

# CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

*2000 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, 2000 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
2000 County, City and School District Election Dates by County .....	ix
2000 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, 2000 .....	3
Table B    Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2000 .....	5
Table C    Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 2000 .....	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, 2000 .....	11
Table 1.2  Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 2000.....	16
Table 1.3  Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2000 .....	25
Table 1.4  Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2000 .....	27
PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES .....	29
Table 2.1  Vote Totals for County Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2000.....	31
Table 2.2  Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2000.....	57



# **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.

## **2000 ELECTION DATA**

For many Californians, 2000 was the millennium year. For the men and women holding elected county positions 2000 was a sesquicentennial year. In April of 1850, Los Angeles and other counties held the first county elections under the Constitution of the State of California. A century and a half later, voters in 58 counties voted on 356 elected positions and 115 ballot measures. Totals that, given the optimism and enthusiasm of California politics in the 1850s, probably would not surprise those first county candidates.

In addition to county elections, the year 2000 also saw numerous city, school and community college district elections. California voters faced 559 local ballot measures and 5,153 candidates for local elective office. In 1999, the totals were only 283 measures and 2,293 candidates. But 2000 is comparable to both 1998 (572 measures and 5,502 candidates) and 1996 (573 measures and 5,530 candidates).

## **BALLOT MEASURES**

Local voters faced 559 ballot measures in 2000 including 115 county, 297 city, and 146 community college and school district ballot measures. As in prior years, these numbers do not indicate a failure of local governments to address issues, thus forcing the voters to do it themselves. The opposite is true as only 42 local ballot measures or 7.5 percent of all such measures were placed on the ballot through the initiative process. The other 517 ballot measures were placed on the ballot by actions of a county board of supervisors, city council, or community college or school district board.



Two interesting developments in political and governance issues are evident in the data from 2000 local ballot measures. First, through the 1980s and 1990s many California communities, either voluntarily or as a result of court orders, abandoned at-large election systems in favor of district elections. District elections were a priority for MALDEF and other voting rights groups and triggered several fights in the Legislature. In 2000, however, five cities and three community college or school districts rejected district elections by either passing measures eliminating existing district election systems and moving instead to at-large elections or defeating measures that would have adopted district systems. Only one at-large measure failed. Second, unlike previous years, term limits measures were comparatively scarce in 2000. Only three measures imposing term limits appeared on local election ballots. No term limit measures appeared on county ballots and only one city adopted term limits (Campbell in Santa Clara County) though an effort to modify term limits in the City of Long Beach in Los Angeles County failed. Two term limit measures appeared on community college and school district ballots, both of which passed. In comparison, in 1998 there was one county and 11 city term limit measures. It is possible that the enthusiasm for local term limits has waned.

Recalls were particularly successful in 2000 with 11 of 11 passing. All recalls of city council members passed. The City of Oroville in Butte County recalled three council members, Huron in Fresno County recalled two and Southgate in Los Angeles County recalled one. All five school board members subject to recalls were recalled. This included one board member in Elk Hills Elementary District in Kern County; two in Fort Sage Unified in Lassen County; and two with Round Valley Unified in Mendocino County

**County Measures.** Voters in the state's 58 counties passed judgment on 115 ballot measures. The fate of these measures was remarkable even with 56 or 48.7 percent passing and 59 or 51.3 percent failing. Tax measures were the largest type of ballot measure with 52 or 45.2 percent of all measures falling in this category. Voters were not friendly to those measures with 37 or 71.1 percent being rejected and only 15 or 28.9 percent passing. In terms of subject matter, governance issues were most frequent with 22 or 19.1 percent of all measures. Land use issues followed with 17 or 14.8 percent of all measures. Governance issues included a successful Inyo county initiative requiring that all county ordinances effecting the creation, elimination or reorganization of county offices and departments be subject to voter approval, and failed measures that would have increased the salaries of county supervisors in San Mateo and Tehama Counties. County voters passed judgment on six bond measures, defeating one in San Mateo and passing five which accounted for \$309,810,000 in bonds (one in El Dorado and five in San Francisco).

Two of the more interesting county measures were Measure G in Mendocino approving the "Cannabis Personal Use Ordinance" and Contra Costa's Measure D which was a failing effort to regulate house sizes to ensure "proportionality between house and lot size." Finally, the proliferation of county service areas is indicated by the fact that 32 or 27.8 percent of all county ballot measures dealt with service areas. The county service area is clearly becoming an important but still obscure part of local governance in California.

**City Measures.** Voters in municipal elections faced a total of 297 ballot measures, which they treated with more approval than did county voters with 60.3 percent passing and 39.7 percent failing. The most frequent type of municipal ballot measure were ordinances (113 or 38.1 percent of all municipal measures) with charter amendments being the second most frequent (71 or 23.9 percent). Ordinances fared well with 55.8 percent being approved. On the other hand only 45.5 percent of tax measures passed and 54.5 percent failed. Governance issues were the most frequent topic of city ballot measures (119 or 40.1 percent of all measures) with land use measures accounting for 56 or 18.9 percent. In both topic areas, voters approved about two-thirds of the

measures (63.9 percent of governance measures and 60.7 percent of land-use measures). City voters also approved nine of 11 bond measures representing \$1.03 billion in bonded indebtedness.

In addition, voters in eight cities faced 15 ballot measures that shifted elected positions to appointed positions. Of these, 13 were defeated and only two were approved. The trend toward making land use decisions through the ballot box was particularly apparent in Escondido in San Diego County. The Escondido ballots in 2000 featured nine ballot measures, eight of which dealt with land use and zoning issues affecting a total of only 105.1 acres. One measure dealt with a single 3.6 acre parcel.

Finally, one of the more interesting city measures was Measure Z in Oroville in Butte County. Measure Z, which was adopted, was the "People's Choice Prison Initiative" the purpose of which is to keep Oroville "prison free."

**School Measures.** Voters in community college and school districts were asked to pass judgment on 146 ballot measures of which 100 or 68.5 percent were bond measures. These bond measures equaled \$6,567,173,000 in bonded indebtedness. Voters actually approved bonds totaling \$3,611,875,000.

After bond measures, the most frequent community college and school district ballot measures were ordinances. Of these, five sought to replace trustee districts with at large elections. Three passed (Chualar Elementary in Monterey County, Twin Ridges Elementary in Nevada County and Atascadero Unified in San Luis Obispo County) and two failed (Pierce Joint District in Colusa County and Pierce Unified in Yolo County).

## CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

California voters in 2000 were able to choose among 5,153 candidates running for 2,325 county, city, school and community college district elected positions. The total number of candidates is approximately 6 percent fewer than the number of candidates in 1998 (5,502) or 1996 (5,530). However, it is obviously too early to determine whether this is a trend of fewer Californians willing to seek local elective office.

Overall, incumbent office holders continued to fare well at the polls. Of the 1,526 incumbents who sought reelection, 1,204 or 78.9 percent won and only 327 or 21.1 lost. Of the 2,325 men and women elected to local elective office in 2000, 1,204 or 51.8 were incumbents and 1,121 were non-incumbents. Thus the year 2000 saw the continuation of the patterns of prior years: high incumbent reelection rates balanced by very significant numbers of non-incumbents taking office.

**County races.** The sesquicentennial county elections witnessed the clear end of the mid-1990s trend of significant numbers of incumbent county supervisors being defeated or choosing not to run for re-election. In November 1994, for example, reelection rate for incumbent county supervisors was 42.1 percent and only 15.3 percent of all supervisors elected were incumbents. In short, of the 52 supervisorial races that November, only 19 featured candidates who were incumbents and only eight of those incumbents won. Moreover, 33 races had no incumbent running for reelection. In 1996, reelection rates for incumbent supervisors was 69.3 percent but of the 222 positions filled, only 42.8 percent were incumbents and 57.2 percent were non-incumbents. Thus of those 222 races, 95 were won by incumbents, 42 lost by incumbents and 85 had no incumbent running. This trend began to reverse in 1998 when incumbent re-election rates jumped to 85.9 percent and incumbents accounted for 55.6 percent of all winners. In 2000, the county supervisor reelection rate was 86.7 percent with 130 of 150 incumbents successfully seeking re-election. Of all

supervisors elected in 2000, 67.0 percent were incumbents. Of the 194 supervisorial positions up in 2000, 130 incumbents were reelected, 20 defeated and only 44 races were open.

It is also interesting to note the significant growth in county community service districts (CSD) and the election of CSD directors. In 1998, 22 individuals ran for 11 CSD director positions. In 2000, 174 candidates ran for 80 CSD director positions.

**City races.** Individuals holding city office and seeking reelection were very successful in 2000. The reelection rate for incumbent city council members was 79.7 percent with 385 of 483 incumbents being reelected. Incumbents of other city elected positions were even more successful with 94.2 percent being reelected. It is important to note, however, that high incumbent reelection rates do not automatically equate with minimal turnover in city elected positions. Voters elected 758 city council members in 2000 of which 50.8 percent were incumbents and 49.2 were non-incumbents. Turnover in California city councils was, therefore, quite healthy in 2000. Among other city positions, turnover was not as dramatic. Of the 221 non-council positions elected, 61.1 percent were incumbents and 33.9 percent were new comers.

**School District Races.** In 2000, 2,059 Californians ran for 990 positions on community college and school district boards. Incumbents were reelected at a rate of 75.0% with 496 of 661 incumbent trustees being reelected. As with the State's city councils, this high incumbent reelection rate did not translate to low turnover and minimal new blood on boards. Of the 990 winners, 50.1 percent were incumbents but 49.9 were non-incumbents. Indeed, only four more incumbents were reelected than newcomers.

## TRENDS

### BALLOT MEASURES

With the publication of this report, CEDA now contains six full years of election data, including one complete gubernatorial year (1998), two featuring statewide elections (1996 and 2000) and three odd-numbered years devoted to local races, bond and tax measures. Fewer ballot measures were offered during the odd-numbered years (252, 342 and 283 in 1995, 1997 and 1999 respectively) than in years with statewide elections (573, 572 and 559) in 1996, 1998 and 2000.

Although more bonds appear on even-year ballots, they make up a higher percentage of all measures in the odd-numbered years, over a third in 1995, 1997 and 1999. Ordinances, tax measures and charter amendments are also more numerous in the even years when statewide elections are held. However, their proportions of all ballot measures do not fluctuate in a regular pattern between odd and even years. Instead, there were proportionately fewer tax measures and charter amendments in the last few years and somewhat more ordinances than occurred in the mid-1990s.

Overall pass rates for ballot measures have been remarkably stable over the six-year period, with rates varying between 59 and 61% in five of the six years, dipping to 57% in 1996. Pass rates for bonds and ordinances are similar and stable (58 to 61% in most years) while those for tax measures are lower and more variable between odd and even years. In statewide election years -- when 70% of the tax measures appear on the ballot -- fewer tax measures pass (39 - 48%); in the off-year elections of 1997 and 1999, tax measures were much more successful, with pass rates of 56 - 57%. Relatively infrequent types of ballot measures (recalls, initiatives and charter amendments) have more variable pass rates -- an artifact of their smaller numbers.

Education and governance issues are the most common topics covered by ballot measures in every election. Together they constituted over half of all ballot measures in CEDA's six year history. They were more dominant in the odd-numbered years, making up roughly two-thirds of all measures in 1995, 1997 and 1999 (64 to 73%), but a bare majority in the even-numbered years (51 - 53%). Land use has been the third most frequent topic of ballot measures over the past six years (a total of 238 measures in the six year period). General services, public safety and public facilities were in fourth place, with roughly comparable frequencies (164, 146 and 141 total in six years). Land use, public safety and public facility measures were more numerous in the even-numbered years, with approximately three-fourths of each appearing on the ballots in 1996, 1998 and 2000. The number of measures focused on general services has been declining since 1996. From a high of 71 on the ballot in that year to a low of 13 in 1999, the number of general services measures rebounded only slightly to 20 in 2000.

Some ballot measure topics are more successful at the polls than others. Governance and education issues have among the highest and least variable pass rates, with roughly two-thirds passing in five of the six election years. The exception was 1995, when 84% of the governance issues passed and only 53% of those dealing with education. Pass rates for other topics are more variable because there are fewer measures covering them. However, combining all of the measures on a given topic over the six election years yields lower average pass rates than governance and education issues enjoy. Four topic areas receive healthy majority support: fifty-eight percent of 238 land use measures, a similar percentage of 64 transportation and 164 general services measures, and 55% of 141 covering public facilities passed. Public safety measures have the lowest average pass rate, with 49% of 146 approved.

**County Measures.** County measures are concentrated in the even-numbered years, when 83% of them appear on the ballot. During these statewide election years, county measures made up 20 - 21% of all ballot measures. In two of the three off-year elections, county measures constituted only 7% of the ballot measures, but in 1999 they made up 17% of the reduced number of ballot measures in these elections. Tax measures, ordinances and charter amendments account for almost three-fourths of all county ballot measures over the six-year period. While two-thirds of all tax measures fail, a roughly similar percentage of ordinances and charter amendments pass (64% and 73% respectively). Governance issues dominate county ballot measures, outnumbering five other topics by at least two to one. Public facilities, land use, transportation, public safety and general services appear with approximately equal frequency (41 to 52 of each over the six year period). Governance and transportation issues passed easily (68 - 69%), general services issues garnered solid majority support (56%), but public facilities, public safety and land use issues were more apt to fail (with pass rates of 35%, 39% and 47% respectively).

**City Measures.** City measures account for over half of all ballot measures during the six-year period. They are not quite as concentrated in statewide election years as county measures (71% appear in even-numbered years), but certainly more so than school district measures which are almost equally distributed between odd and even years. Like the counties, most city measures are either ordinances (30%), tax measures (28%) or charter amendments (24%). And also like the counties, charter amendments and ordinances are more apt to pass (76% and 55% respectively) while tax measures are more apt to fail (46%). However, city tax measures are noticeably more successful than county ones (46% vs. 35%) and city ordinances less so than county ones (55% vs. 64%). Governance issues dominated city ballot measures even more than county measures (38% vs. 25%). In addition, topics of interest for city measures were even more concentrated: governance, land use, general services and public safety accounted for 69% of all city ballot measures, while governance, land use, public facilities, and transportation accounted for 59% of all county measures. Governance issues were equally successful as city and county ballot measures

(68%) and city general services measures were even more successful (62% vs. 56% for county measures). However, while county land use, public facilities and public safety measures tended to fail, city measures on land use and public facilities passed handily (61% and 63%) or, in the case of public safety, with clear majority support (53%).

**School District Measures.** While city and county measures are concentrated in statewide election years, school district measures are more evenly distributed, with a slight majority appearing in the odd-numbered years. They command more attention in those years because they constitute roughly half of all measures in off-year elections. Pass rates for school district measures were remarkably constant, varying between 61 and 63% in five of the six years. Bonds account for almost three-fourths of all school district measures. Tax measures, ordinances and recalls make up another 20%. Pass rates were highest for recalls and ordinances (77% and 78%), and more substantial for taxes (69%) than for bonds (56%).

## CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

Roughly 70% of all candidates for city, county and school board elections run in even-numbered years when statewide elections are held. Almost all elections for county offices are held in these years, along with three-fourths of city races and 60% of those for school boards. Incumbency rebounded in the last few years, from an overall low of 27% and 26% in 1995 and 1996 to 30% to 32% from 1997 forward. With the exception of 1995 and 1996 when the ratio slipped to 30% and 28%, the proportion of incumbent candidates for school boards has remained virtually unchanged at 32 - 33%. Incumbent candidates were heavily favored in all six years, but particularly so in the gubernatorial election year (1998) when 82% won re-election.



## 2000 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/4	1/11	1/25	3/7	4/4	4/11	5/2	5/9	5/16	5/23	6/6	6/20	7/18	7/25	8/8	9/19	9/26	11/7
Alameda				✓														✓
Alpine				✓														
Amador																		✓
Butte				✓			✓				✓						✓	✓
Calaveras				✓														✓
Colusa				✓														✓
Contra Costa				✓		✓												✓
Del Norte				✓														✓
El Dorado				✓	✓								✓		✓	✓		✓
Fresno				✓		✓	✓											✓
Glenn				✓														✓
Humboldt				✓												✓		✓
Imperial				✓														✓
Inyo				✓				✓										✓
Kern				✓				✓		✓								✓
Kings				✓			✓											✓
Lake				✓														✓
Lassen				✓														✓
Los Angeles		✓		✓							✓	✓						✓
Madera				✓							✓							✓
Marin				✓		✓					✓			✓				✓
Mariposa				✓														✓
Mendocino				✓				✓										✓
Merced				✓		✓		✓			✓							✓
Modoc				✓														✓
Mono																	✓	✓
Monterey				✓		✓				✓								✓
Napa	✓			✓														✓
Nevada				✓														✓
Orange				✓		✓					✓							✓







---

2000 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, 2000

	BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		ORDINANCE		TAXES		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		POLICY/POSITION		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	7	1	8	2	1	1	1	0	8	1	7	2							32	7	39
Butte	1	3	2	2			2	1	3	0			3	0					11	6	17
Colusa									1	0	1	0							2	0	2
Contra Costa	1	1			0	1	2	1	4	2	1	5			1	0			9	10	19
El Dorado	1	3					1	0			2	5							4	8	12
Fresno	1	4	0	1	1	0					0	4	2	0					4	9	13
Glenn											1	2							1	2	3
Humboldt	2	1									1	0							3	1	4
Imperial											0	2							0	2	2
Inyo	2	0					1	0	1	0					1	0			5	0	5
Kern	3	1	1	0					0	6	0	3	1	0					5	10	15
Kings	0	3	1	0							0	1							1	4	5
Lassen	0	1			1	0	1	1			0	1	2	0					4	3	7
Los Angeles	18	1	9	4	2	0	1	0	12	1	3	2	1	0					46	8	54
Madera	1	0																	0	1	1
Marin	5	0									4	1			3	0			12	1	13
Mendocino	1	2							1	3	0	1	2	0					4	6	10
Merced	1	1							3	0									4	1	5
Mono	1	0																	1	0	1
Monterey	2	1	3	0			1	0	2	1	3	4							11	6	17
Napa									1	0	0	2							0	3	3
Nevada									1	0	1	1							2	1	3
Orange	3	0	5	2	3	5	1	1	2	4	1	4							15	13	28
Placer	0	2	8	3					2	0	2	1							12	6	18
Plumas									1	2									1	2	3
Riverside	1	0			1	0			2	3	3	0							7	3	10
Sacramento	0	3							3	1	1	2							4	6	10

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		ORDINANCE		TAXES		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		POLICY/POSITION		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
San Benito							1	0											1	0	1
San Bernardino	1	5	0	1					0	2	2	4			1	0			4	12	16
San Diego	5	3	5	2			2	0	4	10	1	3							17	18	35
San Francisco	4	0							7	8	0	2					3	0	14	10	24
San Joaquin	1	3	1	0					5	1	0	2							7	6	13
San Luis Obispo			1	1	2	0			4	3	1	1							8	5	13
San Mateo	2	1	0	1					1	0	2	1							5	3	8
Santa Barbara	2	3	1	0					2	1	1	1							6	5	11
Santa Clara	4	0	6	3	2	0	0	1	5	6	1	3			2	0			20	13	33
Santa Cruz	1	1	0	1							0	1			1	0			2	3	5
Shasta							0	1			0	1							0	2	2
Siskiyou					2	0			0	2									2	2	4
Solano	1	3	1	0					3	0									5	3	8
Sonoma	3	0					0	1	5	1	3	6							11	8	19
Stanislaus	1	0	0	1	1	0			0	2	0	1							2	4	6
Sutter	1	1									2	1							3	2	5
Tehama			0	2															0	2	2
Tulare	1	4	1	0															2	4	6
Tuolumne					1	0					0	2							1	2	3
Ventura	1	1							3	3									4	4	8
Yolo	3	0			4	0			4	1	2	1							13	2	15
Yuba											1	2							1	2	3
All Counties	82	53	53	26	21	7	14	7	90	64	47	75	11	0	9	0	3	0	328	231	559

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		HOUSING		REVENUES		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	6	0	3	2	2	0	10	2			1	0	3	0	1	2	2	0			4	1	32	7	39
Butte	1	3	3	0			6	2	0	1							1	0					11	6	17
Colusa	1	0																			1	0	2	0	2
Contra Costa	1	2	2	3	0	1	2	2					2	1	1	0			1	1			9	10	19
El Dorado	0	3									2	5	1	0							1	0	4	8	12
Fresno	1	4					2	0					1	0	0	1			0	1	0	2	4	9	13
Glenn																					1	2	1	2	3
Humboldt	2	1																			1	0	3	1	4
Imperial																			0	1	0	1	0	2	2
Inyo	2	0	1	0			1	0											1	0			5	0	5
Kern	4	1			0	2	1	6													0	1	5	10	15
Kings	0	3					1	0													0	1	1	4	5
Lassen	2	1	1	0	0	1			0	1			1	0									4	3	7
Los Angeles	25	2	5	0	2	1	10	4					1	0	1	0					2	1	46	8	54
Madera	0	1																					0	1	1
Marin	4	0			2	0					1	0			1	0			3	0	1	1	12	1	13
Mendocino	3	2					0	3													1	1	4	6	10
Merced	1	1					3	0															4	1	5
Mono	1	0																					1	0	1
Monterey	3	1	3	1	3	2	2	0													0	2	11	6	17
Napa			0	1	0	1							0	1									0	3	3
Nevada	1	0			0	1					1	0											2	1	3
Orange	3	1	2	3			5	1			0	2	3	2	2	1					0	3	15	13	28
Placer	1	2	0	1			9	3							1	0					1	0	12	6	18
Plumas							1	2															1	2	3
Riverside	2	0			1	0	1	0									1	3			2	0	7	3	10
Sacramento	0	3	0	1			3	0					1	2									4	6	10

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		HOUSING		REVENUES		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 Benito											1	0											1	0	1
San Bernardino	1	4	0	1	0	2	0	2					0	1	0	1			2	0	1	1	4	12	16
San Diego	5	4	4	8	1	2	7	3											1	0	0	1	17	18	35
San Francisco	1	0	2	3			6	2			1	2	3	0	0	1	1	0			0	2	14	10	24
San Joaquin	3	3	2	1			1	0									1	0			0	2	7	6	13
San Luis Obispo	1	0	1	2			4	1							1	2					1	0	8	5	13
San Mateo	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	1													0	1	5	3	8
Santa Barbara	2	3					2	1	1	0			0	1			1	0					6	5	11
Santa Clara	2	0	2	2	0	1	7	7			0	1	5	0	1	0			2	0	1	2	20	13	33
Santa Cruz	1	1					0	1							0	1			1	0			2	3	5
Shasta					0	1	0	1															0	2	2
Siskiyou							0	2							2	0							2	2	4
Solano	1	3	1	0			3	0															5	3	8
Sonoma	4	0	3	2	1	0					0	2					2	0			1	4	11	8	19
Stanislaus	1	0			1	0	0	3					0	1									2	4	6
Sutter	1	1											0	1							2	0	3	2	5
Tehama							0	2															0	2	2
Tulare	1	4					0	1															2	4	6
Tuolumne											1	0	0	1					0	1			1	2	3
Ventura	1	1	2	2									1	1									4	4	8
Yolo	3	4	2	0	1	0	2	0			1	0	4	0							0	1	13	2	15
Yuba					1	0															0	2	1	2	3
All Counties	95	59	40	33	16	16	89	52	1	2	9	12	26	12	11	9	9	3	11	4	21	32	328	231	559



TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2000

		County Supervisor		Other County Offices		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	86.7	130	61.0	47	79.7	385	94.2	146	75.0	496
	Lose	13.3	20	39.0	30	20.3	98	5.8	9	25.0	165	21.1	322
	Total	100.0	150	100.0	77	100.0	483	100.0	155	100.0	661	100.0	1526
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	18.2	64	36.4	115	27.7	373	34.6	75	35.3	494	30.9	1121
	Lose	81.8	287	63.6	201	72.3	972	65.4	142	64.7	904	69.1	2506
	Total	100.0	351	100.0	316	100.0	1345	100.0	217	100.0	1398	100.0	3627
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	67.0	130	29.0	47	50.8	385	66.1	146	50.1	496	51.8	1204
	Non-Incumbent	33.0	64	71.0	115	49.2	373	33.9	75	49.9	494	48.2	1121
	Total	100.0	194	100.0	162	100.0	758	100.0	221	100.0	990	100.0	2325
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	6.5	20	13.0	30	9.2	98	6.0	9	15.4	165	11.4	322
	Non-Incumbent	93.5	287	87.0	201	90.8	972	94.0	142	84.6	904	88.6	2506
	Total	100.0	307	100.0	231	100.0	1070	100.0	151	100.0	1069	100.0	2828
All Candidates	Incumbent	29.9	150	19.6	77	26.4	483	41.7	155	32.1	661	29.6	1526
	Non-Incumbent	70.1	351	80.4	316	73.6	1345	58.3	217	67.9	1398	70.4	3627
	Total	100.0	501	100.0	393	100.0	1828	100.0	372	100.0	2059	100.0	5153



---

---

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

---

---



TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	3/7/00	Measure B	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	159,131	283,687	56.09%	pass
		Measure C	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	128,808	271,841	47.38%	fail
	11/7/00	Measure A	Utility Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	284,356	390,352	72.85%	pass
		Measure B	Ordinance	Transport: Mass Transit	352,504	432,657	81.47%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure C	Ordinance	Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary	179,858	417,081	43.12%	fail
		Measure D	Ordinance	Land Use: Growth Cap/Boundary	243,094	429,776	56.56%	pass
ALPINE	No County Measures							
BUTTE	3/7/00	Measure L	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	241	397	60.71%	pass
CALAVERAS	No County Measures							
COLUSA	No County Measures							
CONTRA COSTA	3/7/00	Measure C	Property Tax	Land Use: Zoning	233	504	46.23%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure D	Advisory	Land Use: Zoning	233	505	46.14%	fail
	11/7/00	Measure L	Sales Tax	Facilities: Libraries	233,301	353,008	66.09%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure W	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	2,196	2,963	74.11%	pass
		Measure Y	Property Tax	Safety: Police	2,556	4,788	53.38%	fail <sup>T</sup>
DEL NORTE	No County Measures							
EL DORADO	7/18/00	Measure A	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	64	140	45.71%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure B	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	189	418	45.22%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure C	Property Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	62	70	88.57%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure E	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	34	62	54.84%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	8/8/00	Measure G1	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	30	54	55.56%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure G2	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	28	52	53.85%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	9/19/00	Measure S	GO Bond	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	3,369	4,880	69.04%	pass <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure H	Initiative	Transport: Roads	39,343	64,708	60.80%	pass
		Measure J	Sales Tax	Transport: Roads	38,236	65,108	58.73%	pass
FRESNO	11/7/00	Measure A	Sales Tax	Facilities: Zoos	111,107	204,545	54.32%	fail <sup>T</sup>
GLENN	11/7/00	Measure W	Transient Occupancy Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	3,591	8,345	43.03%	fail
HUMBOLDT	No County Measures							
IMPERIAL	3/7/00	Measure Z	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	4,921	20,239	24.31%	fail
INYO	3/7/00	Measure A	Initiative	Governance: Organization	3,622	5,796	62.49%	pass
		Measure B	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	81	95	85.26%	pass
KERN	5/9/00	Measure B	Property Tax	Safety: Police	321	589	54.50%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure F	Property Tax	Safety: Police	517	802	64.46%	fail <sup>T</sup>

<sup>T</sup> 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, 2000

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
KINGS	No County Measures							
LAKE	No County Measures							
LASSEN	3/7/00	Measure R	Advisory	Facilities: Military Base Conversion	4,242	8,336	50.89%	pass
	11/7/00	Measure U	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	427	802	53.24%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure V	Initiative	Land Use: Zoning	6,496	10,366	62.67%	pass
LOS ANGELES	3/7/00	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Organization	697,963	1,381,727	50.51%	pass
	11/7/00	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Organization	851,356	2,374,150	35.86%	fail
MADERA	No County Measures							
MARIN	7/25/00	Measure A	Property Tax	General Services: Maintenance	148	179	82.68%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure B	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	142	179	79.33%	pass
	11/7/00	Measure C	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	1,669	2,236	74.64%	pass
		Measure D	Property Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	486	781	62.23%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure E	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	460	741	62.08%	pass
MARIPOSA	No County Measures							
MENDOCINO	11/7/00	Measure G	Ordinance	Other	19,293	32,962	58.53%	pass
MERCED	No County Measures							
MODOC	No County Measures							
MONO	No County Measures							
MONTEREY	3/7/00	Measure A	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	55,548	78,313	70.93%	pass <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure A	Initiative	Land Use: Open Space	70,475	110,825	63.59%	pass
NAPA	1/4/00	Measure G	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	8,228	21,330	38.57%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	3/7/00	Measure H	Transient Occupancy Tax	Safety: Fire	22,997	35,584	64.63%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure I	Transient Occupancy Tax	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	30,963	48,634	63.67%	fail <sup>T</sup>
NEVADA	11/7/00	Measure L	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	69	81	85.19%	pass <sup>T</sup>
ORANGE	3/7/00	Measure F	Initiative	Land Use: Voter Approval	450,546	668,996	67.35%	pass <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure G	Ordinance	Governance: Budget Processes	393,263	857,489	45.86%	fail
		Measure H	Ordinance	Governance: Budget Processes	550,227	851,491	64.62%	pass
PLACER	11/7/00	Measure V	Sales Tax	General Services	61,977	110,138	56.27%	pass
		Measure W	Sales Tax	Land Use	30,118	110,075	27.36%	fail
PLUMAS	5/23/00	Measure A	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	61	72	84.72%	pass <sup>T</sup>
RIVERSIDE	No County Measures							
SACRAMENTO	11/7/00	Measure O	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	122,464	394,762	31.02%	fail
		Measure P	Property Tax	Facilities: Libraries	166,137	251,707	66.00%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure T	Property Tax	Facilities: Libraries	3,213	5,453	58.92%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure V	Property Tax	Facilities: Libraries	200	291	68.73%	pass <sup>T</sup>
SAN BENITO	11/7/00	Measure O	Initiative	Transport: Roads	8,272	15,872	52.12%	pass

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SAN BERNARDINO	4/11/00	Measure I	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	39	40	97.50%	pass
	11/7/00	Measure J	Property Tax	General Services: Water	937	3,635	25.78%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure P	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	52	68	76.47%	pass <sup>T</sup>
SAN DIEGO	11/7/00	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Contracting/Bidding/Leasing	558,818	816,455	68.44%	pass
		Measure B	Initiative	Governance: Contracting/Bidding/Leasing	450,552	742,134	60.71%	pass
		Measure GG	Miscellaneous Tax	Safety: Fire	39	57	68.42%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure HH	Miscellaneous Tax	Safety: Fire	303	462	65.58%	fail <sup>T</sup>
SAN FRANCISCO	3/7/00	Measure A	GO Bond	Facilities: Parks/ Recreation	144,474	183,359	78.79%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure B	GO Bond	Education: Bonds	122,722	183,090	67.03%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure C	Revenue Bond	Land Use: Open Space	126,478	171,471	73.76%	pass
		Measure D	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	88,671	175,522	50.52%	pass
		Measure E	Ordinance	General Services: Social/Welfare	72,735	175,681	41.40%	fail
		Measure F	Property Tax	Other: Tax Repeal/Reduction/Limit	66,008	175,609	37.59%	fail
	11/7/00	Measure A	GO Bond	Facilities: Libraries	218,378	293,663	74.36%	pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	108,509	289,542	37.48%	fail
		Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	171,682	285,506	60.13%	pass
		Measure D	Ordinance	Governance: Budget Processes	206,546	282,505	73.11%	pass
		Measure E	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	159,161	280,345	56.77%	pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Transport: Traffic Regulation/Reduction	132,986	295,065	45.07%	fail
		Measure G	Ordinance	Transport: Traffic Regulation/Reduction	108,901	285,579	38.13%	fail
		Measure H	Ordinance	Housing: Rent Control	168,888	294,530	57.34%	pass
		Measure I	Business Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	95,958	264,494	36.28%	fail
		Measure J	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	234,787	284,061	82.65%	pass
		Measure K	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	111,006	282,887	39.24%	fail
		Measure L	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	141,434	284,183	49.77%	fail
		Measure M	Ordinance	Governance: Contracting/Bidding/Leasing	103,166	272,231	37.90%	fail
		Measure N	Ordinance	Land Use: Zoning	126,055	274,290	45.96%	fail
Measure O	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	143,881	273,304	52.65%	pass		
Measure P	Policy/Position	Land Use: Military Base	241,456	279,551	86.37%	pass		
Measure Q	Policy/Position	Transport: Roads	189,549	283,355	66.89%	pass		
Measure R	Policy/Position	Facilities: Public Works	201,595	277,762	72.58%	pass		
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures							
SAN LUIS OBISPO	3/7/00	Measure A	Advisory	General Services: Flood Control/Drainage	58,624	78,402	74.77%	pass

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
		Measure D	Property Tax	General Services: Flood Control/Drainage	151	450	33.56%	fail
	11/7/00	Measure M-2000	Ordinance	Land Use: Open Space	43,264	105,647	40.95%	fail
SAN MATEO	3/7/00	Measure A	Miscellaneous Tax	Safety: Police and Fire	1,162	1,584	73.36%	pass <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	76,559	212,769	35.98%	fail
		Measure B	GO Bond	Safety: Police	145,276	222,362	65.33%	fail <sup>T</sup>
SANTA BARBARA	3/7/00	Measure U2000	Sales Tax	Facilities: Military Base Conversion	41,008	105,388	38.91%	fail
SANTA CLARA	No County Measures							
SANTA CRUZ	No County Measures							
SHASTA	11/7/00	Measure A	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	8,951	17,762	50.39%	fail <sup>T</sup>
SIERRA	No County Measures							
SISKIYOU	3/7/00	Measure B	Advisory	General Services: Water	474	550	86.18%	pass
		Measure C	Advisory	General Services: Water	395	549	71.95%	pass
SOLANO	No County Measures							
SONOMA	1/25/00	Measure A	Miscellaneous Tax	Safety: Fire	63	90	70.00%	pass <sup>T</sup>
	3/7/00	Measure B	Sales Tax	Transport: Roads	87,532	149,504	58.55%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure C	Sales Tax	Transport: Mass Transit	88,819	147,263	60.31%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure H	Transient Occupancy Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	65,269	174,314	37.44%	fail
		Measure I	Initiative	Land Use: Open Space	78,590	184,513	42.59%	fail
STANISLAUS	No County Measures							
SUTTER	5/16/00	Measure UU	Property Tax	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	541	872	62.04%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure XX	Transient Occupancy Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	12,695	25,252	50.27%	pass
TEHAMA	11/7/00	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	7,706	19,133	40.28%	fail
		Measure B	Charter Amendment	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	7,246	18,741	38.66%	fail
TRINITY	No County Measures							
TULARE	No County Measures							
TUOLUMNE	3/7/00	Measure T	Advisory	Transport: Roads	12,988	18,465	70.34%	pass
		Measure U	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	6,061	18,668	32.47%	fail <sup>T</sup>
	11/7/00	Measure V	Property Tax	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	485	788	61.55%	fail <sup>T</sup>
VENTURA	3/7/00	Measure F	Ordinance	Facilities: Health Facilities	125,341	171,817	72.95%	pass
	11/7/00	Measure O	Ordinance	Facilities: Health Facilities	84,524	263,774	32.04%	fail
YOLO	11/7/00	Measure P	Transient Occupancy Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	2,514	6,542	38.43%	fail
YUBA	11/7/00	Measure S	Transient Occupancy Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	7,238	15,516	46.65%	fail
		Measure T	Property Tax	Other: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	600	2,084	28.79%	fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure U	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	184	256	71.88%	pass <sup>T</sup>



## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

ALAMEDA	3/7/00	Measure B	Pass
Shall the Charter of the County of Alameda be amended to provide that qualified persons with severe disabilities be exempted from civil service examination requirements for certain entry level positions in County service, with such persons acquiring regular civil service status after one year of satisfactory service?			
ALAMEDA	3/7/00	Measure C	Fail
Shall the Charter of the County of Alameda be amended to eliminate the requirement that all Civil Service examinations shall have a mandatory recruitment period of 25 days or more?			
ALAMEDA	11/7/00	Measure A	Pass
Shall an ordinance be approved to extend until 6/30/2009 the existing 5.5% Utility Users Tax, collected only in the unincorporated areas (e.g. Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo, Sunol), which funds County services, including services to unincorporated areas (e.g. Sheriff, Library, Planning and Code enforcement), and to amend the tax to include additional telecommunications services? The tax DOES NOT APPLY in Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, or Union City.			
ALAMEDA	11/7/00	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Alameda County voters authorize implementing the Alameda County 20 year Transportation Expenditure Plan including: expand BART in Alameda County; expand Altamont Commuter Express service; expand Countywide Express, Local and Feeder Bus service, I-880/I-580/I-680/I-238/Route 84/Route 92 Improvements; extend special transit services for seniors and persons with disabilities; improve pedestrian/bike safety? Approval of this Measure authorizes continuing the 1/2 cent transportation sales tax during the Plan's implementation. A Citizens Watchdog Committee shall audit all expenditures.			
ALAMEDA	11/7/00	Measure C	Fail
Shall a measure that, among other things, affirms the County's urban growth boundary and separates rural lands from lands suitable for urban uses, establishes an advisory commission to develop a plan to enhance agriculture and open space, affirms County open space funding policies, continues cooperative planning efforts, requires a county-wide vote to change these policies except for certain city-adopted urban growth boundary changes, and provides an alternative to Measure D be adopted?			
ALAMEDA	11/7/00	Measure D	Pass
Shall an ordinance amending the Alameda County General Plan to, among other things, revise the urban growth boundary in the East County to reserve less land for urban growth and more land for agriculture and open space, apply similar policies to rural Castro Valley, require new housing to be located primarily within existing cities, modify land use restrictions applicable to rural areas, and require a County-wide vote on changes to these policies, be adopted?			
BUTTE	3/7/00	Measure L	Pass
DISSOLUTION OF DISTRICT. Shall the order adopted on September 28, 1999, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Butte ordering the dissolution of the Lime Saddle Community Services District be confirmed, subject to the terms and conditions specified in the order?			
CONTRA COSTA	3/7/00	Measure C	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 99-47 of the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County be approved so as to authorize a one-time special tax of no more than \$75 per residential property to fund the development and consideration of a general plan amendment and zoning ordinance regulations to establish in the Diablo Community Services District area a Floor Area Ratios proportionality between houses and their lot sizes?			
CONTRA COSTA	3/7/00	Measure D	Fail
Should the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors amend the General Plan and the Zoning Code as they apply to the Diablo area to adopt a Floor Area Ratio Ordinance substantially in the form mailed to the Diablo residents on or about December 10, 1999, and a copy of which is available for public inspection at the District 3 Supervisor's office 309 Diablo Road, Danville, CA, so as to provide proportionality between house and lot size?			
CONTRA COSTA	11/7/00	Measure L	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall County Ordinance 99-51 be approved, restoring and improving local library services by increasing days and hours neighborhood libraries are open; replacing worn and outdated books and materials; expanding reading and educational programs for children and services for adults, seniors, and businesses; providing funds for needed repairs; and updating computers and technology, temporarily increasing the sales tax by one eighth of one percent, exclusively for specific library services and automatically expiring after eight years?			
CONTRA COSTA	11/7/00	Measure W	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit under California Article XIII-B for County Service Area M-8 be maintained at \$600,000, as previously approved by the voters of the Service Area, and adjusted for changes in the cost-of-living and population, with the increase effective for the fiscal years 2000/2001 through 2003/2004 (inclusive) to provide for the expenditure of funds that will be available to the Service Area during the stated fiscal years?			
CONTRA COSTA	11/7/00	Measure Y	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance 2000-26 of the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County be approved so as to authorize a special tax increase on property located in County Service Area P-2 (Zone B), from \$18 to \$36 per parcel for single residential property for the first fiscal year, and not to exceed \$54 per parcel per year for single residential property in succeeding years, with corresponding increases for properties in other use categories identified in the ordinance (i.e., small multiple residential, large multiple residential, and commercial/industrial/institutional), in order to provide additional funding for police protection service?			
EL DORADO	7/18/00	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

Shall the Board of Directors of the Hillwood Community Services District be authorized to tax each parcel within the District \$10.00 per month for the maintenance improvement of roadways and for the other lawful purposes of the District?

EL DORADO 7/18/00 Measure B Fail (2/3 required)

Shall the Board of Directors of the Golden West Community Services District be authorized to increase the present tax of \$120.00 per year by \$120.00 per year for a total not to exceed \$240.00, and to annually tax each parcel within the District said amount of \$240.00 for the improvement and maintenance of roadways and easements within the District, and for other lawful purposes of the District?

EL DORADO 7/18/00 Measure C Pass (2/3 required)

Shall an annual special tax be levied in the amounts as shown on Exhibit A on each parcel of real property within the boundaries of the Green Valley Oaks Road Zone of Benefit #69 commencing with fiscal year 2000/01 and each year thereafter? Said tax is to be assessed and collected with El Dorado County General Taxes commencing with the forthcoming 2000/01 fiscal year and continuing each year thereafter, and shall be used only for those purposes authorized by the zone of benefit under County Service Area law.

EL DORADO 7/18/00 Measure E Fail (2/3 required)

Shall the Board of Directors of the Lakeview Community Services District be authorized to increase the present tax of \$60.00 per year for a total not to exceed \$120.00, and to annually tax each parcel within the District said amount to \$120.00 for the improvement and maintenance of roadways and easements within the District, and for other lawful purposes of the District?

EL DORADO 8/8/00 Measure G1 Fail (2/3 required)

Question #1: Shall a special tax providing funds for the maintenance and repair of existing roads within the Nashville Trail Community Services District be established at the rate of \$300.00 per year and assessed against each parcel within the District, and shall a total appropriations limit be established equal to the amount of the special tax?

EL DORADO 8/8/00 Measure G2 Fail (2/3 required)

Question #2: Shall owners of more than one parcel within the District be assessed \$300.00 for the first parcel owned with or without a dwelling unit, and be assessed another \$300.00 for each additional parcel owned only if it contains a dwelling unit?

EL DORADO 9/19/00 Measure S Pass (2/3 required)

To maintain new bike trails, acquire, construct and equip athletic fields and an ice rink, upgrade Paradise Park facilities, qualify for \$12.5 million in County/State grants, and fund reserves shall (i) Community Facilities District No. 2000-1 of the South Lake Tahoe Recreation Facilities Joint Powers Authority issue \$6,500,000 of bonds; (ii) levy special taxes to pay for such facilities, for maintenance thereof, and incidental expenses, including debt service on such bonds; (iii) establish the District's annual appropriations limit at \$6,500,000, all as provided in Resolutions 05 and 06 of the Authority?

EL DORADO 11/7/00 Measure H Pass

Shall Measure H, entitled "An Initiative Ordinance Requiring the Expenditure of at Least One-Half of the 'Vehicle In-Lieu Tax' Revenues Received by the County of El Dorado Annually on Roads, Ways and Highways for Specified Purposes," be adopted?

EL DORADO 11/7/00 Measure J Pass

Shall the County be authorized to use that portion of its sales tax revenues generated by new development to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset the impacts of traffic generated by non-residential development as allowed under Policy 3.2.

FRESNO 11/7/00 Measure A Fail (2/3 required)

Shall Ordinance No. 00-009 of the Fresno County Arts to Zoo 2000 Authority be approved to provide additional funding to enhance cultural, artistic, historical, and natural science nonprofit organizations by imposing a transactions and use tax at the rate of one-quarter of one percent for a maximum of 10 years?

GLENN 11/7/00 Measure W Fail

Shall Glenn County Code Section 4.12.030, which sets the tax charged to persons who temporarily rent hotel and motel rooms, be amended from five to ten percent?

IMPERIAL 3/7/00 Measure Z Fail

Shall Imperial County Ordinance No. 1309, which would impose, for a period not to exceed eight years, a transactions and use tax (i.e. sales tax) of one-half percent (0.5%), upon retail transactions within the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County be adopted and the revenues used for general governmental purposes and distributed amongst the County of Imperial and cities of Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria, El Centro, Holtville, Imperial and Westmorland?

INYO 3/7/00 Measure A Pass

CREATING, ELIMINATING, COMBINING, REORGANIZING COUNTY OFFICES. INITIATIVE ORDINANCE. Shall the ordinance which requires voter approval of county ordinances creating, eliminating, combining or otherwise reorganizing offices or departments be adopted?

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

INYO	3/7/00	Measure B	Pass
Shall the Olancho Community Service District annual appropriations limit be adjusted to \$200,000 per year for a period of four (4) years, beginning in fiscal year 2000-2001 and concluding in fiscal year 2003-2004, for necessary operations and improvements?			
KERN	5/9/00	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Stallion Springs Community Services District levy a special tax of \$100, per parcel, per year for necessary police protection expenses, including police protection personnel salaries and police protection equipment?			
KERN	11/7/00	Measure F	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Stallion Springs Community Services District Ordinance #115, levying a special tax in the amount of \$50 per parcel per year for improved properties and \$25 per parcel per year for unimproved properties for police protection services and increasing the Stallion Springs Community Services District appropriation limits set in accordance with Article XIII B of the California Constitution by the authorized amount of the special tax, be approved and become effective?			
LASSEN	3/7/00	Measure R	Pass
Should the Federal Bureau of Prisons build a Federal Correctional facility (prison) at Herlong, designed to house approximately 1000 medium or high security inmates, together with a minimum security satellite prison camp to house an additional 150-300 inmates, as described in the June, 1999 Summary Description prepared by the Federal Bureau of Prisons?			
LASSEN	11/7/00	Measure U	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Westwood Community Services District levy a special tax on each parcel of real property located within the boundaries of the District in an amount not to exceed \$32.00 per year for the purpose of funding fire protection and prevention services in accordance with Section 53978 of the Government Code to be collected in the manner authorized by Division 1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code?			
LASSEN	11/7/00	Measure V	Pass
A measure to amend Lassen County's General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and the Westwood Area Plan to provide for development of a four-season mountain resort community at Dyer Mountain.			
LOS ANGELES	3/7/00	Measure A	Pass
CHARTER AMENDMENT. Shall the positions of Chief Deputies, and of assistants or deputies next in line of authority to Chief Deputies, be removed from the County's Civil Service System and placed in the unclassified service?			
LOS ANGELES	11/7/00	Measure A	Fail
CHARTER AMENDMENT. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF COUNTY SUPERVISORS. Shall the Board of Supervisors be increased from five to nine members as detailed in the ordinance adopting the proposed charter amendment?			
MARIN	7/25/00	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the following special tax be levied annually upon the property located within County Service Area No. 9 in order to provide additional landscaping and maintenance services within that area? Fiscal Year 2000-2001 \$111.00 Annual Tax; Fiscal Years 2001-2002 2002-2003 \$56.00 Annual Tax; Fiscal Years 2003-2004 And Thereafter \$28.00 Annual Tax.			
MARIN	7/25/00	Measure B	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit of County Service Area No. 9 be increased for the next four years equal to the proceeds of the taxes imposed?			
MARIN	11/7/00	Measure C	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit established for the Marinwood Community Services District pursuant to Article XIII B of the California Constitution be increased over the appropriations limit established by said article for each of the fiscal years 2001-02 through 2005-06 in the amount equal to the tax revenue received from the voter-approved fire service charges?			
MARIN	11/7/00	Measure D	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the special tax levied annually upon living units located within County Service Area No. 17 be increased from \$195.00 per year to an amount not to exceed \$260.00 per year for each living unit within that area commencing with the 2001-2002 fiscal year?			
MARIN	11/7/00	Measure E	Pass
Shall the appropriations limit of County Service Area No. 17 be increased for four years starting with the 2001-2002 fiscal year equal to the proceeds of the taxes imposed?			
MENDOCINO	11/7/00	Measure G	Pass
Shall the ordinance titled "Cannabis Personal Use Ordinance for Mendocino County" be approved?			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

MONTEREY	3/7/00	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
COUNTYWIDE PARAMEDIC EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES SYSTEM: Shall the current annual benefit assessment of up to \$12.00 per unit be replaced by a special tax of the same amount for the purpose of funding the countywide paramedic emergency medical services system, which will provide advanced life saving support to victims in response to emergency calls, as approved by Monterey County voters in an advisory measure in 1988?			
MONTEREY	11/7/00	Measure A	Pass
Shall the "Del Monte Forest Plan: Forest Preservation and Development Limitations" initiative ordinance be approved?			
NAPA	1/4/00	Measure G	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Napa County Ordinance No. 99-1 be adopted? (Ord No 99-1 creates a Historic Resource General Plan designation ("HR") and a Historic Preservation Combination Zoning District (":HP") and applies the HR designation to the Aetna Springs property within the :HP which will enable Aetna Springs to resume historic resort types of uses and offer lodging accommodations for no more than 200 persons per night).			
NAPA	3/7/00	Measure H	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 1185 be approved? (This ordinance will increase the Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax) applicable in the unincorporated area by one and one-half percent and require the proceeds of this tax increase to be used for the following special purposes: purchase fire protection equipment, fund acquisition of fire station sites and construction of fire stations, provide limited funding for the Visitors and Convention Bureau and protect and enhance open space and open space recreation.)			
NAPA	11/7/00	Measure I	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance No. 2000-1 be enacted? (The Ordinance will increase the Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax) applicable in the unincorporated area from ten and one-half (10 1/2) percent to twelve (12) percent and require the proceeds of this Hotel tax increase to be used for the following special purposes: acquisition, protection and enhancement of parks/open space and providing a stable but limited funding source for the Napa Valley Conference and Visitors Bureau.)			
NEVADA	11/7/00	Measure L	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the County of Nevada levy an annual special tax upon all taxable real property located within the boundaries of the Beyers Lane Community Service District in an amount not to exceed \$100 per parcel for the purpose of providing road maintenance and improvements within the boundaries of the Beyers Lane Community Service District?			
ORANGE	3/7/00	Measure F	Pass (2/3 required)
INITIATIVE TO REQUIRE TWO-THIRDS VOTE FOR RATIFICATION OF NEW OR EXPANDED JAIL, HAZARDOUS WASTE LANDFILL OR CIVILIAN AIRPORT PROJECT. Shall the initiative measure, which would require that no new or expanded jail, hazardous waste landfill or civilian airport project (all as defined in the measure) shall be valid and effective unless ratified by a two-thirds majority of voters voting in a county general election and requiring that the Board of Supervisors conduct a public hearing in each affected city prior to project approval, be approved?			
ORANGE	11/7/00	Measure G	Fail
Should 60% of the revenues received from the tobacco litigation Master Settlement Agreement be used to fund health care services, tobacco use prevention, and public safety programs and services, with the other 40% used to reduce the County's bankruptcy-related debt?			
ORANGE	11/7/00	Measure H	Pass
Should all revenues received from the tobacco litigation Master Settlement Agreement be used to fund health care services, tobacco use prevention, and public safety programs and services?			
PLACER	11/7/00	Measure V	Pass
Shall any new sales tax revenues approved by voters in this election fund the following projects to preserve our quality of life, in the face of increasing growth? Preserve water quality by protecting land around our lakes, rivers and creeks; save farmland and ensure a supply of local produce; protect fish and wildlife habitat; enhance recreational opportunities by developing new large parks and a regional trail network; and protect scenic landscapes, such as the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe.			
PLACER	11/7/00	Measure W	Fail
Shall the Board of Supervisors enact a 1/4 cent sales tax, public oversight and accountability measure for general County purposes with the following mandatory restrictions? A local Citizen's Oversight Committee will monitor all expenditures to ensure funds are used efficiently and effectively; annual financial audits, conducted by an independent auditor, must be reported to the public; and the tax expires after twenty (20) years.			
PLUMAS	5/23/00	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
1. Shall the Board of Directors of the Whitehawk Ranch Community Services District be expanded from three to five members? And further, if the measure to expand the Board is approved: 2. Election of candidates: Terms of the newly elected directors shall expire in December 2001. Election of directors of terms expiring in December 2001, will be held in November 2001 at the regularly scheduled Uniform District election.			
SACRAMENTO	11/7/00	Measure O	Fail
Shall the County General Plan and Zoning Code be amended, and an ordinance adopted, allowing development of a 2000 acre "Senior Community" in an area known as Deer Creek Hills?			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

SACRAMENTO	11/7/00	Measure P	Pass (2/3 required)
SACRAMENTO PUBLIC LIBRARY COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT SPECIAL TAX. To improve libraries by restoring evening and weekend hours; replacing outdated books and materials; expanding reading and literacy programs; and increasing computer access; shall each taxable parcel (exempting commercial, vacant, agricultural, churches and other properties) within a community facilities district encompassing unincorporated Sacramento County and the cities Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Galt and Isleton pay a special tax of \$22 annually for no more than four years raising approximately \$5.1 million per year?			
SACRAMENTO	11/7/00	Measure T	Fail (2/3 required)
SACRAMENTO PUBLIC LIBRARY COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT SPECIAL TAX. Provided the City of Galt is annexed into the Sacramento Public Library CFD, to improve libraries by restoring hours; replacing books; expanding literacy programs; and increasing computer access; shall each taxable parcel, (exempting commercial, vacant, agricultural, churches and other properties) within a community facilities district encompassing unincorporated Sacramento County and the cities Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Galt and Isleton pay a special tax of \$22 annually for four years raising approximately \$5.1 million per year?			
SACRAMENTO	11/7/00	Measure V	Pass (2/3 required)
SACRAMENTO PUBLIC LIBRARY COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT SPECIAL TAX. Provided the City of Isleton is annexed into the Sacramento Public Library CFD, to improve libraries by restoring hours; replacing books; expanding literacy programs; and increasing computer access; shall each taxable parcel, (exempting commercial, vacant, agricultural, churches and other properties) within a community facilities district encompassing unincorporated Sacramento County and the cities Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Galt and Isleton pay a special tax of \$22 annually for four years raising approximately \$5.1 million per year?			
SAN BENITO	11/7/00	Measure O	Pass
Shall the County of San Benito pursue a request of CalTrans to install temporary median barriers as an immediate safety improvement on Highway 25 instead of a sales tax to widen the highway to four (4) lanes?			
SAN BERNADINO	4/11/00	Measure I	Pass
Shall there be established for Improvement Zone HL of County Service Area 70, pursuant to Section 4 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, an appropriations limit of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00) to enable said zone to expend the proceeds of taxes in the furnishing of authorized fire protection services?			
SAN BERNADINO	11/7/00	Measure J	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a special tax be levied to fund water services and improvements within County Service Area 70, Improvement Zone L (Pinon Hills) in the maximum amount of \$66.00 per year per parcel of real property within the District for a period of five (5) years?			
SAN BERNADINO	11/7/00	Measure P	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Board of Directors of the Baker Community Services District pursue special legislation to levy a transactions and use tax at a rate of 0.5 percent (1/2 cent) on taxable sales within the District boundaries? In the event this measure is passed by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the qualified voters within the District and that special legislation is successful, shall the proceeds of this tax be deemed general fund revenues to enhance the quality of life in Baker?			
SAN DIEGO	11/7/00	Measure A	Pass
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER ENTITLED "FULL DISCLOSURE IN COUNTY CONTRACTING CHARTER AMENDMENT" Shall the San Diego County Charter be amended to require contractors and their lobbyists to publicly disclose gifts and campaign contributions made to members of the Board of Supervisors prior to the Board's approval of service contracts?			
SAN DIEGO	11/7/00	Measure B	Pass
INITIATIVE MEASURE: "THE CLEAN CONTRACTING CHARTER AMENDMENT" Shall "The Clean Contracting Charter Amendment" be adopted?			
SAN DIEGO	11/7/00	Measure GG	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall an Ordinance for funding structural fire protection and emergency medical services within County Service Area 109 - Mount Laguna be approved establishing special taxes not exceeding the amounts set forth in the ordinance?			
SAN DIEGO	11/7/00	Measure HH	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an Ordinance for funding structural fire protection and emergency medical services within County Service Area 111 - Boulevard be approved establishing special taxes not exceeding the amounts set forth in the ordinance?			
SAN DIEGO	11/7/00	Measure JJ	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an Ordinance for funding structural fire protection and emergency medical services within County Service Area 112 - Campo be approved establishing special taxes not exceeding the amounts set forth in the ordinance?			
SAN FRANCISCO	3/7/00	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
NEIGHBORHOOD RECREATION AND PARK FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 2000. Shall the City and County incur \$110,000,000 of bonded indebtedness for the acquisition, construction and reconstruction of recreation and park facilities and properties, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes?			
SAN FRANCISCO	3/7/00	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
CALIFORNIA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 2000. Shall the City and County incur \$87,445,000 of bonded indebtedness for the			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of certain improvements to the California Academy of Sciences, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes?

SAN FRANCISCO            3/7/00            Measure C            Pass  
Shall the City extend the Open Space Fund for 30 years, add new planning and budgeting requirements, and authorize the Board of Supervisors to issue revenue bonds secured by the Fund?

SAN FRANCISCO            3/7/00            Measure D            Pass  
Shall members of the Board of Supervisors be added to the City's Employee Retirement System and shall the City be authorized to pay the full cost of health benefits for Board members?

SAN FRANCISCO            3/7/00            Measure E            Fail  
Shall the City limit cash payments for certain public assistance programs to 15 percent of total benefits, add to the residency and fingerprint requirements, and increase the penalties for fraud?

SAN FRANCISCO            3/7/00            Measure F            Fail  
Shall it be City policy to waive taxes on certain residential property and on small businesses in Bayview Hunters Point for five years, and to appropriate \$150 million to create jobs for residents of the neighborhood?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure A            Pass (2/3 required)  
BRANCH LIBRARY FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 2000. Shall the City incur \$105,865,000 of bonded indebtedness for the acquisition, renovation, and construction of branch libraries and other library facilities, other than the Main Library, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure B            Fail  
Shall the City allow each member of the Board of Supervisors to hire a third aide?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure C            Pass  
Shall the City increase retirement benefits for miscellaneous employees hired after 1976?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure D            Pass  
Shall the City extend the Children's Fund until 2016, increase the annual set-aside of property tax revenues for the Fund, create a citizen advisory committee, and add new planning requirements?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure E            Pass  
Shall the City increase health benefits for retired City employees by placing a cap on monthly health care premium costs, and paying one-half the cost of health coverage for the retiree's primary dependent?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure F            Fail  
Shall the City close John F. Kennedy Drive in Golden Gate Park to automobile traffic on Saturdays?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure G            Fail  
Shall the City close John F. Kennedy Drive in Golden Gate Park to automobile traffic on Saturdays after the Music Concourse parking facility is opened?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure H            Pass  
Shall the City's Rent Control Ordinance be amended to limit the type of costs on which a landlord may base a rent increase?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure I            Fail  
Shall the City eliminate the gross receipts method of calculating the business tax and raise the existing payroll expense tax rate from 1.5 to 1.7 percent?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure J            Pass  
Shall the City ban officials from accepting gifts, payments, or campaign contributions from a person or group if the official previously approved granting the donor a contract or special benefit?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure K            Fail  
Shall the City adopt new controls on office development, including office space for computer-based services?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure L            Fail  
Shall the City adopt new controls on office development, including office space for computer-based services, and live/work units?

SAN FRANCISCO            11/7/00           Measure M            Fail  
Shall City law be amended to authorize issuance of restricted taxicab permits in the names of one or more persons, and to set a full-time driving or operating requirement for permit-holders at 800 hours per year?

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

SAN FRANCISCO	11/7/00	Measure N	Fail
Shall the rules that govern converting rental housing to condominiums also apply to converting rental housing to certain forms of joint ownership with exclusive rights of occupancy, and shall the annual 200-unit cap on such conversions be made permanent?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/7/00	Measure O	Pass
Shall the City provide public financing to candidates for the Board of Supervisors, limit contributions to independent committees, and limit the overall amount a person or group may contribute to all City candidates and political committees?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/7/00	Measure P	Pass
Shall it be City policy to support a full clean-up by the Navy of the Hunters Point Shipyard, to allow unrestricted use of the entire site in the future?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/7/00	Measure Q	Pass
Shall it be City policy to establish a Pedestrian Safety Fund to pay for improvements designed to make City streets safer for pedestrians?			
SAN FRANCISCO	11/7/00	Measure R	Pass
Shall it be City policy to use Pier 45 as the site for a public educational facility focusing on the San Francisco Bay and operated by an independent non-profit organization?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	3/7/00	Measure A	Pass
Shall the County Board of Supervisors recognize the Diablo Canyon Lands as an exceptionally precious coastal resource by adopting policies that promote habitat preservation, sustainable agricultural activities, and public use and enjoyment consistent with public safety and property rights once the lands are no longer needed as an emergency buffer for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant after its remaining operating life?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	3/7/00	Measure D	Fail
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 County Service Area No. 23, to provide drainage services within said Area, with the special tax to be at an initial rate not exceeding Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) per parcel having a separate County Assessor's Parcel Number and increasing not more than two percent per year thereafter?			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	11/7/00	Measure M-2000	Fail
Shall an ordinance be adopted requiring a vote of the people for changes to the San Luis Obispo County General Plan policies and land use designations regarding "Open Space", "Agriculture", "Residential Rural", and "Rural Lands" in the unincorporated areas of the county?			
SAN MATEO	3/7/00	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Resolution No. 63236 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	11/7/00	Measure A	Fail
Shall the Charter of the County of San Mateo be amended so that the compensation of members of the Board of Supervisors be set at an amount not greater than 80% of the compensation received by a Judge of the Superior Court?			
SAN MATEO	11/7/00	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)
In order to assist modern effective law enforcement, shall the County of San Mateo be authorized to issue General Obligation Bonds in the amount of \$13 million dollars principal (\$13,000,000) to finance the construction, acquisition, and improvement of a crime laboratory and associated facilities?			
SANTA BARBARA	3/7/00	Measure U2000	Fail
Shall the ordinance which provides for financing, without long-term debt, the construction and operation of a 120-bed North County juvenile hall and 400-bed jail; a rebuilt South County juvenile hall and justice facility; a forensic facility; and countywide correctional programs including prevention, intervention, treatment and supervision, with funds raised by a county sales tax of 1/2%, starting July 1, 2000, and decreasing to 1/4% July 1, 2005, be adopted?			
SHASTA	11/7/00	Measure A	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a special tax of not to exceed \$30.00 per year be levied upon parcels of real property, on which improvements with a value of more than \$2,000 exist, located in County Service Area No. 1 (the area served by the Shasta County Fire Department) to fund the acquisition, outfitting, operation, maintenance, and repair of fire/rescue vehicles as provided in Shasta County Ordinance No. 611?			
SISKIYOU	3/7/00	Measure B	Pass
Shall the Lake Shastina Community Services District exercise the power to provide water, and all related functions required or appropriate in order to provide such water to the Lake Shastina community, including the levying of assessments and the setting of rates in accordance with applicable laws, and upon doing so be the sole provider of such water service for Lake Shastina?			
SISKIYOU	3/7/00	Measure C	Pass
Shall the Lake Shastina Community Services District establish an annual water standby or availability charge not to exceed \$40 per parcel?			

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

SONOMA	1/25/00	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County be authorized to levy a special tax in Mayacamas Community Facilities District No. 7 having a maximum rate of \$66.00 per unit of benefit for the purpose of financing enhanced levels of fire protection and suppression services within the District and shall the District have its annual appropriations limit established at \$60,000.00?			
SONOMA	3/7/00	Measure B	Fail (2/3 required)
In order to (1) widen and improve Highway 101 from Windsor to the Sonoma-Marin border; (2) improve or construct major Highway 101 interchanges; and (3) improve sections of Highway 116, shall a 1/2 cent sales tax be levied for a period not to exceed eight (8) years?			
SONOMA	3/7/00	Measure C	Fail (2/3 required)
In order to (1) repair and improve local streets and roads; (2) implement passenger rail service through Sonoma and Marin counties; (3) expand transit service by increasing bus frequencies and establishing broader service; (4) enhance transit service for seniors and the disabled; and (5) build and improve bicycle and pedestrian paths, shall a 1/4 cent sales tax be levied for a period not to exceed sixteen (16) years?			
SONOMA	11/7/00	Measure H	Fail
Shall an ordinance be approved to amend Section 12-11 of the Sonoma County Code to increase the transient occupancy tax rate from nine (9) percent to twelve (12) percent upon transients occupying lodging located only within the unincorporated area of Sonoma County?			
SONOMA	11/7/00	Measure I	Fail
Shall the "Rural Heritage Initiative" ordinance which would, for the next thirty years, add a requirement for voter approval of any amendment to the Sonoma County General Plan to (i) amend the land use designation or increase the density of lands designated as "Land Intensive Agriculture," "Land Extensive Agriculture," "Diverse Agriculture," or "Resources and Rural Development," or (ii) make changes in specified General Plan land use goals, objectives, or policies, be adopted?			
SUTTER	5/16/00	Measure UU	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall approval be given to Resolution No. 99-29 of the Sutter County Board of Supervisors? The resolution annually imposes a special parcel tax to pay for maintenance of Happy Park, beginning with fiscal year 1999-2000. For the first year the tax is \$27.94. For each subsequent year, the board determines the tax subject to a cap of \$27.94 increased annually by 2% compound interest. The tax will replace assessments previously levied.			
SUTTER	11/7/00	Measure XX	Pass
Shall the ordinance providing for a ten percent (10%) surcharge on the occupancy of hotels, motels, and other lodging facilities located in the unincorporated area of Sutter County be adopted?			
TEHAMA	11/7/00	Measure A	Fail
Shall Article IV, Section 2 of the Charter of Tehama County be amended to read: "From and after January 1, 2001 the salary of each member of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Tehama shall be \$2,000 per month."?			
TEHAMA	11/7/00	Measure B	Fail
Shall the Charter of Tehama County be amended by adding a new section being Article IV, Section 2(a) that reads: "Notwithstanding Article IV, Section 2 of this Charter, from and after February 1, 2002, the salary of each member of the Board of Supervisors shall be annually adjusted by the lesser of the average of the salary increases granted to Tehama County employees in the prior calendar year, or the change occurring in the prior calendar year in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U)."			
TUOLUMNE	3/7/00	Measure T	Pass
THIS MEASURE DOES NOT INCREASE TAXES. Shall any new voter-approved sales tax fund these transportation and safety improvements by implementing projects within twelve years (and limiting funding of administrative expenses to 1%)? Fix streets and roads, potholes; make street safety improvements; complete repairs and renovations to major streets and roads; replace fire equipment and make other improvements for the Tuolumne County Fire Department; increase public safety equipment and personnel for the City of Sonora.			
TUOLUMNE	3/7/00	Measure U	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Board of Supervisors enact a 1/2 cent sales tax for general governmental purposes, with the following mandatory restrictions? The sales tax shall expire after ten years. All tax proceeds shall be expended or encumbered within twelve years. The County Auditor-Controller, and independent elected official will conduct yearly audits of these sales tax expenditures. These expenditures will also be audited by an independent auditor.			
TUOLUMNE	11/7/00	Measure V	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall a special tax be imposed 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, 2001 and continuing through June 30, 2016?			
VENTURA	3/7/00	Measure F	Pass
Shall the ordinance that allows the expansion of the St. Joseph's Health and Retirement Center near Ojai, California, by approving and making effective and operative a Resolution and Ordinance No. 4201 of the Board of Supervisors of Ventura County (both adopted October 19, 1999), which will amend the Ventura County General Plan, the Ojai Valley Area Plan, and the Ventura County Zoning Ordinance, be adopted?			



## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2000

VENTURA	11/7/00	Measure O	Fail
Shall the ordinance that would appropriate all of the County of Ventura's tobacco settlement revenue to private hospitals and others for health care and health related purposes, and that would prohibit the use of such revenue for any County medical service, (an appropriation of approximately \$10 million per year) be adopted?			
YOLO	11/7/00	Measure P	Fail
Shall an Ordinance Amending Section 3-7.03 of the Yolo County Code to Increase the Transient Occupancy Tax Imposed within the Unincorporated Area of the County of Yolo from Eight Percent (8%) to Twelve Percent (12%) of Rent Charged by the Operator become effective?			
YUBA	11/7/00	Measure S	Fail
Shall a ten percent (10%) surcharge upon temporary lodgers in hotels, motels, and similar temporary lodging facilities be enacted?			
YUBA	11/7/00	Measure T	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the LOMA RICA/BROWNS VALLEY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT adopt a special tax whereby THE DISTRICT may levy annually a tax related to the use of property located within THE DISTRICT, such tax to be substituting for previous benefit assessment and special taxes, not to exceed the following: \$.03 per square foot, (with a minimum tax of \$15.00 per residential structure and \$30.00 per commercial structure) subject to annual cost of living adjustments, on the square footage of all taxable structures with a maximum cap which, after annual adjustments, may not exceed \$98.00 per structure without further approval of DISTRICT voters: the special tax to be assessed and collected with the Yuba County General Taxes commencing with the fiscal year 2001-2002 and continuing thereafter, and the proceeds of such tax to be used for the purposes authorized by the Community Services District Law?			
YUBA	11/7/00	Measure U	Pass (2/3 required)
EXHIBIT A Ordinance No. 00-02 imposes an annual special tax in the amount of \$40 for an unimproved parcel and \$50 for an improved parcel within the territorial boundaries of the Camptonville Community Services District, the revenue from which shall be exclusively dedicated to fire protection services. Shall Ordinance No. 00-02 be approved?			



TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		ORDINANCE		TAXES		POLICY/POSITION		GANN LIMIT		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda			1	1					2	1	1	0					4	2	6
Butte									1	0							1	0	1
Contra Costa					0	1					0	3			1	0	1	4	5
El Dorado	1	0					1	0			2	5					4	5	9
Fresno											0	1					0	1	1
Glenn											0	1					0	1	1
Imperial											0	1					0	1	1
Inyo							1	0							1	0	2	0	2
Kern											0	2					0	2	2
Lassen					1	0	1	0			0	1					2	1	3
Los Angeles			1	1													1	1	2
Marin											1	1			3	0	4	1	5
Mendocino									1	0							1	0	1
Monterey							1	0			1	0					2	0	2
Napa									0	1	0	2					0	3	3
Nevada											1	0					1	0	1
Orange							1	0	1	1							2	1	3
Placer											1	1					1	1	2
Plumas									1	0							1	0	1
Sacramento									0	1	1	2					1	3	4
San Benito							1	0									1	0	1
San Bernardino											1	1			1	0	2	1	3
San Diego			1	0			1	0			1	2					3	2	5
San Francisco	4	0							7	8	0	2	2	0			13	10	23
San Luis Obispo					1	0			0	1	0	1					1	2	3

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		ORDINANCE		TAXES		POLICY/POSITION		GANN LIMIT		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
San Mateo	0	1	0	1							1	0					1	2	3
Santa Barbara											0	1					0	1	1
Shasta											0	1					0	1	1
Siskiyou					2	0											2	0	2
Sonoma							0	1			1	3					1	4	5
Sutter											1	1					1	1	2
Tehama			0	2													0	2	2
Tuolumne					1	0					0	2					1	2	3
Ventura									1	1							1	1	2
Yolo											1	1					0	1	1
Yuba											1	2					1	2	3
All Counties	5	1	3	5	5	1	7	1	14	14	15	37	2	0	6	0	56	59	115

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda			1	1			1	1	1	0								1	0	4	2	6	
Butte							1	0												1	0	1	
Contra Costa			0	2	0	1					0	1					1	0			1	4	5
El Dorado									2	5	1	0						1	0	4	5	9	
Fresno											0	1									0	1	1
Glenn																		0	1	0	1	1	
Imperial																	0	1			0	1	1
Inyo							1	0									1	0			2	0	2
Kern					0	2															0	2	2
Lassen			1	0	0	1					1	0									2	1	3
Los Angeles							1	1													1	1	2
Marin															1	0	3	0	0	1	4	1	5
Mendocino																		1	0	1	0	1	
Monterey			1	0	1	0															2	0	2
Napa			0	1	0	1					0	1									0	3	3
Nevada									1	0											1	0	1
Orange			1	0			1	1													2	1	3
Placer			0	1											1	0					1	1	2
Plumas							1	0													1	0	1
Sacramento			0	1							1	2									1	3	4
San Benito									1	0											1	0	1
San Bernardino															0	1	2	0			2	1	3
San Diego					1	2	2	0													3	2	5
San Francisco	1	0	2	3			6	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1			0	2	13	10	23
San Luis Obispo			0	1											1	1					1	2	3

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2000

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUES		OTHER		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
San Mateo					1	1	0	1													1	2	3
Santa Barbara									0	1	0	1									0	1	1
Shasta					0	1															0	1	1
Siskiyou															2	0					2	0	2
Sonoma			0	1	1	0			0	2									0	1	1	4	5
Sutter											0	1							1	0	1	1	2
Tehama							0	2													0	2	2
Tuolumne									1	0	0	1					0	1			1	2	3
Ventura											1	1									1	1	2
Yolo																			0	1	0	1	1
Yuba					1	0													0	2	1	2	3
All Counties	1	0	6	11	5	9	14	8	8	8	5	9	1	0	5	3	7	2	4	8	56	59	115

---

PART 2

VOTE TOTALS FOR  
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

---





TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Haggerty	Scott Patrick	Mbr, Alameda Co. Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	55,658	55,658	100.0%	Yes	
			4	Full	Miley	Nate	City Councilmember	No	8	16,380	57,043	28.7%	Yes	
					Oliver	Audrey Rice	President/CEO	No	8	13,348	57,043	23.4%	No	
					Morrison	Brian A.	Castro Valley Business Owner	No	8	8,847	57,043	15.5%	No	
					Tangren	Linda M.	Businesswoman/Community Advocate	No	8	6,173	57,043	10.8%	No	
					Reyes	Vince	Human Relations Director	No	8	4,921	57,043	8.6%	No	
					Debro	Joseph	President Engineering Firm	No	8	4,230	57,043	7.4%	No	
					Scannell	Dan	Legislative Analyst/Consultant	No	8	1,761	57,043	3.1%	No	
					Breazal	Mark Henry	Economist/General Management	No	8	1,383	57,043	2.4%	No	
					5	Full	Carson	Keith	Mbr, Alameda Co. Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	53,112	53,112	100.0%
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	23	Full	Kliszewski	Mark A.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	96,352	233,738	41.2%	Yes	
	Krashna				David Matthew	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	78,839	233,738	33.7%	No		
	Strimling				Michael	Civil Litigation Attorney	No	3	58,547	233,738	25.0%	No		
		11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Miley	Nate	City Councilmember	No	2	45,146	82,369	54.8%	Yes
	Oliver					Audrey Rice	President/CEO	No	2	37,223	82,369	45.2%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Dublin San Ramon CSD*	Full	McCormick	Tom	Incumbent	Yes	10	3,353	20,369	16.5%	Yes		
	Ford			Thomas W. "Tom"	Retired Manager/Analyst	No	10	2,496	20,369	12.3%	Yes			
	Rose			Richard	Civil Engineer	No	10	2,485	20,369	12.2%	Yes			
	Scannell			Dan	Public Interest Advocate	No	10	2,464	20,369	12.1%	No			
	Vonheeder-Leo			Georgian	Board Member/Accountant	Yes	10	2,200	20,369	10.8%	No			
	Kohnen			James B.	Teacher/Engineer	Yes	10	2,181	20,369	10.7%	No			
	Lee			Richard T.	Operations Manager	No	10	2,016	20,369	9.9%	No			
	Kropp			Elmer Mark	Biotechnology Consultant	No	10	1,452	20,369	7.1%	No			
Cleary	Andrew J.			Computer Scientist	No	10	906	20,369	4.4%	No				
Breazeal	Mark H.			Management Consultant	No	10	816	20,369	4.0%	No				
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	23	Full	Krashna	David Matthew	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	185,587	364,959	50.9%	Yes		
Kliszewski				Mark A.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	179,372	364,959	49.1%	No			
ALPINE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Zellmer	Herman	Incumbent	Yes	1	65	65	100.0%	Yes	
			3	Full	Rakow	Katherine	Incumbent	Yes	1	39	39	100.0%	Yes	
			5	Full	Gansberg, Jr.	Chris H.	Incumbent	Yes	2	84	131	64.1%	Yes	
					O'Neal	Earl H.	Grant Writing Consultant	No	2	47	131	35.9%	No	
AMADOR	No County Contests													

\*CSD-Community Services District

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

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Coughlin	Dick	Small Business Owner	No	3	4,888	11,101	44.0%	Yes			
					Beeler	R. J. "Bob"	County Supervisor	Yes	3	4,796	11,101	43.2%	No			
					Thompson	Vene	Printer Computer Technician	No	3	1,379	11,101	12.4%	No			
			4	Full	Josiassen	Curt	Farmer/Businessman	No	1	9,679	9,854	98.2%	Yes			
			5	Full	Yamaguchi	Kim	Businessman	No	5	6,467	14,760	43.8%	Yes			
					Fulton	Len	Author/Publisher	No	5	4,381	14,760	29.7%	No			
					Hall	Rick	P.I.D. Director/Businessman	No	5	2,709	14,760	18.4%	No			
					Deppe	R. D. "Rick"	Building Inspector/Handyman	No	5	595	14,760	4.0%	No			
					Lee	J. Arnold	Physician	No	5	568	14,760	3.8%	No			
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Howell	Melanie	Attorney at Law	No	4	19,300	58,330	33.1%	Yes		
						Reilley	James F.	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	18,080	58,330	31.0%	No		
						Miller	Valerie	Attorney	No	4	10,873	58,330	18.6%	No		
						Moran	Mike	Attorney	No	4	9,915	58,330	17.0%	No		
						6	Full	Gunn	David E.	Court Commissioner	No	3	22,626	55,945	40.4%	Yes
								Benson	Stephen E.	Attorney at Law	No	3	20,425	55,945	36.5%	No
Glusman	Robert A.	Attorney at Law						No	3	12,729	55,945	22.8%	No			
11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Beeler	R. J. "Bob"	County Supervisor	Yes	2	7,237	13,559	53.4%	Yes				
				Coughlin	Dick	Small Business Owner	No	2	6,279	13,559	46.3%	No				
		5	Full	Yamaguchi	Kim	Businessman	No	2	10,860	18,305	59.3%	Yes				
				Fulton	Len	Author/Publisher	No	2	7,379	18,305	40.3%	No				
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Reilley	James	Prosecutor	No	2	42,133	78,563	53.6%	Yes			
					Howell	Melanie	Attorney at Law	No	2	36,229	78,563	46.1%	No			
			6	Full	Benson	Stephen E.	Attorney at Law	No	2	40,532	76,258	53.2%	Yes			
					Gunn	David E.	Court Commissioner	No	2	35,473	76,258	46.5%	No			
		CALAVERAS	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Thein	Lucille M.	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,752	2,688	65.2%	Yes	
							White	Michael	Building Contractor	No	2	936	2,688	34.8%	No	
2	Full				Stein	Paul	Incumbent	Yes	1	2,077	2,077	100.0%	Yes			
4	Full				Tryon	Thomas M.	County Supervisor/Rancher	No	2	1,691	3,227	52.4%	Yes			
					Klass	Ronald "Ron"	Local Businessman	No	2	1,536	3,227	47.6%	No			
COLUSA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	White	Doug	Incumbent	Yes	2	721	1,068	67.5%	Yes			
					Evans	Tom	Public Relations Counsel	No	2	337	1,068	31.6%	No			
			3	Full	Marshall	Mark	Fire Chief	No	2	657	835	78.7%	Yes			
					Jukusky	Peter	Executive Director	No	2	170	835	20.4%	No			
			4	Full	Waite	William R.	Farmer/Supervisor	Yes	2	568	1,062	53.5%	Yes			
					Masuero	Richard G.	Farm Manager	No	2	490	1,062	46.1%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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		
CONTRA COSTA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Uilkema	Gayle B.	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	3	33,839	49,666	68.1%	Yes		
					Carpenter	Ronald E.	Contractor/Professional Consultant	No	3	9,963	49,666	20.1%	No		
					White	Sean	Doctor of Chiropractic	No	3	5,864	49,666	11.8%	No		
			3	Full	Gerber	Donna	Incumbent	Yes	3	30,965	64,618	47.9%	Yes		
					Kinney	Curt	Mayor/Retired Policeman	No	3	19,758	64,618	30.6%	No		
					Thiessen	Brian D.	Attorney	No	3	13,895	64,618	21.5%	No		
			5	Full	Rocha	Mary	Mayor/Community Coordinator	No	6	13,176	48,040	27.4%	Yes		
					Glover	Federal D.	Councilman	No	6	12,607	48,040	26.2%	No		
					Kidd	Quintin	Mayor, City of Brentwood	No	6	9,637	48,040	20.1%	No		
					Elcenko	Noble O.	Director, Contra Costa Water District	No	6	7,922	48,040	16.5%	No		
					Delacruz	George	Retired	No	6	2,887	48,040	6.0%	No		
					Frederickson	Sandra	Community Promoter	No	6	1,811	48,040	3.8%	No		
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	13	Full	O'Malley	William Daniel	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	116,092	221,193	52.5%	Yes	
						Golub	Joel	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	54,583	221,193	24.7%	No	
						Starr	John M. "Jack"	Attorney/Arbitrator	No	3	50,518	221,193	22.8%	No	
11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Gerber	Donna	Contra Costa County Supervisor	Yes	2	57,006	83,781	68.0%	Yes			
				Kinney	Curt	Mayor/Retired Policeman	No	2	26,593	83,781	31.7%	No			
		5	Full	Glover	Federal D.	City Councilman	No	2	37,805	72,612	52.1%	Yes			
				Rocha	Mary	Mayor/Community Coordinator	No	2	34,479	72,612	47.5%	No			
DEL NORTE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Reese	Jack B.	District One Supervisor	Yes	1	577	577	100.0%	Yes		
					2	Full	McClure	Martha	Incumbent Supervisor/Educator	Yes	1	744	744	100.0%	Yes
					5	Full	Finigan	David	District Five Supervisor	Yes	1	1,119	1,119	100.0%	Yes
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Follett	William H.	Attorney	No	3	3,682	6,655	55.3%	Yes		
					Hoxeng	Scott	Attorney	No	3	1,975	6,655	29.7%	No		
					Henion	Dohn	Attorney/Prosecutor	No	3	998	6,655	15.0%	No		
EL DORADO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Platz	Janice	CSD Director	No	6	3,579	12,509	28.6%	Yes		
					Dupray	Rusty	Fire Captain/Paramedic	No	6	3,404	12,509	27.2%	No		
					Bleir	Bradford	Small Business Entrepreneur	No	6	2,142	12,509	17.1%	No		
					Colenzo	Robert	Small Business Owner	No	6	1,409	12,509	11.3%	No		
					Sellwood	Jeff	Children's Home Administrator	No	6	1,383	12,509	11.1%	No		
					Beardsley	Dave	Youth Counselor	No	6	592	12,509	4.7%	No		
			2	Full	Baumann	Helen K.	Nurse/School Trustee	No	4	4,293	11,832	36.3%	Yes		
					Bush	Kenneth	Retired Law Enforcement	No	4	3,167	11,832	26.8%	No		
					Day	Ellen	Local Business Owner	No	4	2,436	11,832	20.6%	No		
					Mahach	Tom	Retired Air Force	No	4	1,936	11,832	16.4%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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		
EL DORADO (continued)	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Borelli	Carl	Businessman	No	2	5,434	10,416	52.2%	Yes		
					Lishman	Kathi	Teacher/City Councilmember	No	2	4,982	10,416	47.8%	No		
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Dupray	Rusty	Fire Captain/Paramedic	No	2	10,901	16,834	64.8%	Yes		
					Platz	Janice	State Analyst	No	2	5,933	16,834	35.2%	No		
					2	Baumann	Helen K.	Nurse/School Trustee	No	2	7,878	15,438	51.0%	Yes	
						Bush	Kenneth	Retired Sheriff's Deputy	No	2	7,560	15,438	49.0%	No	
					DIRECTOR, Cameron Estates CSD	Full	Rea	Jonathan	Forester	No	3	255	663	38.5%	Yes
							Lustig	John L.	Incumbent	Yes	3	207	663	31.2%	Yes
							Silva	Heidi	Nurse	No	3	201	663	30.3%	No
					3	Sopocko	Richard	Retired Engineer Manager	No	2	206	369	55.8%	Yes	
						Sprague	Nelson J. "Nels"	Licensed General Contractor	No	2	163	369	44.2%	No	
					DIRECTOR, Cameron Park CSD	Full	Scharf	Glyn W.	Educator/Paramedic	No	6	2,425	10,774	22.5%	Yes
							Cater	Ken	Parole Board Commissioner	No	6	2,107	10,774	19.6%	Yes
							Johnson	David M.	Attorney at Law	No	6	2,077	10,774	19.3%	No
							Ramirez	Daniel	Juvenile Youth Counselor	No	6	1,660	10,774	15.4%	No
							Salsbury	Leonard	Retired Military	No	6	1,572	10,774	14.6%	No
							Hill	Nathan "Nate"	Project Manager	No	6	933	10,774	8.7%	No
					DIRECTOR, El Dorado Hills CSD	Full	Brilliant	Larry	Safety Manager	No	5	3,700	13,346	27.7%	Yes
							Witt	Norb	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	5	3,254	13,346	24.4%	Yes
							Leslie	F.J.	Incumbent	Yes	5	2,514	13,346	18.8%	No
							Dimitropoulos	Adel	Business Owner/Homemaker	No	5	2,077	13,346	15.6%	No
							Colenzo	Robert	Local Business Owner	No	5	1,801	13,346	13.5%	No
FRESNO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Anderson	Susan B.	Fresno County Clerk	No	4	22,844	49,533	46.1%	Yes		
					Steitz	Ken	Council President/Businessman	No	4	14,901	49,533	30.1%	No		
					Brand	Lee	Businessman	No	4	9,355	49,533	18.9%	No		
					Mendoza	John	County Planner	No	4	2,365	49,533	4.8%	No		
					3	Arambula	Juan	Incumbent	Yes	3	12,007	17,372	69.1%	Yes	
						Gaston	Rutherford "Bud"	Retired School Principal	No	3	3,564	17,372	20.5%	No	
						Bennett	Stanley E.	Substance Abuse Counselor	No	3	1,779	17,372	10.2%	No	
					5	Full	Waterston	Bob	Clovis Councilmember/Firefighter	No	5	20,168	38,401	52.5%	Yes
							Reynolds	Mike	Anti-Crime Advocate/Businessman	No	5	15,662	38,401	40.8%	No
							Erdman	Phil	Deputy Probation Officer	No	5	1,619	38,401	4.2%	No
							Carbone	Pasquale F.	Computer Programmer Analyst	No	5	869	38,401	2.3%	No
							Golden	Michael	No Ballot Designation	No	5	13	38,401	0.0%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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	
FRESNO (continued)	03/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Kazanjian	Debra	Attorney at Law	No	4	69,625	144,723	48.1%	Yes	
					Casas	Dan	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	40,300	144,723	27.8%	No	
					Hill	Glenda Allen	Superior Court Commissioner	No	4	24,402	144,723	16.9%	No	
					Roberts	David A.	Attorney at Law	No	4	10,187	144,723	7.0%	No	
				10	Full	York	Jane A.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	96,839	134,923	71.8%	Yes
						Criego	Franz	Attorney/Farmer/Cattleman	No	2	37,823	134,923	28.0%	No
		11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Anderson	Susan B.	Fresno County Clerk	No	2	44,471	64,924	68.5%	Yes
						Steitz	Ken	Council President/Businessman	No	2	20,383	64,924	31.4%	No
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Kazanjian	Debra	Attorney at Law	No	2	109,174	203,367	53.7%	Yes
						Casas	Dan	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	93,838	203,367	46.1%	No
GLENN	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McGowan	Thomas M.	Businessman/Farmer	No	2	843	1,568	53.8%	Yes	
						Harris, Sr.	Charles E.	Incumbent	Yes	2	718	1,568	45.8%	No
			3	Full	Sprague	Forrest J.	General Contractor/Businessman	No	3	923	1,813	50.9%	Yes	
					Reed	Ronald E.	Teacher	No	3	447	1,813	24.7%	No	
					Lobsien	Ronald J.	Farmer	No	3	437	1,813	24.1%	No	
			5	Full	Hansen	Keith C.	Incumbent	Yes	1	711	733	97.0%	Yes	
			HUMBOLDT	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Jimmy	Harbor Commissioner/Fisherman	No	7	2,989	8,929
Giacomini	Walt	Rancher/Businessman						No	7	2,390	8,929	26.8%	No	
Fullerton	John	Certified Public Accountant						No	7	999	8,929	11.2%	No	
Crawford	Chris	Technology Company Owner						No	7	990	8,929	11.1%	No	
Benemann	Carlos	Mayor						No	7	581	8,929	6.5%	No	
Lazio	Lawrence G.	Businessman						No	7	580	8,929	6.5%	No	
Olsen	Ginger	Businesswoman/Dairywoman/Educator						No	7	400	8,929	4.5%	No	
2	Full	Rodoni				Roger	Incumbent	Yes	2	5,402	7,499	72.0%	Yes	
		Fortson				Dan	Marketing Director	No	2	2,097	7,499	28.0%	No	
		Woolley				John	Incumbent	Yes	1	6,329	6,329	100.0%	Yes	
11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Jimmy	Harbor Commissioner/Fisherman	No	2	4,419	8,233	53.7%	Yes		
					Giacomini	Walt	Rancher/Businessman	No	2	3,814	8,233	46.3%	No	
IMPERIAL	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Cole	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,668	4,051	41.2%	Yes	
						Kuiper	Hank	Insurance Agent	No	3	1,610	4,051	39.7%	No
						Palacio	Vincente G.	Investigator	No	3	773	4,051	19.1%	No
			3	Full	Dhillon	David S.	Councilmember	No	6	1,635	4,741	34.5%	Yes	
					Maruca	Joe	Retired School Superintendent	No	6	1,347	4,741	28.4%	No	
					Gran	Mark T.	Businessman	No	6	523	4,741	11.0%	No	
					Bogue	Richard E.	No Ballot Designation	No	6	461	4,741	9.7%	No	
					Gaddis	Dave	Businessman	No	6	439	4,741	9.3%	No	
					Doyle	Jimmie	Real Estate Broker	No	6	336	4,741	7.1%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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		
IMPERIAL (continued)	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Wyatt	Gary	Crime Prevention	No	3	1,642	4,492	36.6%	Yes		
					Cardenas, Jr.	Rudy	Businessman	No	3	1,437	4,492	32.0%	No		
					Benson	John R.	Businessman	No	3	1,413	4,492	31.5%	No		
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Kuiper	Hank	Insurance Agent	No	2	2,630	4,923	53.4%	Yes		
					Cole	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,293	4,923	46.6%	No		
			3	Full	Maruca	Joe	Retired School Superintendent	No	2	3,869	6,683	57.9%	Yes		
					Dhillon	David S.	Councilmember	No	2	2,814	6,683	42.1%	No		
			4	Full	Wyatt	Gary	Crime Prevention	No	2	3,286	6,186	53.1%	Yes		
					Cardenas, Jr.	Rudy	Businessman	No	2	2,900	6,186	46.9%	No		
			INYO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Bear	Julie K.	Incumbent	Yes	1	815	815	100.0%
4	Full	Hambleton						Carroll "Butch"	Incumbent	Yes	2	905	1,282	70.6%	Yes
		Pound						Jack	Printer/Bulding Contractor	No	2	377	1,282	29.4%	No
5	Full	Dorame						Michael A.	5th District Supervisor	Yes	1	765	765	100.0%	Yes
KERN	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR						1	Full	McQuiston	Jon	Incumbent	Yes	1	22,919
			4	Full	Palla	Cathy	Businesswoman			No	4	12,635	27,785	45.5%	Yes
					Peterson	Ken	Incumbent			Yes	4	11,015	27,785	39.6%	No
					White	Michael W. "Mike"	Businessman			No	4	2,180	27,785	7.8%	No
					Neira	Delfino E.	Assistant Program Manager			No	4	1,915	27,785	6.9%	No
	5	Full	Parra	Pete H.	Incumbent	Yes	1	9,517	10,015	95.0%	Yes				
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	30	Full	Phillips	Craig	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	8,459	12,833	65.9%	Yes			
				Childers	Troy L.	Attorney	No	2	4,310	12,833	33.6%	No			
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Peterson	Ken	Incumbent	Yes	2	18,493	36,550	50.6%	Yes		
					Palla	Cathy	Businesswoman	No	2	18,057	36,550	49.4%	No		
DIRECTOR, Arvin CSD		Full	Arvizu	James "Jim"	Salesperson	No	4	908	2,167	41.9%	Yes				
			Hallum	Millard	Incumbent	Yes	4	509	2,167	23.5%	Yes				
			Sinden	Leo	Fertilizer Service Manager	No	4	422	2,167	19.5%	No				
			Embry	Walter	Incumbent	Yes	4	328	2,167	15.1%	No				
DIRECTOR, Golden Hills CSD		Full	Parrish	Debbie	Incumbent	Yes	11	885	7,472	11.8%	Yes				
			Hamlin	Ed	Assistant Research Director	No	11	881	7,472	11.8%	Yes				
			Yocum	Robert L.	Retired	No	11	878	7,472	11.8%	Yes				
			Kennedy	Eldwin "Ed"	Environmental Consultant/Businessman	No	11	786	7,472	10.5%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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		
KERN (continued)	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Golden Hills CSD		Full	McInerney	Lawrence E.	Retired	No	11	749	7,472	10.0%	No		
					Smith	David	Contract Administration Aerospace	No	11	722	7,472	9.7%	No		
					Sasia, Jr.	Joseph B.	Pipeline Maintenance	No	11	721	7,472	9.6%	No		
					Sargent	Ernest "Bud"	Incumbent	Yes	11	657	7,472	8.8%	No		
					Spector	Carl H. K.	Retired Accountant/Counselor	No	11	453	7,472	6.1%	No		
					White	Leroy E.	Businessman	No	11	423	7,472	5.7%	No		
					Weyrick	Clifford "Cliff"	Retired Contractor	No	11	317	7,472	4.2%	No		
	DIRECTOR, Rosamond CSD	Full	Sperling	Gary	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,952	4,896	39.9%	Yes				
			Wood	Gregory A.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	1,557	4,896	31.8%	Yes				
			MacKay	Ed	Businessman	No	3	1,387	4,896	28.3%	No				
KINGS	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Rachford	Jon	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,154	2,922	39.5%	Yes		
					Smith, Jr.	Allan A.	Local Businessman	No	3	1,152	2,922	39.4%	No		
					Oxford	Sonny-Merrill D.	Bakery Salesman	No	3	616	2,922	21.1%	No		
					5	Full	Taylor	Alene	Incumbent	Yes	3	2,396	4,375	54.8%	Yes
							Dias	Tony L.	Retired Farmer	No	3	1,570	4,375	35.9%	No
							Araujo	Tony	Businessman	No	3	409	4,375	9.3%	No
	SUPERIOR JUDGE-Corcaran	Full	Johnson	Charles R.	Judge	No	2	1,686	2,189	77.0%	Yes				
			Meyer	Laurence E.	Attorney/ Teacher	No	2	503	2,189	23.0%	No				
	SUPERIOR JUDGE-Lemoore	Full	Maciel	Ronald J.	Judge, Lemoore Court	No	2	3,089	5,068	61.0%	Yes				
			Strickland	Gregory	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	1,979	5,068	39.0%	No				
11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Rachford	Joni	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,216	3,827	57.9%	Yes			
				Smith, Jr.	Allan A.	Local Businessman	No	2	1,562	3,827	40.8%	No			
LAKE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Robey	Ed	County Supervisor, District 1	Yes	1	2,921	2,921	100.0%	Yes		
					4	Full	Farrington	Anthony W.	Educator	No	4	1,189	3,795	31.3%	Yes
							McCloud	Peggy J.	County Planning Commisioner	No	4	1,037	3,795	27.3%	No
							McQueen	Mary Ann	Businesswoman	No	4	966	3,795	25.5%	No
			Parmentier	Roy			Sales Associate	No	4	603	3,795	15.9%	No		
			5	Full	Brown	Robert "Bob"	Business Owner/Rancher	No	2	2,071	3,722	55.6%	Yes		
					Merriman	D. W. "Bill"	District 5 Supervisor	Yes	2	1,651	3,722	44.4%	No		
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Mann	Arthur H.	Superior Court Judge, Dept. 3	Yes	2	9,793	16,248	60.3%	Yes	
						Lunas	Michael S.	Attorney	No	2	6,455	16,248	39.7%	No	
			4	Full	Hedstrom	Steve	Attorney/Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	10,843	16,498	65.7%	Yes		
Tulanian	Steve	Attorney			No	2	5,655	16,498	34.3%	No					
11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Farrington	Anthony W.	Educator	No	2	3,011	4,517	66.7%	Yes			
				McCloud	Peggy J.	County Planning Commisioner	No	2	1,506	4,517	33.3%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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		
LASSEN	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pyle	Robert F.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	1,002	1,723	58.2%	Yes		
					Mattern	Robert W.	Retired Lumber Worker	No	3	584	1,723	33.9%	No		
					Bredstrand	William A.	Probation Officer	No	3	137	1,723	8.0%	No		
			2	Full	Chapman	Jim	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	1	1,063	1,063	100.0%	Yes		
					4	Full	Dahle	Brian D.	Rancher	Yes	1	1,198	1,198	100.0%	Yes
							SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Lazard	Ridgely	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	4,935
	Murphy	Richard R.	Attorney	No	2	3,111				8,046	38.7%	No			
	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Spalding CSD	Full	Lee	Howard E.	Retired Navy	No	3	106	284	37.3%	Yes			
				McDaniel	Gloria	Retired Businesswoman	No	3	88	284	31.0%	No			
				Kennemore	Kathie	Incumbent	Yes	3	88	284	31.0%	No			
		DIRECTOR, Westwood CSD	Full	Ceaglio	Nick	Engineer	No	6	414	2,059	20.1%	Yes			
				House	Kristine "Krissy"	Bookkeeper	No	6	398	2,059	19.3%	Yes			
Silva				Elta I.	Incumbent	Yes	6	395	2,059	19.2%	Yes				
Hasselwander				Arnold	Incumbent	Yes	6	325	2,059	15.8%	No				
Pritchard				Garry	Power Plant Manager	No	6	318	2,059	15.4%	No				
Edwards				Sonjia	Incumbent	Yes	6	206	2,059	10.0%	No				
LOS ANGELES				03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Burke	Yvonne	Supervisor Second District	Yes	1	180,481	180,481	100.0%
	4	Full	Knabe					Don	Supervisor Fourth District	Yes	1	177,398	177,398	100.0%	Yes
			5					Full	Antonovich	Michael D.	Supervisor 5th District	Yes	1	241,940	241,940
	DISTRICT ATTORNEY	Full	Cooley		Steve	Head Deputy D.A.	No	3	573,236	1,496,204	38.3%	Yes			
			Garcetti		Gil	District Attorney	Yes	3	558,066	1,496,204	37.3%	No			
			Groveman		Barry	Chief Investigative Attorney	No	3	364,902	1,496,204	24.4%	No			
	MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Alhambra	Full	Vargas-Rodriguez		Maria C.	Attorney/Law Professor	No	3	15,134	39,849	38.0%	Yes			
			Martinez		John L.	Judge of the Municipal Court	Yes	3	13,817	39,849	34.7%	No			
			Chin		Llewellyn	Teacher/Mediator/Attorney	No	3	10,898	39,849	27.3%	No			
	MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Antelope	1	Full	Estes	Christopher G.	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	25,355	45,395	55.9%	Yes			
				Bianchi	David	Family Law Attorney	No	2	20,040	45,395	44.1%	No			
		2	Full	Rogers	Pamela R.	Judge of the Municipal Court	Yes	3	27,435	42,136	65.1%	Yes			
Clark				William Allen	Attorney at Law	No	3	9,441	42,136	22.4%	No				
Layton				Larry H.	Actor/Attorney/Professor	No	3	5,260	42,136	12.5%	No				
MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Beverly				2	Full	Stone	Richard	Prosecutor/University Instructor	No	4	9,309	16,530	56.3%	Yes	
	Dawson	Mitchell J.	City Commissioner/Attorney			No	4	4,093	16,530	24.8%	No				
	Bobys	Hugh M.	Municipal Court Commissioner			No	4	2,487	16,530	15.0%	No				
	Khoury	John Antoine	Attorney at Law			No	4	641	16,530	3.9%	No				
MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Downey	4	Full	Rodriguez	Jesse I.	Judge, Downey Municipal Court	Yes	2	34,787	43,499	80.0%	Yes				
			Hopson	Kirt J.	Attorney	No	2	8,712	43,499	20.0%	No				



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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)	03/07/00	MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Inglewood	1	Full	Titus	Patricia	Criminal Prosecutor	No	2	21,036	39,669	53.0%	Yes
					Christian	Deborah L.	Commissioner Municipal Court	No	2	18,633	39,669	47.0%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Los Angeles	1	Full	Mintz	David M.	Criminal Prosecutor/Professor	No	6	89,042	419,663	21.2%	Yes
					Roberts	Vicki M.	Attorney at Law	No	6	86,786	419,663	20.7%	No
					Ladner	John	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	6	85,849	419,663	20.5%	No
					Stuart	David W.	Criminal Trial Prosecutor	No	6	68,152	419,663	16.2%	No
					Slawson	John A.	Municipal Court Commissioner	No	6	64,189	419,663	15.3%	No
					Silverton	Ronald R.	Attorney at Law	No	6	25,645	419,663	6.1%	No
		MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Los Angeles	44	Full	Rico	Richard E.	Judge of the Los Angeles Municipal Court	Yes	2	197,091	293,171	67.2%	Yes
					Borges	Bernita "Susan"	Attorney/Teacher	No	2	96,080	293,171	32.8%	No
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	31	Full	Mader	Katherine	Criminal Prosecutor	No	3	769,452	1,369,571	56.2%	Yes
					Carnahan	Douglas G.	Court Commissioner/Professor	No	3	333,476	1,369,571	24.3%	No
					Marckese	Jeffrey N.	Superior Court Referee	No	3	266,643	1,369,571	19.5%	No
		11/07/00	ASSESSOR	Full	Auerbach	Rick	Los Angeles County Assessor, Appointed	Yes	16	806,614	2,103,166	38.4%	Yes
					Salazar	Yolanda T.	Deputy Assessor	No	16	327,929	2,103,166	15.6%	No
					Wong	John Y.	Boardmember, Assessment Appeals	No	16	169,443	2,103,166	8.1%	No
					Lynch	John	Property Taxpayer Counsel	No	16	168,948	2,103,166	8.0%	No
					Garcia	Don	Chief, Assessment Appeals	No	16	112,461	2,103,166	5.3%	No
					McNeil	Mark	Deputy Assessor	No	16	99,419	2,103,166	4.7%	No
					Robles	Albert T.	City Treasurer	No	16	95,722	2,103,166	4.6%	No
Kester	Desmond				Deputy Assessor	No	16	59,645	2,103,166	2.8%	No		
Khalil	Khalil				Engineer/Financial Consultant	No	16	52,754	2,103,166	2.5%	No		
Lee	Peter W. "Pete"				Deputy Assessor	No	16	51,965	2,103,166	2.5%	No		
Hasley	John E.				Deputy County Assessor	No	16	46,424	2,103,166	2.2%	No		
Bannister	Wayne				Chief, Urban Research	No	16	36,279	2,103,166	1.7%	No		
Brogdon	John Carl				Retired Deputy Assessor	No	16	20,639	2,103,166	1.0%	No		
Loew	John				Deputy Assessor	No	16	19,705	2,103,166	0.9%	No		
Driver, III	F. Eugene				Deputy Assessor	No	16	18,849	2,103,166	0.9%	No		
Kumaus	Dan				Deputy Assessor	No	16	16,370	2,103,166	0.8%	No		
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	Full				Cooley	Steve	Head Deputy D.A.	No	2	1,448,418	2,271,264	63.8%	Yes
		Garcetti	Gil	District Attorney	Yes	2	822,846	2,271,264	36.2%	No			
MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Alhambra	Full	Martinez	John L.	Judge of the Municipal Court	Yes	2	35,693	57,020	62.6%	Yes			
		Vargas-Rodriguez	Maria C.	Attorney/Law Professor	No	2	21,327	57,020	37.4%	No			
MUNICIPAL JUDGE-Los Angeles	1	Full	Mintz	David M.	Prosecutor/Law Professor	No	2	411,192	771,024	53.3%	Yes		
			Roberts	Vicki M.	Attorney at Law	No	2	359,832	771,024	46.7%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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				
MADERA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Dominici	Ronn	Law Enforcement Officer	Yes	3	2,076	4,291	48.4%	Yes				
					McIntyre	Gail Hanhart	County Supervisor	Yes	3	1,692	4,291	39.4%	No				
					Scalzo	Marc	Administrative Consultant	No	3	523	4,291	12.2%	No				
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Silva	John V.	Supervisor, District 4	Yes	2	1,059	2,110	50.2%	Yes				
					Medellin-Esquivel	Marge	Employment/Training Coordinator	No	2	1,051	2,110	49.8%	No				
					Dominici	Ronn	Law Enforcement Officer	Yes	2	2,903	5,523	52.6%	Yes				
MARIN	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Brown, Jr.	Harold	Marin County Supervisor	Yes	1	13,640	13,640	100.0%	Yes				
					Rose	Annette	Incumbent	Yes	2	9,777	16,286	60.0%	Yes				
					Kendall	Toni	Educator	No	2	6,509	16,286	40.0%	No				
	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Kinsey	Steve	Marin County Supervisor	Yes	2	8,559	13,943	61.4%	Yes				
					Nuyens	Louis	Information Systems Manager	No	2	5,384	13,943	38.6%	No				
					Balmain	Doug	Incumbent	Yes	3	843	1,208	69.8%	Yes				
MARIPOSA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Bennett	Yvonne	Care Giver	No	3	269	1,208	22.3%	No				
					Upperman, Sr.	James M.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	96	1,208	7.9%	No				
					Parker	Garry R.	Incumbent	Yes	2	753	1,309	57.5%	Yes				
	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Borchard	Robert "Bob"	City Planner	No	2	556	1,309	42.5%	No				
					Pickard	Robert "Bob"	Incumbent	Yes	2	859	1,563	55.0%	Yes				
					Iudice	Ron	Businessperson	No	2	704	1,563	45.0%	No				
	11/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Walton	F. Dana	Attorney at Law	No	3	2,653	6,509	40.8%	Yes				
					Parrish	Wayne R. "Dick"	Attorney	No	3	2,374	6,509	36.5%	No				
					Dahlem	Steven W.	Attorney at Law	No	3	1,482	6,509	22.8%	No				
11/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Walton	F. Dana	Attorney at Law	No	2	4,133	7,717	53.6%	Yes					
				Parrish	Wayne R. "Dick"	Attorney	No	2	3,584	7,717	46.4%	No					
				MENDOCINO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Delbar	Mike	Supervisor, First District	Yes	2	2,837	4,578	62.0%	Yes
Haldane	Bruce	Journalist-Gardener	No						2	1,327	4,578	29.0%	No				
Shoemaker	Richard	2nd District Supervisor	Yes						2	2,601	4,453	58.4%	Yes				
03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full		Dickey	David L.	Small Business Owner	No	2	1,852	4,453	41.6%	No				
					Campbell	Patricia	4th District Supervisor	Yes	2	3,021	5,343	56.5%	Yes				
					Jones	Rodney Richard	Public Interest Lawyer	No	2	2,322	5,343	43.5%	No				
03/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Henderson	Richard J.	Attorney	No	2	12,761	23,204	55.0%	Yes					
				Jackson	Jone Lemos	Attorney	No	2	10,443	23,204	45.0%	No					
				Combest	Ronald R.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	15,139	22,866	66.2%	Yes					
03/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	5	Full	McDonald	Eugene T.	Attorney At Law	No	2	7,727	22,866	33.8%	No					
				MERCED	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Keene	Cloria Cortez	Supervisor District One	Yes	1	2,947	3,071	96.0%	Yes
									2	Full	Crookham	Kathleen M.	Supervisor District Two	Yes	1	6,399	6,529

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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
MERCED	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	4	Full	Kelsey	Deidre F.	Supervisor District Four	Yes	1	5,251	5,462	96.1%	Yes
(continued)		SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	Flannagan	Hugh M.	Attorney	No	2	19,729	33,690	58.6%	Yes
					Morris-Jones	Angil	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	13,849	33,690	41.1%	No
MODOC	No County Contests												
MONO	No County Contests												
MONTEREY	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Armenta	Fernando	City Councilman	No	2	3,860	7,165	53.9%	Yes
					Fickas	Paul	Businessman/Coach	No	2	3,305	7,165	46.1%	No
			4	Full	Johnsen	Edith	Monterey County Supervisor, District 4	Yes	2	5,334	9,200	58.0%	Yes
					Bailey	Debora "Debbie"	Small Businesswoman	No	2	3,866	9,200	42.0%	No
			5	Full	Potter	Dave	Monterey County Supervisor, 5th District	Yes	3	14,102	24,853	56.7%	Yes
					Kremer	Don	Independent Management Consultant	No	3	6,740	24,853	27.1%	No
Fosmark	Kathy Martins	Businesswoman			No	3	4,011	24,853	16.1%	No			
NAPA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Luce	Mark C.	Engineer/Incumbent	Yes	1	6,381	6,381	100.0%	Yes
					4	Full	Dodd	Bill	Local Businessowner	No	3	3,836	7,401
			Winter	Kathryn			Supervisor/Incumbent	Yes	3	2,821	7,401	38.1%	No
			Malan	Christine "Chris"			Counselor/Businessperson	No	3	744	7,401	10.1%	No
			5	Full	Rippey	Mike	Fifth District Supervisor	Yes	3	3,565	6,747	52.8%	Yes
					Henderson	Ed	Mayor/Retired Educator	No	3	2,720	6,747	40.3%	No
				Reyes, Sr.	Samuel John	Businessman	No	3	462	6,747	6.8%	No	
NEVADA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Van Zant	Peter	Business Owner/Supervisor	Yes	3	3,661	8,111	45.1%	Yes
					Seghezzi	Gregory Peter	Small Businessman	No	3	3,499	8,111	43.1%	No
					Ingram	Russel W. "Pat"	Consulting Civil Engineer	No	3	935	8,111	11.5%	No
			2	Full	Clarke	Gary	Dir, Break River Recreation & Park Dis	No	4	3,444	7,165	48.1%	Yes
					Conley	Arthur "Art"	Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	4	2,637	7,165	36.8%	No
					Marsh	Dave	Retired Businessman	No	4	532	7,165	7.4%	No
	Ferrari	Craig			Businessman	No	4	523	7,165	7.3%	No		
	5	Full	Green	Barbara	Businessperson	No	3	3,339	6,238	53.5%	Yes		
			Hall	Clyde A.	Retired Engineer	No	3	2,360	6,238	37.8%	No		
			Steele	Marion William	Entrepreneur	No	3	517	6,238	8.3%	No		
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Van Zant	Peter	Businessman/County Supervisor	Yes	2	5,317	9,957	53.4%	Yes
					Seghezzi	Gregory Peter	Small Businessman	No	2	4,560	9,957	45.8%	No
2			Full	Clarke	Gary	Dir, Break River Recreation & Park Dis	No	2	3,767	8,875	42.4%	Yes	
	Conley	Arthur "Art"		Retired Deputy Sheriff	No	2	1,194	8,875	13.5%	No			
ORANGE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Charles V.	Incumbent	Yes	2	38,369	63,342	60.6%	Yes
					Elizondo	Eleazar G.	Educator	No	2	24,973	63,342	39.4%	No
			3	Full	Spitzer	Todd	Supervisor, Third District	Yes	1	119,450	119,450	100.0%	Yes

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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	
ORANGE (continued)	03/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Kelly	Marc	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	418,424	548,611	76.3%	Yes	
					Gullixson	John Michael	Attorney/Mayor, City of Yorba Linda	No	2	130,187	548,611	23.7%	No	
			6	Full	Conley	John	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	305,332	534,019	57.2%	Yes	
					Larsh	Erick L. "Rick"	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	228,687	534,019	42.8%	No	
			7	Full	Fell	Sheila	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	244,388	536,576	45.5%	Yes	
					Dunn	Tom	Senior Judicial Attorney	No	3	201,829	536,576	37.6%	No	
					Leversen	Michael A.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	90,359	536,576	16.8%	No	
			10	Full	Paer	Gary	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	330,769	530,497	62.4%	Yes	
					Oliver	Terese S.	Prosecutor	No	2	199,728	530,497	37.6%	No	
			24	Full	George	Stephanie	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	332,224	544,110	61.1%	Yes	
					Capizzi	Michael R.	Retired District Attorney	No	2	211,886	544,110	38.9%	No	
			26	Full	Siegel	H. Warren	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	3	299,115	517,858	57.8%	Yes	
					Anderson	Fred	Consumer Law Attorney	No	3	156,210	517,858	30.2%	No	
					Farrar	Mark E.	Attorney at Law	No	3	62,533	517,858	12.1%	No	
			30	Full	McNerney	Dan	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	235,028	514,087	45.7%	Yes	
					Nolan	Jan	Retired Orange County Prosecutor	No	4	115,593	514,087	22.5%	No	
					Cassidy	Michael J.	Superior Court Referee	No	4	92,382	514,087	18.0%	No	
					Duarte	Jamie	Consumer Law Attorney	No	4	71,084	514,087	13.8%	No	
			11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Rossmoor CSD	Full	Poe	Tom	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	5	3,058	11,420	26.8%	Yes
						Coleman-Hyman	Dawn	Appointed Director, Rossmoor CSD	Yes	5	2,520	11,420	22.1%	Yes
Anisman	Erwin	Retired Project Engineer				No	5	2,449	11,420	21.4%	Yes			
Boyd	James	Appointed Director, Rossmoor CSD				Yes	5	2,339	11,420	20.5%	No			
Pummel	Gerald	Retired Telecommunications Engineer				No	5	1,054	11,420	9.2%	No			
Short	Alexander	Jim			Retired Military Officer	No	2	2,589	4,971	52.1%	Yes			
	Goodrich	Linda			Dir, Rossmoor Community Services Dist	Yes	2	2,382	4,971	47.9%	No			
7	Full	Fell			Sheila	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	417,382	765,852	54.5%	Yes		
		Dunn			Tom	Senior Judicial Attorney	No	2	348,470	765,852	45.5%	No		
30	Full	McNerney			Dan	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	478,532	757,571	63.2%	Yes		
		Nolan	Jan	Retired Orange County Prosecutor	No	2	279,039	757,571	36.8%	No				
PLACER	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	White	Harriet	Incumbent	Yes	2	7,960	13,637	58.4%	Yes	
					Williams	George E.	City Councilman/Consultant	No	2	5,620	13,637	41.2%	No	
			4	Full	Gaines	Ted	Small Business Owner	No	3	8,444	16,391	51.5%	Yes	
					Harris	Sandy	Secretary Special Education	No	3	6,539	16,391	39.9%	No	
					Ucovich	Miguel	Loomis Councilmember/Businessman	No	3	1,374	16,391	8.4%	No	
			5	Full	Bloomfield	Rex	Placer County Supervisor/Teacher	Yes	3	6,376	12,724	50.1%	Yes	
					Kranz	Bruce	State Parks Superintendent	No	3	5,269	12,724	41.4%	No	
					Gilbert	Stephen	Service Technician	No	3	1,033	12,724	8.1%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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	
PLACER (continued)	03/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE		Full	O'Flaherty	Joseph W.	Placer County Superior Court Judge	No	2	45,321	77,167	58.7%	Yes	
					Dutton	John	Local Attorney/Businessman	No	2	31,347	77,167	40.6%	No	
	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Heather Glen CSD		Full	Lowary	Willa May	Director, Heather Glen CSD	Yes	2	59	93	63.4%	Yes	
					De Berge	Vickie	House Cleaner	No	2	31	93	33.3%	No	
					DIRECTOR, Northstar CSD	Mann	Marion "Monk"	Retired Civil Engineer	No	3	85	228	37.3%	Yes
						Campion	Byrne	Incumbent	Yes	3	75	228	32.9%	Yes
PLUMAS	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Pearson	B. J.	Businessman	No	3	522	1,506	34.7%	Yes	
					Roudebush	Fran	Supervisor District 1	Yes	3	476	1,506	31.6%	No	
					Fuller	Jerry L.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	61	1,506	4.1%	No	
			2		Meacher	Robert	Incumbent	Yes	3	554	1,439	38.5%	Yes	
					Tucker	Nathan W.	Businessman/ Volunteer Firefighter	No	3	484	1,439	33.6%	No	
					Delizio	Mark K.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	391	1,439	27.2%	No	
			4		Nelson	Kenneth R.	Business Owner	No	4	740	1,643	45.0%	Yes	
					Bresciani	Philip A.	Incumbent	Yes	4	482	1,643	29.3%	No	
					Reeves	Harry	Semi-Retired	No	4	243	1,643	14.8%	No	
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Olney	Garret William	Superior Court Judge	Yes	4	3,641	8,463	43.0%	Yes		
				Settlemyre	Craig	Attorney at Law	No	4	2,106	8,463	24.9%	No		
				McGowan	Gary T.	Deputy District Attorney	No	4	1,679	8,463	19.8%	No		
	05/23/00	DIRECTOR, Whitehawk Ranch CSD		Short	Zube	George C.	Attorney	No	4	1,019	8,463	12.0%	No	
					Purvis	Jim	Retired Dentist	No	3	50	143	35.0%	Yes	
					Skutt	Terri	Homemaker	No	3	49	143	34.3%	Yes	
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Stowell	Richard	No Ballot Designation	No	3	44	143	30.8%	No	
					Pearson	B. J.	Businessman	No	2	908	1,818	49.9%	Yes	
					Roudebush	Fran	Supervisor District 1	Yes	2	892	1,818	49.1%	No	
2			Meacher		Robert	Incumbent	Yes	2	857	1,644	52.1%	Yes		
			Tucker		Nathan W.	Businessman/ Volunteer Firefighter	No	2	780	1,644	47.4%	No		
4			Nelson		Kenneth R.	Business Owner	No	2	1,211	1,928	62.8%	Yes		
			Bresciani		Philip A.	Incumbent	Yes	2	710	1,928	36.8%	No		
SUPERIOR JUDGE			1		Full	Olney	Garret William	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	5,395	10,116	53.3%	Yes
						Settlemyre	Craig	Attorney at Law	No	2	4,695	10,116	46.4%	No
RIVERSIDE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Buster	Bob	County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	3	30,024	59,441	50.5%	Yes	
					Bell	John	Corporate Facilities Director	No	3	25,260	59,441	42.5%	No	
					Poppa	Les	Industrial Programmer	No	3	4,157	59,441	7.0%	No	
			3		Venable	Jim	Riverside County Supervisor	Yes	1	60,621	60,621	100.0%	Yes	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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			
RIVERSIDE (continued)	03/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Zellerbach	Paul E.	Supervising District Attorney	No	2	148,943	251,557	59.2%	Yes			
					Swanson	Martin H.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	102,614	251,557	40.8%	No			
	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Rubidoux CSD			Full	Muniz	Armando	Incumbent	Yes	5	2,285	9,357	24.4%	Yes		
						Thompson	Leland	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,993	9,357	21.3%	Yes		
						Newberry	Garth M.	High School Teacher	No	5	1,989	9,357	21.3%	Yes		
						Calzada	Gilbert J.	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,606	9,357	17.2%	No		
						Rasmussen	Vaughn	Field Operations Supervisor	No	5	1,484	9,357	15.9%	No		
	SACRAMENTO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Johnson	Muriel P.	Sacramento County Supervisor	Yes	2	45,545	65,242	69.8%	Yes		
						Duveneck	Mike	Clinical Psychologist/Consultant	No	2	19,697	65,242	30.2%	No		
4				Full	Niello	Roger	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	3	43,471	65,483	66.4%	Yes			
					Stevens	Douglas	Business Owner	No	3	11,039	65,483	16.9%	No			
1			Full	Russell	Tony	Employment Development Analyst	No	3	10,973	65,483	16.8%	No				
11/07/00			SUPERIOR JUDGE			Full	Burger	Trena	Attorney/Fire Commissioner	No	3	130,636	279,422	46.8%	Yes	
							Steed	Don	Supervising District Attorney	No	3	113,730	279,422	40.7%	No	
							Engel	Julius M.	Senior Supervising Attorney	No	3	35,056	279,422	12.5%	No	
							DIRECTOR, Elk Grove CSD	Full	Perez	Pat	Incumbent	Yes	7	13,810	65,133	21.2%
		McElroy							Doug	Incumbent	Yes	7	12,554	65,133	19.3%	Yes
		Derr							Gerald H.	Retired Fire Chief	No	7	11,145	65,133	17.1%	Yes
Fetler		Mark	Appointed Elk Grove CSD Board Member	Yes	7	10,890			65,133	16.7%	No					
Short		Full	Powell	Lorna D.	Retired Peace Officer	No	7	8,155	65,133	12.5%	No					
			Villanueva	Brian	Engineering Manager	No	7	5,701	65,133	8.8%	No					
DIRECTOR, Rancho Murieta CSD		Full				Coleman	Scott D.	Programmer	No	7	2,878	65,133	4.4%	No		
						Wright	Elaine	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	18,731	25,472	73.5%	Yes		
						Bingham	Gary R.	Construction Worker/Millwright	No	2	6,741	25,472	26.5%	No		
						White	Bill	Retired Pilot/Manager	No	6	1,116	4,010	27.8%	Yes		
						Kuntz	Wayne W.	Retired Engineer	No	6	811	4,010	20.2%	Yes		
	Peacock					Ginger	DOJ, Field Representative	No	6	696	4,010	17.4%	No			
	Hashorva					Frank	Retired School Administrator	No	6	534	4,010	13.3%	No			
	Solomon					Myrna	Bank Teller	No	6	475	4,010	11.8%	No			
	Hensley					R. Joyce	Chief Executive Officer	No	6	378	4,010	9.4%	No			
	SUPERIOR JUDGE					1	Full			Burger	Trena	Supervising Civil Attorney	No	2	216,064	384,198
Steed		Don	Supervising District Attorney	No	2					168,134	384,198	43.8%	No			
SAN BENITO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Scagliotti	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,409	2,695	52.3%	Yes			
					Crisafulli	Roseline	Businesswoman	No	2	1,273	2,695	47.2%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 BENITO (continued)	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Place	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	4	787	2,339	33.6%	Yes			
					Kesler	Ruth	Child Planning Commissioner	No	4	736	2,339	31.5%	No			
					Holte	Marley	Mayor, SJB	No	4	621	2,339	26.5%	No			
					Shelton	John	Marketing Consultant	No	4	188	2,339	8.0%	No			
					Cruz	Bob	Incumbent	Yes	1	1,316	1,361	96.7%	Yes			
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Sanders	Steve	County Counsel	No	5	3,343	7,969	42.0%	Yes				
				Breen	Paul	Attorney	No	5	3,143	7,969	39.4%	No				
				Dankar	Harry	District Attorney	No	5	2,485	7,969	31.2%	No				
				Marshall	Patrick	Attorney at Law	No	5	1,296	7,969	16.3%	No				
				Brown	Maurie	Attorney at Law	No	5	1,023	7,969	12.8%	No				
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Kesler	Ruth	Child Planning Commissioner	No	2	1,589	2,975	53.4%	Yes			
					Place	Richard	Incumbent	Yes	2	1,370	2,975	46.1%	No			
					Sanders	Steve	County Counsel	No	2	9,112	15,816	57.6%	Yes			
					Breen	Paul	Attorney	No	2	6,637	15,816	42.0%	No			
SAN BERNARDINO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Postmus	Bill	Businessman/Legislative Director	No	6	24,105	60,935	39.6%	Yes			
					Davis	Kathy A.	San Bernardino County Supervisor	Yes	6	18,271	60,935	30.0%	No			
					Busby	Jim	Retired/Business Executive	No	6	8,664	60,935	14.2%	No			
					Garza	Marcelino	Businessman/Educational Specialist	No	6	4,564	60,935	7.5%	No			
					Burnell	Scott A.	Police Lieutenant/Businessman	No	6	3,033	60,935	5.0%	No			
					Channing	Richard	Life Support Nurse	No	6	2,298	60,935	3.8%	No			
					3	Full	Hansberger	Dennis	San Bernardino County Supervisor	Yes	3	46,742	66,905	69.9%	Yes	
							Negin	Gary A.	University Professor	No	3	13,031	66,905	19.5%	No	
							Wilson	Robert	Automated Systems Analyst	No	3	7,132	66,905	10.7%	No	
					5	Full	Eaves	Jerry	San Bernardino County Supervisor	Yes	5	15,975	35,295	45.3%	Yes	
							Scott	Ed	Businessman/Rialto Councilmember	No	5	7,017	35,295	19.9%	No	
							Lopez-Carson	Maria	Gov. Board Member, Colton Joint USD	No	5	6,970	35,295	19.7%	No	
							McGinnis	Gordon	Councilmember, City of San Bernardino	No	5	2,749	35,295	7.8%	No	
							Lindberg	Maureen K.	Educator	No	5	2,584	35,295	7.3%	No	
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Kamansky	Craig S.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	173,446	245,512	70.6%	Yes
								Redinger	G. S.	Constitutional Lawyer	No	2	72,066	245,512	29.4%	No
					7	Full	Harrison	Arthur	Deputy District Attorney	No	5	112,784	238,571	47.3%	Yes	
							de la Pena	Mary "M. J."	Attorney at Law	M	5	52,504	238,571	22.0%	No	
							Brock	E. Lawrence	Attorney/Litigator/Arbitrator	No	5	29,665	238,571	12.4%	No	
							Pankratz	Steve	Automobile Club Attorney	No	5	25,589	238,571	10.7%	No	
Morales	William J.	Lawyer	No	5			18,029	238,571	7.6%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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)	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Postmus	Bill	Businessman/Legislative Director	No	2	44,986	85,616	52.5%	Yes	
					Davis	Kathy A.	San Bernadino County Supervisor	Yes	2	40,630	85,616	47.5%	No	
			5	Full	Eaves	Jerry	San Bernadino County Supervisor	Yes	2	27,265	53,515	50.9%	Yes	
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Skropos	Gus James	Municipal Law Attorney	No	1	273,364	273,364	100.0%	Yes	
					Harrison	Arthur	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	196,977	358,022	55.0%	Yes	
			7	Full	de la Pena	Mary "M. J."	Attorney at Law	No	2	161,045	358,022	45.0%	No	
SAN DIEGO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cox	Greg	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	1	61,479	61,479	100.0%	Yes	
					2	Full	Jacob	Dianne	San Diego County Supervisor	Yes	4	84,505	137,353	61.5%
			4	Full	Madrid	Art	Mayor, La Mesa	No	4	32,482	137,353	23.6%	No	
					McCarthy	Florence L.	Health Administrator/Educator	No	4	11,729	137,353	8.5%	No	
					Hammerstrand	John L.	Environment Health Specialist	No	4	8,637	137,353	6.3%	No	
			3	Full	Slater	Pam	County Supervisor, District 3	Yes	3	92,310	149,496	61.7%	Yes	
					Dodson	Marion B.	Solana Beach Mayor/Businesswoman	No	3	35,443	149,496	23.7%	No	
					Bourke	Ken	Engineer/Teacher/Realtor	No	3	21,743	149,496	14.5%	No	
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	25	Full	O'Connell	Bill	Attorney/Judicial Arbitrator	No	3	185,333	464,381	39.9%	Yes
						Ervin	Charles W.	Sheriff's Chief Counsel	No	3	182,958	464,381	39.4%	No
		Yost				Lloyd	Attorney/Arbitrator/Mediator	No	3	96,090	464,381	20.7%	No	
		26	Full	Pate	William C. "Bill"	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	344,203	440,297	78.2%	Yes		
				Teyssier	Paul	Lawyer	No	2	96,094	440,297	21.8%	No		
		44	Full	Maguire	Frederick	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	269,369	425,659	63.3%	Yes		
				Whitney	Richard S.	Practicing Courtroom Attorney	No	3	90,779	425,659	21.3%	No		
				White	K. Martin	Attorney	No	3	65,511	425,659	15.4%	No		
		46	Full	Rogers	Charles G.	Judge	No	3	230,100	437,474	52.6%	Yes		
				Shaw	Dennis	Businessman/Professor/Attorney	No	3	145,390	437,474	33.2%	No		
				Miller	Richard P.	Attorney	No	3	61,984	437,474	14.2%	No		
		11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Jacumba CSD	Full	Mitchell	Peter	Retired	No	3	75	213	35.2%	Yes	
Bossard	Thomas Rodney				Military	No	3	69	213	32.4%	No			
Theel	Larry Dean				Retired	No	3	69	213	32.4%	No			
DIRECTOR, Julian CSD	Full		Porter, Jr.	William H.	Artist/Blacksmith	No	6	68	260	26.2%	Yes			
			Klaesson	Susan M.	Housewife/Business Owner	No	6	53	260	20.4%	Yes			
			Straube	Darrell	Businessman	No	6	50	260	19.2%	Yes			
			Arter	Scott A.	Property Management	No	6	41	260	15.8%	No			
			Levan	Patricia	Editor	No	6	26	260	10.0%	No			
			Kerr	Starr	Homemaker	No	6	22	260	8.5%	No			



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 DIEGO (continued)	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Valley Center CSD		Full	Lamb	Ronald A.	Nurseryman/Retired Teacher	No	3	3,275	7,930	41.3%	Yes		
					Scibilia	John M.	General Engineering Contractor	No	3	2,635	7,930	33.2%	Yes		
					Bumgardner	Thomas T.	Retired Citizen	No	3	2,020	7,930	25.5%	No		
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	25	Full	Ervin	Charles	Attorney/Sheriff's Department	No	2	397,649	761,144	52.2%	Yes		
					O'Connell	Bill	Attorney/Arbitrator	No	2	363,495	761,144	47.8%	No		
SAN FRANCISCO	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Yaki	Michael	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	5	9,056	23,713	38.2%	Yes		
					McGoldrick	Jake	College English Teacher	No	5	6,726	23,713	28.4%	No		
					Tsai	Rose	Neighborhood Advocate/Radio Host	No	5	5,241	23,713	22.1%	No		
					Konopaski	Ron "Dr. K"	Dentist - Retired	No	5	2,029	23,713	8.6%	No		
					Jungreis	Jason Z.	Attorney	No	5	661	23,713	2.8%	No		
					2	Full	Newsom	Gavin	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	26,192	26,192	100.0%	Yes
					3	Full	Peskin	Aaron	President, Environmental Nonprofit	No	8	7,542	20,847	36.2%	Yes
							Wong	Lawrence	S.F. Community College Board Member	No	8	3,068	20,847	14.7%	No
							Levitan	Meagan	Community Affairs Director	No	8	2,648	20,847	12.7%	No
							Chung	Rose	Health Care Professional	No	8	2,286	20,847	11.0%	No
							DeNunzio	Mike	Community Projects Consultant	No	8	2,247	20,847	10.8%	No
							Becerril	Alicia	Mbr, San Francisco Board of Supervisors	Yes	8	2,187	20,847	10.5%	No
							Coleman	Bob	Attorney/Educator	No	8	520	20,847	2.5%	No
							Jacobucci	Pelino "Paul"	No Ballot Designation	No	8	349	20,847	1.7%	No
					4	Full	Yee	Leland	Educator/San Francisco Supervisor	Yes	7	10,614	24,287	43.7%	Yes
							Shanley	John	Public Relations Specialist	No	7	4,095	24,287	16.9%	No
							Hsieh	Tom	Small Business Owner	No	7	3,872	24,287	15.9%	No
							Dudum	Ron	Small Businessman	No	7	3,688	24,287	15.2%	No
							Honda	Darryl	No Ballot Designation	No	7	823	24,287	3.4%	No
							Vuong	Vu-Duc	Teacher	No	7	656	24,287	2.7%	No
							Rogers	Jeffrey Dilwyn	Husband/Father/Craftsman	No	7	539	24,287	2.2%	No
							5	Full	Gonzalez	Matt	Sr. Trial Attorney, Public Defender's Off.	No	11	12,640	29,721
					Owens	Juanita			City College Dean	No	11	8,459	29,721	28.5%	No
					Jaicks	Agar			TV Director/Producer	No	11	3,584	29,721	12.1%	No
					Turner	Holman			Educator/Artist/Businessman	No	11	1,250	29,721	4.2%	No
					Hongisto	Richard			No Ballot Designation	No	11	1,183	29,721	4.0%	No
					Konopka	Joe			Food Service Consultant	No	11	782	29,721	2.6%	No
					Bagi	Jay			Restaurateur/Chef	No	11	739	29,721	2.5%	No
					Gaffney	Nicholas			Public Relations Consultant/Lawyer	No	11	498	29,721	1.7%	No
					Barrett	Demian			Business Owner	No	11	320	29,721	1.1%	No
Palmer	John D.	Business Systems Consultant	No	11	162	29,721			0.5%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 FRANCISCO (continued)	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	6	Full	Anderson	Rob	No Ballot Designation	No	11	104	29,721	0.3%	No					
					Daly	Chris	Affordable Housing Organizer	No	17	5,922	18,300	32.4%	Yes					
					Dittenhafer	Chris	Commissioner/Bank Manager	No	17	2,852	18,300	15.6%	No					
					Silver	Carol Ruth	Attorney/Businesswoman/Mother	No	17	2,607	18,300	14.2%	No					
					Magilavy	Beryl	President, Environmental Nonprofit	No	17	2,135	18,300	11.7%	No					
					Jones	Davy	Pres., Prostate Cancer Nonprofit Corp.	No	17	729	18,300	4.0%	No					
					D'Anne	Denise	Retired Mgr, Dept. of Human Services	No	17	587	18,300	3.2%	No					
					Wilson	Hank	Social Justice Activist	No	17	498	18,300	2.7%	No					
					Saloman	Marc	Engineer/Environmentalist	No	17	490	18,300	2.7%	No					
					Blue	Joseph	Senior Loan Consultant	No	17	473	18,300	2.6%	No					
					Roughgarden	Joan	Ecologist/Author/Professor	No	17	468	18,300	2.6%	No					
					Reid	Jim	Building Contractor	No	17	397	18,300	2.2%	No					
					Jenkins	Garrett	Community Relations Officer	No	17	357	18,300	2.0%	No					
					Dunn	James Leo	Inventor	No	17	196	18,300	1.1%	No					
					Holland	Brenton	Property Management/Business Owner	No	17	196	18,300	1.1%	No					
					Brown	Harold L.	No Ballot Designation	No	17	182	18,300	1.0%	No					
					Isner	Dennis	No Ballot Designation	No	17	162	18,300	0.9%	No					
					Criswell	Gilbert F.	Journalist/Cable Talk Show Host	No	17	49	18,300	0.3%	No					
								7	Full	Teng	Mabel	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	6	13,105	29,844	43.9%	Yes
										Hall	Tony	City Executive/Administrator	No	6	6,650	29,844	22.3%	No
										O'Brien	Rennie	Health Care Practitioner	No	6	3,622	29,844	12.1%	No
Wilson	Bud	Retired USAF Officer	No	6						3,241	29,844	10.9%	No					
Hoogasian	Harold M.	Small Business Owner	No	6						2,762	29,844	9.3%	No					
Mogannam	Maryo	Small Businessman/Notary Public	No	6						464	29,844	1.6%	No					
			8	Full	Leno	Mark	San Francisco Supervisor	Yes	6	16,834	33,665	50.0%	Yes					
					Hansen	Eileen	Public Policy Director	No	6	11,370	33,665	33.8%	No					
					Green	James	Fire Department Paramedic	No	6	2,027	33,665	6.0%	No					
					Virginia	Gary	AIDS Fundraiser	No	6	1,317	33,665	3.9%	No					
					Bingham	Scott	CEO, Internet Company	No	6	1,199	33,665	3.6%	No					
					O'Hearn	Shawn	HIV Prevention Educator	No	6	918	33,665	2.7%	No					
			9	Full	Ammiano	Tom	Supervisor	Yes	5	14,181	20,738	68.4%	Yes					
					Martinez	Maria	Citizen's Complaint Officer	No	5	2,934	20,738	14.1%	No					
					Bermudez	Lucrecia	No Ballot Designation	No	5	1,369	20,738	6.6%	No					
					Norlin	Ron	Businessman/Entrepreneur	No	5	1,149	20,738	5.5%	No					
					Tulier	Valerie	Community Advocate/Consultant	No	5	1,105	20,738	5.3%	No					

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 FRANCISCO (continued)	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	10	Full	Richardson	Linda	SF Planning Commissioner	No	12	6,349	19,382	32.8%	Yes
					Maxwell	Sophenia	Electrician	No	12	4,042	19,382	20.9%	No
					Harrison	Marie	Columnist/Arbitrator/Counselor	No	12	1,745	19,382	9.0%	No
					Jackson	Espanola	Consultant/Community Liaison	No	12	1,671	19,382	8.6%	No
					Chan	Robert H.	Nonprofit Executive Director	No	12	1,492	19,382	7.7%	No
					Rodriguez	Jim	Health Care Professional	No	12	952	19,382	4.9%	No
					Shockey	Larry	Civil Rights Attorney	No	12	779	19,382	4.0%	No
					Yee	Hubert	Marketing Specialist	No	12	776	19,382	4.0%	No
					Jusino	Dwayne	Insurance Fraud Investigator	No	12	570	19,382	2.9%	No
					Manuel	J. R.	Businessman/Developer	No	12	469	19,382	2.4%	No
			Banks	Hamp "Bubba"	Songwriter/Record Prod./Entrepreneur	No	12	341	19,382	1.8%	No		
			Bertone	Don	No Ballot Designation	No	12	196	19,382	1.0%	No		
			11	Full	Sandoval	Gerardo	Deputy Public Defender	No	9	6,211	21,035	29.5%	Yes
					Brown	Amos	Incumbent	Yes	9	5,600	21,035	26.6%	No
					Lim	Myrna Viray	Businesswoman/Mother	No	9	4,048	21,035	19.2%	No
					Silverberg	Rebecca	Educators Benefits Coordinator	No	9	2,203	21,035	10.5%	No
					Currier	Steven R.	Retired Law Office Administrator	No	9	906	21,035	4.3%	No
					McConnell	Kathleen	Parent	No	9	842	21,035	4.0%	No
					Petroni	Carlos	Investigative Journalist	No	9	494	21,035	2.3%	No
Huber	John	Retired Navy Chief			No	9	373	21,035	1.8%	No			
Moran	Douglas	University Purchasing Administrator			No	9	358	21,035	1.7%	No			
SAN JOAQUIN	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gutierrez	Steve	County Supervisor	Yes	3	9,518	14,670	64.9%	Yes
					Fritchen	Dale	Chief, Child Protection	No	3	4,065	14,670	27.7%	No
					Garcia	Ed	Defense Logistics Manager	No	3	1,087	14,670	7.4%	No
		3	Full	Mow	Victor	Medical Technologist/Councilmember	No	3	12,049	22,727	53.0%	Yes	
				Simas	Ed	Businessman/County Supervisor	Yes	3	6,067	22,727	26.7%	No	
				Shackelford	John	Business Owner	No	3	4,611	22,727	20.3%	No	
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Smith	Sandra	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	78,073	110,450	70.7%	Yes	
				Beckman	Ron	Attorney	No	2	32,377	110,450	29.3%	No	
		SAN LUIS OBISPO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Ovitt, III	Harry L.	County Supervisor	Yes	3	10,281	17,277
DiSandro	Dean A.						Software Entrepreneur	No	3	3,784	17,277	21.9%	No
Ferravanti	Nicholas						Business Owner	No	3	3,161	17,277	18.3%	No
3	Full			Pinard	Peg	San Luis Obispo County Supervisor	Yes	2	10,383	15,013	69.2%	Yes	
				Hampton	Antonia	Manager	No	2	4,560	15,013	30.4%	No	
5	Full			Ryan	Michael P.	Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	2	6,839	13,436	50.9%	Yes	
				Blakely	David A.	Educator	No	2	6,524	13,436	48.6%	No	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 LUIS OBISPO (continued)	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Cambria CSD		Full	Villeneuve	Don	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,937	9,830	19.7%	Yes
					Fitzgerald	Gregory A.	Businessman	No	6	1,740	9,830	17.7%	Yes
					Funke-Bilu	Ilan	Attorney/Parent	No	6	1,642	9,830	16.7%	Yes
					Kalshan	Vern	Attorney	No	6	1,582	9,830	16.1%	No
					Taves	Phillip R.	Retired Police Supervisor	No	6	1,516	9,830	15.4%	No
					Gray	Gerald	Realtor/Contractor	No	6	1,392	9,830	14.2%	No
		DIRECTOR, Heritage Ranch CSD	Full	Cummings	Karen	Homemaker	No	5	449	1,759	25.5%	Yes	
				Jackson	Vic	Retired Building Contractor	No	5	410	1,759	23.3%	Yes	
				Clarke	Don	Incumbent	Yes	5	339	1,759	19.3%	No	
				Bushor	David	Incumbent	Yes	5	325	1,759	18.5%	No	
				Watt	John A.	Retired Businessman	No	5	236	1,759	13.4%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Independ. Ranch CSD	Full	Barba	Kristen	Construction Worker	No	4	71	234	30.3%	Yes	
				Kolach	Linda	Incumbent	Yes	4	68	234	29.1%	Yes	
				Beebe	Harold W.	Electrical Cost Engineer	No	4	61	234	26.1%	No	
				Mercier	Jerry	Office Manager	No	4	34	234	14.5%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Los Osos CSD	Full	Bowker	Rosemary	Computer Consultant	No	4	4,901	12,405	39.5%	Yes	
				Freiler	Frank	General Remodeling Contractor	No	4	4,618	12,405	37.2%	Yes	
				Hopkins	Kris	Parent/County Employee	No	4	1,490	12,405	12.0%	No	
				Edwards	J. H. "Jeff"	Land Planner	No	4	1,353	12,405	10.9%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Nipomo CSD	Full	Blair	Bob	Retired Pharmacist	No	3	1,880	5,168	36.4%	Yes	
				Winn	Michael	Educator	No	3	1,716	5,168	33.2%	Yes	
				Evanoff	Evan	Retired	No	3	1,552	5,168	30.0%	No	
			Short	Wirsing	Judith A.	Businesswoman	No	4	969	3,174	30.5%	Yes	
				Dunbar	Jim	Manager/Produce Processor	No	4	796	3,174	25.1%	No	
McCarthy	Vince			Retired	No	4	753	3,174	23.7%	No			
Murray	Guy W.			Attorney at Law	No	4	647	3,174	20.4%	No			
DIRECTOR, Oceano CSD	Full			Searcy	Rick	Construction Worker	No	8	708	4,360	16.2%	Yes	
		Gallardo	Anthony "Tony"	Incumbent	Yes	8	694	4,360	15.9%	Yes			
		Senna	Bill	Independent Insurance Agent	No	8	667	4,360	15.3%	Yes			
		Wilson	Peggy	No Ballot Designation	No	8	539	4,360	12.4%	No			
		Carnahan	Tim	Retired Military Officer	No	8	503	4,360	11.5%	No			
		Dahl	Vern	Businessman	No	8	469	4,360	10.8%	No			
		Dyer	Walt	Business Owner	No	8	454	4,360	10.4%	No			
		Ramler	Thomas J.	Business Owner	No	8	322	4,360	7.4%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 LUIS OBISPO (continued)	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, San Miguel CSD		Full	Buckman	Gib	Retired	No	10	223	1,455	15.3%	Yes	
					Harrison	Richard	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	10	189	1,455	13.0%	Yes	
					Machado	Gene	Retired	No	10	184	1,455	12.6%	Yes	
					Jarvis	Connie L.	Retired	No	10	151	1,455	10.4%	Yes	
					Campbell	Gregory G.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	10	134	1,455	9.2%	Yes	
					Kalvans	Mary Ann	Director, San Miguel Sanitary District	No	10	124	1,455	8.5%	No	
					Rowe	Lewis	Retired	No	10	119	1,455	8.2%	No	
					Hamblin	Dale	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	10	111	1,455	7.6%	No	
					James	Alicia J.	Director, San Miguel Sanitary District	No	10	100	1,455	6.9%	No	
		Forgash	Barbara R.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	10	99	1,455	6.8%	No				
		DIRECTOR, San Simeon CSD	Short	McLaughlin	Bob	Retired	No	2	73	132	55.3%	Yes		
				Lambeth	Terry L.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	58	132	43.9%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Templeton CSD	Full	Bergman	Robert	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,332	4,894	27.2%	Yes		
				Dietch	Judy	Psychologist	No	5	1,090	4,894	22.3%	Yes		
				Beere	Clifford "Scotty"	Incumbent	Yes	5	1,033	4,894	21.1%	Yes		
		Vreeken	Keith W.	Home Inspector	No	5	795	4,894	16.2%	No				
		McGill	Mike	Care Provider	No	5	630	4,894	12.9%	No				
SAN MATEO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Church	Mark	Business Owner/Attorney	No	2	105,710	105,750	100.0%	Yes	
					Elias	Norma Bureau	No Ballot Designation	No	2	40	105,750	0.0%	No	
					Gibson	Rose Jacobs	Appointed Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	1	130,435	130,435	100.0%	Yes	
					Nevin	Mike	Mbr, San Mateo County Brd of Superviso	Yes	1	111,758	111,758	100.0%	Yes	
					Simms	Steve D.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	427	1,241	34.4%	Yes	
	11/07/00	MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL			Full	O'Sullivan	Linda "Sam"	Waitress	No	4	368	1,241	29.7%	Yes
						Mitton	Irma Rodriguez	Writer	No	4	228	1,241	18.4%	Yes
						Schweickert,	James F. "Jim"	Incumbent	Yes	4	218	1,241	17.6%	No
						Schwartz	Naomi L.	County Supervisor	Yes	2	12,610	20,462	61.6%	Yes
						Crossland	Steve	Corporate President	No	2	7,852	20,462	38.4%	No
SANTA BARBARA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR		Full	Marshall	Gail	3rd District Supervisor	Yes	2	13,204	23,786	55.5%	Yes	
					Mills	Larry	Engineering Manager	No	2	10,582	23,786	44.5%	No	
					Gray	Joni	4th District Supervisor	Yes	2	14,259	22,361	63.8%	Yes	
					Howerton	Joyce	Business Owner/Mediator	No	2	8,102	22,361	36.2%	No	
					Staffel	Timothy J.	Judge of the Superior Court	Yes	2	67,205	103,617	64.9%	Yes	
					Sato	Annette G.	Attorney	No	2	36,412	103,617	35.1%	No	
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full										

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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			
SANTA BARBARA (continued)	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Mission Hills CSD		Full	Nix	Bruce	No Ballot Designation	Yes	4	801	3,031	26.4%	Yes			
					Schlottmann	Cathy	Incumbent	Yes	4	774	3,031	25.5%	Yes			
					Warnstrom	Susan	District Executive Assistant	No	4	729	3,031	24.1%	Yes			
					Burnett	Walter B.	Incumbent	Yes	4	727	3,031	24.0%	No			
		DIRECTOR, Vandenberg Village CSD	Full		Wyckoff	Robert A.	Aerospace Operations Manager	No	7	1,307	8,162	16.0%	Yes			
				Blair	Charles E.	Retired USAF Surgeon	No	7	1,296	8,162	15.9%	Yes				
				Rowland	Donald D.	Retired Aerospace Engineer	No	7	1,286	8,162	15.8%	Yes				
				White	Phyllis	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,210	8,162	14.8%	No				
				Ellis	Peter	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,064	8,162	13.0%	No				
				Flaherty	Bob	Retired Pilot	Yes	7	1,032	8,162	12.6%	No				
				Smith	Mike R.	Technical Support Engineer	No	7	967	8,162	11.8%	No				
	SANTA CLARA			03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Alvarado	Blanca	Supervisor, District 2	Yes	1	31,661	31,661	100.0%	Yes
						3	Full	McHugh	Peter A.	Santa Clara County Supervisor	Yes	1	43,961	43,961	100.0%	Yes
5		Full	Kniss			Liz	Councilmember/Technology Manager	No	3	31,144	73,217	42.5%	Yes			
			Sandoval			Dolores	Teacher/College Trustee	No	3	24,818	73,217	33.9%	No			
			Trumbull			Terry Alan	County Commissioner/Educator	No	3	17,255	73,217	23.6%	No			
SUPERIOR JUDGE		1	Full			Carr	Dolores	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	193,986	272,744	71.1%	Yes		
						Allen	Douglas B.	Attorney at Law	No	2	78,758	272,744	28.9%	No		
		2	Full			Bernardini	Susan	Santa Clara County Govt. Attorney	No	3	110,779	266,952	41.5%	Yes		
						Schroeder	John G.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	85,466	266,952	32.0%	No		
						Lohman	Dale	Deputy District Attorney	No	3	70,707	266,952	26.5%	No		
		11	Full	Johnson	Margaret	Superior Court Commissioner	No	3	127,344	263,193	48.4%	Yes				
				Priest	William G. "Bill"	Attorney/Legal Educator	No	3	91,344	263,193	34.7%	No				
				Fields	Blaine L.	Trial Attorney	No	3	44,505	263,193	16.9%	No				
		14	Full	Bernal	Paul	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	178,765	259,275	68.9%	Yes				
				Spielbauer	Thomas	Deputy Public Defender	No	2	80,510	259,275	31.1%	No				
20		Full	Condron	Linda R.	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	149,616	254,370	58.8%	Yes					
			Saldivar	Gregory H.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	104,754	254,370	41.2%	No					
11/07/00		COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Kniss	Liz	Mayor/Technology Manager	No	2	55,304	107,944	51.2%	Yes			
					Sandoval	Dolores "Dolly"	Teacher/College Trustee	No	2	52,640	107,944	48.8%	No			
		SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Bernardini	Susan	Santa Clara Co. Government Attorney	No	2	241,972	422,061	57.3%	Yes			
	Schroeder				John G.	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	180,089	422,061	42.7%	No				
	11	Full	Johnson	Margaret	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	214,064	403,036	53.1%	Yes					
			Priest	William	Attorney/Legal Educator	No	2	188,972	403,036	46.9%	No					
SANTA CRUZ	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Beautz	Janet K.	First District Supervisor	Yes	2	9,418	15,354	61.3%	Yes			
					Pearl	Art	University Professor	No	2	5,936	15,354	38.7%	No			

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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		
SANTA CRUZ (continued)	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Pirie	Ellen	Senior Citizens' Attorney	No	4	6,498	15,586	41.7%	Yes		
					McGuire	Christine	Prosecutor/Attorney/Author	No	4	4,398	15,586	28.2%	No		
					Gray	Sharon	Pajaro Valley Unified SD Trustee	No	4	3,284	15,586	21.1%	No		
					Deitch	Douglas	Nonprofit Executive Director	No	4	1,406	15,586	9.0%	No		
			5	Full	Almquist	Jeff	County Supervisor - 5th District	Yes	2	11,451	16,629	68.9%	Yes		
					Dugan	Patrick	Property Manager	No	2	5,178	16,629	31.1%	No		
					DISTRICT ATTNY. - PUBLIC ADMIN.		Full	Canlis	Kate	Prosecutor	No	3	30,913	70,662	43.7%
	SUPERIOR JUDGE	4	Full	Ruiz	Ronald L.	Appted Santa Cruz County District Attorn	Yes	3	29,932	70,662	42.4%	No			
				Chang, Jr.	Peter A.	Attorney at Law	No	3	9,817	70,662	13.9%	No			
				Akao	Kathleen K.	Incumbent	Yes	2	51,336	67,577	76.0%	Yes			
	11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Bosshard	Jeff	Private Lawyer	No	2	16,241	67,577	24.0%	No		
					Pirie	Ellen	Senior Citizens' Attorney	No	2	11,889	21,109	56.3%	Yes		
			DISTRICT ATTNY. - PUBLIC ADMIN.	Full	McGuire	Christine	Prosecutor/Attorney/Author	No	2	9,220	21,109	43.7%	No		
					Canlis	Kate	Prosecutor	No	2	50,170	97,891	51.3%	Yes		
Ruiz					Ronald L.	Appted Santa Cruz County District Attorn	Yes	2	47,721	97,891	48.7%	No			
SHASTA			03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Fust	Irwin	County Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	1	6,988	6,988	100.0%	Yes
							3	Full	Hawes	Glenn	County Supervisor/Rancher	Yes	1	7,399	7,399
	4	Full			Wilson	Molly	County Supervisor	Yes	2	7,203	9,702	74.2%	Yes		
					Bailey	Dwight M.	Journeyman Painter/Carpenter	No	2	2,499	9,702	25.8%	No		
SIERRA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Gutman	Arnold "Arnie"	Incumbent	Yes	1	231	242	95.5%	Yes		
					3	Full	Nunes	Bill	Supervisor, 3rd District	Yes	1	328	336	97.6%	Yes
					4	Full	Mitchell	Brooks	Incumbent	Yes	2	173	299	57.9%	Yes
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Bowling	Donald E.	Business Manager	No	2	126	299	42.1%	No		
					Skillman	William A.	Incumbent	Yes	2	919	1,597	57.5%	Yes		
					Slocumb	Laura A.	Attorney	No	2	668	1,597	41.8%	No		
SISKIYOU	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Smith	Joan	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,760	2,722	64.7%	Yes		
					Bergeron	Leo "T."	Rancher/Businessman	No	3	754	2,722	27.7%	No		
					Foulke	Tim	No Ballot Designation	No	3	208	2,722	7.6%	No		
			2	Full	Erickson	LaVada	Supervisor District 2	Yes	1	2,632	2,632	100.0%	Yes		
					4	Full	Overman	Bill	Retired Businessman	No	2	1,829	2,986	61.3%	Yes
			Osborn	Jan			Retired Teacher/Administrator	No	2	1,157	2,986	38.7%	No		
			SUPERIOR JUDGE	1	Full	Davis	Bill	Assistant District Attorney	No	1	10,833	10,833	100.0%	Yes	

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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 (continued)	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, Happy Camp CSD		Full	Gould	John	Retired USFS	No	6	211	799	26.4%	Yes	
					Hahn	Gary	CALTrans	No	6	197	799	24.7%	Yes	
					Burcell	Tracy L.	Community Campus Coordinator	No	6	168	799	21.0%	Yes	
					Hulsey	Gary	Business Owner	No	6	102	799	12.8%	No	
					Silva	Viola	Community Health Representative	No	6	95	799	11.9%	No	
					Fisher	Donna L.	No Ballot Designation	No	6	26	799	3.3%	No	
	11/07/00	DIRECTOR, McCloud CSD			Full	Goates	Ken	Incumbent	Yes	6	369	1,061	34.8%	Yes
						Young	Catherine	Secretary/Business Owner	No	6	233	1,061	22.0%	Yes
						Stedman	Debbie	Hospital Cook	No	6	206	1,061	19.4%	No
						Muma	David	No Ballot Designation	No	6	142	1,061	13.4%	No
						Terry	Marianne C.	No Ballot Designation	No	6	84	1,061	7.9%	No
Einstein	Arthur	No Ballot Designation	No	6	27	1,061	2.5%	No						
SOLANO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Kondylis	Barbara R.	County Supervisor	Yes	2	7,130	13,688	52.1%	Yes	
					Curtola, Jr.	Terry	Medical Foundation Director	No	2	6,558	13,688	47.9%	No	
					Silva	John F.	Supervisor District 2	Yes	1	13,165	13,165	100.0%	Yes	
	11/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Thomson	Skip	Incumbent	Yes	1	16,277	16,277	100.0%	Yes	
					Riggins Unger	Cynda	Deputy District Attorney	No	2	66,887	119,856	55.8%	Yes	
Davis	Osby	Attorney At Law	No	2	52,969	119,856	44.2%	No						
SONOMA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Cale	Michael J.	Supervisor and Vintner	Yes	2	18,495	31,941	57.9%	Yes	
					Mittleman	Dawn	Businesswoman/Urban Planner	No	2	13,446	31,941	42.1%	No	
					Smith	Tim	Sonoma County Supervisor, 3rd District	Yes	2	12,908	24,912	51.8%	Yes	
	11/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	2	Full	Evans	Noreen	Councilwoman/Mother/Businessperson	No	2	12,004	24,912	48.2%	No	
					Reilly	Mike	5th District Supervisor	Yes	1	22,588	23,299	96.9%	Yes	
	11/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Daum	Elliot Lee	Trial Lawyer/Professor	No	2	70,517	137,563	51.3%	Yes	
					Gray	Patricia A.	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	67,046	137,563	48.7%	No	
					Martinsen	Cheryl	Civil Attorney	No	5	29,377	124,213	23.7%	Yes	
					Bertoli	Jim	Attorney	No	5	27,531	124,213	22.2%	No	
					Briceno	Frank	Attorney at Law	No	5	26,095	124,213	21.0%	No	
					Jilka	Greg	Attorney/Court Arbitrator	No	5	25,898	124,213	20.8%	No	
11/07/00	SUPERIOR JUDGE	3	Full	Lemmon	John F.	Justice Professional	No	5	15,312	124,213	12.3%	No		
				Bertoli	Jim	Attorney	No	2	90,718	168,043	54.0%	Yes		
Martinsen	Cheryl	Trial Attorney	No	2	77,325	168,043	46.0%	No						
STANISLAUS	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Paul	Pat	No Ballot Designation	Yes	2	13,454	21,288	63.2%	Yes	
					Ellett	Rob	Realtor/Businessman	No	2	7,834	21,288	36.8%	No	
					Mayfield	Tom	Incumbent	Yes	1	13,014	13,014	100.0%	Yes	
					Caruso	Paul	Supervisor/Businessman	Yes	1	9,727	9,727	100.0%	Yes	



TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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	
SUTTER	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Kroon	Casey	Instructor	No	1	2,443	2,443	100.0%	Yes	
			4	Full	Bechtel	Joan	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,811	5,054	55.6%	Yes	
					Southard	Ronald	Businessman	No	2	2,243	5,054	44.4%	No	
			5	Full	Silva	Dan L.	Rancher	No	3	2,729	4,688	58.2%	Yes	
					Bradley, III	Herbert W.	Businessman/Farmer	No	3	1,051	4,688	22.4%	No	
		Long	Mark	Wholesale Sales Representative	No	3	908	4,688	19.4%	No				
TEHAMA	No County Contests													
TRINITY	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Miller	Billie A.	Administrative Services Officer	No	3	732	1,166	62.8%	Yes	
					Fackrell	Paul	Incumbent	Yes	3	244	1,166	20.9%	No	
					Bates, Jr.	Edmond E.	Tax Preparer, EA	No	3	185	1,166	15.9%	No	
			3	Full	Modine	Ralph R.	Incumbent	Yes	3	374	782	47.8%	Yes	
					Everett	Robert "Bob"	Military Retired	No	3	249	782	31.8%	No	
					Wallace	Russell C.	No Ballot Designation	No	3	155	782	19.8%	No	
		11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Reiss	Robert	Incumbent	Yes	1	580	649	89.4%	Yes
				3	Full	Modine	Ralph R.	Incumbent	Yes	2	573	943	60.8%	Yes
						Everett	Robert "Bob"	Retired Military	No	2	368	943	39.0%	No
	TULARE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Sanders	Bill	Supervisor, District 1	Yes	4	7,898	14,578	54.2%	Yes
					Elam	Jack	Business Owner	No	4	3,157	14,578	21.7%	No	
					Gundy	Susanne	Teacher/Grant Writer	No	4	2,350	14,578	16.1%	No	
					Shirk	Greg	Businessman	No	4	1,144	14,578	7.8%	No	
2				Full	Cox	Bob	Farmer/Investor	No	5	3,425	11,454	29.9%	Yes	
					Conway	Connie	Health Care Manager	No	5	2,849	11,454	24.9%	No	
					Richmond	Mel	Incumbent	Yes	5	2,804	11,454	24.5%	No	
					Vandegrift	Philip E.	Business Owner	No	5	1,240	11,454	10.8%	No	
					Lopez	Carmen	Real Estate Agent	No	5	1,127	11,454	9.8%	No	
3				Full	Maze	Bill	County Supervisor, 3rd District	Yes	2	9,324	16,474	56.6%	Yes	
					Carey	Peter	Executive Director	No	2	7,117	16,474	43.2%	No	
					SUPERIOR JUDGE	Full	Drew	Stephen	Superior Court Judge	Yes	2	40,506	61,716	65.6%
					Allredge	Brett	Superior Court Commissioner	No	2	21,064	61,716	34.1%	No	
		11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Conway	Connie	Health Care Manager	No	2	8,019	15,778	50.8%	Yes
					Cox	Bob	Farmer/Investor	No	2	7,735	15,778	49.0%	No	
TUOLUMNE	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Rotelli	Larry A.	Supervisor/Truck Driver	Yes	2	2,104	3,431	61.3%	Yes	
					Selesia, Sr.	Randall S.	Businessman	No	2	1,301	3,431	37.9%	No	
			4	Full	Thornton	Mark V.	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,235	4,168	53.6%	Yes	
		Viglienzoni	John L.	Rancher/Businessman	No	2	1,922	4,168	46.1%	No				

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2000

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
TUOLUMNE (continued)	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	5	Full	Pland	Richard H.	Incumbent	Yes	2	2,794	3,827	73.0%	Yes
					Brown	Timothy M.	Businessman	No	2	1,018	3,827	26.6%	No
VENTURA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bennett	Steve	Teacher	No	3	17,580	39,779	44.2%	Yes
					Monahan	Jim	Small Businessman/Councilmember	No	3	12,555	39,779	31.6%	No
					Measures	Rosa Lee	Financial Manager/Businesswoman	No	3	9,479	39,779	23.8%	No
			3	Full	Long	Kathy I.	County Supervisor	Yes	3	18,763	38,895	48.2%	Yes
					Morgan	Michael	Camarillo City Councilman	No	3	17,493	38,895	45.0%	No
					Shinn	James F.	Financial Consultant	No	3	2,432	38,895	6.3%	No
			5	Full	Flynn	John K.	Member, Board of Supervisors	Yes	3	10,637	20,201	52.7%	Yes
					Dominguez	Francisco	School Trustee/Administrator	No	3	7,086	20,201	35.1%	No
					Fraser	Arlene N.	Chamber Executive Director	No	3	2,316	20,201	11.5%	No
			11/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	Bennett	Steve	Teacher	No	2	36,155	57,712
Monahan	Jim	Small Businessman/Councilmember					No	2	21,323	57,712	36.9%	No	
3	Full	Long			Kathy I.	Chair, Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	28,206	54,667	51.6%	Yes	
				Morgan	Michael	Camarillo City Councilman	No	2	26,193	54,667	47.9%	No	
YOLO	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	1	Full	McGowan	Mike	Incumbent	Yes	1	5,018	5,018	100.0%	Yes
					Rosenburg	Dave	Yolo County Supervisor, 4th District	Yes	1	9,885	9,885	100.0%	Yes
			5	Full	Pollock	Lynnel	Yolo County Supervisor/Farmer	Yes	2	6,495	8,368	77.6%	Yes
					Boney	Wayne	Mentor Program Coordinator	No	2	1,873	8,368	22.4%	No
YUBA	03/07/00	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	2	Full	Simmons	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	3	1,381	2,637	52.4%	Yes
					Smith	Chuck	Writer/Labor Representative	No	3	922	2,637	35.0%	No
					Gless	Ronald W.	Publisher	No	3	326	2,637	12.4%	No
			3	Full	Griego	Mary Jane	Restaurant Manager	No	2	1,483	2,430	61.0%	Yes
					Downs	Linda	Office Manager	No	2	926	2,430	38.1%	No
			4	Full	Schrader	Don	Incumbent	Yes	2	590	1,113	53.0%	Yes
					Hall	Craig	No Ballot Designation	No	2	514	1,113	46.2%	No

TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY OFFICES, 2000

		County				Municipal						Total					
		Supervisor		Superior Judge		Municipal Judge		Advisory Council		District Attorney <sup>1</sup>		Assessor		DIRECTOR, CSD <sup>2</sup>		Percent	N
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	86.7	130	87.5	14	80.0	4	50.0	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	55.1	27	78.0	177
	Lose	13.3	20	12.5	2	20.0	1	50.0	1	100.0	4	0.0	0	44.9	22	22.0	50
	Total	100.0	150	100.0	16	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0	49	100.0	227
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	18.2	64	35.9	52	26.1	6	100.0	2	66.7	4	0.0	0	42.4	53	27.1	181
	Lose	81.8	287	64.1	93	73.9	17	0.0	0	33.3	2	100.0	15	57.6	72	72.9	486
	Total	100.0	351	100.0	145	100.0	23	100.0	2	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0	125	100.0	667
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	67.0	130	21.2	14	40.0	4	33.3	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	33.8	27	49.4	177
	Non-Incumbent	33.0	64	78.8	52	60.0	6	66.7	2	100.0	4	0.0	0	66.3	53	50.6	181
	Total	100.0	194	100.0	66	100.0	10	100.0	3	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0	80	100.0	358
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	6.5	20	2.1	2	5.6	1	100.0	1	66.7	4	0.0	0	23.4	22	9.3	50
	Non-Incumbent	93.5	287	97.9	93	94.4	17	0.0	0	33.3	2	100.0	15	76.6	72	90.7	486
	Total	100.0	307	100.0	95	100.0	18	100.0	1	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0	94	100.0	536
All Candidates	Incumbent	29.9	150	9.9	16	17.9	5	50.0	2	40.0	4	6.3	1	28.2	49	25.4	227
	Non-Incumbent	70.1	351	90.1	145	82.1	23	50.0	2	60.0	6	93.8	15	71.8	125	74.6	667
	Total	100.0	501	100.0	161	100.0	28	100.0	4	100.0	10	100.0	16	100.0	174	100.0	894

<sup>1</sup> Also multi-position offices, including: Public Administrator.

<sup>2</sup> Directors of Community Service Districts and County Service Areas.