



State and County Tax and Bond Ballot Measures

*Summary of General Election
November 8, 1988*

Thomas W. Hayes
*California State Treasurer
and Chairman*



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 400
P.O. BOX 942809
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94209-0001
TELEPHONE: (916) 324-2585

MEMBERS

- Thomas W. Hayes
State Treasurer
- George Deukmejian
Governor
- Gray Davis
State Controller
- Robert G. Beverly
State Senator
- Newton R. Russell
State Senator
- Jim Costa
State Assemblyman
- Patrick J. Nolan
State Assemblyman
- Thomas C. Rupert
Treasurer, City of Torrance
- Richard B. Dixon
*Chief Administrative Officer
County of Los Angeles*

February 1, 1989

I am pleased to release this report, prepared by the California Debt Advisory Commission, summarizing the 173 bond and tax measures considered by the voters at the General Election on November 8, 1988.

In the 1986 General Election, there were 99 such measures on the ballots. This phenomenal increase reflects the growing pressure between the various restrictions on the growth of government and the demands for improved or expanded services. While voters seem quite willing to incur additional debt for statewide programs, they are about evenly split on incurring debt at the local level. Generally speaking, voters are still reluctant to raise their own taxes as the most popular revenue raisers include such items as the transit occupancy tax or business fees and licenses.

Information presented in this report was provided by the Secretary of State's office and the election departments of the 58 County Clerks' offices. Our office appreciates the assistance they provided.

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. HAYES
California State Treasurer
Chairman, California Debt Advisory Commission

**STATE AND COUNTY
TAX AND BOND BALLOT MEASURES
SUMMARY OF GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 8, 1988**

February 1, 1989

**CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMISSION
P.O. Box 942809
Sacramento, California 94209-0001
(916)324-2585**

CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMISSION

The California Debt Advisory Commission is the State's clearinghouse for public debt issuance information. The Commission was created by the California Legislature in 1981 to assist State and local government agencies with the monitoring, issuance, and management of public debt.

The California Debt Advisory Commission members include:

Thomas W. Hayes
California State Treasurer
and Chairman

George Deukmejian
Governor

Gray Davis
Controller

Robert Beverly
State Senator

Newton Russell
State Senator

Jim Costa
State Assemblyman

Patrick Nolan
State Assemblyman

Richard B. Dixon
Chief Administrative Officer
Los Angeles County

Thomas C. Rupert
Treasurer
Torrance

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

California Debt Advisory Commission
(916)324-2585

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The prompt attention, expertise, and courtesy of all 58 California county clerks' elections departments and the California Secretary of State's Election Department is gratefully acknowledged. Without the helpful responses from these public agencies, the information contained and summarized in this report would not have been possible.

The report was prepared by Martha Riley, Virginia Bergman, and Scott Lord of the Commission staff.

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Summary	2
III	Summary of State and Local Measures by Purpose.....	3
IV.	Legislation	4
V.	Bonds	
	A. State General Obligation Bond Measures	5
	B. Local General Obligation Bond Measures.....	6
	C. Local Revenue Bond Measures.....	7
VI.	Tax Measures	
	A. State Cigarette Tax Measure	8
	B. Local Tax Measures	
	1. Use/Transaction (Sales) Tax Measures.....	8
	2. Special Tax Measures.....	9
	3. General Tax Measures	11
	4. Other Tax Measures.....	12

TABLES

Table 1	Results, Local General Obligation Bond Measures.....	6
Table 2	Results, Local Revenue Bond Measures.....	7
Table 3	Results, Local Use/Transaction (Sales) Tax Measures.....	8
Table 4	Results, Special Tax Measures.....	9
Table 5	Results, General Tax Measures.....	11
Table A-1	Summary of State General Obligation Measures Considered Since 1900 By Purpose.....	13
Table A-2	Summary of Authorized and Outstanding State General Obligation Bond Programs as of December 31, 1988.....	14
Table A-3	Summary, State General Obligation Bond Measures.....	16
Table A-4	Summary, Local Government General Obligation Measures.....	17
Table A-5	Summary, Local Use/Transaction (Sales) Tax Measures.....	19
Table A-6	Summary, Local Special Tax Measures.....	20
Table A-7	Summary, Local General Tax Measures	23
Table A-8	Summary, Other Local Tax Measures.....	26

STATE AND COUNTY TAX AND BOND BALLOT MEASURES:

Summary of General Election November 8, 1988

I. INTRODUCTION

Voters considered 173 bond and tax measures at the 1988 General Election held on November 8, 1988. Of that total, the entire State electorate voted on ten State bond and tax measures. The remaining 163 measures were on local ballots for cities, counties, and special districts throughout the State.

All of the State measures--nine general obligation bond propositions and one tax measure--passed. They needed only a simple majority for passage. Of the 163 local bond and tax measures, about half passed (81) and half failed (82).

This is the California Debt Advisory Commission's second report on bond and tax measures. The first report, entitled *State Bond Measures and County Tax and Bond Ballot Measures: Summary of General Election November 4, 1986*, was published February 9, 1987, and contained the results of 99 bond and tax measures.

The information in this report was obtained through the assistance of the California Secretary of State's Elections Department and the county clerks' departments in the State's 58 counties. The accuracy and completeness of local election data presented depends wholly on sample ballots and voter results provided by the county clerks' offices. There is no centralized source of information for local bond or tax measures which appear on the ballots. This material has been reviewed by other knowledgeable parties, but there is no way to verify independently that information on local measures is complete. Results of the State of California ballot measures is taken from final election results provided by the California Secretary of State's Office and includes the results from all 58 counties.

The following sections of the report expand on the various types of tax and bond financing measures presented in the election. Section II presents a summary of the major points discussed further in the report; Section III discusses the purposes of the measures; Section IV is a short review of significant legislation; Section V discusses State and local general obligation and revenue bond measures; and Section VI, State tax measures and local sales, special, general, and other tax measures. Summary tables follow the text of the report.

II. SUMMARY

- All nine State of California general obligation bond measures passed. State voters approved a total of \$3.292 billion in bond authorizations.
- There were 30 local general obligation bond measures in the 1988 November election. Twelve measures passed while 18 measures failed. Voters approved over \$417 million for local projects.
- Three local revenue bond measures, totalling \$1.860 billion, were considered in the 1988 election and all passed.
- A total of fifteen measures providing an increase in use and transaction (sales) taxes for counties and county transportation districts were on the ballot. Only three (all transportation measures) of the fifteen passed.
- There were 41 special tax measures considered, of which 14 passed and 27 failed. The two-thirds majority required for passage of special taxes continued to be an obstacle to the passage of many programs. Over 59 percent of the failing measures received a vote of more than 50 percent and several measures received 65 percent or more approval.
- Of the total 60 general tax measures, 38 measures passed, and 22 measures failed. In this category, 33 transient occupancy tax (TOT) measures were presented. Of that total, 24 passed and 9 failed.
- Voters in seven Bay Area counties voted overwhelmingly (71 percent to 29 percent) to approve up to a \$1 toll on bridges in the area to fund the construction and repair of bridges, as well as provide transit improvements.
- Voters approved an additional State tax on tobacco products by a 58 to 42 percent vote.
- Seven counties reported no local bond or tax measures. They were Alpine, Lassen, Mendocino, Nevada, Shasta, Trinity, and Yuba counties.

III. SUMMARY OF STATE AND LOCAL MEASURES BY PURPOSE

The 173 State and local measures fell into one of five general categories--housing, hospital and health care, capital improvements and public works, education, and government and governmental services. The following summarizes the measures by purpose.

--Housing: One State housing measure (State Proposition 84) passed and one local housing measure (Alameda County's Measure C) failed.

--Hospitals: Two local hospital measures were considered--one passed and one failed.

--Capital improvements and public works: Thirty-two measures passed and 25 measures failed. They included projects for water, wastewater treatment, jails, prisons, transportation, library construction, and parks and recreation facilities.

The electorate voted to approve \$1.317 billion in general obligation bonds for prisons and jails at the State level, but did not approve any local jail facilities.

Three-fourths of the water/wastewater proposals passed (9 passed/3 failed).

Passage and failure of transportation measures were approximately even when the seven Bay Area tax measures for bridges and transit improvements are viewed as one measure. Four other transit/roadway improvement projects passed and 5 failed.

Of the six library services and library construction measures considered at the State and local levels, five were approved. However, measures to build or improve county or community centers were defeated.

--Education: Overall, 12 education measures passed and 9 measures failed.

--General government: The measures were split almost evenly with 45 passing and 46 failing. This category included basic governmental operations, as well as fire and police protection services, emergency medical treatment services (EMT), and drug and drug prevention projects.

A further breakdown of this category shows that over two-thirds of the measures to provide public services such as fire, police, EMT, and mosquito abatement failed (8 passed/16 failed).

Several innovative tax measures--two dealing with drug prevention and one with gang violence--were defeated.

IV. LEGISLATION

Several constitutional amendments and new legislation affecting the issuance of general obligation bonds, the use of general and special taxes, and the implementation of use/transaction (sales) taxes resulted in increases in the number of bond and tax measures considered in this election.

- Local general obligation bond measures appeared on 17 county ballots this election due primarily to the provisions of Proposition 46. Proposition 46, passed in June 1986, allowed the sale of general obligation bonds only for the acquisition or improvements of real property (e.g., fire and police stations, schools, streets, and various public works projects) if such sale is approved by two-thirds of the voters. Prior to this amendment, voters were subject to the provisions of Proposition 13 and had been unable to pass general obligation bond measures. The enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978 impaired the ability of a local government to make an unlimited pledge of repayment on general obligation bonds by limiting (with certain exceptions) the *ad valorem* tax rate to not greater than one percent. Local general obligation bond measures are discussed further in Section V of the report.
- Proposition 62, an initiative measure passed in November 1986, added Section 53720, et seq., to the Government Code and defined, among other provisions, general taxes and specific taxes. General taxes require a majority vote. Special or specific taxes require a two-thirds vote of the qualified voters. Taxes imposed prior to August 1, 1985 are not subject to the statute. All taxes imposed after August 1, 1985 must be affirmed by vote. The November 1988 election noted the occurrence of business license and construction taxes and transient occupancy taxes on many county ballots. The discussion in Section VI on special and general taxes identifies the various types of tax measures which must be ratified due to Proposition 62 provisions.
- The final statutory change which prompted tax measures was Section 7285 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, effective January 1, 1988. This legislation enabled counties with a population of 350,000 or less to adopt a sales tax for general county services. Counties which took advantage of this legislation and the results of the vote are listed in Section VI, Use/Transaction (Sales) Taxes.

V. BONDS

A. State General Obligation Bond Measures

All nine State of California general obligation (GO) bond measures passed. In the November 8, 1988 General Election, voters approved a total of \$3.292 billion in bond authorizations. State GOs must receive a majority of the vote for passage and in this election, the measures garnered 53 to 72 percent approval. With the bond authorizations approved by the voters in the November election plus the \$2.236 billion authorized at the Primary Election held June 6, 1988, a total of \$5.528 billion in general obligation bonds was authorized in 1988.

The November propositions fall into three major categories--housing, capital improvements and public works, and education. One housing measure provides \$300 million in funds for homeless shelters and low-income housing. Two education bond measures were approved for school facilities and higher education facilities and together total \$1.4 billion.

Capital improvement project bond measures approved include: two prison and jail construction measures (totalling \$1.317 billion); two water and clean water bond measures (totalling \$135 million), one public library facilities measure (\$75 million), and one wastewater conservation measure (\$65 million).

With the approval of the State general obligation bond measures in this election, State voters have approved \$7.661 billion for education, \$7.095 billion for veterans' housing, \$3.650 billion for water programs, and \$3.637 billion for correction facilities since 1900. Table A-1, in the appendix, presents the total number of bond measures and the volume for each purpose category from 1900 through the present election. This table is updated from one prepared by the Commission for its 1987 report, *The Use of General Obligation Bonds by the State of California*.

With the addition of the nine measures authorized in this election, Californians now have approved general obligation bonds in excess of \$25.970 billion in the last 88 years. Of that amount, \$8.093 billion is still outstanding and \$9.872 billion is unissued. Table A-2 lists the active general obligation bond programs in the State of California and shows the amount of bonds authorized by the voters, the amounts issued and outstanding, and the amounts remaining unissued from prior years as of December 31, 1988. General obligation bonds are not sold until programs or projects are defined by State agencies.

Table A-3 summarizes the November 1988 State general obligation measures.

B. Local General Obligation Bond Measures

There were 30 local general obligation bond measures in the 1988 November election. Voters were asked to approve a total of approximately \$1.145 billion to construct school facilities; expand and build library facilities, park and recreation facilities; acquire open space; and construct storm drainage systems, jail facilities, and bikeway and roadway systems.

All local general obligation bond measures need two-thirds majority vote for passage. Twelve measures (40 percent) passed and 18 measures (60 percent failed). A total of \$418 million in general obligation bonds was authorized at the local level. Over half that total is attributable to the passage of the East Bay Regional Park District's Measure AA which provides \$225 million for wetland preservation and open space acquisition in the District which encompasses areas in both Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Voters approved the measure by a 68 to 32 percent majority.

**TABLE 1
RESULTS
LOCAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURES**

	TOTAL NUMBER	% OF TOTAL	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL
PASSED	12	40.0	\$417,750,000	36.5
FAILED	<u>18</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>727,027,000</u>	<u>63.5</u>
TOTAL	30	100.0	\$1,144,777,000	100.0

Other general obligation bonds that passed included eight measures authorizing the construction of school facilities, two measures for library facilities, and one measure for the construction of a health facility.

Compared to previous years, there were more ballot measures for school facility bond financings this election as school districts took advantage of the provisions of Proposition 46. There were only two local school general obligation bond measures on the ballot in the 1986 General Election as reported in *State Bond and County Tax and Bond Ballot Measures: November 6, 1986*. By comparison, in this General Election, 13 school districts presented general obligation bond measures to the voters. Eight measures (62 percent) passed. Of the five that failed, all received a majority of the votes (from 52 to 65 percent), but not quite the two-thirds majority needed for passage.

Local voters defeated all local GO jail and prison construction measures presented to them. Measures failed in Alameda and Los Angeles counties and Alhambra. Only the Los Angeles County measure received more than a simple majority vote. All

public improvement GO measures were also defeated. They included storm drainage (Anaheim), street improvements (Chico and Anaheim), and road and bikeway improvements (Davis). The Anaheim storm drainage measure failed by a fraction of a percentage point as it garnered 66.5 percent of the votes.

Four of five measures for park, recreation and open space facilities failed, as well as a measure for low-income, disabled and senior housing.

Table A-4 presents a summary of the local general obligation bond measures considered.

C. Local Revenue Bond Measures

Three revenue bond measures, totalling \$1.860 billion, were considered in the 1988 election and all passed.

**TABLE 2
RESULTS
LOCAL REVENUE BOND MEASURES**

AGENCY	% YES	% NO	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	PURPOSE
CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT	68%	32%	\$350,000,000	WATER SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION LOS VAQUEROS PROJECT
LOS ANGELES	75%	25%	1,500,000,000	WASTEWATER TREATMENT DISTRIBUTION
SOQUEL CREEK WATER DISTRICT	83%	17%	<u>10,000,000</u>	WATER SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION
TOTAL			\$1,860,000,000	

Los Angeles approved the largest measure--\$1.5 billion--to fund a wastewater treatment improvement project. Voters in the Contra Costa Water District and Soquel Creek Water District in Santa Cruz County approved water treatment, supply, and distribution projects for \$350 million and \$10 million, respectively. Although, each revenue bond measure needed only a simple majority for passage, they all received over 68 percent approval.

VI. TAX MEASURES

A. State Cigarette Tax Measure

California voters approved an additional tax on tobacco products by a 58 to 42 percent vote. This initiative measure imposes an additional tax upon cigarette distributors of approximately 25 cents per pack of cigarettes and an additional tax on other tobacco products. The monies raised from this tax will be placed in special accounts to be used for treatment and research of tobacco-related diseases; school and community health education programs; fire prevention; and environmental conservation/damage restoration programs. The initiative also provides a Constitutional exemption from the appropriations limit for the funds collected from the tax.

B. Local Tax Measures

1. Use/Transaction (Sales) Tax Measures

A total of fifteen measures providing an increase in use and transaction (sales) taxes for counties and county transportation districts were on the ballot. The measures allowed the counties to increase their sales tax from one-half of one percent to one percent. Only three of the fifteen passed. The remaining twelve were unable to obtain the simple majority needed for passage.

**TABLE 3
RESULTS
LOCAL USE/TRANSACTION (SALES) TAX MEASURES**

	TOTAL NUMBER	% OF TOTAL
PASSED	3	20.0
FAILED	<u>12</u>	<u>80.0</u>
TOTAL	15	100.0

Use and transaction (sales) tax measures fell into two general categories-- transportation and county services.

____ Transportation

Three transportation tax measures were approved and two failed. The successful passage of sales tax measures for transportation and transit projects in Contra Costa, Riverside, and Sacramento counties brings the number of transportation tax measures in effect to 12. (Other counties with transportation sales taxes include: San Benito, San Mateo (two taxes), San Diego, Fresno, Alameda, Santa Clara, Los Angeles, and Santa Cruz.) Sales tax measures for transportation have failed eight times in this and previous elections. Two counties (Contra Costa and Sacramento) passed measures this election after failing to do so in prior years.

____ County Services

Several counties used new legislation (Section 7285, Revenue and Taxation Code, effective January 1, 1988) to provide funds for general county government. This legislation enabled counties to adopt a sales tax for general county services. Ten counties took advantage of the opportunity citing the need for increased funding for public services, jail facilities, paramedic services, and drug prevention programs as reasons for the increase. None of the measures passed.

Table A-5 lists all the use/transaction (sales) tax measures.

2. Special Tax Measures

Special tax measures were on the ballot in 25 counties. A total of 41 measures were considered, of which 14 (over one-third) passed and 27 (two-thirds) failed. Special taxes generally benefit property in a defined area or provide a special service. Taxes may be determined by footage (acre, square foot, etc.); type of property (commercial, residential, industrial), or improvement to land (improved versus unimproved property) and generally require a two-thirds majority vote for passage.

**TABLE 4
RESULTS
SPECIAL TAX MEASURES**

	TOTAL NUMBER	% OF TOTAL
PASSED	14	34.1
FAILED	<u>27</u>	<u>65.9</u>
TOTAL	41	100.0

Programs and projects proposed to be funded by special taxes encompassed a wide range of purposes.

Los Angeles voters approved a levy of a special tax for ten years to repay a proposed \$67 million for fire safety and paramedic communications and dispatch equipment. The tax received a 71 to 29 percent approval vote.

About half of the special tax measures (6 of 13) to provide fire protection and EMT services passed. All three measures to provide police protection services and five measures for parks and recreation facilities failed.

Two proposals for government operations passed--to continue general operations for Etna Cemetery District, and Contra Costa County Service Area P-1--but measures to provide mosquito abatement services, hospital operations, and a drug prevention program failed.

Two school measures designed to provide enhancements to the educational programs in Shoreline Unified School District and Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District passed. Shoreline Unified School District has a multicounty border--Marin and Sonoma counties. The passage of this measure is reported by aggregating the results from each county.

_____Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts

Seven Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) special tax measures were considered in the election. Two of the measures passed. Both measures provided authorization of a special tax of \$15 and \$18 per year to provide library services in Timber Cove and Modoc County, respectively.

Of the five defeated CFD measures, three authorized school facilities and one authorized a parks and recreation facility. Their passage would have levied special taxes and authorized bonds totalling over \$115 million. The final CFD measure, a two-year special tax levy in Rialto, to fund a three-phase attack on gang violence, was defeated.

_____Transient Occupancy Tax

Three transient occupancy tax (TOT) measures were considered in this category--all three failed. Measures in Chico for a community center, Carlsbad for a golf course, and Redlands for visitor and cultural arts promotion needed a two-thirds majority for passage. Other TOT measures are discussed in the next section, *General Tax Measures*.

_____Advisory Measures

There were three advisory measures in the special tax category. Contra Costa County received a 72 percent affirmative vote to levy a \$10 per parcel fee for an EMT program. The two other advisory measures failed--a proposal to increase property tax one-half of one percent in Amador County for a county center, and the levy of an additional charge in the East Bay Municipal Utilities District for the Buckhorn reservoir project. The measures were merely an indication of voter preference and do not become law until further action by a legislative body.

Table A-6 lists the summary of special tax measures.

3. General Tax Measures

General tax measures fared better than all other types of local tax measures presented in this election. Over 63 percent (38 measures) passed, with 37 percent (22 measures) failing. General tax measures provide those taxes which flow to the general fund and are not earmarked for specific programs. The funds are used for programs which benefit the entire jurisdiction and are passed by a simple majority vote.

In the previous elections report published in 1986, general tax measures were classified under *assessments*. Since 1986, there has been a change in statute (Proposition 62) which requires ratification of all local general tax measures by the voters. Therefore, general tax measures appear as a separate category in this report. Prominent among these measures are the transient occupancy tax (TOT) measures--those taxes assessed on motel and hotel rooms and remitted to local agencies to pay for general governmental services. Also included for the first time are measures which ratify existing or new business license taxes, and other local fees such as fees on construction and building permits.

TABLE 5
RESULTS
GENERAL TAX MEASURES

	TOTAL NUMBER	% OF TOTAL
PASSED	38	63.3
FAILED	22	36.7
TOTAL	60	100.0

____ Transient Occupancy Tax

Thirty-three transient occupancy tax (TOT) measures are included in this category. Of the total 24 TOT measures (73 percent) passed, and nine failed. TOT rates were approved ranging from 7 percent to 12 percent. In the previous section, *Special Tax Measures*, three additional TOT measures were discussed. They were considered in Chico, Carlsbad, and Redlands, needed a two-thirds majority, and were defeated.

____ Utility Tax

Twelve jurisdictions voted on tax levies for utility service or telephone service. There was one advisory measure in this classification--Sacramento, where voters affirmed by 55 percent the existing utility tax of 7.5 percent.

Beaumont and Los Altos residents ratified existing utility taxes in their jurisdictions. Voters also passed measures in Fairfax reducing the utility tax and in Petaluma forbidding the city council from enacting a utility tax. The other seven

utility or telephone tax measures were soundly defeated. One measure garnered only a nine percent affirmative vote.

Remaining Taxes and Fees

The remaining general tax measures presented were for a variety of purposes. Three license fees were approved, two defeated. An admissions tax to swap meets in Azusa was defeated, but an existing admissions tax in Montclair was ratified. Half (3) the measures to raise fees on improved and unimproved property for general governmental purposes were passed, half (3) failed. An existing tax for water supply and distribution in the Green Valley County Water District in Los Angeles County was confirmed.

The summary of general tax measures appears in Table A-7.

4. Other Tax Measures

Several measures fall into the *Other* tax measure category. Oakland voters passed Measure U which allows the Port of Oakland to use short-term financing and sell bonds at a variable rate of interest.

Voters in seven Bay Area counties voted overwhelmingly to approve up to a \$1 toll on bridges in the area to fund construction and repair of bridges, as well as provide transit improvements. Regional Measure No. 1 sponsored by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission received a majority approval in Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Solano counties. Over 1.2 million voters (71 percent) approved the increase in the toll.

The final three measures approved in this category are taxes to be assessed by local governments on multiuser hazardous waste site operators. Kern and Solano counties and Azusa voted to impose a tax of up to 10 percent of the gross receipts of hazardous waste site owners. Jurisdictions are allowed to use the taxes for site inspection and regulation, as well as general governmental purposes such as fire and police protection services.

Table A-8 summarizes the other tax measures.

TABLE A-1
SUMMARY OF STATE GENERAL OBLIGATION MEASURES CONSIDERED SINCE 1900 BY PURPOSE
(DOLLAR AMOUNTS SHOWN IN THOUSANDS)

PURPOSE	PASSED		FAILED		CONSIDERED		% OF TOTAL
	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	# OF ISSUES	AMOUNT	# OF ISSUES	AMOUNT	# OF ISSUES	
CORRECTIONS	\$3,637,000	8	---	---	\$3,637,000	8	11.7%
EDUCATION	7,661,200	25	\$1,546,300	6	9,207,500	31	29.5%
ENERGY/ENVIRONMENTAL WASTE	100,000	1	25,000	1	125,000	2	0.4%
HARBOR DEVELOPMENT	83,500	6	3,000	2	86,500	8	0.3%
TRANSPORTATION/HIGHWAYS	73,000	3	1,010,000	2	1,083,000	5	3.5%
HOUSING	500,000	2	600,000	2	1,100,000	4	3.5%
PARKS/NATURAL RESOURCES	2,447,000	11	730,000	3	3,177,000	14	10.2%
STATE FACILITY CONSTRUCTION	404,000	4	285,950	4	689,950	8	2.2%
VETERANS HOUSING	7,095,000	23	---	---	7,095,000	23	22.8%
WATER/WASTEWATER	3,650,000	12	---	---	3,650,000	12	11.7%
MISCELLANEOUS							
EARTHQUAKE SAFETY/HOUSING	150,000	1	---	---	150,000	1	0.5%
LAND SETTLEMENT			3,000	1	3,000	1	0.0%
LIBRARIES	75,000	1	---	---	75,000	1	0.2%
OLYMPICS	1,000	1	---	---	1,000	1	0.0%
SENIOR CENTER	50,000	1	---	---	50,000	1	0.2%
UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF	44,000	2	---	---	44,000	2	0.1%
WATER AND POWER			1,000,000	2	1,000,000	2	3.2%
TOTAL	\$25,970,700	101	\$5,203,250	23	\$31,173,950	124	100.0%

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMISSION

TABLE A-2
SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING STATE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAMS
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1988

BOND AUTHORIZATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	AMOUNT OUTSTANDING	AMOUNT UNISSUED
NON SELF-LIQUIDATING (GENERAL FUND BONDS)			
CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER BOND ACT OF 1970	\$250,000,000	\$68,000,000	\$10,000,000
CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER BOND ACT OF 1974	\$250,000,000	\$119,450,000	\$20,000,000
CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER BOND ACT OF 1984	\$325,000,000	\$41,250,000	\$280,000,000
CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER AND WATER CONSERVATION BOND LAW OF 1978	\$375,000,000	\$225,400,000	\$45,000,000
CALIFORNIA EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND HOUSING ACT OF 1988	\$150,000,000	-----	\$150,000,000
CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984	\$370,000,000	\$97,000,000	\$260,000,000
CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE, COASTAL AND PARK LAND CONSERVATION BOND ACT OF 1988	\$776,000,000	-----	\$776,000,000
CLEAN WATER AND WATER RECLAMATION BOND LAW OF 1988	\$65,000,000	-----	\$65,000,000
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1972	\$160,000,000	\$52,750,000	-----
COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986	\$100,000,000	-----	\$100,000,000
COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986	\$495,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$465,000,000
COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND YOUTH FACILITY BOND ACT OF 1988	\$500,000,000	-----	\$500,000,000
COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981	\$280,000,000	\$199,550,000	\$55,000,000
COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984	\$250,000,000	\$218,750,000	\$15,000,000
FIRST TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982	\$200,000,000	\$6,985,000	\$185,000,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984	\$85,000,000	\$25,500,000	\$55,000,000
HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT OF 1984	\$100,000,000	\$42,500,000	\$50,000,000
HEALTH SCIENCE FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1971	\$155,900,000	\$66,200,000	-----
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986	\$400,000,000	\$110,000,000	\$290,000,000
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1988	\$600,000,000	-----	\$600,000,000
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1988	\$300,000,000	-----	\$300,000,000
JUNIOR COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM BOND ACT OF 1968	\$65,000,000	\$7,400,000	-----
LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT	\$85,000,000	\$26,500,000	\$55,000,000
LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION BOND ACT OF 1988	\$75,000,000	-----	\$75,000,000
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1981	\$495,000,000	\$398,000,000	-----
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984	\$300,000,000	\$257,500,000	-----
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986	\$500,000,000	\$160,000,000	\$340,000,000
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1988	\$817,000,000	-----	\$817,000,000
RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1970	\$60,000,000	\$15,500,000	-----
SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1976	\$175,000,000	\$127,735,000	\$15,000,000
SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984	\$75,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$55,000,000
SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986	\$100,000,000	-----	\$100,000,000
SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1988	\$75,000,000	-----	\$75,000,000

TABLE A-2 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING STATE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAMS
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1988

BOND AUTHORIZATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	AMOUNT OUTSTANDING	AMOUNT UNISSUED
NON SELF-LIQUIDATING (GENERAL FUND BONDS) CONTINUED			
1988 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT	\$800,000,000	-----	\$800,000,000
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1988	\$800,000,000	-----	\$800,000,000
SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984	\$50,000,000	\$44,750,000	-----
STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES	\$400,000,000	\$129,775,000	-----
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM BONDS	\$1,050,000,000	\$91,050,000	-----
STATE HIGHER EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM BOND ACT OF 1966	\$230,000,000	\$37,410,000	-----
STATE PARKLANDS BOND ACT OF 1980	\$285,000,000	\$160,945,000	\$45,000,000
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982	\$500,000,000	\$372,215,000	-----
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984	\$450,000,000	\$225,000,000	\$200,000,000
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986	\$800,000,000	-----	\$800,000,000
STATE URBAN AND COASTAL PARK BOND ACT OF 1976	\$280,000,000	\$142,410,000	\$25,000,000
WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986	\$150,000,000	\$800,000	\$149,200,000
WATER CONSERVATION BOND LAW OF 1988	\$60,000,000	-----	\$60,000,000
 TOTAL GENERAL FUND BONDS	 \$14,863,900,000	 \$3,517,325,000	 \$8,632,200,000
SELF-LIQUIDATING (ENTERPRISE FUND BONDS)			
CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BOND ACT OF 1959	\$1,750,000,000	\$1,322,945,000	\$180,000,000
HARBOR DEVELOPMENT BOND LAW OF 1958	\$60,000,000	\$10,150,000	-----
SAN FRANCISCO AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT AND INDIA BASIN ACT OF 1909	\$29,303,000	\$105,000	-----
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID BONDS	\$2,140,000,000	\$309,480,000	\$40,000,000
VETERANS BONDS	\$5,950,000,000	\$2,932,805,000	\$510,000,000
VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1988	\$510,000,000	-----	\$510,000,000
 TOTAL ENTERPRISE FUND BONDS	 \$10,439,303,000	 \$4,575,485,000	 \$1,240,000,000
 TOTAL STATE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS	 \$25,303,203,000	 \$8,092,810,000	 \$9,872,200,000

SOURCE: STATE TREASURER'S OFFICE, DECEMBER 31, 1988

TABLE A-3
SUMMARY
STATE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

PROGRAM	MEASURE	PASS/		AMOUNT
		FAIL	% YES % NO	
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES	78	P	58% 42%	\$600,000,000
SCHOOL FACILITIES	79	P	61% 39%	\$800,000,000
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION	80	P	61% 39%	\$817,000,000
CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER	81	P	72% 28%	\$75,000,000
WATER CONSERVATION	82	P	62% 38%	\$60,000,000
CLEAN WATER AND WATER RECLAMATION	83	P	64% 36%	\$65,000,000
HOUSING AND HOMELESS	84	P	58% 42%	\$300,000,000
CALIFORNIA LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION/RENOVATION	85	P	53% 47%	\$75,000,000
COUNTY CORRECTIONAL/YOUTH FACILITIES	86	P	55% 45%	\$500,000,000
TOTAL				\$3,292,000,000

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE

TABLE A-4
SUMMARY
LOCAL GOVERNMENT GENERAL OBLIGATION MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	MEASURE	PASS/			AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	PURPOSE
			FAIL	% YES	% NO		
ALAMEDA							
	ALAMEDA COUNTY	C	F	64%	36%	\$139,967,000	HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME/SENIORS/DISABLED
	ALAMEDA COUNTY	D	F	50%	50%	\$83,400,000	PRISONS & JAILS/ SANTA RITA JAIL
	DUBLIN JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	A	P	74%	26%	\$3,500,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
BUTTE							
	CHICO	L	F	47%	53%	\$5,000,000	STREET IMPROVEMENTS
CONTRA COSTA							
	ACALANES UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	B	P	71%	29%	\$34,000,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
FRESNO							
	COALINGA HOSPITAL DISTRICT	M	P	89%	11%	\$9,500,000	HEALTH FACILITIES
	MENDOTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	E	P	76%	24%	\$9,800,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
	PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	F	P	67%	33%	\$2,000,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
	WASHINGTON UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	G	P	69%	31%	\$3,000,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
IMPERIAL							
	BRAWLEY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	A	P	78%	22%	\$800,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
	IMPERIAL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	B	P	72%	28%	\$1,200,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
KERN							
	SOUTHERN KERN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	E	F	52%	48%	\$1,300,000	SCHOOL FACILITY/PERFORM ART CTR/ROSAMOND HS
	SOUTHERN KERN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	D	F	64%	36%	\$1,200,000	SCHOOL FACILITY/COMM SWIMMING POOL
LOS ANGELES							
	ALHAMBRA	A	F	47%	53%	\$16,600,000	POLICE AND JAIL FACILITY
	LOS ANGELES	L	F	62%	38%	\$90,000,000	LIBRARY FACILITIES
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	J	F	53%	47%	\$197,500,000	ADULT JAIL/JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITIES
	SANTA MONICA	JJ	P	70%	30%	\$4,500,000	LIBRARY EXPANSION/PARKING
ORANGE							
	ANAHEIM	D	F	57%	43%	\$30,000,000	STREET/ROAD CONSTRUCTION
	ANAHEIM	E	F	66%	34%	\$20,000,000	STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM

TABLE A-4 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY
LOCAL GOVERNMENT GENERAL OBLIGATION MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	MEASURE	PASS/		AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	PURPOSE
			FAIL	% YES % NO		
SACRAMENTO	FULTON-EL CAMINO RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT	J	F	57% 43%	\$2,750,000	PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES
SAN BERNARDINO	REDLANDS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	J	F	65% 35%	\$37,000,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
SAN DIEGO	VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	LL	F	60% 40%	\$63,000,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	A	P	76% 24%	\$109,500,000	LIBRARY FACILITIES
SANTA BARBARA	ISLA VISTA RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT	O	F	52% 48%	\$750,000	PARK/RECREATION/CENTER
	ISLA VISTA RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT	P	F	57% 43%	\$800,000	PARK/RECREATION/OPEN SPACE
SANTA CLARA	CUPERTINO	K	F	54% 46%	\$30,000,000	PARK/RECREATION/OPEN SPACE
	FRANKLIN-MCKINLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT	R	P	67% 33%	\$14,950,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES
YOLO	DAVIS	U	F	60% 40%	\$7,000,000	ROAD/BIKEWAY/TRANSPORTATION PROJECT
MULTIPLE	EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT (ALAMEDA/CONTRA COSTA)	AA	P	68% 32%	\$225,000,000	PARKS/RECREATION/OPEN SPACE
	TRAVER JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT (TULARE/KINGS)	D B	F	58% 42%	\$750,000	SCHOOL FACILITIES

SOURCE: COUNTY CLERKS' ELECTION DEPARTMENTS

TABLE A-5
SUMMARY
LOCAL USE/TRANSACTION (SALES) TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	MEASURE	PASS/ FAIL		USE/TRANSACTION (SALES) TAXES		PURPOSE
			% YES	% NO			
BUTTE	BUTTE COUNTY	A	F	23%	77%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA CO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	C	P	58%	42%	1/2 OF 1%	TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS
GLENN	GLENN COUNTY	A	F	29%	71%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
HUMBOLDT	HUMBOLDT COUNTY	A	F	34%	66%	1/2 OF 1%	PUBLIC SERVICES/JAIL FACILITIES
MADERA	MADERA COUNTY	A	F	42%	58%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MARIN	MARIN COUNTY	A	F	25%	75%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT/JAIL
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA COUNTY	A	F	42%	58%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MONO	MONO COUNTY	A	F	50%	50%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT/PARAMEDIC SERVICES
PLACER	PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	A	F	36%	64%	1/2 OF 1%	TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	A	P	79%	21%	1/2 OF 1%	TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	A	P	57%	43%	1/2 OF 1%	TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO COUNTY	G	F	49%	51%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC SERVICES
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	A	F	30%	70%	1/2 OF 1%	DRUG PREVENTION/TREATMENT/ENFORCEMENT
STANISLAUS	STANISLAUS COUNTY	Y	F	43%	57%	1/2 OF 1%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC SERVICES
TULARE	TULARE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	A	F	40%	60%	1%	TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

SOURCE: COUNTY CLERKS' ELECTION DEPARTMENTS

TABLE A-6
SUMMARY
LOCAL SPECIAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	MEASURE	PASS/		SPECIAL TAXES	PURPOSE	
			FAIL	% YES			% NO
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	E	F	42%	58%	\$10 PER YR/PER UNIT	DRUG PREVENTION
	BERKELEY	H	P	67%	33%	.072 RES/.109 COMM SQ FT	LIBRARY SERVICES
	EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITIES DISTRICT (AD)	Z	F	45%	55%	\$1 PER MO/PER RES CUSTOMER	WATER RESERVOIR/BUCKHORN PROJECT
AMADOR	AMADOR COUNTY (AD)	C	F	22%	78%	INCR PROP TAX TO .06%	COUNTY CENTER
BUTTE	CHICO	K	F	48%	52%	INCR TOT 6%-9%	GENERAL GOV/TOURISM/COMM CTR/ARTS
COLUSA	COLUSA COUNTY	C	F	41%	59%	\$1 AC/\$15 RES/\$30 COMM	BASIC LIFE SUPPORT SERV/COLUSA CO AMBUL
	COLUSA COUNTY	D	F	32%	68%	.04 ACRE/\$30 RES/\$60 COMM	ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT SERV/COLUSA CO AMBUL
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY(AD)	H	P	72%	28%	\$10 PER YR/PER PARCEL	EMT SERVICES/INSTITUTE EMT BENEFIT AD
	COUNTY SERVICE AREA P-1	J	P	77%	23%	EXIST \$57 PER PARCEL	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	MT DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST CFD NO 1	A	F	62%	38%	SPEC TAX/AUTH \$90 MILLION	SCHOOL FACILITIES
DEL NORTE	CRESCENT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	D	P	60%	40%	EXIST TAX	FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES
	DEL NORTE COUNTY USD CFD NO 1	E	F	27%	73%	SPEC TAX/AUTH \$7 MILLION	SCHOOL FACILITIES
IMPERIAL	CALEXICO UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST CFD NO 88-1	C	F	65%	35%	SPEC TAX/AUTH \$10.65 MILLION	SCHOOL FACILITIES
INYO	STARLITE COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT	C	P	79%	21%	PER PAR \$750 1 YR/488 3 YR	WATER SUPPLY/DISTRIBUTION
KERN	RIDGECREST	G	F	36%	64%	\$40 PER DWELLING UNIT	PARKS & RECREATION
LAKE	HIDDEN VALLEY LAKE COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTR	C	F	50%	50%	EXIST \$20 PER LOT/5 YR	WASTEWATER TREATMENT/DISTRIBUTION
LOS ANGELES	HAWTHORNE	V	F	40%	60%	INCR UTILITY TAX 6%	POLICE SERVICES
	LOS ANGELES	N	P	71%	29%	PROP TAX/REPAY \$67 MILLION	FIRE/SAFETY/PARAMEDIC SERVICES
	SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	TT	P	75%	25%	EXIST TAX \$58 PER PAR/6 YR	EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

TABLE A-6 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY
LOCAL SPECIAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	PASS/		% YES	% NO	SPECIAL TAXES	PURPOSE
		MEASURE	FAIL				
MODOC	MODOC COUNTY CFD NO 1	A	P	68%	32%	\$18 PER YR/PER UNIT	LIBRARY SERVICES
ORANGE	ORANGE COUNTY CFD NO 88-3	AA	F	30%	70%	SPEC TAX/AUTH \$7.5 MILLION	PARK/REC FAC/NO TUSTIN
	SILVERADO-MODJESKA PARK & RECREATION DIST	BB	F	62%	38%	\$64 IMP/\$32 UNIMP	COMMUNITY CTR/TRABUCO ZONE
PLUMAS	SENECA HOSPITAL DISTRICT	E	F	59%	41%	\$36 PER YR/PER IMP PARCEL	HOSPITAL OPERATIONS
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	C	F	54%	46%	TAX UNINCORPORATED	POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES
SAN BERNARDINO	COUNTY SERVICES AREA 38 IMPROVEMENT ZONE O	Y	F	52%	48%	\$20 IMP/\$15.50 UNIMP	FIRE PROTECTION/RESCUE SERVICES
	REDLANDS	U	F	59%	41%	INCR TOT 5X-9%	INCR TOT/TOUR/CULTURAL ARTS
	RIALTO CFD NO 88-1	V	F	57%	43%	LEVY TAX FOR 2 YR	3-PHASE ATTACK/GANG VIOLENCE
SAN DIEGO	CARLSBAD	M	F	62%	38%	INCR TOT 2X-10%	INCR TOT PUBLIC GOLF COURSE/REC FAC
SAN JOAQUIN	COLLEGEVILLE RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	F	F	62%	38%	YR TAX/BENEFIT AREAS	FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES
	EASTSIDE RURAL COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DIST	G	F	54%	46%	YR TAX/BENEFIT AREAS	FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES
	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DIST	E	F	52%	48%	INCR PROP TAX	MOSQUITO ABATEMENT SERVICES
SAN MATEO	EAST PALO ALTO	K	F	61%	39%	\$50 RES/\$500 COMM	POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES
SANTA CRUZ	BRANCIFORTE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	D	P	69%	31%	INCR TAX IN SERVICE AREAS	FIRE PROTECTION/PREVENTION SERVICES
SISKIYOU	DUNSMUIR FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	A	P	72%	28%	\$25 PER YR/PER PARCEL	FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES
	ETNA CEMETARY DISTRICT	G	P	74%	26%	\$12 PER YR/PER IMP PARCEL	GENERAL OPERATIONS

TABLE A-6 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY
LOCAL SPECIAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	PASS/		% YES	% NO	SPECIAL TAXES	PURPOSE
		MEASURE	FAIL				
SONOMA	GRAVENSTEIN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	E	F	56%	44%	\$35 PER PARCEL/PER YR	INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS/PROGRAMS
	SWEETWATER SPRINGS WATER DISTRICT	O	P	72%	28%	\$5 PER PARCEL/4 YR	WATER DISTRICT STARTUP COSTS
	TIMBER COVE CFD NO 1	L	P	76%	24%	\$15 PER YR/PER BENEFIT UNIT	FIRE PROTECTION/SUPPRESSION/EMT SERVICES
SUTTER	COUNTY SERVICES AREA A	A	F	63%	37%	VAR TAX RES/COMM/INDUS/AGR	FIRE SUPPRESSION SERVICES
TUOLUMNE	STRAWBERRY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	A	F	48%	52%	\$15 PER YR/PER BENEFIT UNIT	FIRE PROTECTION/PREVENTION SERVICES
MULTIPLE	SHORELINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (SONOMA/MARIN)	D	P	72%	28%	EXIST \$80 PER YR/PER UNIT	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

NOTE: THE ADVISORY MEASURES ARE LISTED WITH (AD) AFTER THE JURISDICTION'S NAME.

SOURCE: COUNTY CLERKS' ELECTION DEPARTMENTS

TABLE A-7
SUMMARY
LOCAL GENERAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	PASS/ MEASURE FAIL				GENERAL TAX	PURPOSE
		% YES	% NO				
ALAMEDA	FREMONT	P	P	70%	30%	INCR TOT 6.5%-7%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PIEDMONT	W	P	52%	48%	MUNI SER DEV/UNDEV 4YR	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
CALAVERAS	ANGELS	B	F	43%	57%	INCR TOT 4%-6%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
CONTA COSTA	ANTIOCH	T	P	78%	22%	EXIST TOT	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
EL DORADO	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	C	P	78%	22%	INCR TOT TO 10% (12% RDA)	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
FRESNO	FRESNO	H	F	14%	86%	UTILITY TAX 5%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	KINGSBURG	K	P	57%	43%	INCR TOT 5%-8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PARLIER	L	F	9%	91%	UTILITY TAX 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
IMPERIAL	CALIPATRIA	D	F	44%	56%	\$150 IMPROV/\$125 UNIMP	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
KERN	RIDGECREST	H	P	61%	39%	TOT 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
LAKE	CLEARLAKE	B	F	12%	88%	UTILITY TAX 6%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
LOS ANGELES	AZUSA	C	P	59%	41%	10% SANITARY LANDFILL/\$100,000	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	AZUSA	D	F	50%	50%	INCR TOT TO 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	AZUSA	E	F	42%	58%	BUS LIC FEE SURCHARGE	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	AZUSA	F	F	45%	55%	ADMISS TAX/SWAP MEET/OTHER EVENTS	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	AZUSA	G	P	56%	44%	BUS LIC MINING/WOOD PROCESSING/EXCAVATION	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	AZUSA	K	F	34%	66%	BUS LICENSE MOTION PIC	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	BEVERLY HILLS	T	P	81%	19%	EXIST TOT 11%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	GREEN VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT	U	P	72%	28%	EXIST \$60 PER PARCEL TAX	WATER SUPPLY/DISTRIBUTION
	HERMOSA BEACH	W	P	62%	38%	EXIST LIC/FEEES/TOT 8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	LYNWOOD	EE	F	19%	81%	TELEPHONE TAX 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT/FIRE/POLICE
	SOUTH GATE	NN	F	19%	81%	TELEPHONE TAX \$7 PER HOUSEHOLD	GENERAL GOVERNMENT/POLICE

TABLE A-7 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY
LOCAL GENERAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	PASS/ MEASURE	FAIL	%		GENERAL TAX	PURPOSE
				YES	NO		
MARIN							
	FAIRFAX	C	P	77%	23%	LOWER UTILITY TAX 5%-4%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	LARKSPUR	B	P	68%	32%	EXIST TOT 8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MERCED							
	ATWATER	A	P	60%	40%	INCR TOT 4%-8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	LOS BANOS	C	P	58%	42%	INCR TOT 6%-9%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
MONTEREY							
	MONTEREY	B	P	74%	26%	EXIST TOT 10%	COMMUNITY PROJECTS
NAPA							
	NAPA	B	P	56%	44%	INCR TOT 10%-10.5%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
ORANGE							
	ORANGE	L	F	47%	53%	INCR TOT 8%-10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
PLACER							
	LINCOLN	B	F	39%	61%	GEN TAX RES/COMM/INDUS	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	LINCOLN	C	F	42%	58%	NEW CONSTRUCT/BLDG PERMIT	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
RIVERSIDE							
	BEAUMONT	S	P	67%	33%	EXIST UTILITY USERS 3%/1991	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	HEMET	H	F	42%	58%	EXIST TOT 8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	INDIO	I	F	46%	54%	INCR TOT 8%-10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	LA QUINTA	K	P	64%	36%	INCR TOT 8%-9%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PALM DESERT	R	P	63%	37%	INCR TOT 6%-8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PALM SPRINGS	L	P	56%	44%	EXIST BUS LIC TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PALM SPRINGS	M	F	39%	61%	UTILITY USERS TAX 3%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	RANCHO MIRAGE	N	P	64%	36%	INCR TOT 8%-9%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SACRAMENTO							
	FOLSOM	H	P	65%	35%	EXIST TOT 8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	SACRAMENTO (AD)	G	P	55%	45%	EXIST UTILITY TAX 7.5%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SAN BENITO							
	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	F	P	51%	49%	INCR TOT TO 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SAN BERNARDINO							
	MONTCLAIR	R	P	58%	42%	EXIST ADMISS TAX 6%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	ONTARIO	T	F	46%	54%	INCR TOT 8%-10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT

TABLE A-7 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY
LOCAL GENERAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	PASS/				GENERAL TAX	PURPOSE
		MEASURE	FAIL	% YES	% NO		
SAN LUIS OBISPO	MORRO BAY	A	P	50%	50%	INCR BUS LIC	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SAN MATEO	EAST PALO ALTO	L	F	43%	57%	UTILITY USERS TAX 6.2%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	PACIFICA	F	P	78%	22%	EXIST TOT 10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	SAN CARLOS	I	P	64%	36%	INCR TOT 6%-10%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SANTA CLARA	LOS ALTOS	N	P	80%	20%	EXIST BUS LIC	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	LOS ALTOS	O	P	57%	43%	EXIST UTILITY USERS TAX	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	MILPITAS	P	F	49%	51%	INCR TOT 8%-9%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	SANTA CLARA COUNTY	A	P	62%	38%	EXIST TOT IN UNINCORP	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SIERRA	LOYALTON	D	F	46%	54%	TOT 6%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
SOLANO	RIO VISTA	G	P	51%	49%	\$1.50 PER MO/RES/COMM/INDUS	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	VACAVILLE	I	P	52%	48%	2% TOT EXCISE RES/COMM/INDUS	PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS
SONOMA	PETALUMA	G	P	64%	36%	PROHIBIT CITY UTILITY TAX	PROHIBIT UTILITY TAX LEVY
	SONOMA	J	P	66%	34%	INCR TOT 6%-8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
TEHAMA	CORNING	F	F	49%	51%	INCR TOT 5%-6.5%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
	TEHAMA COUNTY	A	P	58%	42%	INCR TOT 5%-8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT
VENTURA	SIMI VALLEY	B	P	81%	19%	EXIST TOT 8%	GENERAL GOVERNMENT

NOTE: THE ADVISORY MEASURES ARE LISTED WITH (AD) AFTER THE JURISDICTION'S NAME.

SOURCE: COUNTY CLERKS' ELECTION DEPARTMENTS

TABLE A-8
SUMMARY
OTHER LOCAL TAX MEASURES
NOVEMBER 8, 1988 GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY	AGENCY	MEASURE	PASS/		% YES	% NO	OTHER TAX MEASURES	PURPOSE
			FAIL					
ALAMEDA	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		72%	28%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE REPAIRS/TRANSIT
	OAKLAND	U	P		72%	28%	VAR RATE/ SHORT TERM FINANCING	APPROVE FINANCING/PORT OF OAKLAND
AMADOR	AMADOR COUNTY(AD)	B	F		36%	64%	FINANCE COUNTY CENTER	CONSTRUCT/FINANCE CO CNTR
CONTRA COSTA	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		68%	32%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE/REPAIRS/TRANSIT
KERN	KERN COUNTY	B	P		51%	49%	10% MULTIUSER HAZARDOUS WASTE	HAZARDOUS WASTE/GENERAL GOVERNMENT
LOS ANGELES	AZUSA	B	P		70%	30%	10% MULTIUSER HAZARDOUS WASTE	HAZARDOUS WASTE
MARIN	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		77%	23%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE/REPAIRS/TRANSIT
SAN FRANCISCO	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		70%	30%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE/REPAIRS/TRANSIT
SAN MATEO	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		74%	26%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE/REPAIRS/TRANSIT
SANTA CLARA	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		71%	29%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE/REPAIRS/TRANSIT
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	C	P		70%	30%	10% MULTIUSER HAZARDOUS WASTE	HAZARDOUS WASTE
	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	REGNL #1	P		58%	42%	\$1 BRIDGE TOLL	CTC & MTC BRIDGE/REPAIRS/TRANSIT

NOTE: THE ADVISORY MEASURES ARE LISTED WITH (AD) AFTER THE JURISDICTION'S NAME.

SOURCE: COUNTY CLERKS' ELECTION DEPARTMENTS