

# CALIFORNIA COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION OUTCOMES

*2003 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, 2003 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
2003 County, City and School District Election Dates by County .....		ix
Trend Table A	Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Type, Jurisdiction and Year .....	xi
Trend Table B	Number of Ballot Measures, Percent of Total Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic, Jurisdiction and Year .....	xii
Trend Table C	Community Service District and County Service Area Ballot Measures by County .....	xiv
Trend Table D	Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Ballot Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Type and Year .....	xv
Trend Table E	Number of Community Service District and County Service Area Ballot Measures, Percent of Total County Measures, and Percent Passing by Topic and Year .....	xv
Trend Table F	Comparison of Pass Rates for County-Wide and Community Service District/County Service Area Tax Measures, 1998-2003 .....	xv
Trend Table G	Number of Candidates by Jurisdiction and Year .....	xvi
Trend Table H	Number of Candidates for Major County Offices by Year .....	xvi
Trend Table I	Percent of Incumbent Candidates and Percent of Prevailing Incumbents by Major Office, Jurisdiction and Year .....	xvii
2003 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, 2003 .....	3
Table B	Summary of Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2003 .....	5
Table C	Summary of Election Outcomes for <i>All</i> County, City and School District Offices, 2003 .....	7



PART 1 VOTE TOTALS, ELECTION OUTCOMES AND TEXT FOR CITY BALLOT MEASURES.....	9
Table 1.1 Vote Totals for City Ballot Measures by County, 2003.....	11
Table 1.2 Text for City Ballot Measures by County, 2003.....	14
Table 1.3 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures by Type of Measure and County, 2003.....	16
Table 1.4 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Ballot Measures by Topic of Measure and County, 2003.....	17
 PART 2 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES.....	 19
Table 2.1 Vote Totals for City Office Candidates by County and Election Date, 2003.....	 21
Table 2.2 Summary of Election Outcomes for City Offices, 2003.....	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, 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.

## **HISTORICAL PATTERNS AND TRENDS**

CEDA now encompasses nine full years of election data, including two gubernatorial years (1998 and 2002), an historic recall of the governor in 2003, two statewide elections (1996 and 2000) and five odd-numbered years devoted to local races. The multi-year trends help to place the 2003 results in context.

### **BALLOT MEASURES**

With respect to ballot measures, there are both consistent features across elections and what appear to be emerging trends. Among the consistent features are the following:

#### **Type of Ballot Measure**

- Bonds, tax measures, ordinance and charter amendments remain the most common ballot measures. All four are concentrated in even-year elections -- a pattern in evidence at CEDA's initiation in 1995 for all but bonds, which made the shift to even-year elections in 1998. The 2002 election ballot had the greatest number of bonds (245) and the 2003 ballot the fewest number (22) in CEDA's nine-year history. (Trend Table A)
- Most bonds are placed on the ballot by school districts, while tax measures are more often placed on the ballot by cities and counties. School districts, with fewer tax measures, deviate from the other jurisdictions in placing more of their tax measures on the odd-numbered year ballots (106 vs. 36 in even-numbered years between 1995 and 2003). Ordinances and charter amendments are mostly city measures. Cities place 3.2

ordinances on the ballot for every 1 placed by counties and 7.9 ordinances for every 1 placed by school districts. (Trend Table A)

- Recall measures are most common in cities (88) and school districts (66). In CEDA's nine years there were only 13 recall measures for county offices, although once on the ballot, they were more often successful (84.6% vs. 75.8% and 71.6% for school district and city offices). Recall measures are more likely to pass than any other type of measure. (Trend Table A)
- In the late 1990s, twenty-five California counties created Community Service Districts (CSD) and County Service Areas (CSA) as a reaction to the state-local finance environment that developed after the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978. The expectation was that smaller, more homogeneous areas would be more apt to approve tax increases to provide services that the broader county population would not support or that were lost as a result of Proposition 13. This expectation is supported by data on CSD/CSA tax measures which, together with Gann Limit measures, make up most of the ballot measures introduced by CSD/CSAs (110 out of 132 or 83.3%). In five of the six years that CEDA has tracked these measures, pass rates for CSD/CSA tax measures were significantly higher than for other county tax measures. While 22 of 70 county-wide tax measures passed (31.4%) between 1998 and 2003, 43 of 94 CSD/CSA tax measures passed (45.7%). Virtually all Gann Limit measures introduced by CSD/CSAs passed (15 out of 16). (Trend Tables D and F)
- Over the past six years, four counties account for half (50.8%) of all CSD/CSA ballot measures: Marin (23 measures), San Diego (16), El Dorado (16) and Kern (12). (Trend Table C)

Emerging trends include the following:

### **Number of Measures**

- The number of ballot measures in odd-numbered year elections has been on the wane since 1997. 2003 saw the fewest ballot measures of any year since CEDA began tracking local election results in 1994. This decline has been partially compensated for by an increase in the number of even-numbered year measures (up 17.5% in 2002 over 2000), producing the largest number of measures in CEDA's history (657). This reflects a wide-spread movement in the 1990s to consolidate municipal elections with state elections held in even-numbered years. After a brief period of higher pass rates in 2001 (70%) and 2002 (65%), 2003 pass rates dropped closer to the rates of the mid-1990s (62% in 2003 compared with 57% to 61% in 1994 through 2000). (Trend Table A)
- Regular elections for county offices and measures are held in even-numbered years and thus the bulk of county ballot measures occur in even-numbered years. The shift of many city elections from odd to even-numbered districts (to achieve cost savings resulting from consolidating city with state and county elections) increased the number of city ballot measures being decided in even-numbered years. Unlike cities, many school districts initially retained odd-numbered regular elections schedules. In 1995, for example, there were 117 school district ballot measures while in 1996 there were only 87. In recent years this pattern has shifted with 250 school district measures appearing in 2002 but only 61 in 2003. (Trend Table A)

- While pass rates for city and county measures have been highly variable over time, school districts have seen a gradual but continual increase in pass rates from 51% in 1995 to a peak of 75% in 2002. In 2003, there was a dramatic reversal to a pass rate of 52%, a function perhaps of the lagging state and national economies. Most of the school district measures were bonds (20) and taxes (36). (Trend Table A)

### **Type of Measures**

- An unusually large number of bonds are mainly responsible for the jump in ballot measures in 2002, accompanied by a dramatic drop in the number in 2003 (22 compared with a range of 73 to 128 in the odd-numbered years from 1995 to 2001). The unusual number of bond measures in 2002 may have temporarily satisfied the need for bonds and saturated local bond markets. This, in conjunction with a downgrading of the state's credit rating and a weak state and national economy, may have discouraged the placement of bond measures on the 2003 ballot. The peak number of bonds in 2002 may have been spurred by an unusually high pass rate for bonds in 2001 (75% passed), following passage of Proposition 39, which lowered the threshold for passage from 67% to 55% for school bonds meeting its requirements. Bond supporters in 2002 were rewarded with an equally high pass rate (76%) – a feat that was not repeated in 2003 when only 55% of bonds were approved (the second lowest pass rate in CEDA's 9-year history). (Trend Table A)

### **Ballot Measure Topics**

- Governance measures found more favor with the electorate in 2003 than at any time since 1995: 73% of 52 governance measures passed in 2003, compared with 84% in 1995 and 63% to 67% during the intervening years. (Trend Table B)
- Also of interest was the sudden increase in support for public safety measures during 2001 and the return to historically lower levels by 2003. In five of the six years between 1995 and 2000, public safety measures enjoyed a pass rate of 42% to 51%. In 2001, this jumped to 73%, a presumed effect of 9/11. In 2002, the pass rate for these measures declined to 57%, returning to historical levels in 2003 with a pass rate of 50%. (Trend Table B)
- Public safety is the dominant topic of ballot measures sponsored by CSD/CSAs. Of 114 measures, 46 or 40.4% dealt with public safety. Moreover, CSD/CSAs accounted for two-thirds (68%) of the public safety measures on the ballots in the past six years. Success, however, was not assured. While 52.2% of the 46 passed, the winning odds are a function of the success in 2001 of all six measures. Without the year of 9/11, pass rates for public safety measures in CSD/CSAs averaged only 45%. (Trend Tables B and E)
- Finally, from 1998 on, support for transportation measures has been declining during the even-numbered years when most appear on the ballot. While 70% of the 23 transportation measures in 1998 passed, only 11% of 35 such measures passed in 2002. (Trend Table B)

## CANDIDATES

With respect to candidate races, continuity dominates. Among the consistent features of local candidate races are the following:

- More than twice as many candidates for local offices (county boards of supervisors, other county offices, city councils, and local school boards) run in even-numbered years than in odd-numbered years. (Trend Table G)
- School district candidates dominate odd-year elections. In those years, they make up between 62% and 69% of all candidates on the ballot. Although more school board races occur in even-numbered years when most county and city races are decided, they constitute a minority of candidates for local offices in those years (40% to 46%). (Trend Table G)

Emerging trends in candidate elections include the following:

- Fewer people ran for local office in 2003 than in any election year in CEDA's history. Even though there are fewer contested seats in odd-numbered year elections, the 2,106 candidates in 2003 represented a noticeable decline from the number of candidates in four such years between 1995 and 2001. There were 16% fewer candidates in 2003 than in 1997 and 2001 (with 2498 and 2525 candidates respectively) and 8% to 12% fewer than in 1999 and 1995 (with 2293 and 2381 candidates). (Trend Table G)
- Since the number of candidates for county offices continued to increase in the odd-numbered years, the decline in total candidates is due to a significant decrease in the number of candidates for city office in the odd-numbered years (from an average of 736 to 571) and a similar decline (of 17%) in the number of school district candidates relative to the average of the preceding four odd-numbered years (1322 candidates in 2003 compared with an average of 1602). (Trend Table G)
- The growth in county candidates represents races for other county offices since the number of Community Service District and Community Service Area candidates in odd-numbered years has leveled off. CSDs and CSAs may be adopting the county's preference for even-numbered year elections; 2002 had more CSD/CSA candidates (266) than any year since their introduction. (Trend Table G and H)
- The proportion of incumbents among all candidates held steady at 31% -- the average of the preceding six years. This average, however, disguised opposing trends among city council and school board candidates. There were fewer incumbents among city council candidates (22%) than in any CEDA year since 1995, when only 18% of the candidates were incumbents, while there were more incumbents among school board candidates (35%) than in any CEDA year except 2002 (36%). With an incumbency percentage of 31.1% for school district candidates in the preceding 7 years, 2002 and 2003 represent a noticeable break with the past. (Trend Table I)

## 2003 ELECTION DATA

### BALLOT MEASURES

Although Californians continue to love ballot measures, 2003 saw the fewest local ballot measures since 1995. In 2001, local voters faced 233 ballot measures and in 2002, a nine year high of 657. In 2003, the number fell to 178. Only 34 counties offered ballot measures in 2003, a third of them in three urban counties (31 in Los Angeles, 14 in San Francisco and 13 in San Mateo). Because county elections are not typically conducted in odd-numbered years, city ballot measures predominated with 89 compared with 61 school district and 28 county measures. Most were tax measures (62 or 34.8%) or ordinances (47 or 26.4%). Charter amendments and bonds accounted for another 26.8%. (Trend Table A and Table A)

The overall pass rate for ballot measures in 2003 was 62 per cent. School district measures passed at the lowest rate in eight years (52 per cent), while city and county measures passed at higher rates (67 per cent and 64 per cent respectively). The differing pass rates are a function of the types of measures associated with these jurisdictions. Bonds and tax measures made up the bulk of school district measures in 2003 and most such measures on the ballot were proposed by school districts. A slight majority of tax measures failed (51.6%) while a slight majority of bond measures passed (54.6%). Ordinances and charter amendments, on the other hand, were largely city and county affairs and much more likely to pass (70.2% and 75% respectively). (Table A and Trend Table A)

In the year of the first successful gubernatorial recall in California history, local ballots also saw a number of recall measures. Of the nine recalls, eight led to recall of the official; only one defeated the recall attempt. (Table A)

Education and governance issues dominated the ballot measures (61 or 34.3% and 52 or 29.2% respectively). A slim majority of education measures passed (52.5%), while most governance measures were approved (73.1%). Land use and revenue measures (15 and 13 respectively) were more apt to pass (60% and 61.5%), while transportation issues were more likely to fail (62.5%). (Table B)

**County Measures.** Voters in the 58 counties approved a clear majority of the 28 ballot measures (64 per cent). Ordinances (15) and taxes (12) predominated -- a not untypical pattern for odd-numbered year elections. Somewhat atypically, however, fewer of the tax measures passed (25 per cent) than usual for an odd-numbered year (between 33 per cent and 77 per cent from 1995 through 2001). Tax measures have generally been more successful, though less numerous, in odd-year elections. San Francisco, as usual, had the highest number of ballot measures, accounting for 13 of the 28 total county measures. All of San Francisco's measures passed. (Table 1.3)

County governance issues accounted for more than a third of all ballot measures in 2003 (36 per cent). This was the highest percentage of governance issues on county ballots since 1996, when they made up 39 per cent of all county ballot measures. The pass rate for these measures was the highest in nine years (90 per cent). Half a dozen revenue measures appeared on county ballots in 2003, but only one passed. In contrast, two general services and two transportation measures appeared, and all four passed. Public safety measures passed at slightly below the eight-year average rate (40 per cent vs. 43 per cent on average). Interestingly, there were no county land use or public facilities measures in 2003. (Table 1.4 and Trend Table B)



**City Measures.** Voters in municipal elections faced a total of 89 ballot measures, the smallest number in nine years. Pass rates for the city measures were only marginally higher than those for the county measures (67 per cent vs. 64 per cent). Ordinances and charter amendments accounted for over half of all city ballot measures (60 per cent) with taxes making up the next largest category (16 per cent). Five counties (Los Angeles, Napa, Riverside, Stanislaus, and Tulare) accounted for 58 per cent of all city ballot measures. (Table 1.3 and Trend Table A)

City tax measures were particularly successful in 2003. Indeed, the 2003 pass rate of 71 percent was the second highest in CEDA's 9 year history. Charter amendments were successful as always, with 75 per cent passing. All municipal recalls were successful with 6 city council members in Fresno and Los Angeles being recalled. (Table 1.3 and Trend Table A)

Governance issues dominated city ballots as they did in the county, accounting for nearly one-half (47 per cent) of all measures in the city and one-third (36 per cent) in the county. City pass rates on governance issues were somewhat lower than the counties' (69 per cent in the city vs. 90 per cent in the county). Land use issues, the second most common topic of city ballot measures, met with comparable success (60% passed). Although limited in number, all of the cities' revenue measures (7) and general services measures (4) passed. In contrast, only one of six county revenue measures succeeded. Transportation measures fared differently in the two jurisdictions: all six of the counties' transportation measures passed, while only two the cities' six measures succeeded. Public safety and public facilities issues made up relatively small proportions of city ballot measures (8 and 6 per cent respectively) but enjoyed similar pass rates (57 per cent and 60 per cent respectively). (Table 1.4)

**School District Measures.** Voters in community college and school districts passed judgment on a record low number of ballot measures (61 in 2003 compared with 250 in 2002 and an annual average of 147 between 1995 and 2002). Most of these were tax measures (59 per cent) or bonds (33%). While slightly less than half of the tax measures passed (47%), slightly more than half of the bonds succeeded (55%). The two recalls in the 2003 school district elections succeeded, a heavily favored outcome given the 76% pass rate for school district recalls over the previous eight years. (Table 1.3 and Trend Table A)

## CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

Fewer Californians sought local office in 2003 than in any odd-numbered election year since CEDA began. There were only 2,106 local candidates in 2003 as compared to 2,525 in 2001, 2,293 in 1999 and 2,498 in 1997 and 2,381 in 1995. Most candidates in off-year elections are running for the school board (1322) or city offices (571). These numbers, however, fell by nearly a fifth between 2001 and 2003. Relatively few county offices (213) appear on odd-year election ballots. Most of these (181) are for directors of Community Service Districts and Community Service Areas. (Trend Table G and Table C)

The proportion of incumbents was unusually high for school district candidates (35% compared with an average of 31.1% between 1995 and 2001) and unusually low for city council positions - at 22%, the lowest since 1995 when only 18% of all candidates were incumbents. (Table C and Trend Table I)

Incumbents seeking reelection enjoyed a typically high success rate (76 per cent) though the number of winning candidates who were incumbents in county and city races was less than half.

For example, in city council races held in 2003, incumbents had a 78 percent re-election rate but less than half of council members elected were incumbents. This is typical of local elections where many incumbents choose not to seek reelection or pass away leaving open seats. School board elections, however, bucked the trend with incumbents making up 53 percent of winning candidates. (Table C)

**County Races.** Most county candidates were running for CSD/CSA directorships (181 out of 213 county positions). Almost 75 per cent of all candidates for county offices were non-incumbents and they prevailed in 65 per cent of the races. When they participated, however, incumbents were heavy favorites, winning 67.3 per cent of their races. Incumbent community service district (CSD/CSA) directors, in particular, won 65.4 per cent their races. In the few district attorney and sheriff's races, all incumbent candidates won. (Table 2.2)

**City Races.** As in county races, 75 per cent of all candidates for city offices were non-incumbents, but they prevailed in only 52.1 per cent of the elections. Incumbents won more often in all but the city council races where a majority (60.8 per cent) of the winning candidates were challengers. When they ran, however, incumbents prevailed in 78.3 per cent of their races. (Table 2.2)

**School Board Races.** School district elections attract more incumbents than cities and counties (a third of all school board candidates are incumbents while only a fourth of city and county candidates fall in this category.) Although incumbents are more likely to win in all three jurisdictions, incumbent candidates for county offices are less likely to be reelected than those running in city and school district elections (67.3% vs. 78.3% and 76.5% respectively). A solid majority of winning school board candidates were incumbents (53.6 per cent) while less than half of the city and county candidates who prevailed were incumbents (47.9% and 34.9% respectively). (Tables C and 2.2)

## 2003 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/14	1/28	2/4	2/25	3/4	4/1	4/8	4/15	5/13	5/20	6/3	6/17	7/15	7/23	7/29	8/5	9/16	9/23	10/7	11/4	12/9	12/16
Alameda											✓									✓		
Contra Costa					✓													✓		✓		
El Dorado												✓	✓		✓	✓				✓		
Fresno																					✓	
Glenn																			✓			
Humboldt											✓										✓	
Imperial											✓										✓	
Inyo																					✓	
Kern																					✓	
Kings																					✓	
Lake																					✓	
Los Angeles	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓							✓	✓		✓	
Madera																			✓		✓	
Marin					✓						✓										✓	
Mendocino											✓										✓	
Merced									✓												✓	
Mono											✓											
Monterey																					✓	
Napa					✓																	
Orange		✓	✓								✓											
Plumas										✓											✓	
Riverside					✓						✓			✓							✓	
San Bernardino					✓						✓										✓	
San Francisco																					✓	✓
San Joaquin					✓																	
San Luis Obispo																					✓	
San Mateo					✓						✓										✓	
Santa Barbara																					✓	
Santa Clara					✓						✓										✓	

### 2003 COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION DATES BY COUNTY

	1/14	1/28	2/4	2/25	3/4	4/1	4/8	4/15	5/13	5/20	6/3	6/17	7/15	7/23	7/29	8/5	9/16	9/23	10/7	11/4	12/9	12/16	
Santa Cruz											✓												
Shasta																					✓		
Solano																					✓		
Sonoma																					✓		✓
Stanislaus											✓										✓		
Trinity																					✓		
Tulare						✓															✓		
Tuolumne						✓															✓		
Ventura											✓										✓		
Yolo						✓															✓		

TREND TABLE A NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TYPE, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

	ALL MEASURES			BONDS			TAXES			ORDINANCE			RECALLS			INITIATIVES			CHARTER AMENDMENT			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	
ALL MEASURES	1995	252	100	61	91	36	47	26	10	35	46	18	61	8	3	88	8	3	50	60	21	93
	1996	573	100	57	64	11	59	141	25	40	176	31	58	33	6	70	18	3	39	115	20	73
	1997	342	100	60	128	37	59	99	29	56	1	0	100(1)	45	13	69	7	2	71	31	9	81
	1998	572	100	60	147	26	58	161	28	48	118	21	58	19	3	74	9	2	56	94	16	77
	1999	283	100	59	107	38	59	54	19	57	68	24	57	14	5	69	10	4	40	20	7	50
	2000	559	100	59	135	24	61	122	22	39	154	28	58	11	2	100	21	4	67	79	14	67
	2001	233	100	70	73	31	75	68	29	72	33	14	58	21	9	71	1	0	100(1)	25	11	60
	2002	657	100	65	245	37	76	155	24	54	136	21	54	8	1	63	10	2	40	77	12	77
	2003	178	100	62	22	12	55	62	35	48	47	26	70	9	5	89	5	3	40	24	13	75
COUNTY MEASURES	1995	17	7	53				6	35	33	2	12	0							6	35	83
	1996	115	20	49	4	3	50	35	30	29	35	30	54	4	3	100	7	6	14	23	20	65
	1997	24	7	63	8	33	63	6	25	67				4	17	100				4	17	25
	1998	121	21	59	1	1	0	32	26	38	32	26	72				4	3	25	25	21	76
	1999	33	17	67	1	3	100(1)	16	48	50	8	24	63							4	12	100
	2000	115	21	49	6	5	83	52	45	29	28	24	50				8	7	88	8	7	88
	2001	36	15	75	3	8	100	13	36	77	11	31	64	4	11	75	1	3	0	25	69	60
	2002	98	15	56	5	5	20	38	39	45	39	40	67	1	1	0	2	2	50	7	7	71
	2003	28	16	64	0	0	0	12	43	25	15	54	100	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CITY MEASURES	1995	118	47	71	4	3	75	7	6	29	38	32	58				7	6	43	48	41	94
	1996	371	65	58	10	3	30	98	26	43	120	32	58	25	7	76	11	3	55	92	25	75
	1997	144	42	58	2	1	50	70	49	50				28	19	54	7	49	71	27	19	89
	1998	287	50	60	9	3	78	102	36	48	79	28	53	7	2	43	5	2	80	69	24	77
	1999	119	42	53	4	3	75	27	23	52	48	40	48	8	67	100	10	8	40	16	13	38
	2000	297	53	60	11	4	82	65	22	45	113	38	56	6	2	100	11	4	64	71	24	70
	2001	94	40	68	8	9	63	32	34	72	18	19	61	3	3	100	1	1	100	24	26	63
	2002	309	47	60	12	4	83	102	33	58	94	30	48	5	2	60	8	3	38	70	23	77
	2003	89	50	67	2	2	50	14	16	71	29	33	55	6	7	100	5	6	40	24	27	75
SCHOOL DISTRICT MEASURES	1995	117	46	51	87	74	45	13	11	38	6	5	100	8	7	88	1	1	100(1)			
	1996	87	15	61	50	57	66	8	9	63	21	24	62	4	5	0						
	1997	174	51	62	118	68	59	23	13	70	1	1	100	13	7	92						
	1998	164	29	62	137	84	57	9	5	100	5	3	40	12	7	92						
	1999	131	46	62	102	78	58	11	8	82	12	9	92	6	5	33						
	2000	146	26	63	100	68	51	4	3	75	13	9	92	5	3	100						
	2001	103	44	71	62	60	76	23	22	70	4	4	25	14	14	64						
	2002	250	38	75	228	91	76	15	6	53	3	1	100	2	1	100						
	2003	61	34	52	20	33	55	36	59	47	3	5	67	2	3	100						

TREND TABLE B NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TOPIC, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

	ALL MEASURES			EDUCATION			GOVERNANCE			LAND USE			PUBLIC SAFETY			PUBLIC FACILITIES			GENERAL SERVICES			TRANSPORTATION			REVENUE			
	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of All Measures	Pass Rate	
ALL MEASURES	1995	252	100	61	120	48	53	63	25	84	16	6	63	12	5	50	14	6	50				2	1	0			
	1996	573	100	57	94	16	67	210	37	65	54	9	56	39	7	51	38	7	37	71	12	51	6	1	50			
	1997	342	100	60	176	51	63	43	13	67	20	6	70	12	4	42	15	4	60	34	10	59	4	1	50			
	1998	572	100	60	164	29	62	125	22	65	46	8	70	37	6	43	32	6	59	26	5	77	23	4	70			
	1999	283	100	59	119	42	59	62	22	63	29	10	41	14	5	57	4	1	75	13	5	54	8	3	88			
	2000	559	100	59	154	28	62	141	25	63	73	13	55	32	6	50	38	7	68	20	4	55	21	4	43	15	3	73
	2001	233	100	70	106	45	72	45	19	67	7	3	71	11	5	73	16	7	50	7	3	71	4	2	25	31	13	87
	2002	657	100	65	250	38	75	144	22	66	44	7	43	42	6	57	35	5	49	20	3	60	35	5	11	85	13	62
	2003	178	100	62	61	34	52	52	29	73	15	8	60	12	7	50	5	3	60	6	3	100	8	4	38	13	7	62
COUNTY MEASURES	1995	17	7	53				7	41	71	3	18	33				3	18	67				1	6	0			
	1996	115	20	49	1	1	100(1)	45	39	64	11	10	38	8	7	50	15	13	13	12	10	42	3	3	100			
	1997	24	7	63	2	8	100	5	21	60	3	13	100	2	8	0	5	21	40	3	13	100	1	4	100			
	1998	121	21	59				24	20	75	13	11	62	14	12	36	12	10	42	15	12	67	16	13	75			
	1999	33	17	67				5	15	80				3	9	50	3	9	67	3	9	0	8	24	88			
	2000	115	21	49	1	1	100(1)	22	19	64	17	15	35	14	12	36	14	12	36	8	7	63	16	14	50	9	8	78
	2001	36	15	75	2	6	100	12	33	58	1	3	100	7	19	100	5	14	80	4	11	75	1	3	0	4	11	75
	2002	98	15	56				34	35	71	7	7	71	15	15	33	11	11	36	7	7	57	5	5	40	12	12	67
	2003	28	16	64				10	36	90				5	18	40				2	7	100	2	7	100	6	21	17
CITY MEASURES	1995	118	47	71	3	3	100	56	47	86	11	9	64	12	10	50	11	9	45				1	1	0			
	1996	371	65	58	3	1	67	160	43	68	43	12	63	30	8	53	23	6	52	58	16	53	3	1	0			
	1997	144	42	58				38	26	68	17	12	65	10	7	50	10	7	40	31	22	55	3	2	33			
	1998	287	50	60				101	35	62	33	11	73	23	8	48	21	7	67	10	3	100	7	2	57			
	1999	119	42	53				35	29	69	29	24	41	11	9	64	1	1	100(1)	10	8	70						
	2000	297	53	60	7	2	71	119	40	64	56	19	61	23	8	57	22	7	86	12	4	50	8	3	63	2	1	50
	2001	94	40	68	3	3	0	33	35	73	6	6	67	4	4	25	12	13	58	3	3	67	3	3	33	27	29	89
	2002	309	47	60	1	0	0	110	36	65	37	12	38	27	9	70	24	8	54	13	4	62	5	2	40	72	23	63
	2003	89	50	67				42	47	69	15	17	60	7	8	57	5	6	60	4	4	100	6	7	33	7	8	100

TREND TABLE B NUMBER OF BALLOT MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TOPIC, JURISDICTION AND YEAR

		ALL MEASURES			EDUCATION			GOVERNANCE			LAND USE	PUBLIC SAFETY			PUBLIC FACILITIES			GENERAL SERVICES			TRANSPORTATION	REVENUE			
SCHOOL DISTRICT MEASURES	1995	117	46	51	117	100	51																		
	1996	87	15	61	80	92	66	5	6	0		1	1	0		1	1	0							
	1997	174	51	62	174	100	62																		
	1998	164	29	62	158	96	63	5	3	40															
	1999	131	46	62	119	91	59	12	9	92															
	2000	146	26	63	142	97	63																3	2	100
	2001	103	44	71	100	97	73	1	1	0			2	2	0										
	2002	250	38	75	249	100	0																1	0	0
2003	61	34	52	61	100	52																			

TREND TABLE C COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES BY COUNTY

	1998			1999			2000			2001			2002			2003			1998-2003		
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate
Butte							1	100	100										1	100	100
Contra Costa	1	33	100				4	80	25	1	100	100	2	100	50				8	73	50
El Dorado	2	12	50				7	78	29				1	50	100	6	100	0	16	47	25
Fresno	1	50	100																1	50	100
Inyo							1	50	100										1	50	100
Kern	6	100	50				2	100	0	4	100	75							12	100	50
Lassen							1	33	0				4	80	25				5	63	20
Marin				4	100	100	5	100	80	10	91	90	3	100	100	1	100	100	23	96	91
Mendocino				1	100	0							1	100	0				2	100	0
Monterey													1	100	0				1	100	0
Nevada							1	100	100										1	100	100
Orange	1	100	100													1	100	100	2	100	100
Placer	1	33	100																1	33	100
Plumas							1	100	100	2	100	100				1	50	100	4	80	100
Riverside				3	100	33				1	100	0	2	67	50	2	100	0	8	89	25
Sacramento	2	40	100				3	75	33										5	56	60
San Bernardino	2	100	50				3	100	67				1	100	0	1	100	0	7	100	43
San Diego	10	83	30				3	60	33	1	100	100	2	40	0				16	70	31
San Luis Obispo				5	100	100	1	33	0				1	50	100				7	70	86
Santa Barbara										1	100	0							1	100	0
Shasta							1	100	0										1	100	0
Siskiyou							2	100	100										2	100	100
Sonoma							1	20	100	1	100	100				1	100	100	3	43	100
Tuolumne				1	100	0	1	33	0										2	50	0
Yuba							2	67	50										2	67	50
Total for CSD/CSA Measures Over All Counties	26	21	54	14	42	71	40	35	48	21	58	81	18	18	44	13	46	38	132	72	55



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

	ALL CSD/CSA			TAXES			BONDS			ADVISORY			RECALLS			GANN LIMIT			ORDINANCE		
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate
1998	26	21	54	19	16	58													7	6	14
1999	14	42	71	11	33	64									3	9	100				
2000	40	35	48	28	24	29	1	1	100	3	3	67			6	5	100		2	2	100
2001	21	58	81	11	31	82	2	6	100				3	8	100	3	8	100	2	6	0
2002	18	18	44	14	14	36									4	4	75				
2003	13	46	38	11	39	27													2	7	100

**TREND TABLE E NUMBER OF COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT AND COUNTY SERVICE AREA MEASURES, PERCENT OF TOTAL COUNTY MEASURES, AND PERCENT PASSING BY TOPIC AND YEAR**

	ALL CSD/CSA			LAND USE			PUBLIC SAFETY			GOVERNANCE			ENVIRONMENT			TRANSPORTATION			PUBLIC FACILITIES			GENERAL SERVICES			REVENUES			
	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	% of County Measures	Pass Rate	
1998	26	21	54				12	10	58				3	2	33	2	2	50				6	5	17				
1999	14	42	71				2	6	50				3	9	0	5	15	100										
2000	40	35	48	2	2	0	10	9	30	2	2	100				6	5	17	5	4	40	5	4	60	1	1	100	
2001	21	58	81				6	17	100	4	11	75				1	3	0	4	11	75	4	11	75	2	6	100	
2002	18	18	44				11	11	45	3	3	67							3	3	33	1	1	0				
2003	13	46	38				5	18	40	2	7	100													6	21	17	

**TREND TABLE F COMPARISON OF PASS RATES FOR COUNTY-WIDE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT/ COUNTY SERVICE AREA TAX MEASURES, 1998-2003**

	Total Number of County Measures	NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE MEASURES		CSD/CSA MEASURES		NON-CSD/CSA COUNTY-WIDE TAX MEASURES		CSD/CSA COUNTY TAX MEASURES	
		Number of Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	Pass Rate	Number of Measures	Pass Rate
1998	121	95	60	26	54	13	9	19	58
1999	33	19	64	14	71	5	20	11	64
2000	115	75	50	40	48	24	30	28	29
2001	36	15	67	21	81	2	50	11	82
2002	98	80	59	18	44	24	50	14	36
2003	28	15	87	13	38	1	0	11	27

TREND TABLE G NUMBER OF CANDIDATES BY JURISDICTION AND YEAR

	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES			
	ALL CANDIDATES	COUNTY CANDIDATES	CITY CANDIDATES	SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES
1995	2,381	0	754	1,627
1996	5,530	822	2,160	2,548
1997	2,498	21	748	1,729
1998	5,502	1,167	1,903	2,432
1999	2,293	138	738	1,417
2000	5,153	894	2,200	2,059
2001	2,525	189	702	1,634
2002	6,072	1,412	2,210	2,450
2003	2,106	213	571	1,322
Total	34,060	4,856	11,986	17,218

TREND TABLE H NUMBER OF CANDIDATES FOR MAJOR COUNTY OFFICES BY YEAR

	ALL CANDIDATES	COUNTY CANDIDATES	COUNTY SUPERVISOR CANDIDATES	% OF COUNTY CANDIDATES	CSD/CSA CANDIDATES	% OF COUNTY CANDIDATES
1995	2,381	0	0	0	*	*
1996	5,530	822	574	70	*	*
1997	2,498	25	21	84	*	*
1998	5,502	1,167	362	31	22	2
1999	2,293	138	5	4	109	79
2000	5,153	894	501	56	174	19
2001	2,525	189	0	0	186	98
2002	6,072	1,412	362	26	266	19
2003	2,106	213	10	5	181	85
TOTAL	23,651	4,013	1,835	46	938	23

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

**TREND TABLE I PERCENT OF INCUMBENT CANDIDATES AND PERCENT OF PREVAILING INCUMBENTS BY MAJOR OFFICE, JURISDICTION AND YEAR**

		% OF ALL CANDIDATES	% OF COUNTY SUPERVISOR CANDIDATES	% OF CITY COUNCIL CANDIDATES	% OF SCHOOL DISTRICT CANDIDATES
PERCENT OF CANDIDATES WHO ARE INCUMBENTS	1995	27	0	18	30
	1996	26	24	23	28
	1997	30	5	23	33
	1998	32	27	26	32
	1999	30	0	23	32
	2000	30	30	26	32
	2001	30	0	24	32
	2002	34	32	27	36
	2003	31	0	22	35
PERCENTAGE OF INCUMBENTS WHO WIN	1995	79	0	78	78
	1996	79	69	75	78
	1997	76	0	79	74
	1998	85	86	82	83
	1999	77	0	80	75
	2000	79	87	80	75
	2001	77	0	79	76
	2002	82	78	79	79
	2003	76	0	72	77



---

2003 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, 2003

	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	1	1	1	0											1	0	3	1	4
Contra Costa	1	1	1	1											0	1	2	3	5
El Dorado	1	5															1	5	6
Fresno											3	0					3	0	3
Humboldt	0	1															0	1	1
Imperial			1	0													1	0	1
Kings			1	0													1	0	1
Lake	0	1															0	1	1
Los Angeles	3	2	2	1	3	2	1	2			4	0			3	8	16	15	31
Madera			0	1													0	1	1
Marin	4	3													1	0	5	3	8
Mendocino	2	1	2	0													4	1	5
Merced	0	1	1	1											0	1	1	3	4
Mono	1	0															1	0	1
Monterey	1	1													2	0	3	1	4
Napa	1	0			2	1	1	0					1	0			5	1	6
Orange	1	0							0	2	1	0					2	2	4
Plumas											0	1			1	0	1	1	2
Riverside	4	2	0	1											2	0	6	3	9
San Bernardino	1	2	0	1			1	0	1	0					1	0	4	3	7
San Francisco			1	0											13	0	14	0	14
San Joaquin					2	2											2	2	4
San Luis Obispo	0	1															0	1	1
San Mateo	6	2	1	0	1	0			0	1					0	2	8	5	13
Santa Clara	0	5													2	1	2	6	8
Santa Cruz	1	1															1	1	2
Shasta			1	0													1	0	1

TABLE A SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2003

	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
Solano	1	0	0	1					1	0					1	1	3	2	5
Sonoma	0	2													2	0	2	2	4
Stanislaus			0	1	1	1	3	0							2	0	6	2	8
Tulare			0	1	9	0									1	0	10	1	11
Tuolumne			0	1													0	1	1
Ventura															1	0	1	0	1
Yolo	1	0															1	0	1
All Counties	30	32	12	10	18	6	6	2	2	3	8	1	1	0	33	14	110	68	178



TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2003

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		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	TOTAL
Alameda	2	1					1	0											3	1	4
Contra Costa	2	2	0	1															2	3	5
El Dorado															1	5			1	5	6
Fresno	1	0					2	0											3	0	3
Humboldt	0	1																	0	1	1
Imperial	1	0																	1	0	1
Kings	1	0																	1	0	1
Lake									0	1									0	1	1
Los Angeles	3	3	1	1			9	10			1	1			1	0	1	0	16	15	31
Madera	0	1																	0	1	1
Marin	3	3			1	0							1	0					5	3	8
Mendocino	2	1							2	0									4	1	5
Merced	1	3																	1	3	4
Mono	1	0																	1	0	1
Monterey	1	0			0	1	2	0											3	1	4
Napa			1	0	1	0	0	1			1	0			1	0	1	0	5	1	6
Orange	1	0			1	0			0	2									2	2	4
Plumas							1	1											1	1	2
Riverside	0	1	1	0	2	2	1	0							2	0			6	3	9
San Bernardino	0	1			1	1	2	0			0	1			1	0			4	3	7
San Francisco	1	0					7	0	1	0			2	0			3	0	14	0	14
San Joaquin					0	1	1	1							1	0			2	2	4
San Luis Obispo	0	1																	0	1	1
San Mateo	6	2	0	3			1	0							1	0			8	5	13
Santa Clara	0	5	1	0							1	0					0	1	2	6	8
Santa Cruz	1	1																	1	1	2
Shasta	1	0																	1	0	1

**TABLE B SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2003**

	EDUCATION		LAND USE		PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORTATION		PUBLIC FACILITIES		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	TOTAL
Solano	1	0	2	1	0	1													3	2	5
Sonoma			1	0			1	0	0	2									2	2	4
Stanislaus	1	1	1	0			1	1					3	0					6	2	8
Tulare	1	1					9	0											10	1	11
Tuolumne	0	1																	0	1	1
Ventura			1	0															1	0	1
Yolo	1	0																	1	0	1
All Counties	32	29	9	6	6	6	38	14	3	5	3	2	6	0	8	5	5	1	110	68	178

TABLE C SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR ALL COUNTY, CITY AND SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES, 2003

		Director, CSD*		Other County Offices		City Council		Other City Offices		School Board Member		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
		Incumbent Candidates	Win	65.4	34	100.0	3	71.6	73	95.1	39	76.5	351
	Lose	34.6	18	0.0	0	28.4	29	4.9	2	23.5	108	23.9	157
	Total	100.0	52	100.0	3	100.0	102	100.0	41	100.0	459	100.0	657
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	48.8	63	20.7	6	31.0	113	21.9	14	35.2	304	34.5	500
	Lose	51.2	66	79.3	23	69.0	251	78.1	50	64.8	559	65.5	949
	Total	100.0	129	100.0	29	100.0	364	100.0	64	100.0	863	100.0	1449
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	35.1	34	33.3	3	39.2	73	73.6	39	53.6	351	50.0	500
	Non-Incumbent	64.9	63	66.7	6	60.8	113	26.4	14	46.4	304	50.0	500
	Total	100.0	97	100.0	9	100.0	186	100.0	53	100.0	655	100.0	1000
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	21.4	18	0.0	0	10.4	29	3.8	2	16.2	108	14.2	157
	Non-Incumbent	78.6	66	100.0	23	89.6	251	96.2	50	83.8	559	85.8	949
	Total	100.0	84	100.0	23	100.0	280	100.0	52	100.0	667	100.0	1106
All Candidates	Incumbent	28.7	52	9.4	3	21.9	102	39.0	41	34.7	459	31.2	657
	Non-Incumbent	71.3	129	90.6	29	78.1	364	61.0	64	65.3	863	68.8	1449
	Total	100.0	181	100.0	32	100.0	466	100.0	105	100.0	1322	100.0	2106

\*Directors of Community Service Districts, Community Service Areas, and Community Councils



---

---

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

---

---



TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2003

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
ALAMEDA	No County Measures							
ALPINE	No County Measures							
AMADOR	No County Measures							
BUTTE	No County Measures							
CALAVERAS	No County Measures							
COLUSA	No County Measures							
CONTRA COSTA	No County Measures							
DEL NORTE	No County Measures							
EL DORADO	6/17/2003	Measure F	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	82	189	43.4%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure T	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	56	105	53.3%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
	7/15/2003	Measure R	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	19	33	57.6%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
	8/5/2003	Measure G	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	438	885	49.5%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure W	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	211	465	45.4%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure S	Property Tax	Revenues: Tax Creation/Increase/Continuation	18	19	94.7%	Pass <sup>T</sup>
FRESNO	No County Measures							
GLENN	No County Measures							
HUMBOLDT	No County Measures							
IMPERIAL	No County Measures							
INYO	No County Measures							
KERN	No County Measures							
KINGS	No County Measures							
LAKE	11/4/2003	Measure C	Sales Tax	Transport: Roads	4,858	9,667	50.3%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
LASSEN	No County Measures							
LOS ANGELES	No County Measures							
MADERA	No County Measures							
MARIN	11/4/2003	Measure D	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	928	1,266	73.3%	Pass <sup>T</sup>
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							

<sup>T</sup> Indicates measure required a two-thirds vote to pass. <sup>F</sup> Indicates measure required a 55% vote to pass. All other county measures required a majority vote.

TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2003

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
NEVADA	No County Measures							
ORANGE	6/3/2003	Measure A	Property Tax	Safety: Police	343	415	82.7%	Pass <sup>T</sup>
PLACER	No County Measures							
PLUMAS	11/4/2003	Measure G	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	43	50	86.0%	Pass
	5/20/2003	Recall 2	Recall	Governance: Recall	587	1,644	35.7%	Fail
RIVERSIDE	7/23/2003	Measure E	Property Tax	Safety: Emergency Medical/Paramedic	2,112	4,127	51.2%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
		Measure F	Property Tax	Safety: Police	2,043	4,110	49.7%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
SACRAMENTO	No County Measures							
SAN BENITO	No County Measures							
SAN BERNARDINO	11/4/2003	Measure P	Property Tax	Safety: Fire	417	652	64.0%	Fail <sup>T</sup>
SAN DIEGO	No County Measures							
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2003	Measure B	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	125,142	187,245	66.8%	Pass
		Measure C	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	133,879	189,698	70.6%	Pass
		Measure D	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	104,922	187,620	55.9%	Pass
		Measure E	Ordinance	Governance	114,010	184,055	61.9%	Pass
		Measure F	Ordinance	Governance: Personnel/Labor Relations	128,112	189,577	67.6%	Pass
		Measure G	Ordinance	Governance	146,004	192,609	75.8%	Pass
		Measure H	Ordinance	Governance: Organization	99,314	191,214	51.9%	Pass
		Measure I	Ordinance	General Services: Social/Welfare	115,146	192,402	59.8%	Pass
		Measure J	Ordinance	General Services: Social/Welfare	113,564	193,435	58.7%	Pass
		Measure K	Ordinance	Transport: Mass Transit	142,042	189,921	74.8%	Pass <sup>T</sup>
		Measure L	Ordinance	Other	117,140	196,638	59.6%	Pass
		Measure M	Ordinance	Other	117,405	196,780	59.7%	Pass
		Measure N	Ordinance	Other	134,465	186,791	72.0%	Pass
		SAN JOAQUIN	No County Measures					
SAN LUIS OBISPO	No County Measures							
SAN MATEO	No County Measures							
SANTA BARBARA	No County Measures							
SANTA CLARA	No County Measures							
SANTA CRUZ	No County Measures							
SHASTA	No County Measures							
SIERRA	No County Measures							
SISKIYOU	No County Measures							
SOLANO	No County Measures							
SONOMA	12/16/2003	Measure F	Ordinance	Governance: Incorpor./Formation/Annexation	294	352	83.5%	Pass
STANISLAUS	No County Measures							



TABLE 1.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2003

COUNTY	DATE	MEASURE TITLE	TYPE OF MEASURE	TOPIC OF MEASURE	VOTE IN FAVOR	TOTAL VOTE	PERCENT OF VOTE	PASS OR FAIL
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, 2003

EL DORADO	6/17/2003	Measure F	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an annual special tax be levied in an amount not more than \$250.00 on each parcel of real property commencing with fiscal year 2003/04 and continuing each year thereafter?			
EL DORADO	6/17/2003	Measure T	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an annual special tax be levied in an amount not more than \$500.00 on each parcel of real property commencing with fiscal year 2003/04 and continuing each year thereafter?			
EL DORADO	7/15/2003	Measure R	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an annual special tax be levied in an amount not more than \$450.00 on each parcel of real property commencing with fiscal year 2003/04 and continuing each year thereafter?			
EL DORADO	8/5/2003	Measure G	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall an annual special tax be levied in an amount not more than \$15.00 on each parcel of real property commencing with fiscal year 2003/04 and continuing each year thereafter?; and if the election passes by a 2/3rd majority the county Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing to annex additional parcels into the existing Zone of Benefit #98585 making the Zone boundaries coterminous with the Fire District Boundaries.			
EL DORADO	8/5/2003	Measure W	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the annual parcel tax be increased for \$120.00 annually to \$156.00 for fiscal year 2003/2004; \$192.00 for fiscal year 2004/2005; \$228.00 for fiscal year 2005/2006; \$264.00 for fiscal year 2006/2007; and \$300.00 for fiscal year 2007/2008 and each fiscal year thereafter?			
EL DORADO	8/5/2003	Measure S	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall an annual special tax be levied in an amount not more than \$200.00 on each parcel of real property commencing with fiscal year 2003/04 and continuing each year thereafter?; and if the election passes by a 2/3rd majority the County Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing to form the Shadow Lane Road Zone of Benefit #98101 and LAFCO will dissolve the Shadow Lane CSD.			
LAKE	11/4/2003	Measure C	Fail (2/3 required)
Shall the Sales Tax Authority for Roadway Repairs impose a retail transactions and use tax at the rate of one-half percent (0.5%) for twenty (20) years within Lake County and the cities of Clearlake and Lakeport, and dedicated at least 85 percent of the money to fix potholes and repair and maintain local streets and roads, and the rest to pedestrian, bicycle, and bus improvements, with all expenditures subject to audits by a citizens' oversight committee and that the appropriations limit for fiscal year 2003/04 be set at \$3,000,000, as required by California Constitution XIII.B.			
MARIN	11/4/2003	Measure D	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall the Marinwood CSD Special Tax for Fire Protection and Prevention be increased from a maximum of 12 to a maximum of 18 cents per square foot of living or working area and, for unimproved acreage, increased from forty dollars to sixty dollars per acre; and shall the appropriations limit be increased by the amount of this voter-approved tax?			
ORANGE	6/3/2003	Measure A	Pass (2/3 required)
Shall an Ordinance be adopted extending and increasing the special tax on the parcels of property in Three Arch Bay District on the basis of \$200.00 per fiscal year per parcel containing residential or commercial improvements and \$130.00 per fiscal year per parcel of vacant land, for the purpose of providing Law Enforcement Services.			
PLUMAS	11/4/2003	Measure G	Pass
Upon adoption by the majority of registered voters in the Greenhorn Creek Community Services District, shall the Board of Directors of the District (currently the County Board of Supervisors) be changed to a Board of Directors elected by registered voters of the District, with the election of directors to be held at the next general district election?			
PLUMAS	5/20/2003	Recall 2	Fail
Shall Robert Meacher be recalled (removed) from the office of Supervisor District 2?			
RIVERSIDE	7/23/2003	Measure E	Fail (2/3 required)
Firefighter Paramedic Services. Shall the county of Riverside be authorized to establish a Special Tax of \$54.99 per parcel, per year on all parcels within CSA 152 "D" to finance the service of two firefighter paramedics? The Special Tax will be subject to an annual adjustment that is the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for all Consumers ("CPI-U") for the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County California Standard Metropolitan Statistical area ("Index") published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.			
RIVERSIDE	7/23/2003	Measure F	Fail (2/3 required)
Sheriff Services. Shall the county of Riverside be authorized to establish a Special Tax of \$41.31 per parcel, per year on all parcels within CSA 152 "D" to finance the service of two sheriff deputies? The Special Tax will be subject to an annual adjustment that is the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for all Consumers ("CPI-U") for the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County California Standard Metropolitan Statistical area ("Index") published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.			
SAN BERNARDINO	11/4/2003	Measure P	Fail (2/3 required)

## TABLE 1.2 TEXT FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY COUNTY, 2003

Shall a limited 4 year Special Fire Department Tax terminating June 30, 2007 in the amount of \$49.50 per year per parcel, both developed and undeveloped within the Morongo Valley Community Services District, be authorized to fund fire protection and emergency response services?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure B Pass  
Shall the City be authorized to amend its contract with the Public Employees Retirement System for retirement benefits for certain safety employees if the employees pay any increase in cost?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure C Pass  
Shall the Controller be required to monitor City services, audit City programs, and investigate complaints, and shall the City set aside at least 0.2% of the annual budget to fund these activities?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure D Pass  
Shall the City be required to have a Small Business Commission to set policies affecting small businesses, with four member appointed by the Mayor and three members appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure E Pass  
Shall the City consolidate its governmental ethics law in one code, amend some of those ethics laws, and create new ethics laws?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure F Pass  
Shall the City allow some of its employees to retire early if they are in job classifications where individual positions are being eliminated because of the City's budget shortfall?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure G Pass  
Shall the City create a "rainy day" fund for money collected when there is an unusually large surplus, and for use in years when there is a revenue shortfall?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure H Pass  
Shall the City increase the size of the Police Commission and change how its members are appointed, and shall the Office of Citizen Complaints be authorized to file charges against police officers with the Police Commission.

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure I Pass  
Shall the City create a program to pay part of the cost of child care and preschool for families with income under a specified limit and with at least one child between three and five years old?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure J Pass  
Shall the City provide temporary shelter for homeless seniors, youth, families and disabled individuals that is separate from the temporary shelter provided to the general homeless population?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure K Pass (2/3 required)  
Shall the City implement a 30-year New Transportation Expenditure Plan directing transportation sales tax funds to improved maintenance of local streets, transportation for the elderly and disabled, the Central Subway, a citywide network of fast and reliable buses, the Caltrain Extension to a new Transbay Terminal, improvements to pedestrian and bicycle safety and other projects and continue the existing half-cent sales tax during implementation of the New Transportation Expenditure Plan and future Plan updates?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure L Pass  
Shall the City require employers to pay a minimum wage of \$8.50 per hour (as adjusted for increases in the regional consumer price index) for work performed in San Francisco?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure M Pass  
Shall the City replace its anti-begging and aggressive solicitation laws with a new, more specific law that bans solicitation in certain public places and aggressive solicitation in all public places?

SAN FRANCISCO 11/4/2003 Measure N Pass  
Shall the City be prohibited from taking away a taxi permit if the permit holder is unable, because of a disability, to drive the taxi the required minimum number of hours or shifts per year?

SONOMA 12/16/2003 Measure F Pass  
Shall the order adopted on September 10, 2003 by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County ordering a reorganization consisting of dissolution of the Graton Sanitation Zone of the Sonoma County Water Agency, formation of the Graton Community Services District, and designation of the Graton Community Services District as the successor in interest to the Graton Sanitation Zone be approved, subject to the terms and conditions specified in the order?

TABLE 1.3 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TYPE OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2003

	TAXES		RECALL		ORDINANCE		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
El Dorado	1	5					1	5	6
Lake	0	1					0	1	1
Marin	1	0					1	0	1
Orange	1	0					1	0	1
Plumas			0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Riverside	0	2					0	2	2
San Bernardino	0	1					0	1	1
San Francisco					13	0	13	0	13
Sonoma					1	0	1	0	1
All Counties	3	10	0	1	15	0	18	10	28

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY BALLOT MEASURES BY TOPIC OF MEASURE AND COUNTY, 2003

	PUBLIC SAFETY		GOVERNANCE		TRANSPORTATION		GENERAL SERVICES		REVENUE		OTHER		ALL COUNTY MEASURES		
	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	FAIL	TOTAL
El Dorado									1	5			1	5	6
Lake					0	1							0	1	1
Marin	1	0											1	0	1
Orange	1	0											1	0	1
Plumas			1	1									1	1	2
Riverside	0	2											0	2	2
San Bernardino	0	1											0	1	1
San Francisco			7	0	1	0	2	0			3	0	13	0	13
Sonoma			1	0									1	0	1
All Counties	2	3	9	1	1	1	2	0	1	5	3	0	18	10	28



---

PART 2

VOTE TOTALS FOR  
COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES

---





TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

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	No County Contests												
ALPINE	No County Contests												
AMADOR	No County Contests												
BUTTE	No County Contests												
CALAVERAS	No County Contests												
COLUSA	No County Contests												
CONTRA COSTA	No County Contests												
DEL NORTE	No County Contests												
EL DORADO	7/29/2003	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Full	Sweeney	Jack	Local Business Owner	No	3	3,398	6,438	52.8%	Yes
					Lishman	Kathi	Teacher/City Councilmember	No	3	2,169	6,438	33.7%	No
					Amaro	Allen	Businessman/Energy Consultant	No	3	871	6,438	13.5%	No
	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Fallen Leaf Lake CSD	Full	Stauffer	Karl	Consultant	No	4	39	127	30.7%	Yes	
				Calof	Larry	Attorney	No	4	37	127	29.1%	Yes	
				Malley	Stephen A.	Attorney	No	4	32	127	25.2%	Yes	
				Bacchetti	Tom	Performing Arts Executive	No	4	19	127	15.0%	No	
				DIRECTOR, Grizzly Flats CSD	Short	Lacy	Barbara S.	Retired Banker	No	2	125	164	76.2%
		Tyler	Walt	Appointed Incumbent		Yes	2	39	164	23.8%	No		
FRESNO	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Easton CSD	Full	Ruiz	Sue	Teacher	No	3	96	282	34.0%	Yes	
				Koop	Rose R.	Retired	No	3	94	282	33.3%	Yes	
				Koop	Richard R.	Retired	Yes	3	81	282	28.7%	No	
GLENN	No County Contests												
HUMBOLDT	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Manila CSD	Full	Dengler	Dendra	Preschool Teacher	No	4	101	352	28.7%	Yes	
				Glass	Violet	Landscaper	No	4	90	352	25.6%	Yes	
				Dellas	Tim	Incumbent	Yes	4	86	352	24.4%	Yes	
				Fennell	Michael W.	Incumbent	Yes	4	74	352	21.0%	No	
	DIRECTOR, McKinleyville CSD	Full	Trepanier	Paul	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,400	4,267	32.8%	Yes		
			Corbett	John W.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	1,325	4,267	31.1%	Yes		
			Johnson	Robert W.	Local Business Owner	No	4	893	4,267	20.9%	No		
			Mayo	Dennis R.	Rancher/Horse Breeder	No	4	633	4,267	14.8%	No		
			Short	Masters	Kevin	Utility Crew Leader	No	3	950	2,203	43.1%	Yes	
				Fritz	James L.	Retired	No	3	642	2,203	29.1%	No	
		Dodd	Donald	Electronic Systems Analyst	No	3	605	2,203	27.5%	No			

<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, 2003

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
HUMBOLDT (continued)	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Willow Creek CSD		Full	Ogorman	Tom	Farmer	No	5	236	900	26.2%	Yes
					Gower	Judy	Bank Manager	No	5	231	900	25.7%	Yes
					Hansen	Betty	Business Owner	No	5	199	900	22.1%	Yes
					Duggan	E.B.	Incumbent	Yes	5	179	900	19.9%	No
					Shannon	Katherine	Land Manager	No	5	51	900	5.7%	No
IMPERIAL	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Salton CSD		Full	Palmer	Shirley Lee	Business Woman	No	5	115	456	25.2%	Yes
					Butler	Bob	Incumbent	Yes	5	102	456	22.4%	Yes
					Cannell	Thomas	Retired District Manager	No	5	101	456	22.1%	No
					Bigelow	Judson	No Ballot Designation	No	5	97	456	21.3%	No
					McGinzie	Charlotee A.	Retired Visiting Nurse	No	5	41	456	9.0%	No
				Short	Patterson	David C.	Firefighter	No	6	99	454	21.8%	Yes
					Urbanoski	David J.	No Ballot Designation	No	6	99	454	21.8%	Yes
					Erskine	E. David	Retired District Manager	No	6	95	454	20.9%	No
					Kotlensky	William V.	Incumbent	Yes	6	64	454	14.1%	No
					Rusinko	Dottie	Editor	No	6	50	454	11.0%	No
					Mischel	Gerri	In-home Care Nurse	No	6	47	454	10.4%	No
INYO	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Olancho CSD		Full	Gordon	Neale S.	Labor Supervisor	No	5	67	226	29.6%	Yes
					Jones	Tim E.	No Ballot Designation	No	5	56	226	24.8%	Yes
					Salmonds	Melinda	No Ballot Designation	Yes	5	39	226	17.3%	Yes
					Swadley	Norma	No Ballot Designation	Yes	5	36	226	15.9%	No
					Pruce	Lawrence A.	No Ballot Designation	No	5	28	226	12.4%	No
				Short	Martinez	Ray	Retired SBC Technician	No	2	56	82	68.3%	Yes
					Palley	Mickey	No Ballot Designation	Yes	2	26	82	31.7%	No
KERN	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Boron CSD		Full	Petrey	Brad	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	97	304	31.9%	Yes
					Judd	Pete	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	88	304	28.9%	Yes
					Campbell	Curtis R.	Accounting Clerk	No	4	65	304	21.4%	No
					Welling	James	Businessman/Field Representative	No	4	54	304	17.8%	No
		DIRECTOR, Desert Lake CSD		Full	Bumgardner	Bill R.	Incumbent	Yes	4	132	443	29.8%	Yes
					Lucks	Timothy D.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	108	443	24.4%	Yes
					Searcy	Aaron	Millwright	No	4	103	443	23.3%	Yes
					Kostopoulos	Dollie	Incumbent	Yes	4	100	443	22.6%	No
KINGS	No County Contests												
LAKE	No County Contests												
LASSEN	No County Contests												
LOS ANGELES	No County Contests												
MADERA	No County Contests												

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

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		
MARIN	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Bel Marin Keys CSD		Full	McGrath	Bill	Vice President Construction	No	8	509	1,787	28.5%	Yes		
					Foley	Bob	Retired	No	8	503	1,787	28.1%	Yes		
					Khachadour	Angele	Retired Attorney	No	8	474	1,787	26.5%	Yes		
					Williams-Clarke	Victoria	Incumbent	Yes	8	100	1,787	5.6%	No		
					Casler	Mary Ann	Graphic Artist	No	8	78	1,787	4.4%	No		
					Tweed	Kevin S.	Marine Services	No	8	78	1,787	4.4%	No		
					Crawford	John	Retired	No	8	26	1,787	1.5%	No		
					Graves	Jefferson James	Retired Bank Officer	No	8	18	1,787	1.0%	No		
		DIRECTOR, Marin City CSD	Full	Krog	Hazlitt	Multimedia Producer/Entrepreneur	No	6	193	785	24.6%	Yes			
				Morgan	Derek A.	Community Service Director	No	6	162	785	20.6%	Yes			
				Parker	Donald	Business Owner	No	6	161	785	20.5%	No			
				Fisher	Robert E.	Businessperson/Engineer	No	6	158	785	20.1%	No			
				Thompson	Terry Aaron	Incumbent	Yes	6	69	785	8.8%	No			
				Ashby	Karen Elaine	Mother	No	6	39	785	5.0%	No			
					Short	Atkins	Melvin	Community Volunteer	No	2	223	424	52.6%	Yes	
		DIRECTOR, Marinwood CSD	Full	Winter	Nita	Photographer	No	2	199	424	46.9%	No			
				Dods	Walter K.	Incumbent	Yes	4	795	2,713	29.3%	Yes			
				Bolding	Genevieve T.	Incumbent	Yes	4	755	2,713	27.8%	Yes			
				Feldstein	Margaret B.	Incumbent	Yes	4	611	2,713	22.5%	Yes			
				Ballas-Ward	Mari C.	Escrow Officer	No	4	541	2,713	19.9%	No			
		DIRECTOR, Tamalpais CSD	Full	Bartschat	Steffen J.	Business Executive	No	4	943	3,187	29.6%	Yes			
				Johnson	Linda F.	Business Owner	No	4	908	3,187	28.5%	Yes			
				Kirby-Glading	Sandra	Businesswoman	No	4	873	3,187	27.4%	Yes			
				Chapman	Judith	Incumbent	Yes	4	455	3,187	14.3%	No			
		MARIPOSA	No County Contests												
		MENDOCINO	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Brooktrails Townsh. CSD		Full	Ziady	Mary S.	Nurse Practitioner	No	3	344	880	39.1%	Yes
							Horrick	Ed	Incumbent	Yes	3	267	880	30.3%	Yes
							Dussault	Don	Retired Teacher	No	3	265	880	30.1%	No
DIRECTOR, Covelo CSD	Full			Tucker	Tony	Butcher	No	3	58	117	49.6%	Yes			
				Brown	Jani	Incumbent	Yes	3	41	117	35.0%	Yes			
				Arge	Robert C.	Incumbent	Yes	3	17	117	14.5%	No			
MERCED	No County Contests														
MODOC	No County Contests														
MONO	No County Contests														

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

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
MONTEREY	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Pebble Beach CSD		Full	Stewart, III	Hampton	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,324	4,410	30.0%	Yes
					Laska	Leo M.	Incumbent	Yes	4	1,106	4,410	25.1%	Yes
					Hornbuckle	Gary D.	Engineer	No	4	1,072	4,410	24.3%	Yes
					Nero	James J.	Attorney	No	4	908	4,410	20.6%	No
NAPA	No County Contests												
NEVADA	No County Contests												
ORANGE	1/28/2003	COUNTY SUPERVISOR	3	Short	Campbell	Bill	Local Businessman/Legislator	No	5	26,206	35,116	74.6%	Yes
					Potts	Jim	Police Supervisor/Businessman	No	5	4,692	35,116	13.4%	No
					Boeckler	Douglas	Supervising Veterans Representative	No	5	2,085	35,116	5.9%	No
					Wetzel	William A.	Assistant Professor	No	5	1,548	35,116	4.4%	No
					Douglas	Robert Louis	Reserve Deputy Sheriff	No	5	585	35,116	1.7%	No
PLACER	No County Contests												
PLUMAS	5/20/2003	COUNTY SUPERVISOR <sup>R</sup>	2	Short	Baker	Paul	Retired C. H. P.	No	2	579	1,206	48.0%	Yes
					Donnell	Ken "K. D."	Businessman/Inventor/Parent	No	2	497	1,206	41.2%	No
	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Indian Valley CSD		Full	Peter	James B.	Incumbent	Yes	4	299	1,095	27.3%	Yes
					Austin	Floyd R.	Self Employed	No	4	295	1,095	26.9%	Yes
					Walker	Kenneth	No Ballot Designation	No	4	261	1,095	23.8%	No
Soares	Phillip Butch	Retired Construction Worker	No	4	240	1,095	21.9%	No					
RIVERSIDE	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Santa Rosa CSD		Full	Kelly	Walt	Avocado Grower	No	3	159	355	44.8%	Yes
					Rubin	Steven	Business Owner	No	3	111	355	31.3%	Yes
					Hayes	Fred M.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	3	85	355	23.9%	No
SACRAMENTO	No County Contests												
SAN BENITO	No County Contests												
SAN BERNARDINO	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Big Bear CSD		Full	Ollila	Rick	Engineer/Business Owner	No	6	510	2,121	24.0%	Yes
					Colven	Robert W.	Incumbent	Yes	6	469	2,121	22.1%	Yes
					Espinoza	Barbara	Retired Educator	No	6	452	2,121	21.3%	No
					Miller	Patricia M.	Retired	No	6	433	2,121	20.4%	No
					Johnston	Susan	No Ballot Designation	No	6	135	2,121	6.4%	No
					Mitchell	Mike	Security Officer	No	6	119	2,121	5.6%	No
		Short		Cartwright	Bob	Owner Business	No	2	754	1,291	58.4%	Yes	
				Ziegler	Al	Business Owner	No	2	522	1,291	40.4%	No	
		DIRECTOR, Big River CSD		Full	Grugel	Paul H.	Retired Police Officer	Yes	5	93	346	26.9%	Yes
					Oelrich	Jack R.	No Ballot Designation	No	5	88	346	25.4%	Yes
					Gaffney	Kathy Robyn	Master Optician	Yes	5	75	346	21.7%	Yes
Robledo	Dianne L.		No Ballot Designation		No	5	54	346	15.6%	No			
Harvey	Nelson T.		Retired		No	5	36	346	10.4%	No			

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

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

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)	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Daggett CSD		Full	Alf	Lawrence	Retired	Yes	4	44	143	30.8%	Yes
					Rodriguez	Ramon A.	Retired	Yes	4	42	143	29.4%	Yes
					Koch	Irene L.	Retired	Yes	4	30	143	21.0%	Yes
					Hazelett	Mentie	Cable Worker	No	4	27	143	18.9%	No
	DIRECTOR, Lake Arrowhead CSD	Full	Keefe	Steven R.	Mortgage Lender	No	6	417	1,479	28.2%	Yes		
			Heyck	Ted	Attorney	No	6	340	1,479	23.0%	Yes		
			Marsella	Greg	Attorney	No	6	279	1,479	18.9%	No		
			Xander	Pete	Land Use Planner	No	6	184	1,479	12.4%	No		
			Crawford	Dan	Pharmacist	No	6	138	1,479	9.3%	No		
			Melville	Robert "Bob"	Property Manager	No	6	120	1,479	8.1%	No		
		Short	Kendrick	John "Jack"	Retired	No	3	412	849	48.5%	Yes		
			Roberts	Bill	Business Consultant	No	3	315	849	37.1%	No		
			Bobbitt	Charles F.	Retired Engineer	No	3	121	849	14.3%	No		
			DIRECTOR, Morongo Valley CSD			Full	Egan	Bill	Incumbent	Yes	3	319	933
	Osborne	Chuck	Incumbent	Yes	3		301	933	32.3%	Yes			
	Moon	Michael	Wastewater Specialist	No	3		283	933	30.3%	No			
	Short	Mallett	Rosemary	Educator	No		2	270	545	49.5%	Yes		
		Miller	Robert "Bob"	Appointed Incumbent	Yes		2	266	545	48.8%	No		
	DIRECTOR, Newberry CSD	Full	Olson	John L.	Retired County Employee	No	3	179	394	45.4%	Yes		
			Merrell	Susan	Retired	No	3	126	394	32.0%	Yes		
Riseling			Lois Marie	Retired	No	3	83	394	21.1%	No			
SAN DIEGO	No County Contests												
SAN FRANCISCO	11/4/2003	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Hallinan	Terrence	District Attorney	Yes	3	70,580	196,892	35.8%	Yes
					Harris	Kamala	Deputy City Attorney	No	3	66,248	196,892	33.6%	No
					Fazio	Bill	Attorney	No	3	59,834	196,892	30.4%	No
	MAYOR	Full	Newsom	Gavin	Member, Board of Supervisors	No	9	87,196	208,008	41.9%	Yes		
			Gonzalez	Matt	President, Board of Supervisors	No	9	40,714	208,008	19.6%	No		
			Alioto	Angela	Civil Rights Attorney	No	9	33,446	208,008	16.1%	No		
			Ammiano	Tom	Mbr, San Francisco Board of Supervisors	No	9	21,452	208,008	10.3%	No		
			Leal	Susan	San Francisco Treasurer	No	9	17,641	208,008	8.5%	No		
			Ribera	Tony	Educator/Public Administrator	No	9	5,015	208,008	2.4%	No		
			Denny	Michael F.	Company President	No	9	925	208,008	0.4%	No		
			Schulke	Roger E.	Computer Company Executive	No	9	755	208,008	0.4%	No		
			Reid	Jim	Constructor/Builder	No	9	733	208,008	0.4%	No		
			SHERIFF	Full	Hennessey	Michael	Sheriff	Yes	2	145,583	177,527	82.0%	Yes
	Carrasco	Tony			Deputy Sheriff	No	2	31,446	177,527	17.7%	No		

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

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)	12/9/2003	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		Full	Hallinan	Terence	District Attorney	Yes	2	137,111	242,728	56.5%	Yes
					Harris	Kamala	Deputy City Attorney	No	2	105,617	242,728	43.5%	No
		MAYOR		Full	Newsom	Gavin	Member, Board of Supervisors	No	2	133,546	252,875	52.8%	Yes
					Gonzalez	Matt	President, Board of Supervisors	No	2	119,329	252,875	47.2%	No
SAN JOAQUIN	3/4/2003	CITY COUNCIL		Full	De Brum	Steve	Agri-Businessman	No	4	1,997	4,121	48.5%	Yes
					Flores	Wayne	Peace Officer/Teacher	No	4	769	4,121	18.7%	No
					Thomas	Alan B.	Businessman/Golf Professional	No	4	700	4,121	17.0%	No
					Reams	Sid	Realtor	No	4	641	4,121	15.6%	No
SAN LUIS OBISPO	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, California Valley CSD		Full	Forrest	Tammy L.	Homemaker	No	6	35	165	21.2%	Yes
					Ortega	Thomas	Incumbent	Yes	6	33	165	20.0%	Yes
					Rahner	Fred	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	6	31	165	18.8%	Yes
					Legaspi	Ruth	Housewife	No	6	30	165	18.2%	No
					Guidotti	Melody L.	Housewife	No	6	12	165	7.3%	No
					Guide	Sal	Retired	No	6	12	165	7.3%	No
SAN MATEO	11/4/2003	MEMBER, Midcoast CC		Full	Gardner	Charles M.	Civil Engineer	No	6	1,172	5,813	20.2%	Yes
					Lieberman	Howard R.	Intellectual Property Professor	No	6	1,028	5,813	17.7%	Yes
					Bassler	Sara	Psychiatrist	No	6	993	5,813	17.1%	Yes
					Merrilees	Neil	Father/Designer/Contractor	No	6	908	5,813	15.6%	No
					Erickson	Gael	No Ballot Designation	No	6	899	5,813	15.5%	No
					Hosilyk	David	Attorney	No	6	813	5,813	14.0%	No
SANTA BARBARA	No County Contests												
SANTA CLARA	No County Contests												
SANTA CRUZ	No County Contests												
SHASTA	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Centerville CSD		Full	Moty	Leonard	Incumbent	Yes	4	324	965	33.6%	Yes
					Richison	Walt	Incumbent	Yes	4	284	965	29.4%	Yes
					Harding	Robert D.	Retired Civil Engineer	No	4	186	965	19.3%	No
					Goodwin	Bill	Engineer/Surveyor	No	4	171	965	17.7%	No
		DIRECTOR, Shasta CSD		Full	Swagerty	Brian	Incumbent	Yes	3	199	539	36.9%	Yes
					Lampley	Bonnie	Geologist/Hydrologist	No	3	171	539	31.7%	Yes
					Pratt	Larry E.	Incumbent	Yes	3	169	539	31.4%	No
SIERRA	No County Contests												
SISKIYOU	No County Contests												
SOLANO	No County Contests												
SONOMA	No County Contests												

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

COUNTY	DATE	OFFICE	DIS-TRICT/ SEAT	TERM OF OFFICE	CANDIDATE'S LAST NAME	CANDIDATE'S FIRST NAME	CANDIDATE'S BALLOT DESIGNATION	IN- CUM BENT	NUMBER OF CAN- DIDATES	VOTES FOR CAN- DIDATE	TOTAL VOTES CAST <sup>1</sup>	PER- CENT OF VOTE	ELECTED
STANISLAUS	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Monterey Park CSD		Full	McNeir	David J.	Appointed Incumbent	Yes	4	18	44	40.9%	Yes
					Jones	Sebastian J.	No Ballot Designation	No	4	10	44	22.7%	No
					McNeir	Lucille	Minister	No	4	10	44	22.7%	No
					Jordan, Jr.	Herman	No Ballot Designation	No	4	3	44	6.8%	No
				Short	Martinez	Shirley A.	Account Clerk	No	4	24	67	35.8%	Yes
					Simpson	Darrel Lewis	No Ballot Designation	No	4	23	67	34.3%	Yes
					Jordan, Sr.	Grady Lee	No Ballot Designation	No	4	19	67	28.4%	Yes
					Gradford	Jerry Ann	Director	Yes	4	1	67	1.5%	No
SUTTER	No County Contests												
TEHAMA	No County Contests												
TRINITY	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Douglas City CSD		Full	Whitridge	Arnold	Incumbent	Yes	3	132	290	45.5%	Yes
					Wallace	David	Retired Firefighter	No	3	82	290	28.3%	Yes
					Whiting	Geary Hilton	No Ballot Designation	No	3	75	290	25.9%	No
		DIRECTOR, Lewiston CSD		Full	Jud	Barbara	Incumbent	Yes	4	193	635	30.4%	Yes
					Harris	John R.	Incumbent	Yes	4	168	635	26.5%	Yes
					Poulton	Cliff	General Contractor/Businessman	No	4	148	635	23.3%	No
					Leedy	Ron	Pastor	No	4	125	635	19.7%	No
		Short		Ryan	Joelyn	Retired	No	3	191	540	35.4%	Yes	
				Chandler	Cliff	Retired	No	3	174	540	32.2%	Yes	
				Pratt	Gerald G.	Incumbent	Yes	3	173	540	32.0%	No	
TULARE	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Richgrove CSD		Full	Irizarry	Benicio T.	Truck Driver	No	5	44	151	29.1%	Yes
					Alvizo	Abel	Auto Body/Painter	No	5	36	151	23.8%	Yes
					Rodriguez	Rose B.	Incumbent	Yes	5	33	151	21.9%	No
					Martinez	Juan	No Ballot Designation	No	5	29	151	19.2%	No
					Espinoza	Eulalio	Retired	No	5	9	151	6.0%	No
		DIRECTOR, Three Rivers CSD		Full	Mills	Dennis S.	Transportation Engineer	No	4	292	940	31.1%	Yes
					Sparks	Tom	Electric Power Consultant	No	4	248	940	26.4%	Yes
					Andrus	Vincent D.	General Building Contractor	No	4	218	940	23.2%	Yes
					Simonian	Rod A.	Business Owner	No	4	181	940	19.3%	No
					TUOLUMNE	11/4/2003	DIRECTOR, Groveland CSD		Full	Brizard	Al	Retired Farmer	No
			Maxwell	Craig	Inn Keeper/Consultant	No	3	381		1,207	31.6%	Yes	
			Crivello	Joseph	Emergency Medical Technician	No	3	351		1,207	29.1%	No	
			Short	Myers	Don	Retired Peace Officer	No	3		299	721	41.5%	Yes
				Baker	Jerry	Retired Operations Mgmt	No	3		247	721	34.3%	No
				Henderson	Allie	Human Resources/Payroll	No	3		175	721	24.3%	No

TABLE 2.1 VOTE TOTALS FOR COUNTY OFFICE CANDIDATES BY COUNTY AND ELECTION DATE, 2003

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
VENTURA	6/3/2003	DIRECTOR, Bell Canyon CSD		Short	Christie	Howard J.	Retired Engineer/Management	No	3	51	132	38.6%	Yes
					Subbaraman	G.	Project Manager	No	3	41	132	31.1%	No
					Keijer	Iris Malsman	Attorney at Law	No	3	40	132	30.3%	No
YOLO	No County Contests												
YUBA	No County Contests												



TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF ELECTION OUTCOMES FOR COUNTY OFFICES, 2003

		County Supervisor		Director, CSD*		District Attorney		Sheriff		Other County Offices		Total	
		Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
		Incumbent Candidates	Win	0.0	0	65.4	34	100.0	2	100.0	1	0.0	0
	Lose	0.0	0	34.6	18	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	32.7	18
	Total	0.0	0	100.0	52	100.0	2	100.0	1	0.0	0	100.0	55
Non-Incumbent Candidates	Win	30.0	3	48.8	63	0.0	0	0.0	0	20.0	3	43.7	69
	Lose	70.0	7	51.2	66	100.0	3	100.0	1	80.0	12	56.3	89
	Total	100.0	10	100.0	129	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0	15	100.0	158
Winning Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	35.1	34	100.0	2	100.0	1	0.0	0	34.9	37
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	3	64.9	63	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	3	65.1	69
	Total	100.0	3	100.0	97	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	3	100.0	106
Losing Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	21.4	18	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	16.8	18
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	7	78.6	66	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0	12	83.2	89
	Total	100.0	7	100.0	84	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0	12	100.0	107
All Candidates	Incumbent	0.0	0	28.7	52	40.0	2	50.0	1	0.0	0	25.8	55
	Non-Incumbent	100.0	10	71.3	129	60.0	3	50.0	1	100.0	15	74.2	158
	Total	100.0	10	100.0	181	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	15	100.0	213

\* Directors of Community Service Districts, County Service Areas and Community Councils