

**2006 --COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS--BALLOTS CAST vs VOTES CAST COMPARISON**  
**BOLD FONT INDICATES THOSE ELECTED**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>TOTAL BALLOTS CAST</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES CAST</b>	<b>% BALLOTS CAST METHOD (1)</b>	<b>% VOTES CAST METHOD (2)</b>
ECTON		9,402	<b>50.90%</b>	<b>58.45%</b>
LITTLEFIELD		8,089	43.79%	50.29%
NELSEN		9,596	<b>51.95%</b>	<b>59.65%</b>
OSTERMAN		8,261	44.72%	<b>51.36%</b>
BOYD		3,269	17.70%	20.32%
CRAWFORD		2,843	15.39%	17.67%
GINDLESPERGER		1,397	7.56%	8.68%
HUGUS		1,343	7.27%	8.35%
LOOMIS		867	4.69%	5.39%
REICH		2,046	11.08%	12.72%
STAFFORD		643	3.48%	4.00%
WRITE INS		495	2.68%	3.08%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18,472</b>	<b>48,251</b>		

**COMMENTS:**

UNDER EXISTING CHARTER PROVISIONS THE ELECTION RESULTS WERE....MR.ECTON & MR. NELSEN WERE ELECTED & MR. OSTERMAN & MR. LITTLEFIELD PARTICIPATED IN THE "RUN OFF" ELECTION WON BY MR. LITTLEFIELD....,UNDER THE VOTE COUNTING METHOD ALL 4 OF THESE CANDIDATES WOULD HAVE BEEN DEEMED TO HAVE A MAJORITY OF THE VOTES CAST AND MR. ECTON & MR. NELSEN & MR. OSTERMAN WOULD HAVE BEEN ELECTED EVEN THOUGH **MR. OSTERMAN WOULD HAVE BEEN NAMED BY ONLY 44.72% OF THOSE CASTING BALLOTS**

**1) EXISTING CHARTER---COUNT BALLOTS BASE**

TOTAL BALLOTS CAST	18,472	
TOTAL REQUIRED TO ELECT--- TOTAL BALLOTS CAST DIVIDED BY 2 + 1	9,237	REQUIRED TO ELECT-BALLOTS COUNTING METHOD-- EXISTING CHARTER

**2) EFFECT OF CHANGING TO --COUNT VOTES BASE**

TOTAL VOTES CAST	48,251	
TOTAL VOTES CAST DIVIDED BY 3	16,084	
TOTAL VOTES CAST--DIVIDED BY 3 THEN DIVIDED BY 2 + 1	8,042	REQUIRED TO ELECT-VOTES COUNTING METHOD