



# **STATE AND LOCAL BOND AND TAX BALLOT MEASURES**

*Results of the June 1998 Primary Election*

**MATT FONG**  
*State Treasurer and Chairman*

**CALIFORNIA DEBT AND INVESTMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION**

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 400  
P.O. BOX 942809  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94209-0001  
TELEPHONE: (916) 653-3269  
FAX: (916) 654-7440  
Executive Director  
Peter W. Schaafsma

September 1998

To All Interested Parties:

This report presents the results of bond and tax measures submitted to the voters at the June 1998 Primary Election. This is the tenth in a series of reports on statewide elections in California prepared by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC).

Of the 96 bond and tax measures tracked by the Commission, 50 (52 percent) passed and 46 (48 percent) failed. Twenty-four of 39 (62 percent) local G.O. bond proposals were approved. The 24 G.O. Bond measures approved totaled \$441 million, more than three times the \$134 million approved in the 1996 primary. Support for special tax measures, designed to fund public services such as senior programs, libraries, police, emergency medical and fire, were mixed, with 16 of 41 passing (39 percent).


This Primary Election's results are notable for two reasons:

- Unlike every preceding primary election this decade, the 1998 Primary Election had no state G.O. bond measures on the ballot; and
- Of the 15 defeated local G.O. bond proposals, 14 received more than 50% of the votes cast.

CDIAC identified nineteen local ballot measures on the June ballot that were placed there as a direct result of Proposition 218, the *Right to Vote on Taxes Act*, which passed in November 1996. In addition, one measure was placed on the ballot in response to the California Supreme Court's December 1995 decision on Proposition 62, originally passed in 1986. Voters approved nine of nineteen measures motivated by Proposition 218, and the sole Proposition 62 validation measure.

This report includes a summary of the statewide election results, as well as data on the individual tax and bond ballot measures themselves. The Commission would like to recognize the assistance of the elections departments of the 58 county clerks' offices in preparing this report.

Warmest regards,



Matt Fong  
State Treasurer and Chairman

**STATE AND LOCAL  
BOND AND TAX BALLOT MEASURES  
RESULTS OF PRIMARY ELECTION  
JUNE 2, 1998**

September 1998

**CALIFORNIA DEBT AND INVESTMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION  
P.O. Box 942809  
Sacramento, CA 94209-0001  
(916) 653-3269**

The California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission complies with the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA). If you need additional information or assistance, please contact the Commission at (916) 653-3269.

## **CALIFORNIA DEBT AND INVESTMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION**

The California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission was created by the Legislature to assist state and local agencies with the issuance, monitoring and management of public debt and with the investment of public funds through its research and technical assistance programs. CDIAC also acts as the state's clearinghouse for public debt issuance information.

The California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission members include:

**Matt Fong**

California State Treasurer  
and Chairman

**Pete Wilson**

Governor

or

**Craig Brown**

Director

Department of Finance

**Kathleen Connell**

State Controller

**Vacancy**

State Senator

**Vacancy**

State Senator

**Louis J. Papan**

State Assemblyman

**Scott Wildman**

State Assemblyman

**Donald W. Merz**

Treasurer-Tax Collector  
Sonoma County

**Robert Leland**

Finance Director  
City of Fairfield

**Additional information concerning this report  
or the programs of the California Debt and  
Investment Advisory Commission may be  
obtained by contacting:**

**Peter W. Schaafsma**

Executive Director

California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission

(916) 653-3269

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission wishes to thank the staff of the county clerks' election departments for their assistance in providing the information contained in this publication.

The report was prepared by Hardy Gumnor of the Commission Staff and David Felman, a student intern on a fellowship from Stanford University.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. SUMMARY OF LOCAL MEASURES BY PURPOSE.....	1
A. Education.....	2
B. Capital Improvements and Public Works.....	2
C. Life Support.....	3
D. General Government.....	4
E. Miscellaneous Purposes.....	5
III. SUMMARY OF LOCAL MEASURES BY TYPE.....	5
A. Bonds.....	5
1. Local General Obligation Bonds.....	5
B. Tax Measures.....	6
1. Special Tax Measures.....	6
2. General Tax Measures.....	7
a) Proposition 62 Measures.....	7
3. Proposition 218 Measures.....	8
4. Other Measures.....	9
IV. COUNTIES NOT REPORTING LOCAL BOND OR TAX MEASURES.....	9

### TABLES AND CHARTS:

Table 1: Bond and Tax Measures Results.....	1
Table 2: Results of Bond and Tax Measures By Purpose.....	1
Table 3: Capital Improvements and Public Works By Purpose.....	3
Table 4: Life Support Measures By Purpose.....	4
Table 5: Results of Bond and Tax Measures By Type.....	6
Table 6: Special Tax Measures By Purpose.....	7
Chart 1: All Proposed Bond and Tax Measures By Type.....	5

### APPENDIX: SUMMARY TABLES

Table A-1 Local General Obligation Bond Measures.....	A-1
Table A-2 Local Special Tax Measures.....	A-3
Table A-3 Local General Tax Measures.....	A-5
Table A-4 Local Transactions and Use (Sales) Tax Measures.....	A-6
Table A-5 Other Local Tax Measures.....	A-7
Table A-6 Proposition 218 Tax Measures.....	A-8
Table A-7 Summary of Election Results.....	A-9
Table A-8 Summary of Types and Purposes.....	A-13

# STATE AND LOCAL BOND AND TAX BALLOT MEASURES

Summary of Primary Election Results  
June 2, 1998

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of local tax and bond measures that appeared on ballots in the June 2, 1998 Primary Election in California. Included in the report is certified data obtained from the 58 county clerks' election departments. This is the tenth report the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) has published summarizing statewide bond and tax elections.

### Primary Election Results

Ninety-six bond and tax measures in the June Primary Election were tracked by CDIAC. Unlike every preceding primary election this decade, the 1998 Primary Election had no state bond or tax measures on the ballot.<sup>1</sup> Of the 96 measures, 50 (52 percent) were approved by voters and 46 (48 percent) were defeated. The number of measures in this election, 96, is up considerably from the 1996 Primary Election,

when 80 state and local bond and tax measures were reported to CDIAC, and the 1994 Primary Election, when 61 measures were reported. The overall passage rate of 52 percent in the 1998 Primary Election is notably higher than in both the 1996 and the 1994 Primary Elections which had approval rates of 40 and 38 percent, respectively. The results are listed in Table 1.

	State	Local	Totals
Passed	0	50	50
Failed	0	46	46
Totals	0	96	96

## II. SUMMARY OF LOCAL MEASURES BY PURPOSE

In Table 2 (below), the results of the 96 bond and tax measures are classified by the following five purposes: education, capital improvements, life support, general government, and miscellaneous. A discussion of each category follows.

	Education	Capital Imp.	Life Support	General Gov.	Misc.	Totals
Passed	22	11	5	8	4	50
Failed	15	14	8	6	3	46
Totals	37	25	13	14	7	96

<sup>1</sup>There were eight state measures in the 1990 Primary, two in 1992, three in 1994, and three in 1996.

## **A. Education**

There were 37 education issues presented to voters in the June election, accounting for nearly 40 percent of all measures offered. Overall, 22 of the 37 education measures were approved, yielding an approval rate of 59 percent. This is down from the 1996 approval rate of 75 percent, but up from the 1994 rate of 48 percent, for education-related measures.

Thirty-four of the 37 education measures, or 92 percent, were for K-12 education; three were for community college facilities. Twenty-one of the 34 K-12 education measures were approved. The 62 percent passing rate for K-12 measures is much higher than the 1994 rate of 36 percent, when five of 14 measures passed, but down from the 1996 rate of 75 percent, when six of eight passed.

Thirty-three of the 34 K-12 education measures were for general obligation bonds; the remaining one was a special tax measure in Kerman Unified School District of Fresno County which was defeated. K-12 G.O. bond amounts ranged from \$233,000 for Buena Vista Elementary School District in Tulare County, which passed comfortably with 78 percent of the vote, to \$91 million for Visalia Unified School District (also in Tulare County) which failed by about seven percent.

All of the 34 K-12 measures, except a \$1 million G.O. bond for Pope Valley Union Elementary School District in Napa County, received at least 50 percent of the votes cast. However, thirteen of the 33 receiving a majority failed to attain the two-thirds super-majority required for G.O. bond and special tax passage. A \$9.2 million bond for Wasco Unified High School District in Kern County fell short of the two-thirds mark by just 0.4 percent.

Only one of three G.O. bond measures for community college facilities passed. An \$85 million G.O. bond measure for the Cabrillo Community College District of Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties received over 74 percent of the vote, making it the largest G.O. bond measure to win approval in the 1998 Primary Election.

For the two community college measures that failed, the margin of defeat was slim. A West Hills Community College District of Fresno, Kings, Madera, Monterey, and San Benito Counties \$19 million bond measure was defeated by just 0.5 of a percentage point. Although it won 68.5 percent of the vote in Kings County, the West Hills Community College District measure failed to receive enough votes in the district's other four counties to achieve victory. A \$15 million bond for Imperial Valley Community College District fell short of approval by only 1.5 percentage points.

## **B. Capital Improvements and Public Works**

Eleven of 25 (44 percent) measures for capital improvements and public works passed, which is up significantly from 1996 when five of 23 capital improvements and public works measures, or 22 percent, were approved. Successful measures included:

- Three measures for communication systems in San Diego County;

- A special tax for drainage services in the Rancho Murieta Community Services District of Sacramento County;
- Four measures for multiple capital improvements and public works in California City of Kern County, Davis of Yolo County, El Paso De Robles of San Luis Obispo County, and Big River Community Services District of San Bernardino County;
- An advisory vote in Woodland, Yolo County that limits expenditure of new sales tax revenues to multiple capital improvements and public works;
- A special tax for street improvement in Placer County's Northstar Community Services District; and,
- A \$210 million Certificates of Participation measure in San Diego County for convention center construction.

Among the defeated measures, voters in the City and County of San Francisco rejected this election's only public building measure. With the second highest dollar amount in the primary, this \$89.9 million G.O. Bond for the acquisition, construction, and renovation of the De Young Memorial Museum missed the two-thirds majority it needed for passage by slightly more than two percentage points.

For the second consecutive primary election, a \$90 per parcel special tax for water supply storage in the Bear Valley Community Services District of Kern County also was defeated. In the 1998 Primary Election, the measure failed by 6 percent compared with 23 percent in the 1996 Primary Election.

Measures for solid waste recovery, wastewater collection, and water supply storage were also defeated. Please see Table 3 for complete results by purpose.

	Pass	Fail	Totals
Communications	3	6	9
Convention Center	0	0	1
Flood Control	1	1	2
Multiple CIPW	5	1	6
Public Building	0	1	1
Solid Waste Recovery	0	1	1
Street Improvements/ Maintenance	1	2	3
Wastewater Collection	0	1	1
Waste Supply/Storage	0	1	1
Totals	11	14	25

### C. Life Support

Of the 13 issues proposed to provide, increase or enhance police, fire or emergency medical services, five were approved. The 38 percent approval rate for life support measures represents a slight decline from the 46 percent rate witnessed in the 1996 Primary Election, when six of 13 measures passed.

Voters approved three of eight fire protection measures, or 38 percent, and two of five public safety measures, or 40 percent. Successful measures included:

- A \$100 per parcel special tax for fire suppression, prevention, rescue and emergency services in the Clear Creek Community Services District of Lassen County;
- A special tax for police and fire protection in Hillsborough, San Mateo County;
- A special tax of \$15 per parcel for fire protection in the Loleta Fire Protection District of Humboldt County;
- A special tax to raise revenue for the support of security services within Sacramento County's Rancho Murieta Community Services District; and,
- An extension of a special tax for law enforcement services in the Three Arch Bay Community Services District, Orange County.

Of the eight life support measures which failed to capture the two-thirds majority needed for passage, six still received over 50 percent of the vote. Of those which received a majority, half (three of six) came within approximately two percentage points of approval. They were two fire protection special taxes for the Eastside Rural Fire Protection District of San Joaquin County and the Valley of the Moon Fire Protection District of Sonoma County and a proposed 0.25 percent sales tax for public safety in Madera County. Each received over 64 percent of the vote. Table 4 presents the results of life support measures by purpose.

	Pass	Fail	Totals
Fire Protection	3	5	8
Public Safety	2	3	5
Totals	5	8	13

#### D. General Government

Eight of 14 measures for general government purposes were approved. All of the measures were general taxes, which require a majority vote. The 57 percent passing rate is slightly higher than the 1996 Primary Election approval rate of 46 percent, when 13 of 28 measures passed.

The approved measures included two business taxes, four utility users' taxes, one municipal services tax, and one new construction tax. A 2.4 percent business tax on total firearms receipts in the City of Oakland (Alameda County) received 73 percent of the vote, more than any other general government tax measure. A utility users' tax measure for Rio Dell in Humboldt County fell short of the 50 percent majority needed by just 0.1 percent.

## E. Miscellaneous Purposes

Included in this category are seven measures for library and health care facilities and services. All five library measures up for approval were special taxes, which require a two-thirds vote for approval. Although each library measure managed to gain more than 50 percent of the vote, only two 0.125 percent sales tax measures for library services in Solano and Nevada Counties obtained the two-thirds needed. This election's 40 percent rate of passage for library measures matches the 40 percent rate in the 1996 Primary Election, when two of five measures passed.

Both health care measures in the 1998 Primary Election won decisively. Passing with 90 percent of the vote, a tax measure for the Surprise Valley Health Care District in Modoc County will levy a four-year annual \$150 special tax for health care services. Also, a \$2.3 million G.O. bond for the maintenance of health care facilities in the Sierra Valley Hospital District in Sierra County won with 72 percent of the vote.


## III. SUMMARY OF MEASURES BY TYPE

As shown in Chart 1 (below), local measures in the 1998 Primary Election can be categorized into four types: general obligation bonds, special tax, general tax, and other measures. Table 5 (page 6) presents the results of the measures by type.

### A. BONDS

#### 1. Local General Obligation Bonds

Of the 39 G.O. bond measures amounting to nearly \$924 million, voters approved 24. The 62 percent passage rate is slightly lower than the 1996 Primary Election rate of 66 percent, but much higher than the 33 percent figure for 1994. The 24 G.O. bonds approved totaled \$441 million, more than three times the \$134 million in local G.O. bonds passed in 1996 and more than twice the \$168 million passed in 1994.



The overwhelming majority of G.O. measures on the ballot, 33 of 39 measures or 85 percent, were designated for K-12 educational facility improvements. Of the 24 G.O. bond measures that passed, 21 totaling nearly \$316 million, promoted K-12 education. In the 1996 Primary Election, six of nine bonds, or 66 percent, were for K-12 education. The successful five of these nine bond measures totaled \$134 million, which is less than half the 1998 figure.

The remaining three of the 24 G.O. bond measures which passed included: an \$85 million bond measure for the Cabrillo Community College District in Monterey and Santa

Cruz Counties, a measure for a \$2.3 million bond for health care services in the Sierra Valley Hospital District of Sierra County, and a \$38 million bond measure designated for multiple capital improvements and public works in El Paso De Robles, San Luis Obispo County.

All local G.O. bond measures except one for Pope Valley Union Elementary School District in Napa County received more than 50 percent of the vote. Of these, 14 failed to muster the two-thirds vote necessary for G.O. bond passage. In all, voters rejected nearly \$483 million in local G.O. bonds.

The details of the local General Obligation bond measures can be found in Table A-1 beginning on page A-1.

	G.O. Bonds	Special Tax	General Tax	Other	Sales Tax	Totals*
Passed	24	16	8	2	2	50
Failed	15	25	6	0	8	46
Totals	39	41	14	2	10	96

\*This column excludes sales taxes to avoid double-counting.

## B. TAX MEASURES

Fifty-five of the 96 bond and tax measures on the ballot, or 57 percent, were tax measures. This number is slightly more than the 50 tax measures which appeared in the 1996 Primary Election, but lower as a percentage of all measures (57 percent in 1998 versus 63 percent in 1996). Twenty-four of 55 tax measures in the 1998 Primary Election passed, a 44 percent approval rate, which is higher than the 1996 rate of 38 percent when 19 of 50 passed. Detailed tables for tax measures begin on page A-2.

### 1. Special Tax Measures

Support for special tax measures was mixed with 16 of 41 gaining approval. While the 39 percent passage rate was notably higher than the 1996 Primary Election rate of 22 percent, when 5 of 22 passed, it was slightly lower than the 1994 rate of 40 percent, when 13 of 33 were approved. Special taxes represented the greatest number of tax measures submitted to voters, 41 of 55, or 75 percent, unlike the 1996 primary, when just 22 of the 50 tax measures, or 44 percent, were special taxes.

Special tax measures for multiple capital improvements and public works fared best with three of four passing. Three of eight special tax measures for fire protection and suppression, two of five special tax measures for library services and facilities, two of five public safety taxes, and one of three street maintenance and improvement taxes also were approved. Of the nine special tax measures for communications systems in

San Diego County, voters supported three. Two other special tax measures for flood control and health care facilities and services won approval. The only measures for wastewater collection, water supply, solid waste recovery, and K-12 education failed.

Voters in Maywood, Los Angeles County, gave a street improvement measure just 34 percent of the votes, while a public safety special tax for Victorville in San Bernardino County received only 26 percent of the votes. Two defeated fire protection measures came within one percent of passage, with the Eastside Rural County Fire Protection District of San Joaquin County obtaining 65.6 percent of the vote and the Valley of the Moon Fire Protection District of Sonoma County Valley with 66.1 percent.

Eight sales tax measures on the June ballot were proposed as special taxes, significantly more than the one sales tax proposed in the 1996 Primary Election, which failed. Voters approved two *special* sales taxes in the 1998 Primary Election for library services, one in Nevada County and one in Solano County. Six other *special* sales tax measures for library services, flood control, public safety, and multiple capital improvements and public works received over 50 percent approval but fell short of the two-thirds necessary for passage.

	Pass	Fail	Totals
Multiple CIPW	3	1	4
Fire Protection	3	5	8
Communications	3	6	9
Library Fac	2	3	5
Public Safety	2	3	5
Health Care	1	0	1
Flood Control	1	1	2
Street Improv	1	2	3
K-12 Education	0	1	1
Solid Waste	0	1	1
Wastewater	0	1	1
Water Supply	0	1	1
Totals	16	25	41

## 2. General Tax Measures

Voters approved eight of 14 (57 percent) general tax measures for general government purposes, a slightly higher approval rate than in 1996 when 14 of 28 (50 percent) passed. The utility users tax was the most successful type of general tax with four of five passing. The 80 percent approval rate represents a notable increase from the 33 percent rate in 1996 when only three of nine were approved by voters. The business tax also emerged successfully in the 1998 Primary Election with a 66 percent approval rate, or two of three. One municipal services and one construction tax also were approved.

Two sales taxes designated as general taxes, including a four year one-half cent sales tax for the City of Woodland in Yolo County and a ten year 0.25 percent sales tax in the City of Del Norte, missed the simple majority needed for general tax approval by six percent and eleven percent, respectively. In addition, a transient occupancy tax for Mono County, the only tax of its type on the ballot, failed.

### a) Proposition 62 Measures

Passed in 1986, Proposition 62 included two statutory voting requirements: (1) local governments cannot impose a general tax until it is approved by a majority of voters;

and, (2) local governments cannot impose a special tax until it has obtained two-thirds voter approval. The latter requirement duplicates a constitutional voting requirement put in place by Proposition 13 in 1978.

In the years following the passage of Proposition 62, California's appellate courts effectively threw out the first requirement mentioned above. Relying on those decisions, the City of Brawley in Imperial County enacted a utility users' tax without voter approval in 1991. In December 1995, however, the California Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Proposition 62, and in August 1996, the City of Brawley was directed to conduct an election to decide whether it should continue to collect the utility tax. The Imperial County Superior Court ruled that the 1995 decision could be applied retroactively to Brawley's utility user's tax; the City appealed the court's decision but did not prevail.

The only Proposition 62-related measure in the 1998 Primary Election, a four percent utility users tax for Brawley, Imperial County, passed with 59 percent of the vote, more than the majority vote it needed. In the 1996 Primary Election, 14 Proposition 62 measures appeared on the ballot, 10 of which passed.

### **3. Proposition 218 Measures**

Proposition 218, *The Right to Vote on Taxes Act*, instituted voter approval requirements for general taxes, assessments, and *property-related* fees. General taxes imposed after January 1, 1995 and prior to the November 1996 election must be submitted to the electorate for approval by November 6, 1998. Assessments that were not grandfathered by the measure had to meet calculation and voting requirements by July 1, 1997. In addition, assessments that did not meet the new *special benefit* definition were eliminated. Certain uses of *property-related* fees were also eliminated and those fees which were still allowed had to comply with a fee rate calculation requirement by July 1, 1997.

CDIAC has identified nineteen Proposition 218 measures that appeared on the June 1998 ballot, 15 designated as special taxes and four as general taxes. Nine of the 19 measures passed, a 47 percent approval rate. The successful measures included:

- A special tax to replace existing Landscaping and Lighting assessments in Davis, Yolo County, which received 78 percent of the vote. The assessments would have expired on June 30, 1998 if not replaced by a voter-approved tax;
- A measure to continue a Supplemental Building Construction and Improvement Tax in Hayward, Alameda County which was made permanent by the City Council in 1995;
- Two special tax measures to replace existing fees for security services and drainage services in Sacramento County's Rancho Murrieta Community Services District. The fees did not comply with Proposition 218's new requirements for *property-related* fees;

- A special tax to replace a fire protection assessment for the Loleta Fire Protection District of Humboldt County. The assessment was eliminated for not meeting Proposition 218's *special benefit* definition.
- Three special tax measures to replace county service area zone charges, no longer allowed under the provisions of Proposition 218, for the Police, Fire and Public Safety Regional Communications System used by San Diego County municipalities and unincorporated area; and,
- A general tax to replace a current in-lieu franchise fee and property tax on water, sewage, drainage, and garbage for the City of Sacramento. Taxpayer groups argued that the City's in-lieu franchise and property tax fees did not comply with Proposition 218's definition of *property-related* fees and threatened litigation to halt this revenue stream.

#### **4. Other Measures**

Each of the two miscellaneous bond- and tax-related measures on local ballots passed. They were:

- Voters in the San Diego Unified Port District authorized \$210 million in Certificates of Participation for the expansion of the San Diego Convention Center, which is owned by the Port District but managed by the City. The measure passed with 62 percent of the vote, far more than the 50 percent majority needed for its approval; and,
- An advisory vote to determine the expenditure of new city sales tax revenues in Woodland, Yolo County exceeded the simple majority it needed with 62 percent of the vote. With the passage of this measure, new sales tax revenues will only be used to provide funds for street repair, flood control facilities, additional police officers, and recreational facilities. Interestingly, voters in Woodland gave an accompanying sales tax measure which would have qualified under the restrictions of this advisory vote only 44 percent approval, short of the majority needed for passage.

#### **IV. COUNTIES REPORTING NO LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**

The following 16 Counties reported no local bond or tax measures: Alpine, Amador, Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Inyo, Lake, Merced, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Stanislaus, Tehema, Trinity, Ventura, and Yuba.

TABLE A-1  
**SUMMARY OF LOCAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>AMOUNT AUTHORIZED</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>24 LOCAL MEASURES PASSED</b>						
CONTRA COSTA	WEST CONTRA COSTA USD	E	76.0%	24.0%	40,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
FRESNO/KINGS/TULARE	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	C	68.3%	31.7%	10,100,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
KINGS	REEF-SUNSET USD	R	76.9%	23.1%	2,400,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	REEF-SUNSET USD	S	76.8%	23.2%	7,600,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
LOS ANGELES	LENNOX SD	A	85.8%	14.2%	10,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	POMONA USD	B	69.9%	30.1%	50,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MADERA/MARIPOSA	YOSEMITE JT UN HSD*	B	71.0%	29.0%	11,760,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MARIN	KENTFIELD SD	B	77.2%	22.8%	13,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MENDOCINO	MENDOCINO USD	X	69.2%	30.7%	2,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MONTEREY/SANTA CRUZ	CABRILLO CCD*	C	74.2%	25.8%	85,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
PLACER	LOOMIS UN ESD	D	69.6%	30.4%	9,300,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
RIVERSIDE	PALO VERDE USD	E	72.6%	27.4%	10,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN BERNARDINO	NEEDLES USD	Y	82.7%	17.2%	6,819,604	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN DIEGO	MOUNTAIN EMPIRE USD	N	70.3%	29.7%	3,200,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN LUIS OBISPO	EL PASO DE ROBLES	D98	68.3%	31.7%	38,000,000	MULTIPLE CIPW
SAN MATEO	PORTOLA VALLEY SD	A	77.4%	22.6%	17,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA ESD	I98	77.1%	22.9%	25,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SANTA CRUZ	LOS GATOS - SARATOGA JT UN HSD	B	76.4%	23.6%	79,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SIERRA	SIERRA VALLEY HOSPITAL DISTRICT	A	71.8%	28.2%	2,300,000	HEALTH CARE FAC/SERV
TULARE	BUENA VISTA ESD	K	78.5%	21.5%	233,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	SUNDALE UN ESD	L	76.4%	23.6%	1,250,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	WOODLAKE UN ESD	M	71.7%	28.3%	2,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	WOODLAKE UN HSD	J	73.5%	26.5%	3,600,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
TUOLUMNE	SUMMERVILLE UN HSD	Q	68.1%	31.9%	9,991,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>441,053,604</b>	

TABLE A-1  
**SUMMARY OF LOCAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u> <u>AUTHORIZED</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>15 LOCAL MEASURES FAILED</b>						
FRESNO/KINGS/MADERA/ MONTEREY/SAN BENITO	WEST HILLS CCD*	G	66.1%	33.9%	19,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
HUMBOLDT	SOUTH BAY UN SD	Y	63.2%	36.8%	1,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL VALLEY CCD	Q	65.1%	34.9%	15,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC.
KERN	WASCO UN HSD	C	66.2%	33.8%	9,200,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
KINGS	PIONEER UN SD	P	63.8%	36.2%	5,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA USD	A	52.0%	48.0%	29,790,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MONTEREY/SANTA CRUZ	PAJARO VALLEY USD*	A	60.9%	39.1%	75,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
NAPA	POPE VALLEY UNION ESD	B	39.5%	60.5%	1,070,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
RIVERSIDE	HEMET USD	G	59.4%	40.6%	37,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SACRAMENTO	GALT JT UN HSD	G	59.0%	41.0%	30,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	A	64.3%	35.6%	89,900,000	PUBLIC BUILDING
SAN JOAQUIN	LINDEN USD	B	63.8%	36.2%	11,825,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN LUIS OBISPO	PASO ROBLES JT USD SCHOOL FAC IMP DIST NO 1	C-98	59.2%	40.8%	65,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SUTTER	BRITTAN SD	HH	53.0%	47.0%	2,100,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
TULARE	VISALIA USD	I	58.9%	41.1%	91,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
TOTAL					482,885,000	

\*MULTI-COUNTY MEASURE

TABLE A-2  
**SUMMARY OF LOCAL SPECIAL TAX MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>SPECIAL TAX AMOUNTS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>16 LOCAL MEASURES PASSED</b>						
HUMBOLDT	LOLETA FIRE PROTECTION DIST*	Z	79.7%	20.3%	\$15 PER PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
KERN	CALIFORNIA CITY	B	76.5%	23.5%	\$75 PER PARCEL/3YR	MULTIPLE CIPW
LASSEN	CLEAR CREEK CSD	P	70.8%	29.2%	\$100 PER PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
MODOC	SURPRISE VALLEY HEALTH CARE DIST	A	89.8%	10.2%	\$150 PER PARCEL/4YR	HEALTH CARE FAC/SERVICES
NEVADA	NEVADA CO	B	69.4%	30.6%	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
ORANGE	THREE ARCH BAY CSD	B	77.4%	22.6%	\$150 RES AND COMM/5YR	PUBLIC SAFETY
PLACER	NORTHSTAR CSD	E	78.7%	21.3%	\$280 PER PARCEL	STREET IMPROV/MAINTENANCE
SACRAMENTO	RANCHO MURIETA CSD*	J	76.6%	23.4%	\$4.73-19.62 PER LOT RES/\$.011-\$.175 PER SQ FT NON-RES (MONTHLY)	PUBLIC SAFETY
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD*	K	79.4%	20.6%	\$2.30-\$3.45 PER LOT RES/\$0- \$18.36 PER ACRE NON-RES (MONTHLY)	FLOOD CONTROL/STORM DRAIN
SAN BERNARDINO	BIG RIVER CSD	F	62.3%	37.6%	\$0-\$36 PER LANDOWNER	MULTIPLE CIPW
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE B)*	F	73.9%	26.1%	\$15.75 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE F)*	J	68.5%	31.5%	\$7.84 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE H)*	L	69.2%	30.8%	\$5.68 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
SAN MATEO	HILLSBOROUGH	B	78.9%	21.1%	\$496 IMPROVED/\$190 UNIMPROVED PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	B	68.1%	31.9%	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
YOLO	DAVIS*	M	78.6%	21.3%	\$49 PER SF RES/\$40 PER 1,000 SQ FT COMM (MAX TAX)	MULTIPLE CIPW
<b>25 LOCAL MEASURES FAILED</b>						
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	B	58.7%	41.2%	\$.005 SALES TAX/15YR	MULTIPLE CIPW
	CASTRO VALLEY SAN DIST	J	60.9%	39.0%	\$15 PER SF RES	SOLID WASTE RECOVERY
CALAVERAS	GLENCOE RAILROAD FLAT FIRE PROTECTION DIST	B	61.0%	39.0%	\$40 PER PARCEL/9YR	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION

TABLE A-2  
**SUMMARY OF LOCAL SPECIAL TAX MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>SPECIAL TAX AMOUNTS</u>	<u>PURPOSE/MISC</u>
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA CO	A	64.5%	35.5%	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
EL DORADO	GOLDEN WEST CSD	H	59.6%	40.3%	RAISE FROM \$120 TO \$240	STREET IMPROV/MAINTENANCE
FRESNO	KERMAN USD CFD NO 98-1	A	58.8%	41.1%	\$255 PER SF RES	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	PARLIER	D	52.6%	47.3%	6% UTILITY USERS TAX	PUBLIC SAFETY
HUMBOLDT	HUMBOLDT CO	A	51.1%	48.8%	.25% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
KERN	BEAR VALLEY CSD	A	61.3%	38.7%	\$90 PER PARCEL	WATER SUPPLY/STORAGE
LASSEN	NORTHWEST LASSEN FIRE PROTECTION DIST*	N	60.3%	39.7%	\$50 RES/\$100 COMM	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
	STONES-BENGARD CSD	O	57.1%	42.9%	\$100 PER PARCEL/3YR	WASTEWATER COLLECTION
LOS ANGELES	MAYWOOD	S	34.0%	66.0%	\$96-\$154 RES/\$614-\$1536 COMM ≤ 1 ACRE/\$1536 PER ACRE COMM ≥ 1 ACRE	STREET IMPROV/MAINTENANCE
MADERA	MADERA	P	64.3%	35.7%	.25% SALES TAX	PUBLIC SAFETY
RIVERSIDE	COACHELLA FIRE PROTECTION DIST	N	40.0%	60.0%	\$52 PER PARCEL (MAX TAX)	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO CO	I	55.1%	44.9%	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
	VICTORVILLE*	E	26.4%	73.5%	\$86.29 SFR/\$.052 PER SQ FT COMM	PUBLIC SAFETY
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135)*	C	56.2%	43.8%	\$6.16 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE C)*	G	53.1%	46.9%	\$4.13 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE D)*	H	56.9%	43.1%	\$4.97 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE G)*	K	58.7%	41.4%	\$7.21 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE J)*	D	55.7%	44.3%	\$17.50 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	VISTA*	M	53.3%	46.7%	\$4.83 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
SAN JOAQUIN	EASTSIDE RURAL CO FIRE PROTECTION DIST	C	65.6%	34.4%	\$.05 PER SQ FT RES/\$.06 PER SQ FT COMM (MAX TAX)	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
SONOMA	VALLEY OF THE MOON FIRE PROTECTION DIST	C	66.1%	33.9%	\$40 PER SFR (MAX TAX)	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
SUTTER	SUTTER CO FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY	II	65.2%	34.8%	.5% SALES TAX	FLOOD CONTROL/STORM DRAIN

TABLE A-3  
**SUMMARY OF LOCAL GENERAL TAX MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>GENERAL TAX AMOUNTS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>8 LOCAL MEASURES PASSED</b>						
ALAMEDA	HAYWARD*	F	61.9%	38.0%	\$1/RES SQUARE FT/ \$1.4 COMM (NEW CONSTRUCTION)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
ALAMEDA	OAKLAND	D	73.1%	26.8%	2.4% ON TOTAL FIREARMS RECEIPTS	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
ALAMEDA	SAN LEANDRO	H	53.2%	46.7%	\$50 BASE FEE PLUS 3% OF SALES	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	P	58.9%	41.1%	4% UTILITY USERS TAX (PROP 62)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MONTEREY	MARINA	F	63.7%	36.2%	5% UTILITY USERS TAX (CONTINUE)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO*	I	54.4%	45.6%	11% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
YOLO	WINTERS	O	71.9%	28.0%	RAISE MONTHLY MUNI SERVICES TAX FROM \$5 TO \$10	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
YOLO	WINTERS	P	68.5%	31.4%	5% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
<b>6 LOCAL MEASURES FAILED</b>						
ALAMEDA	SAN LEANDRO*	I	39.5%	60.4%	\$50 MINIMUM FEE	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE CO	B	39.1%	60.9%	.25% SALES TAX/10 YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
HUMBOLDT	RIO DELL*	B	49.9%	50.1%	7% RES UTILITY USERS TAX/2% NON RES	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MONO	MONO CO	B	46.8%	53.2%	RAISE TOT FROM 9% TO 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SAN BERNARDINO	MONTCLAIR	D	38.8%	61.1%	REPEAL 4.74% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
YOLO	WOODLAND	L	44.1%	55.8%	\$.005 SALES TAX/4YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT

TABLE A-4  
**SUMMARY OF TRANSACTIONS AND USE (SALES) TAX MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>TYPE OF TAX</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF TAX (\$)</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>2 MEASURES PASSED</b>							
NEVADA	NEVADA CO	B	69.4%	30.6%	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
SOLANO	SOLANO CO	B	68.1%	31.9%	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
<b>8 MEASURES FAILED</b>							
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	B	58.7%	41.2%	SPECIAL TAX	\$.005 SALES TAX/15YR (CONTINUE)	MULTIPLE CIPW
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA CO	A	64.5%	35.5%	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE CO	B	39.1%	60.9%	GENERAL TAX	.25% SALES TAX/10 YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
HUMBOLDT	HUMBOLDT CO	A	51.1%	48.8%	SPECIAL TAX	.25% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
MADERA	MADERA	P	64.3%	35.7%	SPECIAL TAX	.25% SALES TAX	PUBLIC SAFETY
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO CO	I	55.1%	44.9%	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX/10YR	LIBRARY SERVICES
SUTTER	SUTTER CO FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY	II	65.2%	34.8%	SPECIAL TAX	.5% SALES TAX	FLOOD CONTROL/ STORM DRAIN
YOLO	WOODLAND	L	44.1%	55.8%	GENERAL TAX	\$.005 SALES TAX/4YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT

TABLE A-5  
**SUMMARY OF OTHER LOCAL TAX MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
2 MEASURES PASSED						
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT	A	62.0%	38.0%	\$210,000,000 COP	CONVENTION CENTER
YOLO	WOODLAND	K	61.9%	38.0%	ADVISORY VOTE ON NEW SALES TAX REVENUE	MULTIPLE CIPW

TABLE A-6  
**SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 218 TAX MEASURES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>TAX TYPE</u>	<u>TAX AMOUNT</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>9 MEASURES PASSED</b>							
ALAMEDA	HAYWARD	F	61.9%	38.0%	GENERAL TAX	\$1/RES SQUARE FT/\$1.4 COMM NEW CONSTRUCTION	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
HUMBOLDT	LOLETA FIRE PROTECTION DIST	Z	79.7%	20.3%	SPECIAL TAX	\$15 PER PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSIO
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO	I	54.4%	45.6%	GENERAL TAX	11% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD	J	76.6%	23.4%	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.73-19.62 (MO.) RES	PUBLIC SAFETY
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD	K	79.4%	20.6%	SPECIAL TAX	\$2.30-\$3.45 (MO.) PER LOT	FLOOD CONTROL/STORM DRAIN
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE B)	F	73.9%	26.1%	SPECIAL TAX	\$15.75 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE F)	J	68.5%	31.5%	SPECIAL TAX	\$7.84 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE H)	L	69.2%	30.8%	SPECIAL TAX	\$5.68 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
YOLO	DAVIS	M	78.6%	21.3%	SPECIAL TAX	\$49 SFR (MAX TAX)	MULTIPLE CIPW
<b>10 MEASURES FAILED</b>							
ALAMEDA	SAN LEANDRO	I	39.5%	60.4%	GENERAL TAX	\$50 MINIMUM FEE	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
HUMBOLDT	RIO DELL	B	49.9%	50.1%	GENERAL TAX	7% RES UTILITY USERS TAX/2% NON RES	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
LASSEN	NORTHWEST LASSEN FIRE PROTECTION DIST	N	60.3%	39.7%	SPECIAL TAX	\$50 RES/\$100 COMM	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSIO
SAN BERNARDINO	VICTORVILLE	E	26.4%	73.5%	SPECIAL TAX	\$86.29 SFR/\$.052 SQ FT COMM	PUBLIC SAFETY
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135)	C	56.2%	43.8%	SPECIAL TAX	\$6.16 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE C)	G	53.1%	46.9%	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.13 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE D)	H	56.9%	43.1%	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.97 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE G)	K	58.7%	41.4%	SPECIAL TAX	\$7.21 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE J)	D	55.7%	44.3%	SPECIAL TAX	\$17.50 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	VISTA	M	53.3%	46.7%	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.83 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

TABLE A-7  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF ELECTION RESULTS**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE/ PROP</u>	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PASS/ FAIL</u>	<u>VOTE REQUIRED</u>
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	B	153,231	58.7%	107,514	41.2%	260,745	FAIL	2/3RDS
	CASTRO VALLEY SANITARY DISTRICT	J	7,560	60.9%	4,843	39.0%	12,403	FAIL	2/3RDS
	HAYWARD	F	11,065	61.9%	6,789	38.0%	17,854	PASS	MAJORITY
	OAKLAND	D	53,583	73.1%	19,658	26.8%	73,241	PASS	MAJORITY
	SAN LEANDRO	H	8,529	53.2%	7,500	46.7%	16,029	PASS	MAJORITY
	SAN LEANDRO	I	5,910	39.5%	9,025	60.4%	14,935	FAIL	MAJORITY
CALAVERAS	GLENCOE RAILROAD FLAT FIRE PROTECTION DIST	B	293	61.0%	187	39.0%	480	FAIL	2/3RDS
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA CO	A	134,552	64.5%	73,927	35.5%	208,479	FAIL	2/3RDS
	WEST CONTRA COSTA USD	E	32,895	76.0%	10,416	24.0%	43,311	PASS	2/3RDS
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE CO	B	2,207	39.1%	3,440	60.9%	5,647	FAIL	MAJORITY
EL DORADO	GOLDEN WEST CSD	H	250	59.6%	169	40.3%	419	FAIL	2/3RDS
FRESNO	KERMAN USD CFD NO 98-1	A	1,089	58.8%	761	41.1%	1,850	FAIL	2/3RDS
	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	C	1,769	70.3%	747	29.6%	2,516	PASS	2/3RDS
	PARLIER	D	410	52.6%	368	47.3%	778	FAIL	2/3RDS
	WEST HILLS CCD*	G	2,626	63.5%	1,507	36.4%	4,133	FAIL	2/3RDS
HUMBOLDT	HUMBOLDT CO	A	18,491	51.1%	17,653	48.8%	36,144	FAIL	2/3RDS
	LOLETA FIRE PROTECTION DIST	Z	392	79.7%	100	20.3%	492	PASS	2/3RDS
	RIO DELL	B	367	49.9%	369	50.1%	736	FAIL	MAJORITY
	SOUTH BAY UN SD	Y	1,127	63.2%	656	36.8%	1,783	FAIL	2/3RDS
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	P	2,128	58.9%	1,483	41.1%	3,611	PASS	MAJORITY
	IMPERIAL VALLEY CCD	Q	12,477	65.1%	6,683	34.9%	19,160	FAIL	2/3RDS
KERN	BEAR VALLEY CSD	A	923	61.3%	583	38.7%	1,506	FAIL	2/3RDS
	CALIFORNIA CITY	B	1,583	76.5%	486	23.5%	2,069	PASS	2/3RDS
	WASCO UN HSD	C	1,265	66.2%	646	33.8%	1,911	FAIL	2/3RDS
KINGS	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	C	108	56.8%	82	43.2%	190	FAIL	2/3RDS
	PIONEER UN SD	P	848	63.8%	481	36.2%	1,329	FAIL	2/3RDS
	REEF-SUNSET USD	R	493	76.9%	148	23.1%	641	PASS	2/3RDS
	REEF-SUNSET USD	S	494	76.8%	149	23.2%	643	PASS	2/3RDS
	WEST HILLS CCD*	G	3,377	68.5%	1,553	31.5%	4,930	PASS	2/3RDS
LASSEN	CLEAR CREEK CSD	P	63	70.8%	26	29.2%	89	PASS	2/3RDS
	NORTHWEST LASSEN FIRE PROTECTION DIST	N	88	60.3%	58	39.7%	146	FAIL	2/3RDS
	STONES-BENGARD CSD	O	40	57.1%	30	42.9%	70	FAIL	2/3RDS
LOS ANGELES	LENNOX SD	A	1,417	85.8%	234	14.2%	1,651	PASS	2/3RDS
	MAYWOOD	S	671	34.0%	1,291	66.0%	1,962	FAIL	2/3RDS

\*MULTI-COUNTY MEASURE

TABLE A-7  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF ELECTION RESULTS**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE/ PROP</u>	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PASS/ FAIL</u>	<u>VOTE REQUIRED</u>
LOS ANGELES	POMONA USD	B	11,104	69.9%	4,791	30.1%	15,895	PASS	2/3RDS
MADERA	MADERA	P	2,997	64.3%	1,667	35.7%	4,664	FAIL	2/3RDS
	WEST HILLS CCD*	G	60	58.8%	42	41.2%	102	FAIL	2/3RDS
	YOSEMITE JT UN HSD*	B	4,858	70.9%	1,991	29.1%	6,849	PASS	2/3RDS
MARIN	KENTFIELD SD	B	3,358	77.2%	989	22.8%	4,347	PASS	2/3RDS
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA USD	A	3,073	52.0%	2,837	48.0%	5,910	FAIL	2/3RDS
	YOSEMITE JT UN HSD*	B	82	74.5%	28	25.5%	110	PASS	2/3RDS
MENDOCINO	MENDOCINO USD	X	1,657	69.2%	735	30.7%	2,392	PASS	2/3RDS
MODOC	SURPRISE VALLEY HEALTH CARE DIST	A	513	89.8%	58	10.2%	571	PASS	2/3RDS
MONO	MONO CO	B	1,474	46.8%	1,675	53.2%	3,149	FAIL	MAJORITY
MONTEREY	CABRILLO CCD*	C	1,137	63.9%	641	36.0%	1,778	FAIL	2/3RDS
	MARINA	F	1,976	63.7%	1,126	36.2%	3,102	PASS	MAJORITY
	PAJARO VALLEY USD*	A	655	60.5%	427	39.4%	1,082	FAIL	2/3RDS
	WEST HILLS CCD*	G	5	45.4%	6	54.5%	11	FAIL	2/3RDS
NAPA	POPE VALLEY UN ESD	B	92	39.5%	141	60.5%	233	FAIL	2/3RDS
NEVADA	NEVADA CO	B	21,599	69.4%	9,540	30.6%	31,139	PASS	2/3RDS
ORANGE	THREE ARCH BAY CSD	B	349	77.4%	102	22.6%	451	PASS	2/3RDS
PLACER	LOOMIS UN ESD	D	3,562	69.6%	1,558	30.4%	5,120	PASS	2/3RDS
	NORTHSTAR CSD	E	59	78.7%	16	21.3%	75	PASS	2/3RDS
RIVERSIDE	COACHELLA FIRE PROTECTION DIST	N	431	40.0%	652	60.0%	1,083	FAIL	2/3RDS
	HEMET USD	G	13,376	59.4%	9,141	40.6%	22,517	FAIL	2/3RDS
	PALO VERDE USD	E	1,478	72.6%	557	27.4%	2,035	PASS	2/3RDS
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO	I	37,941	54.4%	31,746	45.6%	69,687	PASS	MAJORITY
	GALT JT UN HSD	G	2,961	59.0%	2,054	41.0%	5,015	FAIL	2/3RDS
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD	J	1,349	76.6%	411	23.4%	1,760	PASS	2/3RDS
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD	K	1,398	79.4%	363	20.6%	1,761	PASS	2/3RDS
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO CO	I	6,054	55.1%	4,942	44.9%	10,996	FAIL	2/3RDS
	WEST HILLS CCD*		-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	-	2/3RDS
SAN BERNARDINO	BIG RIVER CSD	F	174	62.3%	105	37.6%	279	PASS	MAJORITY
	MONTCLAIR	D	1,177	38.8%	1,851	61.1%	3,028	FAIL	MAJORITY
	NEEDLES USD	Y	1,149	82.7%	240	17.2%	1,389	PASS	2/3RDS
	VICTORVILLE	E	1,943	26.4%	5,416	73.5%	7,359	FAIL	2/3RDS
SAN DIEGO	MOUNTAIN EMPIRE USD	N	1,551	70.3%	656	29.7%	2,207	PASS	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135)	C	84,172	56.2%	65,592	43.8%	149,764	FAIL	2/3RDS

\*MULTI-COUNTY MEASURE

TABLE A-7  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF ELECTION RESULTS**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE/ PROP</u>	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PASS/ FAIL</u>	<u>VOTE REQUIRED</u>
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE B)	F	896	73.9%	316	26.1%	1,212	PASS	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE C)	G	5,921	53.1%	5,228	46.9%	11,149	FAIL	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE D)	H	1,636	56.9%	1,242	43.1%	2,878	FAIL	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE F)	J	6,794	68.5%	3,118	31.5%	9,912	PASS	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE G)	K	4,599	58.7%	3,242	41.4%	7,841	FAIL	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE H)	L	2,262	69.2%	1,008	30.8%	3,270	PASS	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE J)	D	43,256	55.7%	34,468	44.3%	77,724	FAIL	2/3RDS
	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT	A	126,589	62.0%	77,635	38.0%	204,224	PASS	MAJORITY
	VISTA	M	6,122	53.3%	5,368	46.7%	11,490	FAIL	2/3RDS
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	A	118,013	64.3%	65,383	35.6%	183,396	FAIL	2/3RDS
SAN JOAQUIN	EASTSIDE RURAL CO FIRE PROTECTION DIST	C	1,616	65.6%	848	34.4%	2,464	FAIL	2/3RDS
	LINDEN USD	B	1,842	63.8%	1,044	36.2%	2,886	FAIL	2/3RDS
SAN LUIS OBISPO	EL PASO DE ROBLES	D-98	3,825	68.3%	1,778	31.7%	5,603	PASS	2/3RDS
	PASO ROBLES JT USD SCHOOL FAC IMP DIST NO 1	C-98	4,941	59.2%	3,405	40.8%	8,346	FAIL	2/3RDS
SAN MATEO	HILLSBOROUGH	B	2,803	78.9%	748	21.1%	3,551	PASS	2/3RDS
	PORTOLA VALLEY SD	A	2,373	77.4%	695	22.6%	3,068	PASS	2/3RDS
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA ESD	I98	15,489	77.1%	4,606	22.9%	20,095	PASS	2/3RDS
SANTA CRUZ	CABRILLO CCD*	C	45,040	74.5%	15,395	25.5%	60,435	PASS	2/3RDS
	LOS GATOS - SARATOGA JT UN HSD	B	1,165	76.4%	359	23.6%	1,524	PASS	2/3RDS
	PAJARO VALLEY USD*	A	11,253	61.0%	7,207	39.0%	18,460	FAIL	2/3RDS
SIERRA	SIERRA VALLEY HOSPITAL DIST	A	663	71.8%	260	28.2%	923	PASS	2/3RDS
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	B	47,712	68.1%	22,329	31.9%	70,041	PASS	2/3RDS
SONOMA	VALLEY OF THE MOON FIRE PROTECTION DIST	C	3,384	66.1%	1,736	33.9%	5,120	FAIL	2/3RDS
SUTTER	BRITTAN SD	HH	510	53.0%	453	47.0%	963	FAIL	2/3RDS
	SUTTER CO FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY	II	12,074	65.2%	6,446	34.8%	18,520	FAIL	2/3RDS
TULARE	BUENA VISTA ESD	K	73	78.5%	20	21.5%	93	PASS	2/3RDS
	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	C	359	64.6%	207	36.6%	566	FAIL	2/3RDS
	SUNDALE UN ESD	L	382	76.4%	118	23.6%	500	PASS	2/3RDS
	VISALIA USD	I	12,518	58.9%	8,743	41.1%	21,261	FAIL	2/3RDS
	WOODLAKE UN ESD	M	753	71.7%	297	28.3%	1,050	PASS	2/3RDS
	WOODLAKE UN HSD	J	1,471	73.5%	529	26.5%	2,000	PASS	2/3RDS
TUOLUMNE	SUMMERVILLE UN HSD	Q	2,305	68.1%	1,078	31.9%	3,383	PASS	2/3RDS
YOLO	DAVIS	M	12,409	78.6%	3,368	21.3%	15,777	PASS	2/3RDS
	WINTERS	O	930	71.9%	362	28.0%	1,292	PASS	MAJORITY

TABLE A-7  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES  
SUMMARY OF ELECTION RESULTS  
JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE/ PROP</u>	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PASS/ FAIL</u>	<u>VOTE REQUIRED</u>
YOLO	WINTERS	P	890	68.5%	408	31.4%	1,298	PASS	MAJORITY
	WOODLAND	K	6,257	61.9%	3,848	38.0%	10,105	PASS	MAJORITY
	WOODLAND	L	4,488	44.1%	5,686	55.8%	10,174	FAIL	MAJORITY

TABLE A-8  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF TYPES AND PURPOSES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TYPE DEBT/TAX</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BOND OR TAX (\$)</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	SPECIAL TAX	\$.005 SALES TAX/15YR	MULTIPLE CIPW
	CASTRO VALLEY SAN DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$15 PER SF RES	SOLID WASTE RECOVERY
	HAYWARD	GENERAL TAX	\$1 RES SQ FT/ \$1.4 COMM (CONTINUE)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	OAKLAND	GENERAL TAX	2.4% ON TOTAL FIREARMS RECEIPTS	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	SAN LEANDRO	GENERAL TAX	\$50 BASE FEE PLUS 3% OF SALES	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
CALAVERAS	SAN LEANDRO	GENERAL TAX	\$50 MINIMUM FEE	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	GLENCOE RAILROAD FLAT FIRE PROT DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$40 PER PARCEL/9YR	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA CO	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
	WEST CONTRA COSTA USD	GO BOND	\$40,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE CO	GENERAL TAX	.25% SALES TAX/10 YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
EL DORADO	GOLDEN WEST CSD	SPECIAL TAX	RAISE FROM \$120 TO \$240	STREET IMPROV/MAINTENANCE
FRESNO	KERMAN USD CFD NO 98-1	SPECIAL TAX	\$255 PER SF RES	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	GO BOND	\$10,100,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	PARLIER	SPECIAL TAX	6% UTILITY USERS TAX	PUBLIC SAFETY
	WEST HILLS CCD*	GO BOND	\$19,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
	HUMBOLDT CO	SPECIAL TAX	.25% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
HUMBOLDT	LOLETA FIRE PROT DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$15 PER PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
	RIO DELL	GENERAL TAX	7% RES UTILITY USERS TAX/2% NON RES	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	SOUTH BAY UN SD	GO BOND	\$1,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	GENERAL TAX	4% UTILITY USERS TAX (PROP 62)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	IMPERIAL VALLEY CCD	GO BOND	\$15,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
KERN	BEAR VALLEY CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$90 PER PARCEL	WATER SUPPLY/STORAGE
	CALIFORNIA CITY	SPECIAL TAX	\$75 PER PARCEL/3YR	MULTIPLE CIPW
KINGS	WASCO UN HSD	GO BOND	\$9,200,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	GO BOND	\$10,100,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	PIONEER USD	GO BOND	\$5,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	REEF-SUNSET USD	GO BOND	\$2,400,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	REEF-SUNSET USD	GO BOND	\$7,600,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
LASSEN	WEST HILLS CCD*	GO BOND	\$19,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
	CLEAR CREEK CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$100 PER PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
	NORTHWEST LASSEN FIRE PROT DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$50 RES/\$100 COMM	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
LOS ANGELES	STONES-BENGARD CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$100 PER PARCEL/3YR	WASTEWATER COLLECTION
	LENNOX SD	GO BOND	\$10,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	MAYWOOD	SPECIAL TAX	\$96-\$154 RES/\$614-\$1536 COMM ≤ 1 ACRE/\$1536 PER ACRE COMM ≥ 1 ACRE	STREET IMPROV/MAINTENANCE

TABLE A-8  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF TYPES AND PURPOSES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TYPE DEBT/TAX</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BOND OR TAX (\$)</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
LOS ANGELES	POMONA USD	GO BOND	\$50,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MADERA	MADERA	SPECIAL TAX	.25% SALES TAX	PUBLIC SAFETY
	WEST HILLS CCD*	GO BOND	\$19,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
	YOSEMITE JT UN HSD*	GO BOND	\$11,760,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MARIN	KENTFIELD SD	GO BOND	\$13,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA USD	GO BOND	\$29,790,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	YOSEMITE JT UN HSD*	GO BOND	\$11,760,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MENDOCINO	MENDOCINO USD	GO BOND	\$2,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
MODOC	SURPRISE VALLEY HEALTH CARE DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$150 PER PARCEL/4YR	HEALTH CARE FAC/SERVICES
MONO	MONO CO	GENERAL TAX	RAISE TOT FROM 9% TO 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MONTEREY	CABRILLO CCD*	GO BOND	\$85,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
	MARINA	GENERAL TAX	5% UTILITY USERS TAX (CONTINUE)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PAJARO VALLEY USD*	GO BOND	\$75,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	WEST HILLS CCD*	GO BOND	\$19,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
NAPA	POPE VALLEY UNION ESD	GO BOND	\$1,070,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
NEVADA	NEVADA CO	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
ORANGE	THREE ARCH BAY CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$150 RES AND COMM/\$100 VACANT/5YR	PUBLIC SAFETY
PLACER	LOOMIS UN ESD	GO BOND	\$9,300,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	NORTHSTAR CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$280 PER PARCEL	STREET IMPROV/MAINTENANCE
RIVERSIDE	COACHELLA FIRE PROTECTION DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$52 PER PARCEL (MAX TAX)	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
	HEMET USD	GO BOND	\$37,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	PALO VERDE USD	GO BOND	\$10,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SACRAMENTO	GALT JT UN HSD	GO BOND	\$30,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.73-19.62 PER LOT RES/\$.011-\$.175 PER SQ FT NON-RES (MONTHLY)	PUBLIC SAFETY
	RANCHO MURIETA CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$2.30-\$3.45 PER LOT RES/\$0-\$18.36 PER ACRE NON-RES (MONTHLY)	FLOOD CONTROL/STORM DRAIN
	SACRAMENTO	GENERAL TAX	11% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO CO	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
	WEST HILLS CCD*	GO BOND	\$19,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
SAN BERNARDINO	BIG RIVER CSD	SPECIAL TAX	\$0-\$36 PER LANDOWNER	MULTIPLE CIPW
	MONTCLAIR	GENERAL TAX	REPEAL 4.74% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	NEEDLES USD	GO BOND	\$6,819,604	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	VICTORVILLE	SPECIAL TAX	\$86.29 SFR/\$.052 PER SQ FT COMM	PUBLIC SAFETY
SAN DIEGO	MOUNTAIN EMPIRE USD	GO BOND	\$3,200,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC

TABLE A-8  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF TYPES AND PURPOSES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TYPE DEBT/TAX</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BOND OR TAX (\$)</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135)	SPECIAL TAX	\$6.16 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE B)	SPECIAL TAX	\$15.75 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE C)	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.13 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE D)	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.97 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE F)	SPECIAL TAX	\$7.84 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE G)	SPECIAL TAX	\$7.21 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE H)	SPECIAL TAX	\$5.68 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO CO (CSA 135, ZONE J)	SPECIAL TAX	\$17.50 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT	COP	\$210,000,000	CONVENTION CENTER
	VISTA	SPECIAL TAX	\$4.83 SFR (MAX TAX)	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	GO BOND	\$89,900,000	PUBLIC BUILDING
SAN JOAQUIN	EASTSIDE RURAL CO FIRE PROT DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$.05 PER SQ FT RES/\$.06 PER SQ FT COMM (MAX TAX)	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
	LINDEN USD	GO BOND	\$11,825,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN LUIS OBISPO	EL PASO DE ROBLES	GO BOND	\$38,000,000	MULTIPLE CIPW
	PASO ROBLES JT USD SCH FAC IMP DIST NO 1	GO BOND	\$65,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SAN MATEO	HILLSBOROUGH	SPECIAL TAX	\$496 IMPROVED/\$190 UNIMPROVED PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
	PORTOLA VALLEY SD	GO BOND	\$17,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA ESD	GO BOND	\$25,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SANTA CRUZ	CABRILLO CCD*	GO BOND	\$85,000,000	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FAC
	LOS GATOS - SARATOGA JT UN HSD	GO BOND	\$79,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	PAJARO VALLEY USD*	GO BOND	\$75,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
SIERRA	SIERRA VALLEY HOSPITAL DISTRICT	GO BOND	\$2,300,000	HEALTH CARE FAC/SERVICES
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	SPECIAL TAX	.125% SALES TAX	LIBRARY SERVICES
SONOMA	VALLEY OF THE MOON FIRE PROT DIST	SPECIAL TAX	\$40 PER SFR (MAX TAX)	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION
SUTTER	BRITTAN SD	GO BOND	\$2,100,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	SUTTER CO FLOOD PROT AUTHORITY	SPECIAL TAX	.5% SALES TAX	FLOOD CONTROL/STORM DRAIN
TULARE	BUENA VISTA ESD	GO BOND	\$233,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	KINGSBURG JT UN HSD*	GO BOND	\$10,100,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	SUNDALE UN ESD	GO BOND	\$1,250,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	VISALIA USD	GO BOND	\$91,000,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	WOODLAKE UN HSD	GO BOND	\$3,600,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
	WOODLAKE UN ESD	GO BOND	\$2,500,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
TUOLUMNE	SUMMERVILLE UN HSD	GO BOND	\$9,991,000	K-12 SCHOOL FAC
YOLO	DAVIS	SPECIAL TAX	\$49 SFR/\$40 PER 1,000 SQ FT COMM	MULTIPLE CIPW

TABLE A-8  
**LOCAL BOND AND TAX MEASURES**  
**SUMMARY OF TYPES AND PURPOSES**  
**JUNE 2, 1998**

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TYPE DEBT/TAX</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BOND OR TAX (\$)</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
YOLO	WINTERS	GENERAL TAX	RAISE MUNI SERVICES TAX FROM \$5 TO \$10 (MONTHLY)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	WINTERS	GENERAL TAX	5% UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	WOODLAND	OTHER	NEW SALES TAX REVENUE ADVISORY VOTE	MULTIPLE CIPW
	WOODLAND	GENERAL TAX	\$.005 SALES TAX/4YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT

**California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission**  
**915 Capitol Mall, Room 400**  
**Sacramento, CA 95814**  
**(916) 653-3269**