a Municipal Transportation Agency with expanded powers and duties to run the Municipal Railway and the Department of Parking and Traffic?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure F Pass
 Shall the City prohibit banks and other financial institutions from charging a fee to persons who do not have an account with that bank for use of the bank's automated teller machines in San Francisco?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure G Pass
 Shall the City make changes in the requirements and procedures regarding public access to City records and meetings provided in the Sunshine Ordinance?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure H Pass
 Shall the City pursue extending Caltrain from the Fourth and Townsend Streets station to a new or rebuilt station on the site of the Transbay Terminal, as well as other improvements in Caltrain facilities and services?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure I Pass
 Shall the City use the proceeds from any sale of excess Central Freeway right-of-way property to fund the Octavia Boulevard Plan and related transportation improvements, support construction of housing and mixed uses on the right-of-way property, and prohibit widening of the existing elevated freeway structure?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure J Fail
 Shall the City repeal 1998's Proposition E and authorize Caltrans to retrofit and widen the lower deck of the Central Freeway to provide a four-lane, single deck structure over Market Street from South Van Ness Avenue to Oak and Fell streets, and prepare an annual transit plan?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/2/99 Measure K Pass
 Shall the City set voluntary spending limits for candidates running for the Board of Supervisors by district at \$75,000 for the general election and \$20,000 for a runoff election?

SAN LUIS OBISPO 11/2/99 Measure J-99 Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the County of San Luis Obispo, commencing Fiscal Year 2000/2001, and annually thereafter, impose, levy and collect a special tax on real property within Ash Street Road Improvement Zone of County Service Area No. 21, to provide road improvements within said Zone, with the Special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding Sixteen Dollars (\$16.00) per front foot of improvement per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?

SAN LUIS OBISPO 11/2/99 Measure H-99 Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the County of San Luis Obispo, commencing Fiscal Year 2000/2001, and annually thereafter, impose, levy and collect a special tax on real property within Harvey Street Road Improvement Zone of County Service Area No. 21, to provide road improvements within said Zone, with the Special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding Sixteen Dollars (\$16.00) per front foot of improvement per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?

SAN LUIS OBISPO 11/2/99 Measure G-99 Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the County of San Luis Obispo, commencing Fiscal Year 2000/2001, and annually thereafter, impose, levy and collect a special tax on real property within Jean Street Road Improvement Zone of County Service Area No. 21, to provide road improvements within said Zone, with the Special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding Sixteen Dollars (\$16.00) per front foot of improvement per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?

SAN LUIS OBISPO 11/2/99 Measure I-99 Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the County of San Luis Obispo, commencing Fiscal Year 2000/2001, and annually thereafter, impose, levy and collect a special tax on real property within London Lane Road Improvement Zone of County Service Area No. 21, to provide road improvements within said Zone, with the Special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding Sixteen Dollars (\$16.00) per front foot of improvement per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?

SAN LUIS OBISPO 11/2/99 Measure F-99 Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the County of San Luis Obispo, commencing Fiscal Year 2000/2001, and annually thereafter, impose, levy and collect a special tax on real property within Marlborough Lane Road Improvement Zone of County Service Area No. 21, to provide road improvements within said Zone, with the Special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding Sixteen Dollars (\$16.00) per front foot of improvement per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?

STANISLAUS 6/8/99 Measure B Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall an ordinance, identical to the one previously adopted by the voters in 1995, authorizing a limited transaction and use tax of one-eighth of one percent for a

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 1999

period not more than five years commencing on July 1, 2000, exclusively for maintaining county-wide library hours, purchase of books, maintain story-times, children and teen programs, access technology, telephone reference and other programs be enacted so that the current tax can be extended until June 30, 2005?

SUTTER	11/2/99	Measure TT		Fail
Should Sutter Community Services District exercise the following powers in addition to providing water service: the collection, treatment or disposal of sewage waste of the district and its inhabitants; public recreation for the district's inhabitants; and street lighting within the district.				

TRINITY	11/2/99	Measure S		Pass
To advise the Board of Supervisors that any new sales tax revenues should be spent only on the crime prevention and fire prevention purposes as stated in the text of Measure S.				

TRINITY	11/2/99	Measure T		Fail
To authorize a one percent sales tax within the County of Trinity to be used for general county purposes.				

TUOLUMNE	11/2/99	Measure S		Fail (2/3 required)
Shall there be imposed a special tax for park and recreation improvements on each parcel within the District in the amount of Twenty-five Dollars (\$25.00) per parcel per year for each year beginning July 1, 2000 and continuing through June 30, 2015?				

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1999

	BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		TAXES		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Imperial									0	1	0	1	0	2	2
Marin							3	0			1	0	4	0	4
Mendocino											0	1	0	1	1
Napa											0	1	0	1	1
Riverside											1	2	1	2	3
San Diego											0	1	0	1	1
San Francisco	1	0	4	0					5	1			10	1	11
San Luis Obispo											5	0	5	0	5
Stanislaus											1	0	1	0	1
Sutter									0	1			0	1	1
Trinity					1	0					0	1	1	1	2
Tuolumne											0	1	0	1	1
All Counties	1	0	4	0	1	0	3	0	5	3	8	8	22	11	33

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 1999

	PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Imperial			0	1							0	1			0	2	2
Marin													4	0	4	0	4
Mendocino	0	1													0	1	1
Napa	0	1													0	1	1
Riverside	1	0			0	2									1	2	3
San Diego									0	1					0	1	1
San Francisco			4	0			2	1	1	0			3	0	10	1	11
San Luis Obispo							5	0							5	0	5
Stanislaus									1	0					1	0	1
Sutter											0	1			0	1	1
Trinity											0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Tuolumne					0	1									0	1	1
All Counties	1	2	4	1	0	3	7	1	2	1	0	3	8	0	22	11	33

PART 2

VOTE TOTALS FOR
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1999

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 ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
ALAMEDA		No County Contests											
ALPINE		No County Contests											
AMADOR		No County Contests											
BUTTE		No County Contests											
CALAVERAS		No County Contests											
COLUSA		No County Contests											
CONTRA COSTA		No County Contests											
DEL NORTE		No County Contests											
EL DORADO		No County Contests											
FRESNO		No County Contests											
GLENN		No County Contests											
HUMBOLDT	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Carlotta CSD*		Full	Leavitt	Phillip	Incumbent	Yes	8	161	742	21.7%	Yes
					Brownfield	Birdie	No ballot designation	No	8	131	742	17.7%	Yes
					Harvey	John E.	Retired	No	8	126	742	17.0%	Yes
					Longnickel	Warren	Retired	No	8	92	742	12.4%	No
					Harkins	Daniel	Local Business Owner	No	8	78	742	10.5%	No
					Plant	Duane	Retired Firefighter	No	8	76	742	10.2%	No
					Segura	Ruben	Court Translator	No	8	62	742	8.4%	No
					Metzger	Ronnie	Disaster Specialist	No	8	16	742	2.2%	No
				Short	Bender	Cheryl	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	124	247	50.2%	Yes
					Benzel	George J.	Retired	No	2	122	247	49.4%	No
		DIRECTOR-Humboldt CSD		Full	Scolari	Frank	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,339	4,661	28.7%	Yes
					McKenny	Kevin	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,316	4,661	28.2%	Yes
					Moe	Mervin R.	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,095	4,661	23.5%	Yes
					Bongio	Alan	Building Contractor Developer	No	4	899	4,661	19.3%	No
		DIRECTOR-McKinleyville CSD		Full	Reid	Javan	Minister	No	5	1,096	3,265	33.6%	Yes
					Trepanier	J. Paul	Business Owner	No	5	994	3,265	30.4%	Yes
					Driver	Jeff	No ballot designation	No	5	623	3,265	19.1%	No
					Elsebusch	Penny	Business Owner/Realtor	No	5	455	3,265	13.9%	No
					Thomas	James E.	No ballot designation	No	5	82	3,265	2.5%	No
		DIRECTOR-Willow Creek CSD		Full	Paine	Steve	No ballot designation	No	5	235	857	27.4%	Yes
					O'Gorman	Tom	Farmer	No	5	199	857	23.2%	Yes
					Duggan	E. B.	Incumbent	Yes	5	176	857	20.5%	Yes
					Bean	Charles L.	Community Volunteer	No	5	128	857	14.9%	No
					Davis	Mike	Construction	No	5	117	857	13.7%	No

* CSD – Community Service District

¹ Write-in candidate votes, when reported by the county, have been included in the total votes cast. For these contests, the sum of candidate votes is less than the total votes cast.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1999

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 ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
IMPERIAL	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Salton CSD		Full	Reyes	Alfred R.	Incumbent	Yes	5	165	449	36.7%	Yes
					Stinson	Mary B.	Retired Fire Chief	No	5	97	449	21.6%	Yes
					Erskine	Dave	Retired	No	5	93	449	20.7%	No
					Brewster	Christopher Ray	Business Owner/Operator	No	5	47	449	10.5%	No
					Lockhart	Linda	Artist/Sign Painter	No	5	47	449	10.5%	No
INYO	No County Contests												
KERN	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Boron CSD		Full	Job	Jeremeh	Maintenance Worker	No	5	136	370	36.8%	Yes
					Cree	Walt	Incumbent	Yes	5	116	370	31.4%	Yes
					Welling	Charlotte	Secretary	No	5	52	370	14.1%	No
					Cunningham	Susan G.	Business Person	No	5	38	370	10.3%	No
					Roe	F. O.	Businessman	No	5	28	370	7.6%	No
		DIRECTOR-East Niles CSD			Johnson	Joseph A.	Incumbent	Yes	4	421	1,517	27.8%	Yes
					Hargis	Roy	Incumbent	Yes	4	391	1,517	25.8%	Yes
					Adams	William D.	Retired Civil Engineer	No	4	379	1,517	25.0%	Yes
					Ruiz	Sally A.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	326	1,517	21.5%	No
					KINGS No County Contests								
LAKE	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Anderson Springs CSD		Full	Henderson	David	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	53	130	40.8%	Yes
					Minter	Alton	Incumbent	Yes	3	42	130	32.3%	Yes
					Sullivan	Patricia	Retired Addiction Specialist	No	3	35	130	26.9%	No
LASSEN	No County Contests												
LOS ANGELES	No County Contests												
MADERA	No County Contests												
MARIN	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Bel Marin Keys CSD		Full	Gibson	Marty	Attorney at Law	No	4	419	1,314	31.9%	Yes
					Williams-Clarke	V.	Publishing General Manager	No	4	413	1,314	31.4%	Yes
					Furst	Ernie	Incumbent	Yes	4	403	1,314	30.7%	Yes
					Marx	Robert B.	Local Business Owner	No	4	79	1,314	6.0%	No
		DIRECTOR-Marin City CSD			Young, Jr.	John	Community Organizer	No	4	114	332	34.3%	Yes
					Thompson	Terry	Incumbent	Yes	4	110	332	33.1%	Yes
					Phillips, Sr.	Frank	Retired	No	4	70	332	21.1%	No
					Ashby	Karen	No ballot designation	No	4	38	332	11.4%	No
		DIRECTOR-Marinwood CSD			Bolding	Genevieve	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	561	1,878	29.9%	Yes
					Runco	Joseph	Incumbent	Yes	4	480	1,878	25.6%	Yes
					Dods	Walter K.	Attorney	No	4	470	1,878	25.0%	Yes
					Munson-Lynch	Victoria	Property Management/Secretary	No	4	367	1,878	19.5%	No
		DIRECTOR-Tamalpais CSD			Chapman	Judith	Incumbent	Yes	4	709	2,167	32.7%	Yes
					Whittle	Sheila J.	Incumbent	Yes	4	648	2,167	29.9%	Yes
					Montizambert	Eric	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	630	2,167	29.1%	Yes
					Wilmore	Scott E.	Web Site Producer	No	4	180	2,167	8.3%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1999

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 ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
MARIPOSA	No County Contests												
MENDOCINO	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Brooktrails CSD		Full	Monteleone	Susan	Writer	No	3	375	1,079	34.8%	Yes
					Venturi	Richard	Retired Police Sergeant	No	3	374	1,079	34.7%	Yes
					Skezas	George C.	Incumbent	Yes	3	330	1,079	30.6%	No
MERCED	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Brooktrails CSD		Full	Chavez	Daniel	Incumbent	Yes	5	135	573	23.6%	Yes
					Moreno	Sylvia	Coordinator/Student Services	No	5	128	573	22.3%	Yes
					Gonzales	Larry	Incumbent	Yes	5	107	573	18.7%	Yes
					Rodriguez	Rita M.	No ballot designation	No	5	106	573	18.5%	No
					Mayo	Louie	Route Sales	No	5	97	573	16.9%	No
MODOC	No County Contests												
MONO	No County Contests												
MONTEREY	No County Contests												
NAPA	No County Contests												
NEVADA	No County Contests												
ORANGE	No County Contests												
PLACER	No County Contests												
PLUMAS	No County Contests												
RIVERSIDE	No County Contests												
SACRAMENTO	2/2/99	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Niello	Roger	Businessman/Community Volunteer	No	5	11,100	20,038	55.4%	Yes
					Aceituno	Tom	Council Member	No	5	5,285	20,038	26.4%	No
					Delk	Jim	Retired Military Officer	No	5	2,375	20,038	11.9%	No
					Stevens	Douglas	Business Owner	No	5	700	20,038	3.5%	No
					Manansala	A. A.	Journalist/Writer	No	5	578	20,038	2.9%	No
SAN BENITO	No County Contests												
SAN BERNARDINO	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Big Bear City CSD		Full	Colven	Robert W.	Retired Peace Officer	Yes	4	950	2,798	34.0%	Yes
					Beck	Barbara R.	Public Relations/Marketing	Yes	4	941	2,798	33.6%	Yes
					Haskins	Michael D.	Self Employed	No	4	513	2,798	18.3%	No
					Koepke	Laura A.	Paralegal/Investigative Journalist	No	4	394	2,798	14.1%	No
		DIRECTOR-Big River CSD		Full	Grugel	Paul H.	Retired Police Officer	No	5	98	415	23.6%	Yes
					Perez	Deniese	Business Owner	No	5	92	415	22.2%	Yes
					Shanks	Maxine Marie	Incumbent	Yes	5	87	415	21.0%	Yes
					Valentine	Debbie	Executive Secretary	Yes	5	78	415	18.8%	No
					Harvey	Nelson T.	Retired	No	5	60	415	14.5%	No
		DIRECTOR-Morongo Valley CSD			Egan	William F.	Businessman	No	3	218	567	38.4%	Yes
					Osborne	Chuck	Incumbent	Yes	3	208	567	36.7%	Yes
					Whiteley	Jackie	Retired School Employee	No	3	141	567	24.9%	No
SAN DIEGO	No County Contests												

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1999

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 ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SAN FRANCISCO ²	11/2/99	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Hallinan	Terence	District Attorney of San Francisco	Yes	5	68,424	179,013	38.2%	Yes
					Fazio	Bill	Attorney	No	5	67,145	179,013	37.5%	No
					Gonzales	Matt	Deputy Public Defender	No	5	20,153	179,013	11.3%	No
					Castleman	Steve	Environmental Prosecutor	No	5	17,677	179,013	9.9%	No
					Schaefer	Mike	Public Interest Attorney	No	5	5,614	179,013	3.1%	No
	MAYOR	Full		Brown, Jr.	Willie Lewis	Mayor	Yes	14	75,732	194,701	38.9%	Yes	
				Jordan	Frank M.	No ballot designation	No	14	32,893	194,701	16.9%	No	
				Reilly	Clint	Manager/Business Owner	No	14	24,322	194,701	12.5%	No	
				Lee-Eng	Martin	Internet Company Founder	No	14	2,232	194,665	1.1%	No	
				Bermudez	Lucrecia	Immigrant Rights Organizer	No	14	1,709	194,701	0.9%	No	
				Ascarrunz	Cesar	Businessman	No	14	1,578	194,701	0.8%	No	
				Reid	Jim	Retired Building Contractor	No	14	1,502	194,701	0.8%	No	
				Ventresca	Joel	International Airport Administrator	No	14	1,379	194,701	0.7%	No	
				Martz	David J.	Attorney	No	14	949	194,701	0.5%	No	
				O'Hara	Mark "Superbooty"	Funk Vocalist/Animator	No	14	919	194,701	0.5%	No	
				Norton	A. D. Wyatt	Artist	No	14	765	194,701	0.4%	No	
				Woods	Max	Mass Transit Engineer	No	14	511	194,701	0.3%	No	
				Felzer	William	Engineer/College Instructor	No	14	494	194,701	0.3%	No	
				Manuel	J. R.	Businessman	No	14	277	194,701	0.1%	No	
				SHERIFF	Full	Hennessey	Michael	Sheriff/Marshall	Yes	1	131,105	131,105	100.0%
12/14/99	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Hallinan	Terrance	District Attorney of San Francisco	Yes	2	105,237	208,654	50.4%	Yes	
				Fazio	Bill	Attorney	No	2	103,417	208,654	49.6%	No	
	MAYOR	Full		Brown, Jr.	Willie Lewis	Mayor	Yes	2	131,983	221,411	59.6%	Yes	
Ammiano				Tom	No ballot designation	No	2	89,428	221,411	40.4%	No		
SAN JOAQUIN	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-California Valley CSD		Full	Scales	James	Retired	No	4	50	153	32.7%	Yes
					Orgtega	Thomas	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	43	153	28.1%	Yes
					Roberson	Ronald G.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	35	153	22.9%	Yes
					Parker	Roy	Precisionist Millwright/Rancher	No	4	25	153	16.3%	No
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No County Contests												
SAN MATEO	No County Contests												
SANTA BARBARA	No County Contests												
SANTA CLARA	No County Contests												
SANTA CRUZ	No County Contests												
SHASTA	No County Contests												
SIERRA	No County Contests												
SISKIYOU	No County Contests												

² County and City of San Francisco are included in the county report.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 1999

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 ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SOLANO		No County Contests											
SONOMA		No County Contests											
STANISLAUS		No County Contests											
SUTTER		No County Contests											
TEHAMA		No County Contests											
TRINITY		No County Contests											
TULARE	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Ponderosa CSD		Full	Lowry	Kent	Retired Business Owner	No	3	18	60	30.0%	Yes
					Barnes	Rodger	Incumbent	Yes	3	14	60	23.3%	Yes
					Rayzor	Tom	Incumbent	Yes	3	13	60	21.7%	No
		DIRECTOR-Poplar CSD		Full	Akin	Billy J.	Incumbent	Yes	4	38	127	29.9%	Yes
					Walker	Frankie W.	Business Owner	No	4	31	127	24.4%	Yes
					Leach	Jesse	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	26	127	20.5%	Yes
					Maynard	Laurie Lee	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	22	127	17.3%	No
		DIRECTOR-Richgrove CSD		Full	Martinez	Juan	School Bus Driver	Yes	3	89	288	30.9%	Yes
					Rodriguez	Rose B.	Secretary	No	3	79	288	27.4%	Yes
					Castillo	Rodolfo	No ballot designation	No	3	69	288	24.0%	No
		DIRECTOR-Three Rivers CSD		Full	Thomas	Bob	Produce Salesman	No	8	270	1,458	18.5%	Yes
					Andrus	Vincent	General Building Contractor	No	8	261	1,458	17.9%	Yes
					Sheltzer	Michael	Attorney at Law	No	8	228	1,458	15.6%	Yes
					Sermuksnis	Julius	Incumbent	Yes	8	204	1,458	14.0%	No
					Turner	Bruce	Incumbent	Yes	8	183	1,458	12.6%	No
					Paradis	David W.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	8	149	1,458	10.2%	No
					Campbell	Warren M.	Minister	No	8	92	1,458	6.3%	No
					Rankin	Jerry	Landscape Maintenance	No	8	70	1,458	4.8%	No
TUOLUMNE	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Groveland CSD		Full	Myers	Don	Retired Highway Patrolman	No	5	539	1,526	35.3%	Yes
					Henderson	Allie	Incumbent	Yes	5	364	1,526	23.9%	Yes
					Van Den Bergh	Gary	Retired Administrator	No	5	287	1,526	18.8%	No
					Corcoran	Bill	No ballot designation	No	5	169	1,526	11.1%	No
					Breed	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	5	167	1,526	10.9%	No
VENTURA		No County Contests											
YOLO	11/2/99	DIRECTOR-Esparto CSD		Full	Kieeny	Laurel A.	Water System Operator	No	5	118	458	25.8%	Yes
					Eary	Bruce N.	Horse Shoer/Rancher	No	5	103	458	22.5%	Yes
					Hayes	Matt	Agriculture Technician	No	5	95	458	20.7%	No
					Langhout	David	Incumbent	Yes	5	76	458	16.6%	No
					Hayes	John M.	Equipment Operator	No	5	66	458	14.4%	No
YUBA		No County Contests											

TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY OFFICES, 1999

		County										Total	
		Supervisor		Mayor ¹		District Attorney ¹		Sheriff		Director, CSD ²		Percent	N
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N		
Incumbent	Win	0.0	0	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	1	76.2	32	78.7	37
	Lose	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	23.8	10	21.3	10
	Candidates Total	100.0	0	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	42	100.0	47
Non-Incumbent	Win	20.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	43.3	29	33.0	30
	Lose	80.0	4	100.0	14	100.0	5	0.0	0	56.7	38	67.0	61
	Candidates Total	100.0	5	100.0	14	100.0	5	0.0	0	100.0	67	100.0	91
Winning	Incumbent	0.0	0	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	1	52.5	32	55.2	37
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	47.5	29	44.8	30
	Candidates Total	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	61	100.0	67
Losing	Incumbent	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	20.8	10	14.1	10
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	4	100.0	14	100.0	5	0.0	0	79.2	38	85.9	61
	Candidates Total	100.0	4	100.0	14	100.0	5	100.0	0	100.0	48	100.0	71
All	Incumbent	0.0	0	12.5	2	28.6	2	100.0	1	38.5	42	34.1	47
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	5	87.5	14	71.4	5	0.0	0	61.5	67	65.9	91
	Candidates Total	100.0	5	100.0	16	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	109	100.0	138

¹ San Francisco county and city contests are reported under county listings.² Director of Community Service District.