**2015 Rural Counties Task Force Board Composition Comparison**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agency | Total Board members | Elected  County Supervisors | Elected each city Council | Other Elected | Non-elected | Alternates elected |
| Alpine | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Amador | 6 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 |  |
| Calaveras | 7 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Colusa | 6 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Del Norte | 6 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 |  |
| EDCTC | 6 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Glenn | 6 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Humboldt | 8 | 1 | 7 |  |  |  |
| Inyo | 6 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| Lake | 8 | 2 | 4 |  | 2 |  |
| Lassen | 6 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Mariposa | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Mendocino | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 |  |  |
| Modoc | 6 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| Mono | 6 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  |
| Monterey | 24 | 6 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Nevada | 7 | 2 | 3 |  | 2 |  |
| Placer | 9 | 2 | 6 |  | 1 |  |
| San Benito | 5 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Santa Cruz | 12 | 5 | 4 |  | 3 |  |
| Sierra | 7 | 3 | 3 |  | 1 |  |
| Siskiyou | 6 | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Tehama | 6 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Trinity | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Tuolumne | 6 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 |  |

Note: some of the agencies may or may not choose to have an *elected* officer over a *non-elected* citizen.