



MOST STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS WIN VOTER APPROVAL

Frank Moore
CDIAC Policy Research Unit

Certified election results gathered by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) shows that state and local general obligation (GO) bonds fared extremely well in the November 5, 2002 General Election. Voters approved all three of the statewide bond proposals and 78 percent of the local bond measures. This article provides an overview of these election results.

State General Obligation Bonds All Approved

All three of the State of California's GO bond measures were approved. The following provides a summary of the three statewide GO bond measures approved by California voters.

- Proposition 46.** This measure allows the State to sell \$2.1 billion of GO bonds to provide shelter for battered women, clean and safe housing for low-income senior citizens, emergency shelters for homeless families with children, housing with social services for the homeless and mentally ill, repairs and accessibility improvements to apartments for families and handicapped citizens, homeownership assistance for military veterans, and security improvements and repairs to existing emergency shelters. Voters approved the measure by a 58 to 42 percent margin. The bond gained majority approval in 29 out of 58 counties in the State. Support came from the San Francisco Bay Area, Central Coast, and Los Angeles, Imperial/San Diego, and Riverside/San Bernardino Counties. Opposition to the measure came primarily from Northern California, Orange County, and the Southern Central Valley.
- Proposition 47.** This measure allows the State to sell \$13.05 billion in GO bonds for educational facilities to relieve overcrowding and to repair older schools. Funds will be targeted to areas of the greatest need and must be spent according to accountability measures. Funds also will be used to upgrade and build new classrooms in the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California, to provide adequate higher education facilities to accommodate growing student enrollment. California voters approved

the measure by a 59 to 41 percent margin. The bond gained majority approval in 33 out of the 58 counties in the State. Vote totals on a county basis resemble the results for Proposition 46, with the majority of voter support coming primarily from the San Francisco Bay Area, Central and South Coasts, and Los Angeles, Orange, Imperial/San Diego, and Riverside/San Bernardino Counties. The measure was generally opposed in Northern California.

- Proposition 50.** This measure allows the State to sell \$3.44 billion in GO bonds to fund a variety of specified water and wetlands projects for water quality, water supply reliability, safe drinking water projects, and for coastal land acquisition and protection. California voters approved the measure by a 55 to 45 percent margin. The bond gained majority approval in 21 out of the 58 counties in the State. The majority of voter support came from the San Francisco Bay Area, Central Coast, and Los Angeles, Orange, Imperial/San Diego, and Riverside/San Bernardino Counties. The measure was generally opposed in Northern California, the Sacramento Area, and the Northern and Southern Central Valleys.

Most Local General Obligation Bond Measures Earmarked for K-12 Education Purposes Approved

The 117 local GO bonds on the ballot were a substantial 44 percent increase compared to the 81 measures on the ballot in March 2002. Figure 1 presents the total number and dollar amount of local GO ballot measures from the November General Election results.

Figure 1
Local General Obligation Bond Measures
November 5, 2002 General Election Results

	NUMBER	AMOUNT
PASS	91	\$9,742,778,535
FAIL	26	2,509,879,000
TOTAL	117	12,252,657,535

Eighty-nine of the 117 local GO bond measures (76 percent) were for K-12 school facility improvements (85 required 55 percent approval while four needed 2/3 voter approval). Community college districts placed 15 proposals on the ballot (13 percent), while the remaining thirteen measures (11 percent) were designated for a variety of non-educational purposes, including fire protection, housing, library/public buildings, multiple capital improvements, seismic safety, water supply/quality, and other miscellaneous purposes.

Ninety-one of the 117 local GO bond measures (78 percent), totaling \$9.7 billion, were approved. Of the 89 bond measures for K-12 school facility improvements, 71 measures (80 percent), totaling \$6.4 billion, passed (however, all four measures under the 2/3 voter requirement failed passage). With respect to community college facilities, voters approved 14 of the 15 measures (93 percent), totaling \$3.0 billion. Also passed were six of the 13 non-educational bond proposals (46 percent), totaling \$280.9 million. These bond measures were dedicated to fire protection, libraries, an animal shelter, multiple capital improvements, and water supply/quality.

Twenty-six local GO bond measures (22 percent), totaling \$2.5 billion, failed to muster the necessary votes for approval. Seven of the 13 non-educational GO bond measures (54 percent) could not garner the necessary 2/3 voter approval for passage. If the same 55 percent requirement existed for these projects, as for most of the education measures, all but one would have passed. Of particular note are a number of large bond measures which were not approved, including a \$1.05 billion multiple county Bay Area Rapid Transit District bond for seismic safety, a \$250 million County of San Francisco measure for housing, and a \$250 million County of Los Angeles measure for multiple capital improvements. A complete list of the local GO bond measures arranged by county appears in Figure 2 on pages 5 and 6. In addition to these GO bonds, there was a \$1.628 billion water supply/quality revenue bond on the ballot in San Francisco County that garnered the simple majority required to pass.

This article uses the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) description of California counties by region for illustrative purposes:

Central Coast Region – Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz
Imperial/San Diego County Region – Imperial, San Diego

Los Angeles County Region – Los Angeles

Northern California Region – Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba

Northern Central Valley Region – Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne

Orange County Region – Orange

Riverside/San Bernardino County Region – Riverside, San Bernardino

Sacramento Area Region – El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Yolo

San Francisco Bay Area Region – Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma

South Coast Region – San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura

Southern Central Valley Region – Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Tulare

Figure 2
Local General Obligation Bond Measures
November 5, 2002 General Election Results
By County

County	Agency	Amount	Purpose	Percent Vote	Result *
Alameda	City of Albany	\$14,500,000	Multiple Capital Improvements	69.4%	Pass
Alameda	City of Berkeley	\$21,500,000	Seismic Safety	39.7%	Fail
Alameda	City of Berkeley	\$7,200,000	Miscellaneous	68.3%	Pass
Alameda	City of Fremont	\$51,000,000	Fire Protection	74.4%	Pass
Alameda	City of Oakland	\$198,250,000	Water Supply/Quality	80.1%	Pass
Amador	Amador County Unified School District	\$11,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	65.2%	Pass
Butte	Oroville City Elementary School District	\$6,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.0%	Pass
Butte	Oroville Union High School District	\$10,400,000	K-12 School Facilities	59.8%	Pass
Contra Costa	Acalanes Union High School District	\$44,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.3%	Pass
Contra Costa	San Ramon Valley Unified School District	\$260,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	58.7%	Pass
Contra Costa	Walnut Creek School District	\$20,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	64.9%	Pass
El Dorado	Gold Trail Union School District	\$1,800,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.6%	Pass
El Dorado	Placerville Union School District	\$5,300,000	K-12 School Facilities	66.8%	Pass
Imperial	Holtville Unified School District	\$8,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	77.0%	Pass
Imperial	McCabe Union Elementary School District	\$2,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	60.5%	Pass
Kern	Buttonwillow Union School District	\$6,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	78.2%	Pass
Kern	Southern Kern Unified School District	\$12,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	62.8%	Pass
Kings	LeMoore Union Elementary District	\$1,700,000	K-12 School Facilities	52.0%	Fail
Los Angeles	Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District	\$21,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	45.4%	Fail
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park Unified School District	\$46,600,000	K-12 School Facilities	79.5%	Pass
Los Angeles	Compton Community College District	\$100,000,000	College/University Facilities	76.3%	Pass
Los Angeles	Compton Unified School District	\$80,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	83.1%	Pass
Los Angeles	County of Los Angeles	\$250,000,000	Multiple Capital Improvements	60.5%	Fail
Los Angeles	Downey Unified School District	\$65,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.1%	Pass
Los Angeles	El Camino Community College District	\$394,516,464	College/University Facilities	61.6%	Pass
Los Angeles	El Monte Union High School District	\$90,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	76.3%	Pass
Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach City Elementary School District	\$13,600,000	K-12 School Facilities	65.2%	Pass
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified School District	\$3,350,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.1%	Pass
Los Angeles	Lynwood Unified School District	\$20,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	76.7%	Pass
Los Angeles	Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District	\$165,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	73.6%	Pass
Los Angeles	Rio Hondo Community College District	\$194,600,000	College/University Facilities	52.7%	Fail
Los Angeles	South Pasadena Unified School District	\$29,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	78.0%	Pass
Madera	Madera Unified School District	\$46,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.1%	Pass
Marin	San Rafael Elementary School District	\$49,300,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.5%	Pass
Marin	San Rafael High School District	\$49,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.6%	Pass
Mendocino	<i>Manchester Union Elementary School District</i>	<i>\$1,180,000</i>	<i>K-12 School Facilities</i>	<i>60.2%</i>	<i>Fail</i>
Mendocino	Mendocino Unified School District	\$8,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	41.1%	Fail
Merced	<i>Atwater Elementary School District</i>	<i>\$16,500,000</i>	<i>K-12 School Facilities</i>	<i>60.9%</i>	<i>Fail</i>
Merced	Hilmar Unified School District	\$2,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	72.9%	Pass
Mono	Eastern Sierra Unified School District	\$1,334,000	K-12 School Facilities	49.7%	Fail
Monterey	City of Marina	\$8,000,000	Library/Public Buildings	79.5%	Pass
Monterey	Hartnell Community College District	\$131,000,000	College/University Facilities	65.7%	Pass
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula Community College	\$145,000,000	College/University Facilities	64.6%	Pass
Monterey	North Monterey County Unified School District	\$20,750,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.3%	Pass
Monterey	Salinas Middle School District	\$37,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.8%	Pass
Monterey	Spreckels Union School District	\$5,335,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.6%	Pass
Multiple	Dinuba Unified School District	\$14,915,000	K-12 School Facilities	71.5%	Pass
Multiple	Dos Palos-Ora Loma Joint Unified School District	\$4,400,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.4%	Pass
Multiple	Elverta Joint School District	\$10,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	59.5%	Pass
Multiple	Kern Community College District	\$180,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	59.1%	Pass
Multiple	Linns Valley-Poso Flat Union School District	\$340,000	K-12 School Facilities	71.8%	Pass
Multiple	Merced Community College District	\$53,500,000	College/University Facilities	55.7%	Pass
Multiple	Merced Community College District	\$11,930,000	College/University Facilities	67.7%	Pass
Multiple	Napa Valley Community College	\$133,800,000	College/University Facilities	61.1%	Pass
Multiple	Oakdale Joint Unified School District	\$20,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	69.5%	Pass
Multiple	Pajaro Valley Unified School District	\$58,250,000	K-12 School Facilities	66.5%	Pass
Multiple	Paso Robles Joint Unified School District	\$6,700,000	K-12 School Facilities	53.9%	Fail
Multiple	Roseville Joint Union High School District	\$65,300,000	K-12 School Facilities	53.8%	Fail
Multiple	San Bernardino Community College District	\$190,000,000	College/University Facilities	62.8%	Pass
Multiple	San Francisco BART District	\$1,050,000,000	Seismic Safety	61.6%	Fail
Multiple	Solano Community College District	\$124,500,000	College/University Facilities	55.5%	Pass
Multiple	State Center Community College District	\$161,000,000	College/University Facilities	56.5%	Pass
Multiple	Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District	\$30,450,000	K-12 School Facilities	57.6%	Pass

Source: County Election official Internet sites supplemented by telephone inquiries.
* Italicized figures indicate school bonds requiring 2/3 vote. All other require 55%.

Figure 2
Local General Obligation Bond Measures
November 5, 2002 General Election Results
By County

Multiple	Tracy Joint Unified School District	\$103,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	50.0%	Fail
Multiple	Turlock Joint Elementary School District	\$10,950,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.9%	Pass
Napa	Napa Valley Unified School District	\$95,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	59.4%	Pass
Orange	Centralia School District	\$17,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.1%	Pass
Orange	Coast Community College District	\$370,000,000	College/University Facilities	65.2%	Pass
Orange	Rancho Santiago Community College District	\$337,000,000	College/University Facilities	64.1%	Pass
Orange	Tustin Unified School District	\$80,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.1%	Pass
Placer	Roseville City Elementary School District	\$29,117,071	K-12 School Facilities	61.3%	Pass
Plumas	Plumas Unified School District	\$15,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.3%	Pass
Riverside	Banning Unified School District	\$12,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.8%	Pass
Riverside	Menifee Union School District	\$14,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	59.2%	Pass
Riverside	Murrieta Valley Unified School District	\$40,400,000	K-12 School Facilities	70.5%	Pass
Riverside	Nuvview Union School District	\$6,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.5%	Pass
Sacramento	Natomas Unified School District	\$45,880,000	K-12 School Facilities	72.4%	Pass
Sacramento	Rio Linda Union High School District	\$15,400,000	K-12 School Facilities	65.5%	Pass
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified School District	\$225,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.2%	Pass
Sacramento	San Juan Unified School District	\$350,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	65.8%	Pass
San Bernardino	Bear Valley Unified School District	\$25,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.9%	Pass
San Bernardino	Ontario-Montclair School District	\$59,655,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.3%	Pass
San Bernardino	Redlands Unified School District	\$60,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	70.1%	Pass
San Bernardino	Upland Unified School District	\$20,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	49.5%	Fail
San Diego	Alpine Union School District	\$12,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	45.4%	Fail
San Diego	Alpine Union School District	\$25,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	44.6%	Fail
San Diego	Fallbrook Union Elementary School District	\$32,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	57.7%	Pass
San Diego	Grossmont Cuyamaca Community College District	\$207,000,000	College/University Facilities	60.2%	Pass
San Diego	<i>Grossmont Union High School District</i>	<i>\$199,000,000</i>	<i>K-12 School Facilities</i>	<i>63.8%</i>	<i>Fail</i>
San Diego	Poway Unified School District	\$193,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	57.4%	Pass
San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe Elementary School District	\$46,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	44.2%	Fail
San Diego	San Diego Community College District	\$685,000,000	College/University Facilities	68.6%	Pass
San Francisco	County of San Francisco	\$250,000,000	Housing	55.7%	Fail
San Francisco	County of San Francisco	\$122,755,000	Seismic Safety	55.0%	Fail
San Joaquin	Banta School District	\$800,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.9%	Pass
San Joaquin	Escalon Unified School District	\$7,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.0%	Pass
San Joaquin	Linden Unified School District	\$11,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	55.8%	Pass
San Luis Obispo	City of Arroyo Grande	\$1,900,000	Fire Protection	72.4%	Pass
San Luis Obispo	Paso Robles Joint Unified School District	\$5,900,000	K-12 School Facilities	51.2%	Fail
San Mateo	Hillsborough City School District	\$66,800,000	K-12 School Facilities	66.5%	Pass
Santa Barbara	Lompoc Unified School District	\$38,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	69.7%	Pass
Santa Clara	Cambrian School District	\$20,975,000	K-12 School Facilities	73.8%	Pass
Santa Clara	City of Palo Alto	\$49,100,000	Library/Public Buildings	61.5%	Fail
Santa Clara	Gilroy Unified School District	\$69,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	62.7%	Pass
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Fire Protection District	\$1,000,000	Fire Protection	63.0%	Fail
Siskiyou	Etna Union High School District	\$1,560,000	K-12 School Facilities	50.2%	Fail
Solano	Dixon Unified School District	\$29,200,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.6%	Pass
Sonoma	Healdsburg Unified School District	\$3,990,000	K-12 School Facilities	65.1%	Pass
Sonoma	Healdsburg Unified School District	\$18,820,000	K-12 School Facilities	67.5%	Pass
Sonoma	Mark West Union School District	\$11,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.0%	Pass
Sonoma	<i>Rincon Valley Union School District</i>	<i>\$30,000,000</i>	<i>K-12 School Facilities</i>	<i>64.6%</i>	<i>Fail</i>
Stanislaus	Paradise Elementary School District	\$400,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.9%	Pass
Tulare	Burton Elementary School District	\$2,455,000	K-12 School Facilities	63.2%	Pass
Tulare	Porterville Unified School District	\$30,000,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.6%	Pass
Tuolumne	Big Oak Flat-Groveland Unified School District	\$5,750,000	K-12 School Facilities	49.2%	Fail
Tuolumne	Soulsbyville School District	\$1,500,000	K-12 School Facilities	68.6%	Pass
Ventura	Mesa Union Elementary School District	\$3,900,000	K-12 School Facilities	65.3%	Pass

Source: County Election official Internet sites supplemented by telephone inquiries.

* Italicized figures indicate school bonds requiring 2/3 vote. All other require 55%.

This Offprint was previously published in DEBT LINE, a monthly publication of the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC). CDIAC was created in 1981 to provide information, education, and technical assistance on public debt and investment to state and local public officials and public finance officers. DEBT LINE serves as a vehicle to reach CDIAC's constituents, providing news and information pertaining to the California municipal finance market. In addition to topical articles, DEBT LINE contains a listing of the proposed and final sales of public debt provided to CDIAC pursuant to Section 8855(g) of the California Government Code. Questions concerning the Commission should be directed to CDIAC at (916) 653-3269 or, by e-mail, at cdiac@treasurer.ca.gov. For a full listing of CDIAC publications, please visit our website at <http://www.treasurer.ca.gov/cdiac>.

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced without written credit given to CDIAC. Permission to reprint with written credit given to CDIAC is hereby granted.