



# **State Bond Measures and County Tax and Bond Ballot Measures**

---

*Summary of General Election  
November 4, 1986*

**Jesse M. Unruh**  
*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**

Jesse M. Unruh, Chairman  
*State Treasurer*

George Deukmejian  
*Governor*

Gray Davis  
*State Controller*

Robert G. Beverly  
*State Senator*

Jim Costa  
*State Assemblyman*

Patrick J. Nolan  
*State Assemblyman*

Thomas C. Rupert  
*Treasurer, City of Torrance*

Richard B. Dixon  
*Treasurer and Tax Collector,  
County of Los Angeles*

February 9, 1987

Four State general obligation bond measures and 95 local bond, tax, and appropriations limit measures were considered on November 4, 1986 at the General Election.

This report summarizes the outcome of these elections.

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

Sincerely,

JESSE M. UNRUH  
California State Treasurer  
Chairman, California Debt Advisory Commission

STATE BOND MEASURES  
AND  
COUNTY TAX AND BOND BALLOT MEASURES  
SUMMARY OF GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 4, 1986

February 9, 1987

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

CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMISSION

The California Debt Advisory Commission is the State's clearing-house 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:

Jesse M. Unruh  
California State Treasurer  
and Chairman

George Deukmejian  
Governor

Gray Davis  
Controller

Robert Beverly  
State Senator

Jim Costa  
State Assemblyman

Patrick Nolan  
State Assemblyman

Richard B. Dixon  
Treasurer and Tax Collector  
of Los Angeles County

Thomas C. Rupert  
Treasurer  
of the City of Torrance

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

Theresa Molinari  
Executive Secretary  
California Debt Advisory Commission  
916/324-2585

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The prompt attention, expertise and courtesy of the 58 California county clerks' election departments is gratefully acknowledged. Without their helpful responses, the information contained and summarized in this report would not have been possible.

Martha Riley of the Commission staff was the principal author of this report.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. General Obligation Bond Measures.....3

III. Lease Revenue and Refunding Bonds.....5

IV. Use and Transaction Tax Measures.....8

V. Special Tax and Benefit Assessment Measures.....9

VI. Appropriation Limit Measures.....11

VII. Summary.....18

List of References.....22

TABLES

Table 1. State of California General Obligation Measures.....4

Table 2. Local Government General Obligation Measures.....6

Table 3. Lease Revenue and Refunding Measures.....8

Table 4. Use and Transaction Tax Measures.....10

Table 5. Local Special Tax/Benefit Assessment Measures.....12

Table 6. Summary: Outcome of Bond Authorization Approvals..20

Table 7. Summary: Outcome of Bond, Tax and  
Appropriations Measures.....21

STATE BOND MEASURES AND COUNTY TAX AND BOND BALLOT MEASURES

SUMMARY OF GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 4, 1986

I. INTRODUCTION

Bond and tax measures were considered by voters in all 58 California counties in the November 4, 1986 General Election. The measures ranged from Statewide general obligation bond issues for education, water quality, and correctional facilities to local school construction and fire protection and prevention special tax measures.

The election provided the first opportunity in a number of years for voters to approve local general obligation bond measures. Selected counties also had the opportunity to consider use and transaction tax measures for transit and transportation projects. Approvals to increase local government agencies' Gann expenditure limits (imposed by Article XIII B of the State Constitution) appeared on several ballots.

Interest in the outcome of the various elections prompted the staff of the California Debt Advisory Commission to survey the 58 counties to assess the outcome of the various bond and tax measures elections. The information received in response to the staff's telephone survey was reviewed, tabulated, and summarized for this report.

Local agency bond and tax measures were reported to have appeared on 40 county ballots. Seventeen counties reported no local bond or tax measures--Alpine, Amador, Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, Sacramento, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Tehama, Ventura and Yolo. Siskiyou did not remit the requested information.

Each county clerk's office was contacted by phone and information was requested on any bond or tax measure which appeared on the November 4th ballot. Of the 58 counties contacted, 57 responded. Because there is no centralized source of information on the consideration of local bond and tax measures, the accuracy and completeness of data presented in this report depends wholly on the sample ballots and voter results provided by county clerks' offices. Although this material has been reviewed by other knowledgeable parties, there is no way to verify independently that the information on local measures is complete.

The information on 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 discusses the outcome of measures to consider general obligation bonds (Section II), lease revenue and refunding bonds (Section III), use and transaction taxes (Section IV), special taxes and benefit assessments (Section V), and appropriation limit changes (Section VI).

## II. GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURES

With the passage of Proposition 46 in June 1986, voters were able to consider local general obligation bonds for the first time since 1978 and the passage of Proposition 13. Proposition 46 allows 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. 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.

There were 21 general obligation bond measures on the November ballot. Four of the 21 were State of California general obligation bond propositions. All four of the State general obligation propositions were approved by the voters. Proposition 55, the Safe Drinking Water measure, received the greatest percentage of yes votes with 79 percent of those voting approving the sale of State general obligation bonds for that program. The two education-related measures, Proposition 53 (K-12 school lease purchase) and Proposition 56 (public higher education facilities), were approved by 61 and 60 percent of the voters, respectively. The sale of State general obligation bonds for new prisons received a 65 percent approval. Table 1 summarizes the State general obligation measures.

Table 1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GENERAL OBLIGATION MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Greene-Hughes School Building Lease Purchase	Prop 53	Pass 61/39	\$800,000,000
New Prison Construction	Prop 54	Pass 65/35	\$500,000,000
Safe Drinking Water	Prop 55	Pass 79/21	\$100,000,000
Higher Education	Prop 56	Pass 60/40	\$400,000,000
<u>Total State General Obligation Bonds Approved:</u>			\$1,800,000,000

Source: Secretary of State

Seventeen local general obligation bond measures were considered in 13 counties. Although all local measures polled a majority of the votes, 10 of the 17 issues did not receive the two-thirds vote needed for passage. Seven of the local general obligation measures passed. Local general obligation bond issues that passed totalled \$225,300,000, while local general obligation bond issues equalling \$190,692,000 were defeated.

The two issues for school construction passed (in Fresno and Imperial counties), as did measures for fire protection and prevention (San Francisco County), wastewater collection and treatment (in Sonoma County), and highway improvements (in Solano County). Only two (both in Los Angeles County) of the seven proposed jail and police facility measures passed. Two recreation and open space issues (in Orange and San Diego Counties) were defeated, as were issues for a civic center (Solano County), a library (in Los Angeles County), and highway improvements (in Solano County). Table 2 on the following page presents a summary of the local general obligation bond measures considered.

### III. LEASE REVENUE AND REFUNDING BONDS

Two additional local bond measures were approved. One measure authorizes the issuance of a lease revenue bond not to exceed \$140,000,000 for the construction and renovation of the Moscone Center in San Francisco and the other (a charter amendment also in San Francisco) allows for the refunding of revenue bonds without voter approval. Both issues, as noted in Table 3 on page 8, received more votes than the majority needed.

Table 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GENERAL OBLIGATION MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>AMOUNT AND PURPOSE</u>
Fresno			
Clovis Unified School District	A	Pass 71/29	\$59,000,000 School construction
Imperial			
Westmoreland School District	A	Pass 77/23	\$350,000 School construction
Kings			
Corcoran	C	Fail 57/43	\$2,000,000 Highway improvements
Lassen			
Lassen County	A	Fail 66/34	\$642,000 Jail facility
Los Angeles			
Los Angeles County	J	Pass 67/33	\$96,000,000 Jail/juvenile facilities
Pasadena	AA	Pass 67/33	\$17,000,000 Police and jail facility
El Segundo	L	Fail 57/43	\$3,250,000 Library facility
Madera			
Madera County	A	Fail 58/42	\$6,550,000 Detention facility
Mendocino			
Willits	C	Fail 60/40	\$600,000 Police facilities
Orange			
Seal Beach	M	Fail 65/35	\$1,950,000 Open space and recreation

Note: Voter results have been rounded.

Source: County Clerks' election departments.

Table 2  
(continued)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GENERAL OBLIGATION MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>AMOUNT AND PURPOSE</u>
San Bernardino San Bernardino County	A	Fail 60/40	\$160,000,000 Jail facilities
San Diego Carlsbad	F	Fail 64/36	\$5,950,000 Park/open space
National City	O	Fail 57/43	\$6,500,000 Police facility
San Francisco San Francisco	A	Pass 89/11	\$46,200,000 Fire protection and prevention
Solano Suisun City	B	Pass 69/31	\$4,250,000 Highway improvements
Suisun City	C	Fail 58/42	\$3,250,000 Civic center
Sonoma Sebastopol	D	Pass 72/28	\$2,500,000 Wastewater collection and treatment
<u>Total Local General Obligation Bonds Approved:</u>			\$225,300,000

Note: Voter results have been rounded.

Source: County Clerks' election departments.

Table 3

LEASE REVENUE AND REFUNDING BOND MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>AMOUNT AND PURPOSE</u>
San Francisco San Francisco	B Lease-revenue bonds	Pass 62/38	\$140,000,000 Construction and remodeling of Moscone Center
OTHER BOND-RELATED MEASURE			
San Francisco San Francisco	C Charter amendment	Pass 74/26	Allows refunding of revenue bonds without voter approval

Note: Voter results have been rounded.

Source: County Clerks' election departments.

IV. USE AND TRANSACTION TAX MEASURES

Local governments in five counties took advantage of specific legislation to consider funding transportation and transit improvements within their boundaries through a use and transactions tax. Legislation, enacted specifically for transit authorities in Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno and Tuolumne counties and the City of Sonoma, allows the voters to approve, by a majority vote, the imposition of use and transaction (sales) taxes between 1/2 of one percent and one percent to fund highway, road, and transportation and transit project improvements for a specified number of years.

Two of the five transportation sales tax measures passed (in Alameda and Fresno counties). The remaining three were defeated by a majority of the voters. One tax measure which was approved included an authorization for the issuance of \$800,000,000 in bonds. The second tax measure approved did not include a bond authorization.

Two additional use and transaction tax measures were considered-- one for a jail facility and the other for a justice facility. The legislation authorizing those votes required a two-thirds approval from the voters. Both measures received majority votes, but failed to receive the needed two-thirds and thus were defeated.

Table 4 summarizes local use and transaction tax measures considered at the November general election.

#### V. SPECIAL TAX AND BENEFIT ASSESSMENT MEASURES

Fifty special tax and benefit assessment measures were voted on in 29 counties. The special taxes were to be levied on various types of property (e.g., commercial, residential, or industrial); living units (e.g., single-family, multifamily, mobile homes, etc.); benefit areas (e.g., flood and storm zones); or acreage amounts. Benefit assessments relate anticipated or estimated benefits to a specific piece of property or area.

Table 4

**USE AND TRANSACTION TAX MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION**

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u> (1)	<u>AMOUNT OF TAX</u> (2)	<u>AMOUNT AND PURPOSE</u> (3)
Alameda Alameda County	B	Pass 57/43	1/2 of 1% (15 years)	\$800,000,000 Transit
Contra Costa Contra Costa County	C	Fail 47/53	1/2 of 1% (15 years)	\$590,000,000 Transportation
Fresno Fresno County	C	Pass 71/29	1/2 of 1% (20 years)	Transportation
Napa Napa County	A	Fail 51/49	1/2 of 1% (18 months)	Jail facilities (upon State legislative action)
San Diego San Diego County	A	Fail 51/49	1/2 of 1% (5 years)	Justice facilities
Tuolumne Tuolumne County	D	Fail 27/73	1% (15 years)	Highway construction
Sonora	G	Fail 25/75	1% (15 years)	Road construction
<b><u>Total Local Limited Obligation Bonds Approved:</u></b>				<b>\$800,000,000</b>

(1) Voter results have been rounded.

(2) The length of time the tax could have been imposed is noted in parenthesis.

(3) When a bond authorization was not considered, no amount is noted.

Source: County Clerks' election departments.

Twenty-one of the total were tax measures for fire protection and prevention. The remaining measures were proposed to fund school or library construction, implement development standards, or provide emergency medical services, recreation and park facilities, police and fire personnel, storm drainage, wastewater treatment, landscaping, and flood protection.

Of the 50 tax and assessment measures considered, 23 passed and 27 failed. Except for the advisory-only measures, special tax measures needed a two-thirds vote for approval, while assessments were approved with a simple majority.

In special tax elections, 14 measures (37 percent) passed and 24 (63 percent) failed. Of the 12 assessment measures, nine (75 percent) assessments were approved and three failed (25 percent). There were three advisory-only measures. Two were approved and one failed. Lastly, a tax measure to repeal a utility tax failed.

Table 5 summarizes local special tax and benefit assessment measures.

## **VI. APPROPRIATION LIMIT MEASURES**

The California Constitution (Article XIII B) limits the total annual appropriation levels for State and local governments. The

Table 5

**LOCAL SPECIAL TAX/BENEFIT ASSESSMENT MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION**

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>TAX/ ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BONDS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
<b>Calaveras</b>					
Calaveras County	A	Fail 59/41	\$10 per year (5 years)	\$0	Library
Valecito Union School Dist	B	Pass 61/39	1% on new construction	\$0	School construction
<b>El Dorado</b>					
Garden Valley Fire Protection Dist	P	Fail 58/42	\$40 per parcel (5 years)	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Cameron Estates Comm Services Dist	O	Pass 70/30	\$12 per year	\$0	Development standards
Placerville Fire Protection Dist	Q	Fail 52/48	Res/com/indus rates (10 years)	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
<b>Glenn</b>					
Willows Union School Dist	B	Fail 48/52	\$36 per year res (5 years)	\$0	School facilities
<b>Imperial</b>					
Niland Fire Protection Dist	B	Pass 77/23	\$8 per benefit unit	\$0	Fire protection
<b>Inyo</b>					
Southern Inyo Hospital	A	Fail 62/38	Parcel tax	\$0	No information available
Mt. Whitney Cemetery Dist	B	Fail 45/55	Annual parcel tax	\$0	No information available

Table 5  
(continued)

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>TAX/ ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BONDS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
Kern					
Buttonwillow Recreation and Park Dist	D	Fail 43/57	\$10 per parcel per year	\$0	No information available
Lake					
Lakeport Fire Protection Dist	B	Fail 66/34	New res/com/indus tax rates	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Los Angeles					
Alhambra	A	Fail 49/51	5%	\$0	Repeal telephone, electricity, gas tax
Hermosa Beach	P	Fail 58/42	\$52 per year (4 years)	\$0	Police and fire personnel
Marin					
Marin County Flood Control Zone No 10	M	Fail 50/50	\$10-\$50 per acreage type	\$0	Flood control
Marin County Flood Control Zone No 7	N	Pass 75/25	\$10 per year increase \$1 per year for 3 years	\$0	Flood control, paramedic services
Mendocino (see also Sonoma County)					
North Sonoma/South Mendocino Counties Coast Life Support Dist	F	Pass 76/24	\$12 per year	\$0	Emergency medical services
Modoc					
Davis Creek Fire Protection Dist	A	Fail 59/41	\$10-\$35 annual per parcel	\$0	Fire protection
Monterey					
Pacific Grove Community Facilities Dist No 1	C	Fail 49/51	\$31 per year res construct \$4 per year O/M	\$2,800,000	Recreational facilities (David Ave Park)

Table 5  
(continued)

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>TAX/ ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BONDS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
Napa					
Napa County Flood Control and Conservation Dist	B	Fail 49/51	\$19.60 per parcel	\$0	Storm drainage
American Canyon Fire Protection Dist	F	Pass 69/31	New construction within 12-24 months	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Nevada					
North San Juan Fire Protection Dist	J	Pass 87/13	\$27.50 improved parcel \$19.50 unimproved parcel	\$0	Fire protection and prevention, rescue services
Rough and Ready Fire Protection Dist	K	Pass 69/31	Special tax	\$0	Fire protection and prevention, rescue services
Nevada City	G	Pass 79/21	Special tax	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Placer					
Eureka School District	E	Pass 70/30	New residential construction	\$0	School facilities
Plumas					
Long Valley Community Services Dist	C	Fail 63/37	\$50 per year	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Riverside					
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation Dist Zone 3	F	Pass 56/44	Levy assessment	\$8,000,000	Storm drainage, flood control

Table 5  
(continued)

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>TAX/ ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BONDS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
San Diego					
Santee (ADVISORY)	U	Fail 33/67	\$16-\$18 per year raise 5% per year	\$0	Landscaping
Jacumba Community Services Dist	W	Fail 49/51	Improved/unimproved parcels	\$0	Park development and services
Ramona Municipal Water District (ADVISORY)	X	Pass 51/49	Raise fees new development	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Ramona Municipal Water District (ADVISORY)	Y	Pass 62/38	Raise fees	\$0	Medical services
Valley Center Community Services Dist	Z	Fail 62/38	\$12 per year (3 years)	\$0	Park facilities
San Joaquin					
Waterloo-Morada Rural Fire Protection Dist	R	Pass 72/28	Residential	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Eastside Rural County Fire Protection Dist	Q	Fail 66/34	\$30 per parcel	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
San Mateo					
San Mateo County Services Area No 1	C	Pass 71/29	Special tax	\$0	Fire protection and prevention, police services
Santa Clara					
Santa Clara Valley Water Dist-Northwest Flood Control Dist	F	Pass 72/28	Replace current assess with resolution	\$0	Flood protection

Table 5  
(continued)

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>TAX/ ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BONDS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
Santa Clara (continued)					
Santa Clara Valley Water Dist-Central Flood Control Dist	G	Pass 66/34	Replace current assess with resolution	\$0	Flood protection
Santa Clara Valley Water Dist-East Flood Control Dist	H	Pass 67/33	Replace current assess with resolution	\$0	Flood protection
Santa Clara Valley Water Dist-South Flood Control Dist	I	Pass 61/39	Replace current assess with resolution	\$0	Flood protection
Shasta					
Shasta County Fire Protection Services Area No 1	B	Pass 59/41	\$20 per year improved	\$0	Fire protection (expenditures only upon voter approval)
Sonoma (see also Mendocino County)					
Coast Life Support Dist	F	Pass 89/11	Special tax	\$0	Emergency services
Bennett Valley Fire Protection Dist	G	Fail 64/36	\$10 per year	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Forestville Fire Dist	I	Fail 57/43	Tax	\$0	No information available
Stanislaus					
Mountain View Fire Protection Dist	C	Fail 58/42	Special tax	\$0	Fire protection and prevention

Table 5  
(continued)

<u>COUNTY/AGENCY</u>	<u>MEASURE</u>	<u>PASS/FAIL % OF VOTE</u>	<u>TAX/ ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF BONDS</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
Sutter					
Sutter County Levee Dist No 1	A	Pass 64/36	Assessment	\$0	Flood protection
Trinity					
Weaverville-Douglas City Recreation Dist	B	Fail 33/67	Special tax	\$0	Park development and maintenance (Lee Fong Park)
Tulare					
Visalia Memorial Dist	E	Fail 55/45	\$3 per parcel (3 years)	\$0	Repair Veterans Memorial Building
Tuolumne					
Groveland Community Services Dist	A	Pass 67/33	\$10 per benefit unit (5 years)	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Mi-Wuk Village Fire Protection Dist	B	Fail 62/38	\$10 per benefit unit	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Tuolumne Fire Protection Dist	C	Fail 52/48	\$10 per benefit unit	\$0	Fire protection and prevention
Yuba					
Marysville	D	Fail 35/65	Raise \$3 per month	\$0	Sewer system operation

**Total Local Assessment Bonds Approved:**

**\$8,000,000**

Note: Voter results have been rounded.

Source: County Clerks' election departments.

limit is adjusted each year based on the changes in the cost of living and population. Governments that collect more funds from assessments or taxes than allowed under their appropriations limit must return the excess. As an alternative, voters are allowed to vote to increase the appropriations limit for a duration of no more than four years.

The November general election featured votes to change 34 appropriation limits. These elections, for the most part, were held in districts or by agencies that provide special services (i.e., fire protection and prevention, paramedic and emergency services or flood control).

Nineteen were measures only to increase the appropriation limit. All 19 were approved. Fifteen other measures were coupled with special tax or use and transactions measures. Eight of the 15 passed (as did their companion measures). Seven failed.

## VII. SUMMARY

There were 95 local bond and tax measures and four State bond measures considered in the General Election held November 4, 1986. All four State measures passed. Fifty-three of the 95 local measures passed (56 percent) and 42 failed (44 percent).

In the local elections, when the majority vote results are compared to those requiring a two-thirds vote, the results are

much different. Of the 42 local measures requiring a majority vote, 35 (83 percent) passed and seven (17 percent) failed. Election measures requiring a two-thirds vote fared poorly. Of the 53 local "two-thirds vote" issues considered, only 18 (34 percent) passed and 35 (66 percent) failed.

Tables 6 and 7 present an overview of the outcome of the measures discussed in this report.

Table 6

## SUMMARY

OUTCOME OF BOND AUTHORIZATION APPROVALS  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION

<u>State</u>	<u>Amount Approved (%)</u>	<u>Amount Disapproved (%)</u>	<u>Total Considered</u>
G. O. Bonds	\$1,800,000,000 (100%)	\$0 (0%)	\$1,800,000,000
Subtotal, State	\$1,800,000,000 (100%)	\$0 (0%)	\$1,800,000,000
<u>Local</u>			
G. O. Bonds	\$225,300,000 (54%)	\$190,692,000 (46%)	\$415,992,000
Revenue	\$1,400,000 (100%)	\$0 (0%)	\$1,400,000
Use/Transaction	\$800,000,000 (58%)	\$590,000,000 (42%)	\$1,390,000,000
Special Tax	\$0 (0%)	\$2,800,000 (100%)	\$2,800,000
Assessment	\$8,000,000 (100%)	\$0 (0%)	\$8,000,000
Subtotal, Local	\$1,034,700,000 (57%)	\$783,492,000 (43%)	\$1,818,192,000
<u>TOTAL</u>	\$2,834,700,000 (78%)	\$783,492,000 (22%)	\$3,618,192,000

Table 7

## SUMMARY

OUTCOME OF BOND, TAX AND APPROPRIATION MEASURES  
NOVEMBER 4, 1986 GENERAL ELECTION

<u>State</u>	<u># of Measures Passing (%)</u>	<u># of Measures Failing (%)</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Obligation Bonds	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4
<u>Local</u>			
General Obligation Bonds	7 (41%)	10 (59%)	17
Revenue Bonds	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1
Use & Transaction Taxes/Bonds	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	7
Special Tax	14 (37%)	24 (63%)	38
Benefit Assessments	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	12
Appropriation Limits	27 (79%)	7 (21%)	34
Other	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1
<u>TOTAL*</u>	57 (58%)	42 (42%)	99

\*Totals do not add due to treatment of measures which proposed more than one change. For example, a single local measure which proposed both an increase in the appropriations limit and an increase in special taxes is counted in each of these two categories under the "local" portion of this table. However, the measure is only counted once in the total.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Deddeh, Wadie. Senate Bill 142., State of California 1987/88  
Legislative Session. Introduced January 6, 1987.
- Kirlin, John J. "November Elections Illustrate Committee on 21  
Themes." Western City, January 1987, pp. 3-6.
- "Local GO Bond Elections, Revived Life Since Proposition 46  
Passed." Cal-Tax News, January 15, 1987, pp. 5-6.
- Meli, Lou. "Voters Approve \$13.37 Billion of Issues in 1986, For  
Record Year." The Bond Buyer, December 29, 1986, pp. 1, 16.
- "Santa Barbara County Approves Spending Override." Cal-Tax News,  
November 15, 1986, pp. 1, 6.
- "Two Counties Vote Higher Sales Tax." Cal-Tax News,  
November 15, 1986, pp. 1, 5.