

CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

2001 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, 2001 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
2001 County, City and School District Election Dates by County	ix
2001 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, 2001	3
Table B Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2001	5
Table C Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 2001	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, 2001	11
Table 1.2 Text for County Ballot Measures by County, 2001.....	14
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2001	17
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2001	18
PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES.....	19
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for County Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2001.....	21
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for County Offices, 2001	29

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, ISR offers program evaluation, needs assessment, time or workload studies, descriptive surveys and the compilation and analysis of existing data to federal, state and local government agencies, non-profit organizations, as well as the University and its faculty. Specific research capabilities include: research and sampling design, questionnaire construction and formatting, in-person interviewing, computer-assisted questionnaires and telephone interviewing, multi-lingual interviewing, focus groups, mailed survey administration, data entry and database management, statistical analysis, table and graph construction, report-writing and production. ISR's supplements its full-time staff with university faculty in the social sciences, health and human services, engineering and education as projects require their specialized expertise. ISR also offers undergraduate and graduate research apprenticeships, providing paraprofessional training in research skills, for pay and/or credit, to the university's students.

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.

2001 ELECTION DATA

The year 2001 saw a total of 96 county, city and school and community college district elections. All of California's 58 counties held at least one local election. The bulk of these elections were held on the regular election dates defined by the state's Election Code: 21 of the elections were conducted on the normal March primary date, 11 conducted in the first Tuesday in June and 34 on the normal November election day. The remaining 30 were special elections scattered through the year. These 96 elections determined the passage or failure of 233 local ballot measures and the election or defeat of 2,525 candidates for local elective office. In comparison, in the last odd-numbered election year, 1999 there were 283 ballot measures and 2,293 candidates for local offices while 2000 witnessed 559 ballot measures and 5,153 candidates. (Table A, Table C)

BALLOT MEASURES

In 2001 California voters faced a total of 233 county, city and school and community college district ballot measures of which 36 were county measures, 94 city measures and 103 school district measures. More than nine out of ten of these measures were placed on the ballot by local governing boards and only 22 or 9.4 percent made it to the ballot through the initiative process. As has been the trend in recent years (see above), the most common subject of local ballot measures was education with 106 measures of 70.3 percent of the statewide total. The most common types of measures were bond measures (73 or 31.3 percent) and tax related measures (69 or 29.6 percent). (Table A, Table B)

Voters were very supportive of local ballot measures, passing 70.4 percent or 164 measures.

Voters were also friendly towards new spending and taxes. Of the 73 bond measures, 55 or 75.3 percent passed. Of the 68 tax measures, 49 or 72.0 percent passed. Thus voters approved bond and tax measures at a higher rate than all ballot measures. This was especially true with education related ballot measures. Of the 106 education measures, 62 percent were bonds of which 47 or 75.8 percent passed. Another 23 education measures were tax measures of which 16 or 69.6 percent were approved by district voters. (Table A)

As noted above (see Trends section), the total number of local ballot measures in 2001 dropped from previous odd-numbered years. To illustrate, in 1995 there were a total of 252 ballots measures, in 1997 312 and in 1999 342 measures. In 2001 there were only 233. The CEDA data do not provide an explanation for this drop. The causes, however, may include the economic uncertainty that characterized most of 2001 that might have led to decisions to delay bond and tax measures. The wave of ballot measures necessitated by Proposition 218 has also peaked. Finally, and given the high number of bond measures in recent years, both the need for bonds and the bonding capacity of various local entities may have been largely met for the time being. (Table A)

County Measures. Only 12 counties had ballot measure elections in 2001 and the total number of county ballots measures was comparatively low. However, of the 36 county measures, 27 were passed for a 75 percent success rate. County measures relating to taxation and bonds were favorably received. Ten of 13 tax measures passed (76.9 percent) as did all 3 bond measures (100 percent). On the other hand, the 12 measures relating to governance issues had decidedly mixed results with 7 passing (58.3 percent) and 5 failing (42.6 percent). (County Report, Table 1.3)

County taxpayers were willing to tax themselves but not through countywide tax measures. The proliferation of community service districts (CSD) or county service areas (CSA) continued in 2001. CSDs and CSAs are county level special districts with governing boards and authority to levy taxes. Community service districts are created to allow voters in a clearly defined geographic area to tax themselves for the purpose of providing specified services to that area. For example a CSD or CSA can be created to finance and administer park and recreation, transportation or other public services that the countywide electorate would not support but voters of the specific area would. In 2001 there were a total of 14 CSD/CSA tax measures of which 11 (78.5 percent) passed. (County Report, Table 1.3, Table 1.4)

Marin County, for example, had a total of 11 ballot measures in 2001. Nine of those measures created or increased taxes for new and existing community service districts and county service areas. Eight of the nine measures passed. These measures primarily provided funding for road, landscape, marine and beach maintenance. Plumas County had only 2 ballot measures in 2001, both community service district tax measures providing revenue for emergency medical and fire services in two separate districts within Plumas County. Both passed. It should be noted that San Francisco traditionally has more ballot measures than any other county but in 2001, its 8 measures was second to Marin. Together Marin and San Francisco were responsible for more than half of all county ballot measures. (County Report, Table 1.3, Table 1.4)

City Measures. In 2001 64 of the 94 city measures presented to the voters passed (68 percent). This success rate was lower than the 75.0 percent rate for county measures. The most common municipal measures were tax measures (32 or 34 percent) with charter amendments being the second most frequent (24 or 25.5 percent). Tax measures fared well with 23 or 71.8 percent passing. However, 10 of the 32 tax measures levied taxes not on city residents but

rather on visitors through transient occupancy or entertainment tax measures. Charter amendments were also generally successful with 15 such measures being adopted (62.5 percent). Governance issues were the most frequent topic of city ballot measures with 35 measures or 37.2 percent of all city measures falling into this category. Revenue measures accounting for 27 or 28.7 percent of the total number of city measures. Both types, but especially revenue measures, enjoyed high success rates, (69 percent and 89 percent respectively). City voters approved 5 out of 8 bond measures (62.5 percent) acquiring \$69,125,000 new municipal indebtedness. (City Report, Table 1.3)

School Measures. As in previous odd-numbered years, school and community college districts measures represented the largest number of ballot measures in 2001. The 103 school measures had a high success rate with 73 measures (70.8 percent) being approved by the voters. Of these measures, the majority, 62, were bond measures (60.1 percent), of which 47 (75.8 percent) passed, creating more than three billion dollars in school bond indebtedness. Of the remaining 41 ballot measures, 23 were tax measures of which 16 or 69.6 percent passed, and 14 recalls, nine of which passed. The remaining 4 measures dealt with ordinances. (School District Report, Table 1.3)

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

In 2001, 2,525 Californians presented themselves to the voters as candidates for 1,175 county, city and school and community college district elected positions. This total of 2,525 candidates is the highest for an odd-numbered year since the inception of CEDA in 1994. The low was 2,293 in 1999. This increase is likely attributable to the increase in both the number of and the visibility of community service districts and community service areas. Both CSDs and CSAs have elective boards of directors. In 1997, there were 21 candidates for such positions; in 1999 there were 138 and 186 in 2001. (Table C)

Overall, incumbents continued to fare well among voters. Of the 755 incumbent candidates that sought reelection, 584 or 77.4 percent succeeded while only 171 or 22.6 percent lost. However, the candidates who won election to local office continue to be split roughly 50/50 between returning incumbents and new faces. In 2001, incumbents filled 49.7 percent of the 1175 available local elected positions available while 50.3 of the positions went to non-incumbents. This remains an important finding. Incumbent reelection rates alone can create the impression of static local governing boards with no turnover. CEDA data provides a clear and more detailed picture of governing boards with steady and significant turnover and local electorates that are positively inclined to reelect incumbents. (Table C)

County races. In 2001 county races were predominantly elections for directors of community service districts. There were 186 candidates for 94 CSD director positions. Of the 186 candidates 38 incumbents won and 14 lost while 56 non-incumbent candidates won and 78 lost. There were only 2 other county elections in California in 2001. One was for a county treasurer. The incumbent was the only candidate. The other election was for a county district attorney. There were two candidates and the incumbent won. (Table C, County Report, Table 2.2)

City races. Incumbents also fared well in city races. In 2001, 702 candidates ran for 268 posts in city government. Most ran for the 224 city council seats up in 2001. Indeed, the 663 city council candidates represented 94.4 percent of all city candidates. (Table C)

Voters continued to favor incumbent council members seeking reelection. Of the 144

incumbents running, 114 or 79.2 percent won and only 30 or 20.8 percent lost. Of the 459 non-incumbent candidates, 110 or 24 percent won while 349 or 76 percent lost. Non-incumbents were elected to 110 or 49.1 percent of all seats up last year while incumbents filled 114 or 50.9 percent. Again, the data underscores that high incumbent reelection rates do not necessarily mean an absence of healthy turnover among local elected officials. There were 44 other city posts open in 2001 that drew 99 candidates. Of these candidates, 33 were incumbents of who 30 won reelection for a 90.9 incumbent reelection rate. Consequently, of the 44 available city offices, 30 or 68.2 percent were taken by incumbents while non-incumbents were elected to 14 or 31.8 percent of the positions. (Table C)

School District Races. In 2001 there were 1,634 candidates for 811 seats on school boards. Of these, 525 were incumbents and 1,109 were non-incumbents. As usual, incumbents were more successful with a success rate of 76.4 percent as compared to the non-incumbent success rate of only 37 percent. However, once again high incumbent reelection rates did not prevent a healthy turnover rate with the 811 trustee positions being filled by 401 incumbents and 410 non-incumbents (49.4 percent and 50.5 percent respectively). (Table C)

TRENDS

The 2001 elections had the fewest ballot measures of the seven election years tracked by CEDA. Although odd-numbered years typically have roughly half as many ballot measures as even-numbered ones, 2001 had still fewer than recent history would suggest -- 233 compared with a range of 252 to 342 in 1995, 1997 and 1999. On the other hand, the 2001 elections offered more candidates (2525) than had previously characterized these odd-numbered years (2293 to 2498). Overall pass rates for the ballot measures reached a seven-year high of 70%, exceeding the high of 61% in 1995 by 9 percentage points. The proportion of incumbents (30%) is consistent with previous years. From 1997 through 2001, the proportion of incumbents varied between 30% and 32%. (Table A, Table C)

BALLOT MEASURES

While bonds continue to make up a higher percentage of ballot measures during the odd-numbered years (36% to 38% in 1995, 1997 and 1999 vs. 11 to 26% in the even-numbered years), there were fewer than expected during 2001 (31%). The pass rate for bonds, however, jumped from a stable range of 58% to 61% during 1996 through 2000 to 75% in 2001. Tax measures as well passed in unprecedented numbers (72% compared with previous highs of 56% and 57% in 1997 and 1999). The number of tax measures rebounded sharply from a low of 19% and 22% in 1999 and 2000 to a level (29%) that characterized 1996 through 1998 (25% to 29%). There were fewer ordinances (33) than any CEDA year except 1997, when a single ordinance was offered and passed. The pass rate of 58% was consistent with that for ordinances in the other five years, which have hardly varied from that figure. There was an above average number of recalls (21) with a very typical 71% passing, but fewer charter amendments (25) than in all but one year of the last seven. Only 20 were offered in 1999, but the number varied from 31 in 1997 to a high of 115 in 1996. The pass rate for charter amendments was also lower in the two years with fewer amendments (50% in 1999 and 60% in 2001 compared with 67% to 93% in the other five years). In 2001, a single initiative appeared on a city ballot and passed. Typically, there have been between 7 and 21 initiatives during an election year. (Table A)

Education remains the hot topic of ballot measures, particularly in odd-numbered years. In each of the four, starting in 1995, education made up between 42% and 51% of the measures. Although governance issues compete with education for voter attention in the even-numbered years, education measures outnumber governance measures by roughly two to one in the alternate years (45% to 19% in 2001). Pass rates, unusually high in 2001 for education measures (72% vs. 53% to 67% in the preceding six years), were on target for governance issues (67% in 2001 with the previous five years varying between 63% and 67%). (Table B)

Ranked third for each of the last six years, land use issues virtually disappeared from the ballot in 2001. However, the seven measures garnered a not untypical 71% pass rate. Public facilities and public safety measures (with 16 and 11 measures respectively) eclipsed land use. While pass rates for public facilities measures were closer to the seven year low (50% compared with lows of 37% and 50% in 1996 and 1995), the pass rate of 73% for public safety measures was at least 50% higher than those for comparable measures in the preceding six years, a legacy perhaps of the World Trade Center tragedy. Markedly fewer measures dealt with general services (7) and transportation (4), numbers so low that pass rates are unreliable. (Table B)

School districts and cities account for most of the ballot measures in each election year, with each averaging slightly less than half of all measures in the odd-numbered years. In 2001, school districts comprised 44% and cities, 40%, of all measures. County measures, a mere 15% of all ballot measures in 2001, make up about a fifth in the even-numbered years. The increasing number of county ballot measures in odd-numbered years, from 17 in 1995 to 36 in 2001, reflects an increase in the number of community service districts (CSDs). CSDs are typically created to provide services to a particular area within a county, allowing parcel tax, bonds and other similar measures to be voted upon only by the people directly affected rather than by the county as a whole. In 2001, 20 of 36, or 56%, of the county measures were CSD measures. Without the CSD measures, the number of county measures (16) would have been right at the usual 7%. (County Report, Table 1.3, City Report Table 1.3, School District Report, Table 1.3)

County Measures. Tax measures and ordinances account for two-thirds of all county ballot measures (36% and 31% respectively). They occur more often in even-numbered years, with three-fourths of those on the ballot in the past seven years appearing in 1996, 1998 and 2000. Although small in number, county tax measures (13) and bonds (3) in 2001 enjoyed high pass rates (77% and 100% respectively). County bonds and recalls are rare; only 20 bonds and 12 recalls appeared on the ballot over the past seven years. County initiatives occur only in even-numbered years while charter amendments are concentrated in those years as well (79% of those on the ballot between 1995 and 2001 appeared in the even-numbered years). (County Report, Table 1.3)

County measures dealt primarily with governance issues (33%), public safety (19%) and public facilities (14%). Because of the small numbers, pass rates are unreliable. (County Report, Table 1.4)

City Measures. Most city measures are taxes (34%), charter amendments (26%) or ordinances (19%). Like counties, cities offer more of these types of measures in the even-numbered years. Three-fourths of city ordinances, and two-thirds of city tax measures and charter amendments appeared on ballots in 1996, 1998 and 2000. While 2001 pass rates for ordinances and charter amendments were close to the usual range (48% to 58% for ordinances and 70% to 94% for charter amendments), the 72% pass rate for taxes was uncharacteristically high -- pass rates

during the previous six years varied between 29% and 52%. While a 70% pass rate is not unusual for school district tax measures, the 72% and 77% pass rates for city and county tax measures in 2001 were much higher than expected. (City Report, Table 1.3)

City measures focused on governance issues (35%), revenue (29%) and public facilities (13%). The pass rate (73%) for governance issues was a little higher than the range for the past five years (62% to 68%). Revenue measures not targeted for specific expenditure categories were introduced as a topic area for city measures in 2000. Voter acceptance of these measures was quite robust (88%). Inspection of their content suggests why: many are occupancy and entertainment taxes which disproportionately tax visitors rather than residents. (City Report, Table 1.4)

School District Measures. While cities and counties concentrate more of their ballot measures in the even-numbered years, school districts make up approximately half of all measures during the odd-numbered years. Most of these measures are either bonds (60% in 2001) or tax measures (22%) with recalls a distant third (14%). Pass rates for bonds were unusually high in 2001 (76% compared with a range of 45% to 59% in five of the last six years); the 70% pass rate for tax measures was in the usual range (63% to 100% in five of the last six years). (School District Report, Table 1.3)

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

Tellingly, almost all county candidates in 2001 were running for directors of CSDs (186 out of 189 candidates for county offices). This caps a dramatic increase in the number of county candidates during the odd-numbered years, beginning with 0 in 1995, growing to 21 in 1997 and 138 in 1999, and jumping to 189 in 2001. Nevertheless, most county offices are decided in even-numbered year elections (79%), while two-thirds of all candidates for city offices (68%) run in those years and roughly half (52%) of those running for school boards. The proportion of incumbents was higher among those running for director of a CSD (28%) than among those running for City Council (24%)-- a substantial difference given the large numbers involved. The short history and lower profile of CSDs may account for the higher proportion of incumbent candidates. The incumbency ratio for school board candidates is consistent with previous years-- it has varied between 30 and 33% during five of the last six years. The city council incumbency ratio is at the low end of its customary range, which has varied between 23% and 26% over the last five years. (Table C)

2001 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/23	2/27	3/6	3/20	4/3	4/10	4/17	5/8	5/22	6/5	6/19	7/10	7/17	7/24	7/31	8/28	9/25	10/23	11/4	11/6	11/8	12/4
Alameda			✓													✓		✓		✓		
Butte										✓												
Colusa																					✓	
Contra Costa			✓							✓											✓	
El Dorado			✓																		✓	
Fresno			✓										✓								✓	
Humboldt																					✓	
Imperial		✓																			✓	
Inyo			✓																			
Kern			✓							✓									✓	✓		✓
Kings			✓																		✓	
Lake																					✓	
Los Angeles		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓											✓	
Marin			✓						✓												✓	
Mendocino																					✓	
Merced																					✓	
Monterey	✓			✓							✓										✓	
Napa			✓																			
Nevada			✓																			
Orange																					✓	
Placer			✓																			
Plumas			✓																		✓	
Riverside															✓		✓				✓	✓
Sacramento						✓													✓			
San Bernardino	✓		✓					✓		✓		✓					✓				✓	
San Diego		✓					✓			✓				✓								
San Francisco																					✓	
San Joaquin			✓																✓			
San Mateo			✓							✓											✓	

2001 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/23	2/27	3/6	3/20	4/3	4/10	4/17	5/8	5/22	6/5	6/19	7/10	7/17	7/24	7/31	8/28	9/25	10/23	11/4	11/6	11/8	12/4	
Santa Barbara			✓																	✓			
Santa Clara			✓							✓											✓		
Santa Cruz										✓													
Shasta			✓																		✓		
Sierra																							
Siskiyou																					✓		
Solano																					✓		
Sonoma			✓							✓											✓	✓	
Stanislaus																					✓		
Tehama																					✓		
Trinity																					✓		
Tulare			✓														✓				✓		
Tuolumne																					✓		
Ventura																					✓		
Yolo										✓											✓		

2001 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, 2001

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	7	0			1	0					4	0					12	0	12
Butte					0	1											0	1	1
Contra Costa	6	1	2	0	1	1	0	1									9	3	12
El Dorado	0	1															0	1	1
Fresno			1	1							1	0					2	1	3
Humboldt			2	0													2	0	2
Imperial											0	1					0	1	1
Kern	1	2	2	1							4	0					7	3	10
Kings	0	1					1	0			1	0					2	1	3
Lake			2	0													2	0	2
Los Angeles	5	4	6	3	3	3	1	1	1	0					4	6	20	17	37
Marin	6	1	5	0							0	1	2	0	0	1	13	3	16
Merced			0	1													0	1	1
Monterey			2	0	1	0											3	0	3
Napa					3	0											3	0	3
Nevada	1	0															1	0	1
Orange	1	0															1	0	1
Placer	1	0															1	0	1
Plumas	2	0									0	1					2	1	3
Riverside	1	1	3	1	1	0	1	0							0	1	6	3	9
Sacramento			1	0													1	0	1
San Bernardino	1	1	4	2	3	0									1	2	9	5	14
San Diego	1	0	0	1													1	1	2
San Francisco			2	0											5	2	7	2	9
San Joaquin			0	2													0	2	2
San Mateo	10	3	8	2	0	1							2	0	2	0	22	6	28
Santa Barbara															1	1	1	1	2

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2001

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		INITIATIVE		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Santa Clara	4	0	4	0	1	1									1	0	10	1	11
Santa Cruz	0	1													2	0	2	1	3
Shasta			1	1							3	0					4	1	5
Sierra											1	0					1	0	1
Siskiyou											1	0					1	0	1
Solano	0	1	1	0											1	0	2	1	3
Sonoma	2	0	2	0									1	0			5	0	5
Stanislaus	0	1	6	0	0	3	2	0							1	0	9	4	13
Tehama			0	1											0	1	0	2	2
Trinity			0	1													0	1	1
Tulare			1	1							0	3					1	4	5
Ventura															1	0	1	0	1
Yolo	0	1			1	0											1	1	2
All Counties	49	19	55	18	15	10	5	2	1	0	15	6	5	0	19	14	164	69	233

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2001

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		OTHER		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Alameda	8	0					1	0											3	0			12	0	12
Butte											0	1											0	1	1
Contra Costa	3	1			2	0	1	1					1	1					2	0			9	3	12
El Dorado	0	1																					0	1	1
Fresno	2	1																					2	1	3
Humboldt	2	0																					2	0	2
Imperial	0	1																					0	1	1
Kern	2	2					4	0			0	1							1	0			7	3	10
Kings					1	0	1	0											0	1			2	1	3
Lake	2	0																					2	0	2
Los Angeles	6	3	1	1	0	2	6	4	0	1	1	1	1	1					5	3	0	1	20	17	37
Marin	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	0							3	1	2	0			13	3	16
Merced	0	1																					0	1	1
Monterey	2	0					1	0															3	0	3
Napa							2	0					1	0									3	0	3
Nevada	1	0																					1	0	1
Orange																			1	0			1	0	1
Placer	1	0																					1	0	1
Plumas	0	1			2	0																	2	1	3
Riverside	3	1					1	0					1	2					1	0			6	3	9
Sacramento	1	0																					1	0	1
San Bernardino	4	2	1	0			3	1					0	2					1	0			9	5	14
San Diego	0	1			1	0																	1	1	2
San Francisco	1	0	1	0			4	2					1	0									7	2	9
San Joaquin	0	2																					0	2	2
San Mateo	7	4	1	0			1	1					3	1					10	0			22	6	28
Santa Barbara							1	1															1	1	2

TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2001

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		ENVIRONMENT		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		HOUSING		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		OTHER		ALL MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Santa Clara	7	0					2	1											1	0			10	1	11
Santa Cruz	2	1																					2	1	3
Shasta	4	1																					4	1	5
Sierra	1	0																					1	0	1
Siskiyou	1	0																					1	0	1
Solano	1	0			0	1	1	0															2	1	3
Sonoma	4	0			1	0																	5	0	5
Stanislaus	6	0					1	3									2	1					9	4	13
Tehama	0	2																					0	2	2
Trinity	0	1																					0	1	1
Tulare	1	4																					1	4	5
Ventura			1	0																			1	0	1
Yolo													0	1	1	0							1	1	2
All Counties	76	30	5	2	8	3	30	15	3	1	1	3	8	8	1	0	5	2	27	4	0	1	164	69	233

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2001

		Director, CSD ¹		Other County Offices		City Council		Other City Offices		School Board Member		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
		Incumbent Candidates	Win	73.1	38	100.0	1	79.2	114	90.9	30	76.4	401
	Lose	26.9	14	0.0	0	20.8	30	9.1	3	23.6	124	22.6	171
	Total	100.0	52	100.0	1	100.0	144	100.0	33	100.0	525	100.0	755
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	41.8	56	50.0	1	24.0	110	21.2	14	37.0	410	33.4	591
	Lose	58.2	78	50.0	1	76.0	349	78.8	52	63.0	699	66.6	1179
	Total	100.0	134	100.0	2	100.0	459	100.0	66	100.0	1109	100.0	1770
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	40.4	38	50.0	1	50.9	114	68.2	30	49.4	401	49.7	584
	Non-Incumbent	59.6	56	50.0	1	49.1	110	31.8	14	50.6	410	50.3	591
	Total	100.0	94	100.0	2	100.0	224	100.0	44	100.0	811	100.0	1175
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	15.2	14	0.0	0	7.9	30	5.5	3	15.1	124	12.7	171
	Non-Incumbent	84.8	78	100.0	1	92.1	349	94.5	52	84.9	699	87.3	1179
	Total	100.0	92	100.0	1	100.0	379	100.0	55	100.0	823	100.0	1350
All Candidates	Incumbent	28.0	52	33.3	1	23.9	144	33.3	33	32.1	525	29.9	755
	Non-Incumbent	72.0	134	66.7	2	76.1	459	66.7	66	67.9	1109	70.1	1770
	Total	100.0	186	100.0	3	100.0	603	100.0	99	100.0	1634	100.0	2525

¹Directors of Community Service Districts and County Service Areas.

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

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	No County Measures							
ALPINE	No County Measures							
AMADOR	No County Measures							
BUTTE	No County Measures							
CALAVERAS	No County Measures							
COLUSA	No County Measures							
CONTRA COSTA	03/06/01	Measure D	Property Tax	Safety: Police	632	789	80.1%	Pass ^T
DEL NORTE	No County Measures							
EL DORADO	No County Measures							
FRESNO	No County Measures							
GLENN	No County Measures							
HUMBOLDT	No County Measures							
IMPERIAL	No County Measures							
INYO	No County Measures							
KERN	06/05/01	Recall 1	Recall	Governance: Recalls	109	207	52.7%	Pass
		Recall 2	Recall	Governance: Recalls	128	212	60.4%	Pass
		Recall 3	Recall	Governance: Recalls	122	206	59.2%	Pass
		Measure D	Property Tax	Transport: Roads	516	1,451	35.6%	Fail ^T
KINGS	03/06/01	Measure A	Advisory	Safety: Jails/Courts	5,209	8,482	61.4%	Pass
		Measure B	Sales Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	4,074	8,472	48.1%	Fail
LAKE	No County Measures							
LASSEN	No County Measures							
LOS ANGELES	No County Measures							
MADERA	No County Measures							
MARIN	03/06/01	Measure B	Property Tax	Safety: Police	441	497	88.7%	Pass ^T
	05/22/01	Recall 1	Recall	Governance: Recalls	6,849	48,064	14.2%	Fail
	11/06/01	Measure D	Property Tax	Facilities: Public Works	658	824	79.9%	Pass ^T
		Measure E	Mello/Roos Bond	Facilities: Public Works	633	822	77.0%	Pass ^T
		Measure F	Mello/Roos Bond	Facilities: Public Works	610	820	74.4%	Pass ^T
		Measure G	Property Tax	General Services: Maintenance	617	1,008	61.2%	Fail ^T
		Measure H	Property Tax	General Services: Maintenance	140	144	97.2%	Pass ^T
		Measure I	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	131	139	94.2%	Pass
		Measure J	Property Tax	General Services: Water	86	113	76.1%	Pass ^T
		Measure K	Utility Tax	General Services: Water	84	113	74.3%	Pass ^T
		Measure L	Gann Limit	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	88	111	79.3%	Pass

^T Indicates that the measure required a two-thirds vote to pass. All other County measures required a majority vote.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
MARIPOSA	No County Measures							
MENDOCINO	No County Measures							
MERCED	No County Measures							
MODOC	No County Measures							
MONO	No County Measures							
MONTEREY	No County Measures							
NAPA	No County Measures							
NEVADA	No County Measures							
ORANGE	No County Measures							
PLACER	No County Measures							
PLUMAS	03/06/01	Measure M	Property Tax	Safety: Jails/Courts	71	76	93.4%	Pass ^T
	11/06/01	Measure A	Property Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	183	230	79.6%	Pass ^T
RIVERSIDE	12/04/01	Measure G	Ordinance	Facilities: Parks/Recreation	150	445	33.7%	Fail ^T
SACRAMENTO	No County Measures							
SAN BENITO	No County Measures							
SAN BERNARDINO	No County Measures							
SAN DIEGO	07/24/01	Measure S	Miscellaneous Tax	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	302	347	87.0%	Pass
SAN FRANCISCO	11/06/01	Measure B	Revenue Bond	Facilities: Public Works	92,798	127,859	72.6%	Pass
		Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	92,534	123,213	75.1%	Pass
		Measure D	Ordinance	Land Use: Voter Approval	94,085	126,362	74.5%	Pass
		Measure E	Ordinance	Governance: Political Reform/Term Limits	76,180	121,499	62.7%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	64,405	129,326	49.8%	Fail
		Measure G	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	67,913	121,363	56.0%	Pass
		Measure H	Ordinance	Governance	68,393	126,886	53.9%	Pass
Measure I	Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Form./Annexation	60,227	124,810	48.3%	Fail		
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures							
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No County Measures							
SAN MATEO	11/06/01	Measure A	Charter Amendment	Governance: Organization	33,442	86,349	38.7%	Fail
		Measure B	Transient Occupancy Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	49,160	86,244	57.0%	Pass
SANTA BARBARA	03/06/01	Measure G	Ordinance	Governance: Incorporation/Form./Annexation	1,462	6,421	22.8%	Fail
SANTA CLARA	No County Measures							
SANTA CRUZ	06/05/01	Measure W	Ordinance	Education: Districts	8	8	100.0%	Pass ^T
		Measure X	Ordinance	Education: Districts	11	11	100.0%	Pass ^T
SHASTA	No County Measures							
SIERRA	No County Measures							
SISKIYOU	No County Measures							

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
SOLANO	No County Measures							
SONOMA	11/06/01	Measure F	Gann Limit	Safety: Multiple Emergency Services	642	683	94.0%	Pass
STANISLAUS	No County Measures							
SUTTER	No County Measures							
TEHAMA	No County Measures							
TRINITY	No County Measures							
TULARE	No County Measures							
TUOLUMNE	No County Measures							
VENTURA	No County Measures							
YOLO	No County Measures							
YUBA	No County Measures							

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2001

CONTRA COSTA	03/06/01	Measure D	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance 2000-38 of the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County be approved so as to authorize an increase in the special tax on property located in County Service Area P-5 from \$150 per parcel per year to \$330 per parcel per year, for all parcels except those used for commercial recreational purposes which shall continue to be taxed at a higher rate, in order to provide additional funding for police protection service?			
KERN	06/05/01	Recall 1	Pass
Shall Michael P. Bean be recalled (removed) from the office of the Director?			
KERN	06/05/01	Recall 2	Pass
Shall Raymond Limesand be recalled (removed) from the office of Director?			
KERN	06/05/01	Recall 3	Pass
Shall Duain J. Nelson be recalled (removed) from the office of Director?			
KERN	06/05/01	Measure D	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Bear Valley Community Services District be authorized to levy an annual special tax in the maximum amount of \$95.00 on each parcel of land within the boundaries of the District? The revenues from the special tax shall be used only for the limited purposes of paying the costs and expenses of constructing, opening, widening, extending, straightening, surfacing and maintaining, in whole or part, of any road in the District, including the installation and maintenance of recessed reflectors and similar safety measures, and to pay the costs and expenses of restricting access to the District's roads to landowners and residents of the District. The annual special tax shall not be increased above \$95.00 on each parcel without a two-thirds vote of the voters in the District.			
KINGS	03/06/01	Measure A	Pass
(Advisory) Shall any new voter-approved sales taxes be used to pay for the following criminal-justice improvements? Expanded jail facilities to keep criminals behind bars. Increased Juvenile Hall capacity to hold juveniles and gang members accountable for criminal acts. Expanded juvenile programs, including the boot camp, to rehabilitate juvenile offenders. Improved Sheriff's operations facilities in aide of law enforcement.			
KINGS	03/06/01	Measure B	Fail
Shall the Board of Supervisors enact a one-half percent sales tax for general County purposes with the following mandatory restrictions? 1) The tax shall expire within eight years. 2) A local citizens' Oversight Committee is formed to monitor all expenditures of the sales tax proceeds, to cause an annual independent audit of the expenditures, and to report it audit annually to the public.			
MARIN	03/06/01	Measure B	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the special tax for Sheriff patrol services, levied annually upon living units located within County Service Area No. 17 (Kent Woodlands) 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	05/22/01	Recall 1	Fail
Shall Paula Kamena be recalled (removed) from the office of District Attorney?			
MARIN	11/06/01	Measure D	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Bel Marin Keys Community Services District (the "District"), be authorized to levy a Parcel Tax in the amount of \$510 upon each taxable parcel of property within the District, commencing in the fiscal year 2002-2003 and increasing thereafter at the rate of 2% per year for the specific purpose of paying for the capital costs of and costs of operation and maintenance of the District's marine facilities and related costs?			
MARIN	11/06/01	Measure E	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Bel Marin Keys Community Services District (the "District"), for its Community Facilities District No. 2001-1 (Marine Facilities Improvements) (the "CFD"), issue special tax bonds in an amount not to exceed \$2,600,000 to finance improvements to the District's marine facilities, including related costs (the "Facilities"); shall a special tax be levied each year on all taxable properties in the CFD to finance the Facilities and bond-related costs; and shall the appropriations limit for the CFD be established at \$1,500,000?			
MARIN	11/06/01	Measure F	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Bel Marin Keys Community Services District (the "District"), for its Community Facilities District No. 2001-2 (Dredging and Marine Improvements) (the "CFD"), issue special tax bonds in an amount not to exceed \$5,600,000 to finance improvements to the District's marine facilities, including related costs (the "Facilities"); shall a special tax be levied each year on all taxable properties in the CFD to pay for the Facilities and bond-related costs; and shall the appropriations limit for the CFD be established at \$3,000,000?			
MARIN	11/06/01	Measure G	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the existing special tax of \$150.00 per annum be increased to \$225.00 per parcel per annum within County Services Area No. 16 to provide additional landscaping and maintenance services within that area?			
MARIN	11/06/01	Measure H	Pass (2/3 required)

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2001

Shall a parcel tax in an amount of Nine Hundred Twenty Five Dollars (\$925.00), be levied on each lot within County Service Area No. 29 annually for a period of ten (10) years, commencing in FY 2002-2003, terminating in FY 2011-2012, to provide funds for ongoing maintenance dredging in the principal waterways of Paradise Cay?

MARIN 11/06/01 Measure I Pass
Shall the appropriations limit of County Service Area No. 29 be increased equal to the proceeds of the taxes imposed?

MARIN 11/06/01 Measure J Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance 2001-07-25-1 of the Muir Beach Community Services District levying a special tax annually for a period of four years, commencing in FY 2001-2002, terminating in FY 2005-2006, in the amount of \$3,250.00 per parcel for improved commercially zoned property, \$300.00 per separate habitable structure on parcels containing residential property and \$300.00 per parcel on all other parcels be adopted to provide funds for water system capital improvements as specified in said Ordinance?

MARIN 11/06/01 Measure K Pass (2/3 required)
Shall Ordinance 2001-07-25-1 of the Muir Beach Community Services District levying a monthly water surcharge for a period of four years, commencing in FY 2001-2002, terminating in FY 2005-2006, in an amount not to exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the monthly billing for water service consumption be adopted as a special tax for water system capital improvements as specified in said Ordinance?

MARIN 11/06/01 Measure L Pass
Shall the appropriations limit of the Muir Beach Community Services District be increased by an amount equal to the proceeds of the taxes imposed?

PLUMAS 03/06/01 Measure M Pass (2/3 required)
Upon a two-thirds vote of approval, shall a special tax of \$420 per residential parcel per fiscal year and a special tax of \$1260.00 per commercial parcel per fiscal year be imposed on each and every above defined parcels within the boundaries of the Whitehawk Ranch Community Services District, excluding those parcels exempt from county property tax? These tax funds will be used for the purpose of funding the services of the volunteer fire department, fire protection and prevention, emergency medical response, and the improvement, operation, management and maintenance of the recreational facilities and amenities to be deeded to the District by Mohawk Valley Ranch, Inc. The tax will commence in the fiscal year starting July 1, 2000. The method of collection said tax during the first fiscal year (July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001) will be by statement sent to the owner of record of each above described parcel as of January 1, 2001, by first class mail, payable in either one or two installments prior to June 30, 2000/

PLUMAS 11/06/01 Measure A Pass (2/3 required)
Should the special tax be increased and continued for 10 years until 2012, for fire and medical protection in the West Almanor Community Services District to consist of a \$90 tax on each condominium unit and each parcel except for parcel numbers: 108-010-04, 108-010-08, 108-010-15, 108-010-16, 108-010-17, 108-010-21, 108-010-23, 108-053-06, 108-053-07, 108-090-02, 108-141-01, 108-211-08, 108-283-04, 108-232-01, and 108-241-03 where there will be no tax and shall the appropriations limit specified in article XIII-B of the California Constitution (also known as Proposition 4) be increased for the West Almanor Community Services District by \$100,000 for the 2002/2003 fiscal year, and for three succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of allowing the district's tax proceeds to be spent for fire protection and emergency medical services?

RIVERSIDE 12/04/01 Measure G Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the authorized powers of the Santa Rosa Community Services District be expanded to include the acquisition and maintenance of equestrian and recreational multipurpose trails?

SAN DIEGO 07/24/01 Measure S Pass
Shall an Ordinance be approved for an annual increase for fifteen years to the existing Special Benefit Tax for structural fire protection and emergency medical services within County Service Area 107 - Elfin Forest, beginning July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2015?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure B Pass
Shall the City and County of San Francisco (or one of its agencies, departments or enterprises) issue revenue bonds and/or other forms of revenue financing in a principal amount not to exceed \$100,000,000, to finance the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, installation and/or improvement of solar energy facilities and equipment, energy conservation facilities and equipment and/or renewable energy facilities and equipment for various agencies, departments and/or enterprises of the City?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure C Pass
Shall the rules for filling vacancies in elective offices be changed to shorten the time that a person appointed to fill a vacant office would serve before there is an election for that office?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure D Pass
Shall voter approval be required for any City project that would place 100 acres or more of fill in San Francisco Bay?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure E Pass
Shall there be (1) a new Elections Commission to oversee the Department of Elections; (2) a rule prohibiting City employees outside the Department of Elections

TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2001

from helping with elections without Board of Supervisors approval; (3) new conflict-of-interest rules for the Elections Department, Elections Commission, Ethics Commission and City Attorney; (4) a reorganization of the Ethics Commission; and (5) new procedures for City agencies to retain outside legal counsel when the City Attorney has a conflict of interest?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure F Fail
 Shall the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission be replaced with a new Municipal Water and Power Agency, governed by an elected board, whose goals would be to provide electricity to San Francisco and to develop renewable energy and conservation projects?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure G Pass
 Shall the rules for redrawing Board of Supervisors district lines be changed to require the use of adjusted census data and to establish deadlines for beginning and completing redistricting?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure H Pass
 Shall the list of projects for which the City may issue revenue bonds without voter approval be expanded to include renewable energy facilities, such as solar power systems, and energy conservation facilities?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/06/01 Measure I Fail
 Shall the "San Francisco-Brisbane Municipal Utility District" be created and established?

SAN MATEO 11/06/01 Measure A Fail
 Shall the Charter of the County of San Mateo be amended to provide that the positions of Coroner and Sheriff shall be combined and that the new position of Sheriff-Coroner shall be elected?

SAN MATEO 11/06/01 Measure B Pass
 Shall Ordinance No. 3268, adopted by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors on October 2, 1990, which increased from 8% to 10% the transient occupancy tax charged to persons for the privilege of occupancy in any hotel, or similar structure occupied or intended or designed for occupancy by transients, in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County, be continued in full force and effect?

SANTA BARBARA 03/06/01 Measure G Fail
 Shall the order adopted on November 14, 2000 by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara ordering the formation of the Orcutt Community Services District and detachment from County Service Area No. 5 be confirmed subject to the terms and conditions specified in the order, including the authorization of a special tax as described?

SANTA CRUZ 06/05/01 Measure W Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the common boundary line between the San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District and the Scotts Valley Unified School District be reorganized in such a manner that parcels 073-141-13 [2044 Lockhart Gulch Road], 073-151-07 [2220 Lockhart Gulch Road], 073-171-05 [2036 Lockhart Gulch Road], 073-171-08 [2028 Lockhart Gulch Road], 073-181-04 [3835 Lockhart Gulch Road], 073-181-37 [uninhabited], 073-181-39 [2030 Lockhart Gulch Road] shall no longer be a part of the San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District and shall become a part of the Scotts Valley Unified School District?

SANTA CRUZ 06/05/01 Measure X Pass (2/3 required)
 Shall the common boundary line between the Scotts Valley Unified School District and the Loma Prieta Elementary and Los Gatos-Saratoga High School Districts be reorganized in such a manner that the parcels listed below shall no longer be a part of the Scotts Valley Unified School District which is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Cruz County Superintendent of Schools and shall become a part of the Loma Prieta Elementary and Los Gatos-Saratoga High School Districts which are under the jurisdiction of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools?

SONOMA 11/06/01 Measure F Pass
 In 1997 the voters approved an increase in the District spending limit (Ordinance No. 5-R) which allowed special tax funds to be spent on fire and emergency medical services; should this spending limit be renewed for another four years to allow the District to continue to spend the approved special tax funds for your local fire and emergency medical services?

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2001

	TAXES		BONDS		CHARTER AMENDMENT		ADVISORY		RECALL		GANN LIMIT		ORDINANCE		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Contra Costa	1	0													1	0	1
Kern	0	1							3	0					3	1	4
Kings	0	1					1	0							1	1	2
Marin	5	1	2	0					0	1	2	0			9	2	11
Plumas	2	0													2	0	2
Riverside													0	1	0	1	1
San Diego	1	0													1	0	1
San Francisco			1	0									5	2	6	2	8
San Mateo	1	0			0	1									1	1	2
Santa Barbara													0	1	0	1	1
Santa Cruz													2	0	2	0	2
Sonoma											1	0			1	0	1
All Counties	10	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	3	0	7	4	27	9	36

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2001

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
Contra Costa					1	0											1	0	1
Kern							3	0	0	1							3	1	4
Kings					1	0									0	1	1	1	2
Marin					1	0	0	1			3	0	3	1	2	0	9	2	11
Plumas					2	0											2	0	2
Riverside											0	1					0	1	1
San Diego					1	0											1	0	1
San Francisco			1	0			4	2			1	0					6	2	8
San Mateo							0	1							1	0	1	1	2
Santa Barbara							0	1									0	1	1
Santa Cruz	2	0															2	0	2
Sonoma					1	0											1	0	1
All Counties	2	0	1	0	7	0	7	5	0	1	4	1	3	1	3	1	27	9	36

PART 2

VOTE TOTALS FOR
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
ALAMEDA	No County Contests													
ALPINE	No County Contests													
AMADOR	No County Contests													
BUTTE	No County Contests													
CALAVERAS	No County Contests													
COLUSA	No County Contests													
CONTRA COSTA	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Discovery Bay CSD*		Full	Piepho	David A.	Incumbent	Yes	4	668	2056	32.5%	Yes	
					Tetreault	Ray	Computer Consultant	No	4	583	2056	28.4%	Yes	
					Murray	Maureen	No Ballot Designation	No	4	553	2056	26.9%	Yes	
					Greggans	Michael	Actor, Teacher	No	4	252	2056	12.3%	No	
DEL NORTE	No County Contests													
EL DORADO	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Fallen Leaf Lake CSD		Full	Darrow	Arthur	Geologist	No	3	56	130	43.1%	Yes	
					Ramsey	Linda L.	Writer/Medical Administrator	No	3	38	130	29.2%	Yes	
					Greco	John T.	Business Owner	No	3	36	130	27.7%	No	
					Short	McDowell	David	Carpenter	No	3	46	78	59.0%	Yes
					Seder	Diana Dobbins	College Admissions Officer	No	3	18	78	23.1%	No	
					Brett	Hudson Bradford	Investor	No	3	14	78	17.9%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Grizzly Flats CSD		Full	Ellis	Arthur	Retired	No	3	139	320	43.4%	Yes	
					Strauss	Fred A.	Incumbent	Yes	3	112	320	35.0%	Yes	
					Cherry	Donald	Retired	No	3	69	320	21.6%	No	
FRESNO	No County Contests													
GLENN	No County Contests													
HUMBOLDT	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Humboldt CSD		Full	Noonan	Thomas R.	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,215	3914	31.0%	Yes	
					Frost	Verne	Incumbent	Yes	6	1,083	3914	27.7%	Yes	
					Bongio	Alan	Building Contractor	No	6	969	3914	24.8%	No	
					Bastian	Kevin	Information Technology Director	No	6	272	3914	6.9%	No	
					Trutna	Tim F.	Computer Programmer/Consultant	No	6	227	3914	5.8%	No	
					Trutna	Jesse J.	Director Web Development	No	6	142	3914	3.6%	No	
					DIRECTOR, McKinleyville CSD	Full	Murphy	Ordell	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,137	3512	32.4%
		Fleury		John J.			Production Manager	No	4	785	3512	22.4%	Yes	
		Wennerholm		Bill			Chiropractor	No	4	783	3512	22.3%	Yes	
		Turner		Scotty	Real Estate Broker	No	4	781	3512	22.2%	No			

*CSD-Community Service District

¹Write-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, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED			
HUMBOLDT (continued)	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Westhaven CSD		Full	Schultz	Kay	Incumbent	Yes	3	85	221	38.5%	Yes			
					Bryant	Barbara	Film Commissioner	No	3	68	221	30.8%	Yes			
					Kostrzewa	Lucy	Civil Engineer	No	3	65	221	29.4%	No			
IMPERIAL	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Salton CSD		Full	Kent	Frank A.	Retired Electronic Technician	No	10	116	755	15.4%	Yes			
						Simone	Attorney	No	10	105	755	13.9%	Yes			
					Brewer	Robert J.	Incumbent	No	10	104	755	13.8%	Yes			
					Bennett	Benny G.	Retired Electrical Engineer	No	10	87	755	11.5%	No			
					Kotlensky	William V. "Bill"	Retired Scientist/Engineer	No	10	84	755	11.1%	No			
					Palmer	Shirley Lee	Incumbent	No	10	71	755	9.4%	No			
					Patterson	David	Retired-U.S.M.	No	10	54	755	7.2%	No			
					Avery	Ron	No Ballot Designation	No	10	51	755	6.8%	No			
					Branch	Rachel A.	No Ballot Designation	No	10	43	755	5.7%	No			
					Lockhart	Linda Charlene	Artist/Sign Painter	No	10	40	755	5.3%	No			
						Short	Butler	Bob	Retired-Engineer	No	4	169	476	35.5%	Yes	
		Neves Lopez	Maggie I.	Grocery Clerk	No	4	116	476	24.4%	Yes						
		Farris-Pakalns	Velda	Incumbent	Yes	4	108	476	22.7%	No						
		Erskine	E. David	Incumbent	Yes	4	83	476	17.4%	No						
INYO	No County Contests															
KERN	06/05/01	DIRECTOR, Desert Lake CSD ^R		Short	Job	Jeffrey	Maintenance Worker	No	1	132	132	100.0%	Yes			
						2	Short	Savage	Woodie	Retired	No	2	75	118	63.6%	Yes
							Love	Dillard W.	Millwright	No	2	43	118	36.4%	No	
						3	Short	Bumgardner	Bill R.	Maintenance Supervisor	No	2	100	182	54.9%	Yes
							Kostopoulos	Dollie D.	Homemaker	No	2	82	182	45.1%	No	
KINGS	No County Contests															
LAKE	No County Contests															
LASSEN	No County Contests															
LOS ANGELES	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Point Dume CSD		Full	Verham	Karen	Teacher, Elementary School	No	5	265	1019	26.0%	Yes			
					Hammond	Beverly J.	Publisher	No	5	255	1019	25.0%	Yes			
					Mazza	John G.	Financial Executive	No	5	233	1019	22.9%	Yes			
					Garvey	Richard	Computer Consultant	No	5	140	1019	13.7%	No			
					Kabrin	Charleen	Incumbent	Yes	5	126	1019	12.4%	No			
MADERA	No County Contests															

^RTo be elected if recall measure passes.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
MARIN	05/22/01	DISTRICT ATTORNEY ^R		Short	Van Zandt	Tom	Patent Attorney	No	1	6,621	6621	100.0%	Yes
	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Bel Marin Keys CSD		Full	Tweed	Leila	Retired Business Owner	No	3	670	1506	44.5%	Yes
			Lattanzio		Vince	Landscape Architect	No	3	633	1506	42.0%	Yes	
			Lawson		H. Dale	Retired	No	3	203	1506	13.5%	No	
			DIRECTOR, Marin City CSD			Full	Klugman	Julian	Retired Community Mediator	No	9	192	987
		Times		Brian K.	School Bus Driver		No	9	159	987	16.1%	Yes	
		Green		Terrie Harris	Community Organizer/Educator		No	9	117	987	11.9%	Yes	
		Morgan		Derek "Dudley"	Outreach Coordinator		No	9	112	987	11.3%	No	
		Johnson		Nancy Jo	Incumbent		Yes	9	107	987	10.8%	No	
		Thomas		Carol	Customer Services Representative		No	9	102	987	10.3%	No	
		Fisher		Robert	Civil Engineer/Businessman		No	9	92	987	9.3%	No	
		McLemore		Royce Y.	Appointed Incumbent		Yes	9	63	987	6.4%	No	
		Randolph		Gary L.	Limo Driver		No	9	43	987	4.4%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Muir Beach CSD			Full		Rudnick	Peter	Incumbent	Yes	4	98	312
			Kamradt	Deborah		Incumbent	Yes	4	91	312	29.2%	Yes	
Hills	Leighton		Investment Manager	No		4	78	312	25.0%	Yes			
Pearlman	Gerald N.		No Ballot Designation	No		4	45	312	14.4%	No			
MARIPOSA	No County Contests												
MENDOCINO	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Brooktrails Twnshp. CSD		Full	Pohlson	Ginger	Retired District Employee	No	4	429	1540	27.9%	Yes
			Skezas		George	Retired	No	4	408	1540	26.5%	Yes	
			Orth		Tony	Small Business Owner	No	4	362	1540	23.5%	Yes	
			Estabrook		Richard	Petroleum Engineer	No	4	341	1540	22.1%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Covelo CSD		Full	Lanham	John B.	Incumbent	Yes	3	41	92	44.6%	Yes	
		Adamsen		Albert C.	Incumbent	Yes	3	31	92	33.7%	Yes		
		Harris-Whipple		Andrea	No Ballot Designation	No	3	20	92	21.7%	No		
MERCED	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Planada CSD		Full	Sanchez	Adrian	Incumbent	Yes	3	177	435	40.7%	Yes
			Adame		John S.	Grocer	No	3	137	435	31.5%	Yes	
			Petersen		Troy	Incumbent	Yes	3	120	435	27.6%	No	
MODOC	No County Contests												
MONO	No County Contests												
MONTEREY	11/06/01	DIRECTOR Pebble Beach, CSD	1	Full	Hendrick	David	Incumbent	Yes	4	621	1945	31.9%	Yes
			McCullough		Nancy	Realtor	No	4	558	1945	28.7%	Yes	
			Nero		James	Retired Air Force	No	4	431	1945	22.2%	No	
			Cuskey		Jeffrey	Professor/Acquisition Management	No	4	335	1945	17.2%	No	
NAPA	No County Contests												
NEVADA	No County Contests												

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS- TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED	
ORANGE	No County Contests													
PLACER	No County Contests													
PLUMAS	No County Contests													
RIVERSIDE	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Edgemont CSD		Full	King	Sharon A.	Incumbent	Yes	4	78	275	28.4%	Yes	
					Nelson, Jr.	George C.	Retired Military Personnel	No	4	73	275	26.5%	No	
					Addie	Michael D.	Incumbent	Yes	4	68	275	24.7%	No	
					Robinson	John S.	No Ballot Designation	Yes	4	56	275	20.4%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Jurupa CSD				Full	McLaughlin	Kenneth James	Maintenance Supervisor	Yes	7	1,300	7237	18.0%	Yes
						Smith	Jack Eugene	Retired Fireman	No	7	1,208	7237	16.7%	Yes
						Hummel	Curtis	Incumbent	Yes	7	1,206	7237	16.7%	Yes
						Maxwell	Craig	Civil Engineer	No	7	1,196	7237	16.5%	No
						Miller	Jaxon E.	Lawyer	No	7	920	7237	12.7%	No
						Gage	Matthew L.	Equipment Operator	No	7	745	7237	10.3%	No
Wolff	Sheila Mufale	Businesswoman	No	7	662	7237	9.1%	No						
SACRAMENTO	No County Contests													
SAN BENITO	No County Contests													
SAN BERNARDINO	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Baker CSD		Full	Hall	Kenneth E.	Incumbent	Yes	6	72	247	29.1%	Yes	
					Johnson	Rich	Incumbent	Yes	6	55	247	22.3%	Yes	
					Crandall	Warren P.	Fire Captain	No	6	45	247	18.2%	No	
					Grimshaw	William Donald	Incumbent	Yes	6	45	247	18.2%	No	
					Ramos	Lynne	Educator	No	6	20	247	8.1%	No	
					Hunt	Ray F.	Businessman	No	6	10	247	4.0%	No	
	DIRECTOR, Big Bear CSD				Full	Newsome	Jeff J.	Highway Patrol Sergeant	No	10	736	4314	17.1%	Yes
						McDonald	Marge	Retired	No	10	700	4314	16.2%	Yes
						Morgan	Dick	Incumbent	Yes	10	608	4314	14.1%	Yes
						Cartwright	Bob	Incumbent	Yes	10	588	4314	13.6%	No
						Hanson	Leland "Stew"	Retired	No	10	385	4314	8.9%	No
						Koepke	Laura A.	Businesswoman/Writer	No	10	367	4314	8.5%	No
						Ziegler	Al	Construction Consultant	No	10	362	4314	8.4%	No
						Schulz	Paul W.	Firefighter/EMT	No	10	283	4314	6.6%	No
Royalty, Jr.	Robert	High School Teacher	No	10	158	4314	3.7%	No						
Robertson	Chris "Scruffy"	Self Employed/Father	No	10	127	4314	2.9%	No						

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SAN BERNARDINO (continued)	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Big River CSD		Full	Lauer	Art	Retired Educator/Military	No	5	110	321	34.3%	Yes
					Keys	William D.	Incumbent	Yes	5	80	321	24.9%	Yes
					Harvey	Nelson T.	Retired	No	5	51	321	15.9%	No
					Bensinger	William D.	Retired Maintenance Mechanic	No	5	42	321	13.1%	No
					Ricard	Deanna	Incumbent	Yes	5	38	321	11.8%	No
		DIRECTOR, Lake Arrowhead CSD			Whitney	Dennis	Retired Engineer	No	4	904	2591	34.9%	Yes
					Gourley	Jim	Consultant	No	4	633	2591	24.4%	Yes
					Field	Bruce	Certified Public Accountant	No	4	545	2591	21.0%	Yes
					Keefe	Steven R.	Mortgage Broker	No	4	509	2591	19.6%	No
		DIRECTOR, Morongo Valley CSD			Goldberg	Carol P.	Occupational Therapist	No	6	172	781	22.0%	Yes
					Cunningham	Jack R.	Contractor	No	6	170	781	21.8%	Yes
					Lindsey	Kenneth R.	Chiropractor	No	6	150	781	19.2%	Yes
					Whiteley	Jackie	School Secretary	No	6	135	781	17.3%	No
					Miller	Robert "Bob"	Business Owner	No	6	110	781	14.1%	No
					Meeks	Darrell	Internet Book Seller	No	6	44	781	5.6%	No
		DIRECTOR, Newberry CSD			Johnson	Ellen	Housewife	No	4	169	598	28.3%	Yes
					Brittian	Sandra W.	Real Estate Broker	No	4	162	598	27.1%	Yes
					Sperry	Wesley S.	Self Employed Businessman	No	4	148	598	24.7%	Yes
					Zilkan	Harry J.	Retired	No	4	119	598	19.9%	No
		SAN DIEGO			No County Contests								
SAN FRANCISCO	11/06/01	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Lazarus	Jim	Attorney/Senate Director	No	3	49,289	122629	40.2%	Yes
					Herrera	Dennis	Attorney/Police Commissioner	No	3	32,792	122629	26.7%	No
					Williams	Steve	Attorney	No	3	22,465	122629	18.3%	No
					Eisenberg	Neil	Attorney	No	3	17,869	122629	14.6%	No
		TREASURER			Leal	Susan	City Treasurer	Yes	2	99,592	114913	86.7%	Yes
		Petroni	Carlos	Newspaper Editor	No	2	14,943	114913	13.0%	No			
SAN JOAQUIN	No County Contests												
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No County Contests												
SAN MATEO	No County Contests												

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
SANTA BARBARA	03/06/01	DIRECTOR, Orcutt CSD ^P		Full	Enstad	Paul Andrew	Gas Station Owner	No	17	1,778	20057	8.9%	Yes
					Withers	Maureen	Senior Center Director	No	17	1,729	20057	8.6%	Yes
					Pierce	George	Retired Military Analyst	No	17	1,642	20057	8.2%	Yes
					Roland	Paul D.	No Ballot Designation	No	17	1,527	20057	7.6%	Yes
					Maggio	Daniel	Journeyman Carpenter	No	17	1,513	20057	7.5%	Yes
					Rabska-Williams	Tami	Insurance Agent	No	17	1,389	20057	6.9%	No
					Velasco	Rick	Finance Manager	No	17	1,352	20057	6.7%	No
					Milder	Jonathan S.	Financial Planner/Paralegal	No	17	1,294	20057	6.5%	No
					Ward	Donald L.	Construction Company Owner	No	17	1,264	20057	6.3%	No
					Piliero	Joseph A.	Retired Federal Employee	No	17	1,219	20057	6.1%	No
					Meissner	Robert "Bob"	Painting Contractor/Referee	No	17	1,063	20057	5.3%	No
					Miller	Roger J.	Communications Engineer	No	17	1,017	20057	5.1%	No
					Thompson	Bill	Engineering Manager	No	17	986	20057	4.9%	No
					Malin	Donald F.	Oil Company Technician	No	17	840	20057	4.2%	No
					Clever	Don J.	No Ballot Designation	No	17	647	20057	3.2%	No
					Grossi, III	Wallace C.	ICC Food Clerk	No	17	546	20057	2.7%	No
Olson	Scott	Political Field Coordinator	No	17	251	20057	1.3%	No					
SANTA CLARA	No County Contests												
SANTA CRUZ	No County Contests												
SHASTA	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Centerville CSD		Full	Whitehead	Larry	Incumbent	Yes	5	403	1674	24.1%	Yes
					Stubban	John H.	Incumbent	Yes	5	351	1674	21.0%	Yes
					Langfield	Darren	Civil Engineer	No	5	350	1674	20.9%	Yes
					Goodwin	Bill	City Engineer	No	5	291	1674	17.4%	No
					Moore	Donna Jean	No Ballot Designation	Yes	5	279	1674	16.7%	No
		DIRECTOR, Mountain Gate CSD		Full	Lee	Katherine	Incumbent	Yes	4	186	577	32.2%	Yes
					Rush	Gary Alfred	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	166	577	28.8%	Yes
					Gunter	Gary M.	Lab Analyst	Yes	4	129	577	22.4%	Yes
					Gunter	Connie	Bookkeeper	No	4	96	577	16.6%	No
					Short	Hastings	Gene	Retired Businessman	No	2	119	207	57.5%
Sherman	Lee Alan	Contractor	Yes	2		88	207	42.5%	No				
SIERRA	No County Contests												
SISKIYOU	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Hornbrook CSD		Full	Burnett	William Robert	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	2	27	58	46.6%	Yes
					McMaster	Mervin L.	No Ballot Designation	No	2	25	58	43.1%	No
SOLANO	No County Contests												
SONOMA	No County Contests												

^PProposed Community Service District.

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2001

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST ¹	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
STANISLAUS	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Keys CSD		Full	Rosas	Joe R.	Director	Yes	5	123	508	24.2%	Yes
					Kent	Melody	Industrial Engineer	No	5	108	508	21.3%	Yes
					Hale	Michael E.	Incumbent	Yes	5	106	508	20.9%	Yes
					Snell	Curtis R.	Sheet Metal Worker	No	5	102	508	20.1%	No
					Moon	Sidney "Pete"	Sales-Service Representative	No	5	69	508	13.6%	No
SUTTER	No County Contests												
TEHAMA	No County Contests												
TRINITY	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Lewiston CSD		Full	Deardorff	Melford E.	Retired Fire Chief	No	7	282	1084	26.0%	Yes
					Richards	Steve	Incumbent	Yes	7	220	1084	20.3%	Yes
					Klipp	David	Retired	No	7	208	1084	19.2%	Yes
					Cox	Jesse	Business Owner	No	7	191	1084	17.6%	No
					Kaspar	Joe	Incumbent	Yes	7	83	1084	7.7%	No
					Dill-Walker	Angela L.	Small Business Owner	No	7	52	1084	4.8%	No
					Crabbe	Robert B.	No Ballot Designation	No	7	48	1084	4.4%	No
TULARE	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Goshen CSD		Full	Cervantes, Jr.	Emilio S.	Safety Instructor	Yes	6	137	604	22.7%	Yes
					Aguirre, Sr.	Joe E.	No Ballot Designation	No	6	111	604	18.4%	Yes
					Delgado	Mary Lou	Incumbent	Yes	6	110	604	18.2%	Yes
					Ortega	Jesse Villarreal	No Ballot Designation	No	6	106	604	17.5%	No
		DIRECTOR, Ponderosa CSD		Full	Carrillo	Jesus	No Ballot Designation	No	6	81	604	13.4%	No
					Espinoza	Eulalio M.	Incumbent	Yes	6	56	604	9.3%	No
					Souza	Ruth M.	Incumbent	Yes	4	41	123	33.3%	Yes
					Gomez	Margarito	No Ballot Designation	Yes	4	40	123	32.5%	Yes
		DIRECTOR, Richgrove CSD		Full	Brewer	Manning P.	No Ballot Designation	Yes	4	27	87	31.0%	Yes
					Kracik	Alvaretta Rose	Business Owner	Yes	4	25	87	28.7%	Yes
					Key	Darrel	Incumbent	Yes	4	23	123	18.7%	Yes
					Luis	Herbert D.	Incumbent	Yes	4	21	87	24.1%	Yes
					Toole	Phillip J.	Chef/Baker	No	4	16	123	13.0%	No
					Cappelen, III	Carl Thorvald	No Ballot Designation	No	4	11	87	12.6%	No
TUOLUMNE	No County Contests												
VENTURA	No County Contests												
YOLO	11/06/01	DIRECTOR, Esparto CSD		Full	Moreland	Joseph D.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	202	712	28.4%	Yes
					Huie	Jack L.	Incumbent	Yes	4	149	712	20.9%	Yes
					Goodin	Mike	Retired Firefighter	No	4	130	712	18.3%	Yes
					Langhout	David	Business Owner	No	4	98	712	13.8%	No
YUBA	No County Contests												

TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY OFFICES, 2001

		District Attorney		Treasurer ¹		Director, CSD ²		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Incumbent Candidates	Win	0.0	0	100.0	1	73.1	38	73.6	39
	Lose	0.0	0	0.0	0	26.9	14	26.4	14
	Total	0.0	0	100.0	1	100.0	52	100.0	53
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	100.0	1	0.0	0	41.8	56	41.9	57
	Lose	0.0	0	100.0	1	58.2	78	58.1	79
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	134	100.0	136
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	100.0	1	40.4	38	40.6	39
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	0.0	0	59.6	56	59.4	57
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	94	100.0	96
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	0.0	0	15.2	14	15.1	14
	Non-Incumbent	0.0	0	100.0	1	84.8	78	84.9	79
	Total	0.0	0	100.0	1	100.0	92	100.0	93
All Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	50.0	1	28.0	52	28.0	53
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	1	50.0	1	72.0	134	72.0	136
	Total	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	189

¹San Francisco county and city contests are reported under county listings.

²Directors of Community Service Districts and County Service Areas.