

MAY 2024 BOND ELECTION REPORT

WRITTEN BY **James Quintero**, Policy Director, Taxpayer Protection Project
AUGUST 2024

KEY POINTS

- Texas voters considered almost 325 bond propositions on May 4th, 2024. Of those, approximately 260 measures were approved.
- The total repayment cost for every bond measure *proposed* was \$38.8 billion.
- The total repayment cost for every bond measure *passed* is \$33.3 billion.
- The passage rate for bond propositions during the May 2024 election cycle was 79.9%.
- Texas' heightened debt environment should prompt the Legislature to consider reforms to improve debt transparency and accountability.

BOND ELECTION SUMMARY

On May 4th, 2024, Texas voters were asked to decide on a multitude of bond propositions put forward by cities, independent school districts (ISDs), and special purpose districts (SPDs). For those unfamiliar with bonds, it may be thought of as “[a] debt instrument in which an investor loans money to the issuer that specifies when the loan is due (‘term’ or ‘maturity’ such as 20 years), the interest rate the borrower will pay (such as 5%), when the debt-service payments will be made (such as monthly, semi-annually, or annually), and the revenue source pledged to make the payments” ([Texas Bond Review Board, 2023, p. 95](#)). In all, voters considered 324 separate bond propositions that had the potential to add \$27.5 billion in new principal debt ([Texas Bond Review Board, n.d.-a](#)). Including interest costs, the total repayment that could have resulted from the passage of all these measures proposed was at least \$38.8 billion.¹

Of course, not every bond proposition was approved by Texas voters. Overall, voters endorsed 259 propositions worth \$24.6 billion (principal only) and rejected 65 measures valued at \$2.9 billion (principal only). Accounting for the cost of interest, those 259 items approved will require \$33.3 billion, while the 65 defeated items could have cost as much as \$5.5 billion.

¹ Author’s calculation is based on the sum of the estimated principal and interest required to pay the debt obligations proposed by cities (\$3,611,953,561) SPDs (\$16,067,712,615), and ISDs (\$19,083,387,810). For certain special districts, interest costs were unavailable.

Among all taxing unit types, the passage rate for May 2024 bond propositions was 79.9%, meaning that voters statewide effectively approved 8 in 10 items. This rate of success is on par with past history, save 2022.²

The remainder of this report offers a more detailed analysis of the bonds proposed by taxing unit type (i.e., cities, ISDs, and SPDs). It combines key data from the Bond Review Board’s searchable bond election database, Voter Information Documents (VIDs), and election orders to provide a more complete examination of those items considered, their cost, and their results. Importantly, each entity’s VID provides much of the fiscal data. A VID is a debt disclosure document that must be prepared by a taxing unit with at least 250 registered voters and must present the following information:

- “The language that would appear on the ballot;
- A table with the principal, estimated interest, and estimated combined principal and interest required for full payment of the proposed bonds and the principal, estimated interest, and estimated combined principal and interest required for full payment of all outstanding bonds as of the date the political subdivision adopted the debt obligation order;
- The estimated maximum annual increase in taxes that would be imposed on a residence homestead with an appraised value of \$100,000, based on certain assumptions made by the governing body of the political subdivision detailed in the bill; and
- Any other information considered relevant or necessary to explain the other information in the document” (HB 477 Bill Analysis, 2021, p. 2).

Using the information located in VIDs and elsewhere, this research is well-positioned to identify each

proposition’s desired principal amount, interest cost, total repayment, purpose, result, and margin of victory or defeat. This report places an emphasis on the total repayment costs—also commonly referred to as local debt service outstanding (LDSO)—as opposed to focusing on the principal debt alone, as is common. By doing so, we may better understand the actual amount of borrowing that was proposed and passed in May 2024.

CITY BOND ELECTIONS

This election cycle, a relatively small number of cities proposed roughly three dozen bond propositions for public consideration. Altogether, 15 municipalities put forward 40 different bond proposals with the potential to add \$3.6 billion in new LDSO. Of these, voters approved 34 measures while rejecting the remaining 6 items. The 34 approved measures may require as much as \$3.1 billion to fully repay. The passage rate for city bond propositions this voting period was 85%.

The largest single-item bond proposition to be approved by voters was the city of Dallas’ \$726.4 million transportation proposal. Its total cost represents approximately 20% of all city debt considered. The largest single-item proposition to be rejected by voters was the city of Irving’s \$379.9 million proposal for a new city hall.

The city of Dallas proposed the greatest number of bond propositions this election cycle. Overall, it sought voter-approval for 10 different items with a total possible cost of \$1.8 billion. It subsequently received public support for all 10 measures. As these bonds are issued over time, the city’s debt will likely grow from its present level, which was estimated at \$7.2 billion in fiscal year 2023 (Texas Bond Review Board, n.d.-b).

The bond to win passage with the narrowest margin was the city of McKinney’s Proposition C (\$44.1 million) which carried by only six votes.

² The Texas Bond Review Board (2023, p. 43) records bond proposition passage rates in the following fiscal years: 2018 (81%); 2019 (89%); 2020 (78%); 2021 (79%); 2022 (59%). The total percentage approved across the five-year period was 75%.

Table 1*City Bond Propositions Considered in May 2024 (in alphabetical order)*

Municipality	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Chandler	A	\$3,030,000	\$1,804,525	\$4,834,525	Street	Rejected	323	332
Chandler	B	\$2,500,000	\$1,521,425	\$4,021,425	Library	Passed	339	327
Dallas	A	\$521,200,000	\$205,215,188	\$726,415,188	Transportation	Passed	36,914	5,846
Dallas	B	\$345,270,000	\$135,941,813	\$481,211,813	Parks & Recreation	Passed	34,628	7,921
Dallas	C	\$52,100,000	\$20,506,125	\$72,606,125	Flood Control	Passed	33,730	8,803
Dallas	D	\$43,530,000	\$17,134,313	\$60,664,313	Library	Passed	33,639	8,763
Dallas	E	\$75,200,000	\$29,601,750	\$104,801,750	Cultural Arts Facility	Passed	31,828	10,569
Dallas	F	\$90,000,000	\$35,429,625	\$125,429,625	Public Safety	Passed	33,101	9,326
Dallas	G	\$72,300,000	\$43,748,538	\$116,048,538	Economic Development	Passed	29,126	13,042
Dallas	H	\$26,400,000	\$15,934,113	\$42,334,113	Housing Facility	Passed	30,686	11,817
Dallas	I	\$19,000,000	\$7,481,250	\$26,481,250	Homeless	Passed	33,404	9,122
Dallas	J	\$5,000,000	\$1,960,875	\$6,960,875	Technology	Passed	34,466	8,022
Donna	A	\$45,000,000	\$69,744,931	\$114,744,931	Bridge	Passed	614	315
Fair Oaks Ranch	A	\$16,000,000	\$9,671,625	\$25,671,625	Street & Drainage	Passed	1,086	499
Farmers Branch	A	\$500,000	\$174,956	\$674,956	Economic Development	Passed	972	800
Farmers Branch	B	\$2,000,000	\$699,823	\$2,699,823	Recreation	Passed	947	823
Farmers Branch	C	\$5,500,000	\$1,924,512	\$7,424,512	Water	Passed	1,238	529
Hallettsville	A	\$6,000,000	\$3,627,500	\$9,627,500	Street	Passed	256	195
Irving	A	\$200,000,000	\$179,910,167	\$379,910,167	City Hall	Rejected	2,263	6,160
Joshua	A	\$16,000,000	\$9,720,000	\$25,720,000	Municipal Building	Rejected	171	315
Joshua	B	\$10,000,000	\$6,075,250	\$16,075,250	Street & Drainage	Rejected	218	268
Lacy-Lakeview	A	\$9,500,000	\$4,227,750	\$13,727,750	Streets & Roads	Passed	318	141
Lakeway	A	\$22,000,000	\$16,319,000	\$38,319,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	2,623	1,243
Lewisville	A	\$6,700,000	\$2,378,000	\$9,078,000	Fire Station Improvements	Passed	4,363	1,134
Lewisville	B	\$9,900,000	\$3,498,000	\$13,398,000	Animal Care & Control	Passed	3,798	1,683
Lewisville	C	\$47,900,000	\$16,960,000	\$64,860,000	Park	Passed	3,817	1,660
Lewisville	D	\$198,900,000	\$91,972,575	\$290,872,575	Street & Drainage	Passed	4,253	1,234
McKinney	A	\$106,000,000	\$49,993,311	\$155,993,311	Parks & Recreation	Passed	3,604	2,574
McKinney	B	\$36,000,000	\$16,978,860	\$52,978,860	Court Facility	Rejected	2,816	3,331
McKinney	C	\$30,000,000	\$14,149,050	\$44,149,050	Public Works	Passed	3,071	3,065
McKinney	D	\$70,000,000	\$33,014,450	\$103,014,450	Public Safety	Passed	4,060	2,114
McKinney	E	\$243,500,000	\$114,843,124	\$358,343,124	Streets & Roads	Passed	4,107	2,070
Melissa	C	\$2,450,000	\$1,366,074	\$3,816,074	City Building	Rejected	507	680
Rhome	A	\$3,000,000	\$2,321,434	\$5,321,434	Water System Improvements	Passed	163	116
Rhome	B	\$11,000,000	\$8,511,926	\$19,511,926	Drainage Improvements	Passed	163	116
Rhome	C	\$3,500,000	\$2,708,340	\$6,208,340	Drainage Improvements	Passed	168	113
Rowlett	A	\$35,000,000	\$18,166,849	\$53,166,849	Transportation	Passed	1,268	457
Rowlett	B	\$8,500,000	\$4,411,949	\$12,911,949	Parks & Recreation	Passed	1,102	612
Rowlett	C	\$4,700,000	\$2,439,548	\$7,139,548	Public Safety	Passed	1,259	460
Rowlett	D	\$3,150,000	\$1,635,016	\$4,785,016	Street	Passed	1,139	579
TOTAL		\$2,408,230,000	\$1,203,723,561	\$3,611,953,561				

SPD BOND ELECTIONS

Special purpose districts are a broad classification of governmental entities “that exist locally and provide infrastructure and deliver specific services, like firefighting, road construction, and water treatment” (Texas Public Policy Foundation, 2018, p. 1). The number of SPDs seeking bond debt was modest at 24; however, those two dozen entities asked voters to approve 73 propositions with an estimated total repayment of \$16.1 billion. The proposed borrowing is second in size only to school districts (\$19.1 billion). Of the 73 items pitched, voters approved 72 measures. Only Lynn County’s proposed hospital district (\$23 million in principal debt) was rejected.

To be fair, SPD bond elections are unique in that the number of voters participating in their elections tends to be quite small. In certain municipal utility district (MUD) contests, the final vote count was 1 – 0 or 2 – 0. This outcome is possible due to the unique way that MUDs originate and operate.³ In addition, it is noteworthy that much of the information compiled is incomplete due to the fact that the law that established VIDs, HB 477 (2019, pp. 5– 7), excluded jurisdictions with fewer than 250 registered voters from having to publish certain details, like the estimated interest costs. As such, the total repayment costs are understated to a fair degree since that information is not publicly available. Lastly, a certain number of jurisdictions sought approval for refunding bonds, which refers to “the process by which an issuer refinances outstanding bonds by issuing new bonds” (Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, n.d., p. 1). Hence, it may be argued that where refunding bonds are concerned, these instruments serve a particular purpose that is outside the bounds of traditional borrowing.

Whatever the case, the data still provides a few interesting insights. For instance, the largest bond proposition to be considered was Comal County water improvement district 3’s \$1.5 billion proposal for water, sewer, and drainage projects. It was approved by a vote of 1 – 0 .

In all, school districts proposed 211 different propositions valued at \$19.1 billion. Of these, voters approved 153 items while defeating the other 58 measures.

The lone defeated measure was Lynn County’s \$23 million hospital district bond which sought taxpayer support to “fix the hospital’s electricity, plumbing, security, add a fast track clinic and provide a new secure Emergency Room” (Reeves, 2024, para. 3). Had the measure passed, “[it] would have raised the tax rate from about 26 cents per \$100 valuation to around 41 cents per \$100 valuation” (KCBD Digital, 2024, para. 2). However, voters overwhelmingly rejected it by a vote of 343 – 947.

ISD BOND ELECTIONS

In comparison to local government types, ISDs were the most aggressive entity seeking to borrow, both in terms of the number of propositions offered up for consideration as well as the amount of new debt sought. In all, school districts proposed 211 different propositions valued at \$19.1 billion. Of these, voters approved 153 items while defeating the other 58 measures. While this might seem like a major setback for debt-hungry ISDs, the value of the items rejected was fairly modest. Consider that the cost of the items refused was just \$5 billion, whereas the measures that passed could cost as much as \$14.1 billion. Hence, school districts received voter approval for 74% of every dollar of new debt asked for.

The largest single-item proposition to pass was Georgetown ISD’s \$1.1 billion for school buildings and buses. It won approval by a vote of 4,944 – 3,211. The only other billion-dollar bond was Mansfield ISD’s \$1 billion proposal for new school building and security measures. It passed by a slightly smaller margin, at 5,828 – 4,891. The largest single-item proposition to

³ To learn more about how MUDs are created and operate, see the Texas Senate Research Center’s (2014) report *Invisible Government: Special Purpose Districts in Texas*.

Table 2

SPD Bond Propositions Considered in November 2023 (in alphabetical order)

Special Purpose Districts	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Atlas Ranch MUD 1	C	\$552,000,000	-	\$552,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	1	0
Atlas Ranch MUD 1	D	\$86,000,000	-	\$86,000,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	1	0
Atlas Ranch MUD 1	E	\$300,000,000	-	\$300,000,000	Road	Passed	1	0
Atlas Ranch MUD 1	F	\$828,000,000	-	\$828,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	1	0
Atlas Ranch MUD 1	G	\$450,000,000	-	\$450,000,000	Roads and Refunding	Passed	1	0
Brookshire MWD	B/D*	\$38,000,000	\$31,146,937	\$69,146,937	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	2	0
Brookshire MWD	C	\$30,000,000	-	\$30,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	2	0
Brookshire MWD	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	Parks & Recreation	Passed	2	0
Brookshire MWD	E	\$8,000,000	-	\$8,000,000	Parks & Recreation Refunding	Passed	2	0
Collin County MUD 05	A	\$494,000,000	-	\$494,000,000	Utility	Passed	1	0
Collin County MUD 05	B	\$617,500,000	-	\$617,500,000	Refunding	Passed	1	0
Collin County MUD 05	C	\$310,000,000	-	\$310,000,000	Road	Passed	1	0
Collin County MUD 05	D	\$387,500,000	-	\$387,500,000	Road & Refunding Roads	Passed	1	0
Comal County WID 3	B	\$1,486,000,000	-	\$1,486,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	1	0
Comal County WID 3	C	\$635,000,000	-	\$635,000,000	Road	Passed	1	0
Comal County WID 3	D	\$116,500,000	-	\$116,500,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	1	0
Comal County WID 3	E	\$1,486,000,000	-	\$1,486,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	Passed	1	0
Comal County WID 3	F	\$635,000,000	-	\$635,000,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	Passed	1	0
Comal County WID 3	G	\$116,500,000	-	\$116,500,000	Parks, Recreation and Refunding	Passed	1	0
Corinthian Point MUD 2	A	\$30,000,000	\$28,827,901	\$58,827,901	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	88	63
Cresson Crossroads MUD 2	A	\$134,645,000	-	\$134,645,000	Utility	Passed	1	0
Cresson Crossroads MUD 2	B	\$168,306,250	-	\$168,306,250	Refunding	Passed	1	0
Cresson Crossroads MUD 2	C	\$148,245,000	-	\$148,245,000	Road	Passed	1	0
Cresson Crossroads MUD 2	D	\$185,306,250	-	\$185,306,250	Road & Refunding Roads	Passed	1	0
Cresswind Cove MUD 1	B	\$78,200,000	-	\$78,200,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	1	0
Cresswind Cove MUD 1	C	\$50,600,000	-	\$50,600,000	Road	Passed	1	0
Cresswind Cove MUD 1	D	\$117,300,000	-	\$117,300,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	1	0
Cresswind Cove MUD 1	E	\$75,900,000	-	\$75,900,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	Passed	1	0
Fort Bend County MUD 162	A	\$300,000,000	\$197,269,063	\$497,269,063	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	21	18
Fort Bend County MUD 162	B	\$50,500,000	\$33,219,063	\$83,719,063	Recreation & Refunding	Passed	23	16
Grayson County JCD	A	\$456,500,000	\$523,213,877	\$979,713,877	School Building & Security	Passed	5753	4016
Harris County MUD 055	A	\$118,000,000	\$111,424,950	\$229,424,950	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	48	40
Harris County MUD 055	B	\$177,000,000	\$74,283,300	\$251,283,300	Refunding	Passed	48	40
Harris County WCID 110	A	\$34,950,000	-	\$34,950,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	1	0

* Brookshire municipal water district's VID combines the estimated principal and interest costs for propositions B and D.

Special Purpose Districts	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Harris County WCID 110	B	\$10,550,000	-	\$10,550,000	Park	Passed	1	0
<u>Lower Valley WD</u>	A	\$35,000,000	\$36,903,992	\$71,903,992	Water & Sewer	Passed	314	308
Lynn County Hospital District	A	\$23,000,000	-	\$23,000,000	Hospital	Rejected	343	947
Montgomery County MUD 153	B	\$327,000,000	-	\$327,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 153	C	\$200,022,752	-	\$200,022,752	Recreation & Refunding	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 153	D	\$238,500,000	-	\$238,500,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 173	A	\$190,000,000	-	\$190,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 173	B	\$51,150,000	-	\$51,150,000	Road	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 173	C	\$8,850,000	-	\$8,850,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 202A	A	\$346,200,000	-	\$346,200,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 202A	B	\$180,500,000	-	\$180,500,000	Road	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 202A	C	\$31,200,000	-	\$31,200,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 202A	D	\$557,900,000	-	\$557,900,000	Refunding	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 238	B	\$30,000,000	-	\$30,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 238	C	\$30,000,000	-	\$30,000,000	Road	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 238	D	\$4,000,000	-	\$4,000,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 238	E	\$64,000,000	-	\$64,000,000	Refunding	Passed	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146B	B	\$209,000,000	-	\$209,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146B	C	\$38,650,000	-	\$38,650,000	Recreation	Passed	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146B	D	\$96,300,000	-	\$96,300,000	Road	Passed	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146B	E	\$209,000,000	-	\$209,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	Passed	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146B	F	\$38,650,000	-	\$38,650,000	Recreation & Refunding	Passed	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146B	G	\$96,300,000	-	\$96,300,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	Passed	2	0
Mustang Ridge MUD	A	\$143,100,000	-	\$143,100,000	Utility	Passed	1	0
Mustang Ridge MUD	B	\$178,875,000	-	\$178,875,000	Refunding	Passed	1	0
Mustang Ridge MUD	C	\$82,400,000	-	\$82,400,000	Road	Passed	1	0
Mustang Ridge MUD	D	\$103,000,000	-	\$103,000,000	Road & Refunding Roads	Passed	1	0
Mustang Ridge MUD	E	\$8,000,000	-	\$8,000,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	1	0
Mustang Ridge MUD	F	\$10,000,000	-	\$10,000,000	Parks & Recreation Refunding	Passed	1	0
North Forest MUD	A	\$12,195,000	\$10,265,000	\$22,460,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	65	9
Northampton MUD	A	\$86,000,000	\$71,498,925	\$157,498,925	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	297	65
Sonterra MUD	A	\$55,000,000	\$44,382,567	\$99,382,567	Parks & Recreation	Passed	72	48
Westwood Shores MUD	A	\$7,000,000	\$4,106,788	\$11,106,788	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	Passed	275	110
Williamson County MUD 49	C	\$140,000,000	-	\$140,000,000	Utility	Passed	1	0
Williamson County MUD 49	D	\$175,000,000	-	\$175,000,000	Refunding	Passed	1	0
Williamson County MUD 49	E	\$60,000,000	-	\$60,000,000	Road	Passed	1	0

Special Purpose Districts	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Williamson County MUD 49	F	\$75,000,000	-	\$75,000,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	Passed	1	0
Williamson County MUD 49	G	\$21,500,000	-	\$21,500,000	Parks & Recreation	Passed	1	0
Williamson County MUD 49	H	\$26,875,000	-	\$26,875,000	Recreation & Refunding	Passed	1	0
TOTAL		\$14,901,170,252	\$1,166,542,363	\$16,067,712,615				

fail was Argyle ISD’s \$983.9 million proposal for school buildings. It was defeated by less than 100 votes.

In addition to the measures above, another eight propositions were proposed that exceeded \$500 million in total cost. Those measures include Gale-na Park ISD proposition A (\$896.1 million); Godley ISD proposition A (\$774.1 million); Canutillo ISD proposition A (\$742.5 million); Elgin ISD proposition A (\$674.1 million); Barbers Hill ISD proposition A (\$658.5 million); Medina Valley ISD proposition A (\$601.5 million); New Braunfels ISD proposition A (\$511.3 million); and Cedar Hill ISD proposition A (\$507.1 million). Among that group, only Goldey ISD’s \$774.1 million bond was defeated.

In terms of quantity, several ISDs proposed bond packages with five separate propositions. Those districts included: Harts Bluff ISD’s \$37.2 million package; Longview ISD’s \$770.2 million package; and Mansfield ISD’s \$1.3 billion package. Voters rejected Harts Bluff’s bond package in its entirety and three of the five measures proposed by Mansfield ISD, while approving each part of Longview ISD’s package. However, one district—Culberson County—Allamore ISD—offered up six propositions for consideration, costing more than \$50 million. Voters in that district approved every measure.

In terms of vote margins, a few measures were either approved or rejected by a razor thin majority.

Table 3
ISD Bond Propositions Considered in November 2023 (in alphabetical order)

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Alice ISD	A	\$38,000,000	\$34,048,489	\$72,048,489	Stadium	Passed	1,128	1,064
Anna ISD	A	\$100,000,000	\$95,158,000	\$195,158,000	Stadium	Rejected	824	1,088
Aquilla ISD	A	\$9,100,000	\$7,365,333	\$16,465,333	School Building	Passed	210	164
Aquilla ISD	B	\$2,900,000	\$2,347,194	\$5,247,194	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	183	189
Argyle ISD	A	\$482,385,000	\$501,521,173	\$983,906,173	School Building	Rejected	1,433	1,530
Argyle ISD	B	\$22,655,000	\$24,829,775	\$47,484,775	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Rejected	1,283	1,699
Argyle ISD	C	\$6,500,000	\$1,397,083	\$7,897,083	Technology	Passed	1,800	1,181
Axtell ISD	A	\$23,460,000	\$15,924,367	\$39,384,367	School Building	Rejected	167	618
Axtell ISD	B	\$1,600,000	\$607,067	\$2,207,067	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	156	629
Banquete ISD	A	\$48,445,000	\$37,767,366	\$86,212,366	School Building & Security	Passed	159	81
Barbers Hill ISD	A	\$378,300,000	\$280,189,000	\$658,489,000	School Building	Passed	902	196
Beeville ISD	A	\$62,380,000	\$57,985,687	\$120,365,687	School Building & Buses	Passed	1,304	1,148
Ben Bolt-Palito Blanco ISD	A	\$8,000,000	\$6,947,220	\$14,947,220	School Building & Buses	Passed	141	29

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Big Spring ISD	A	\$216,700,000	\$208,529,829	\$425,229,829	School Building	Rejected	601	1,201
Big Spring ISD	B	\$2,300,000	\$2,016,616	\$4,316,616	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	609	1,181
Bishop CISD	A	\$20,000,000	\$16,448,418	\$36,448,418	School Building & Buses	Passed	323	310
Bishop CISD	B	\$8,000,000	\$6,569,752	\$14,569,752	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	291	336
Bluff Dale ISD	A	\$9,500,000	\$7,599,828	\$17,099,828	School Building & Buses	Rejected	166	252
Boling ISD	A	\$40,500,000	\$39,399,938	\$79,899,938	School Building	Passed	290	248
Bovina ISD	A	\$8,000,000	\$6,872,967	\$14,872,967	School Building	Passed	231	125
Bovina ISD	B	\$7,000,000	\$6,013,846	\$13,013,846	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	201	152
Bowie ISD	A	\$65,800,000	\$54,434,925	\$120,234,925	School Building & Security	Rejected	479	1,320
Boyd ISD	A	\$20,000,000	\$13,334,805	\$33,334,805	School Building	Passed	407	360
Bridgeport ISD	A	\$26,000,000	\$24,635,722	\$50,635,722	School Building & Buses	Rejected	629	719
Bronte ISD	A	\$10,965,000	\$8,039,188	\$19,004,188	School Building & Buses	Passed	177	57
Bronte ISD	B	\$1,135,000	\$1,021,125	\$2,156,125	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	168	68
Buckholts ISD	A	\$11,145,000	\$4,871,858	\$16,016,858	School Building & Buses	Rejected	-	-
Bynum ISD	A	\$9,000,000	\$4,326,599	\$13,326,599	School Building	Passed	45	21
Calallen ISD	A	\$12,573,000	\$12,595,125	\$25,168,125	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	506	444
Canadian ISD	A	\$18,000,000	\$6,367,748	\$24,367,748	School Building & Buses	Passed	300	58
Canadian ISD	B	\$2,000,000	\$446,552	\$2,446,552	Technology	Passed	298	59
Canutillo ISD	A	\$378,955,000	\$363,525,729	\$742,480,729	School Building	Passed	1,042	1,011
Canutillo ISD	B	\$7,285,000	\$1,361,104	\$8,646,104	Refunding	Passed	1,026	1,014
Castleberry ISD	A	\$98,000,000	\$83,123,658	\$181,123,658	School Building	Passed	441	308
Cayuga ISD	A	\$6,000,000	\$1,178,080	\$7,178,080	School Building	Passed	171	115
Cayuga ISD	B	\$6,000,000	\$1,178,080	\$7,178,080	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Passed	157	132
Cedar Hill ISD	A	\$278,500,000	\$228,615,641	\$507,115,641	School Building	Passed	2,272	1,267
Cedar Hill ISD	B	\$3,900,000	\$205,539	\$4,105,539	Technology	Passed	2,199	1,341
Central ISD	A	\$28,430,000	\$30,447,000	\$58,877,000	School Building & Security	Rejected	462	495
Chapel Hill ISD	A	\$9,300,000	\$8,338,148	\$17,638,148	School Building	Passed	381	187
Charlotte ISD	A	\$16,000,000	\$15,166,139	\$31,166,139	School Building	Passed	-	-
Charlotte ISD	B	\$4,000,000	\$2,406,472	\$6,406,472	Athletic Facilities	Passed	-	-
Chico ISD	A	\$10,500,000	\$4,676,750	\$15,176,750	School Building	Passed	191	136
Chico ISD	B	\$1,500,000	\$666,000	\$2,166,000	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	181	144
Christoval ISD	A	\$19,500,000	\$16,000,000	\$35,500,000	School Building & Buses	Passed	340	285
Clarendon CISD	A	\$1,800,000	\$1,012,750	\$2,812,750	School Building & Buses	Rejected	244	356
Clarendon CISD	B	\$6,900,000	\$5,699,208	\$12,599,208	Athletic Stadium Facilities	Rejected	194	411
Clarendon CISD	C	\$3,000,000	\$2,480,625	\$5,480,625	Agriculture Building	Rejected	217	384
College Station ISD	A	\$40,200,000	\$31,895,500	\$72,095,500	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	3,129	2,373
College Station ISD	B	\$13,270,000	\$10,531,817	\$23,801,817	School Building/ Stadium	Passed	3,106	2,389

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Colorado ISD	A	\$8,100,000	\$5,776,328	\$13,876,328	School Building & Buses	Passed	-	-
Columbus ISD	A	\$8,440,000	\$8,033,750	\$16,473,750	School Building	Passed	762	514
Columbus ISD	B	\$5,320,000	\$5,065,000	\$10,385,000	Educational Center	Passed	807	465
Comanche ISD	A	\$31,700,000	\$18,425,308	\$50,125,308	School Building & Security	Passed	417	356
Comstock ISD	A	\$11,250,000	\$9,095,958	\$20,345,958	Educational Center	Passed	62	24
Comstock ISD	B	\$250,000	\$73,931	\$323,931	Technology	Passed	64	21
Connally ISD	A	\$60,000,000	\$52,863,375	\$112,863,375	School Building & Security	Rejected	491	633
Copperas Cove ISD	A	\$175,000,000	\$148,660,275	\$323,660,275	School Building & Security	Rejected	1,192	1,261
Cranfills Gap ISD	A	\$6,750,000	\$5,697,736	\$12,447,736	School Building & Buses	Passed	120	53
Culberson County-Allamore ISD	A	\$26,000,000	\$3,464,356	\$29,464,356	School Building	Passed	233	51
Culberson County-Allamore ISD	B	\$2,000,000	\$266,489	\$2,266,489	Recreation	Passed	227	58
Culberson County-Allamore ISD	C	\$2,000,000	\$266,489	\$2,266,489	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	232	54
Culberson County-Allamore ISD	D	\$7,000,000	\$932,711	\$7,932,711	Natatorium	Passed	225	59
Culberson County-Allamore ISD	E	\$3,000,000	\$399,733	\$3,399,733	Housing Facility	Passed	232	54
Culberson County-Allamore ISD	F	\$5,000,000	\$666,222	\$5,666,222	Performing Arts	Passed	240	47
Deweyville ISD	A	\$47,665,000	\$43,595,077	\$91,260,077	School Building	Rejected	130	348
Elgin ISD	A	\$366,000,000	\$308,074,500	\$674,074,500	School Building & Buses	Passed	1,069	495
Elgin ISD	B	\$9,000,000	\$7,578,900	\$16,578,900	Technology	Passed	954	617
Elysian Fields ISD	A	\$52,421,531	\$40,324,788	\$92,746,319	School Building & Buses	Passed	213	163
Elysian Fields ISD	B	\$2,578,469	\$2,000,462	\$4,578,931	Stadium	Passed	198	177
Evadale ISD	A	\$24,000,000		\$24,000,000	School Building & Buses	Passed	249	120
Everman ISD	A	\$49,015,479	\$49,453,730	\$98,469,209	School Building & Security	Passed	321	168
Everman ISD	B	\$18,084,304	\$18,243,488	\$36,327,792	Multi-Purpose Center	Passed	246	234
Farmersville ISD	A	\$98,000,000	\$80,548,083	\$178,548,083	School Building	Passed	774	394
Florence ISD	A	\$4,500,000	\$4,347,250	\$8,847,250	School Building & Security	Passed	140	65
Forestburg ISD	A	\$4,100,000	\$2,168,900	\$6,268,900	School Building	Passed	98	59
Forestburg ISD	B	\$2,100,000	\$806,150	\$2,906,150	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	86	72
Galena Park ISD	A	\$530,010,000	\$366,097,200	\$896,107,200	School Building & Buses	Passed	-	-
Gause ISD	A	\$3,000,000	\$2,213,206	\$5,213,206	School Building & Buses	Passed	47	36
Georgetown ISD	A	\$597,470,000	\$507,618,350	\$1,105,088,350	School Building & Buses	Passed	4,944	3,211
Georgetown ISD	B	\$20,300,000	\$17,806,563	\$38,106,563	Technology	Passed	5,709	2,466
Georgetown ISD	C	\$27,850,000	\$24,393,388	\$52,243,388	Performing Arts	Passed	5,508	2,661
Georgetown ISD	D	\$3,860,000	\$2,118,025	\$5,978,025	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	5,118	3,039
Godley ISD	A	\$365,000,000	\$409,079,700	\$774,079,700	School Building & Buses	Rejected	618	829
Graford ISD	A	\$59,950,000	\$66,691,363	\$126,641,363	School Building & Buses	Passed	357	237
Graham ISD	A	\$27,500,000	\$21,002,252	\$48,502,252	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Rejected	716	925
Graham ISD	B	\$10,500,000	\$8,033,094	\$18,533,094	Multi-Purpose Center	Rejected	554	1,086

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/ Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Granbury ISD	A	\$161,500,000	\$153,958,000	\$315,458,000	School Building, Buses & Technology	Rejected	4,933	5,404
Grapevine-Colleyville ISD	A	\$134,236,405	\$100,711,845	\$234,948,250	School Building & Security	Passed	7,249	4,476
Grapevine-Colleyville ISD	B	\$10,225,554	\$2,067,196	\$12,292,750	Technology	Passed	7,367	4,343
Grapevine-Colleyville ISD	C	\$5,538,041	\$3,137,209	\$8,675,250	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	7,044	4,660
Hallettsville ISD	A	\$1,800,000	\$1,668,473	\$3,468,473	School Building & Security	Passed	1,009	543
Hallettsville ISD	B	\$9,325,000	\$8,634,630	\$17,959,630	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Passed	719	831
Hallettsville ISD	C	\$28,245,000	\$25,880,092	\$54,125,092	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	1,003	546
Harmony ISD	A	\$25,000,000	\$26,282,700	\$51,282,700	School Building & Security	Passed	176	114
Harrold ISD	A	\$10,000,000	\$8,173,635	\$18,173,635	School Building & Security	Passed	44	19
Harts Bluff ISD	A	\$6,600,000	\$6,251,333	\$12,851,333	School Building	Rejected	197	353
Harts Bluff ISD	B	\$1,400,000	\$1,325,639	\$2,725,639	Cafeteria	Rejected	219	328
Harts Bluff ISD	C	\$6,000,000	\$5,680,917	\$11,680,917	School Building/Gym	Rejected	179	373
Harts Bluff ISD	D	\$1,100,000	\$1,048,080	\$2,148,080	Fine Arts Venue	Rejected	178	369
Harts Bluff ISD	E	\$4,000,000	\$3,786,111	\$7,786,111	School Building Improvements	Rejected	184	371
Hearne ISD	A	\$11,500,000	\$10,595,700	\$22,095,700	School Building & Security	Passed	261	153
Hearne ISD	B	\$3,500,000	\$3,226,275	\$6,726,275	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	257	157
Hearne ISD	C	\$2,500,000	\$870,750	\$3,370,750	Stadium	Passed	255	157
Hearne ISD	D	\$1,500,000	\$1,380,150	\$2,880,150	Technology	Passed	264	149
Hempstead ISD	A	\$42,320,000	\$31,783,275	\$74,103,275	School Building & Security	Passed	925	349
Hempstead ISD	B	\$3,400,000	\$2,258,775	\$5,658,775	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	862	400
Henrietta ISD	A	\$35,000,000	\$30,492,292	\$65,492,292	School Building	Passed	438	270
Henrietta ISD	B	\$1,000,000	\$815,104	\$1,815,104	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	420	289
Hidalgo ISD	A	\$23,000,000	\$19,161,151	\$42,161,151	School Building	Rejected	322	376
Hidalgo ISD	B	\$2,500,000	\$1,819,317	\$4,319,317	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	296	382
Huckabay ISD	A	\$1,900,000	\$1,022,597	\$2,922,597	School Building	Rejected	131	185
Huckabay ISD	B	\$600,000	\$174,403	\$774,403	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Rejected	121	194
Huckabay ISD	C	\$1,800,000	\$994,569	\$2,794,569	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	120	196
Huckabay ISD	D	\$900,000	\$293,250	\$1,193,250	Refunding	Rejected	133	183
Irion Co ISD	A	\$53,000,000	\$47,115,917	\$100,115,917	School Building & Buses	Passed	192	111
Irion Co ISD	B	\$1,000,000	\$75,167	\$1,075,167	Technology	Passed	201	96
Irion Co ISD	C	\$1,000,000	\$826,583	\$1,826,583	Housing Facility	Passed	205	96
Joshua ISD	A	\$63,070,000	\$43,264,170	\$106,334,170	School Building	Passed	1,545	1,329
Joshua ISD	B	\$8,960,000	\$6,145,695	\$15,105,695	Cafeteria	Passed	1,585	1,294
Joshua ISD	C	\$29,568,000	\$20,282,130	\$49,850,130	Educational Center	Passed	1,526	1,368
Joshua ISD	D	\$4,648,000	\$1,226,205	\$5,874,205	Maintenance	Passed	1,586	1,306
Kaufman ISD	A	\$170,000,000	\$217,076,800	\$387,076,800	School Building	Passed	1,025	617
La Pryor ISD	A	\$23,000,000	\$21,406,500	\$44,406,500	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Passed	150	83

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
La Vega ISD	A	\$76,526,740	\$78,160,135	\$154,686,875	School Building & Buses	Passed	297	128
La Vega ISD	B	\$4,501,507	\$5,155,993	\$9,657,500	Stadium	Passed	275	144
La Vega ISD	C	\$11,915,753	\$13,403,997	\$25,319,750	Community Center	Passed	273	144
Lefors ISD	A	\$2,650,000	\$1,453,288	\$4,103,288	School Buildings	Passed	95	35
Lewisville ISD	A	\$16,250,000	\$8,822,888	\$25,072,888	Natatorium	Passed	12,113	8,767
Lewisville ISD	B	\$65,585,000	\$35,617,069	\$101,202,069	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	11,468	9,516
Lewisville ISD	C	\$19,999,000	\$10,853,381	\$30,852,381	Stadium	Passed	11,768	9,201
Longview ISD	A	\$237,700,000	\$163,611,554	\$401,311,554	School Building & Security	Passed	3,103	1,613
Longview ISD	B	\$76,500,000	\$52,656,267	\$129,156,267	School Building	Passed	2,876	1,824
Longview ISD	C	\$79,100,000	\$54,446,122	\$133,546,122	Multi-Purpose Center	Passed	2,745	1,944
Longview ISD	D	\$21,000,000	\$14,453,861	\$35,453,861	Stadium	Passed	2,722	1,970
Longview ISD	E	\$41,900,000	\$28,841,780	\$70,741,780	Natatorium	Passed	2,841	1,853
Lorena ISD	A	\$37,640,000	\$35,255,280	\$72,895,280	School Building	Rejected	634	884
Lorena ISD	B	\$1,265,000	\$1,167,360	\$2,432,360	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	604	910
Lytle ISD	A	\$20,650,000	\$20,751,500	\$41,401,500	School Building	Passed	209	90
Mabank ISD	A	\$116,000,000	\$70,792,950	\$186,792,950	School Building	Passed	1,404	584
Mansfield ISD	A	\$584,500,000	\$460,529,100	\$1,045,029,100	School Building & Security	Passed	5,828	4,891
Mansfield ISD	B	\$4,000,000	\$213,325	\$4,213,325	Technology	Passed	5,654	5,032
Mansfield ISD	C	\$50,500,000	\$21,279,963	\$71,779,963	Stadium	Rejected	4,730	5,942
Mansfield ISD	D	\$85,000,000	\$52,992,400	\$137,992,400	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	5,112	5,562
Mansfield ISD	E	\$53,000,000	\$33,042,263	\$86,042,263	Multi-Purpose Center	Rejected	4,625	6,011
McDade ISD	A	\$4,000,000	\$3,678,111	\$7,678,111	School Building	Passed	97	93
McGregor ISD	A	\$82,000,000	\$83,727,525	\$165,727,525	School Building & Security	Passed	385	224
McMullen County ISD	A	\$12,000,000	\$2,899,800	\$14,899,800	School Building	Passed	53	8
Medina Valley ISD	A	\$249,150,000	\$352,315,159	\$601,465,159	School Building & Security	Passed	823	698
Medina Valley ISD	B	\$40,850,000	\$57,764,697	\$98,614,697	Stadium	Passed	966	556
Mercedes ISD	A	\$48,125,000	\$49,516,500	\$97,641,500	School Building & Buses	Rejected	285	516
Milford ISD	A	\$11,500,000	\$9,054,413	\$20,554,413	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Rejected	120	46
Morgan Mill ISD	A	\$9,100,000	\$7,675,542	\$16,775,542	School Building	Rejected	124	201
Natalia ISD	A	\$17,465,000	\$17,655,000	\$35,120,000	School Building	Passed	170	79
Natalia ISD	B	\$5,555,000	\$5,643,960	\$11,198,960	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	158	90
Navarro ISD	A	\$73,700,000	\$168,705,841	\$242,405,841	School Building & Security	Passed	598	261
Navarro ISD	B	\$35,500,000	\$81,262,651	\$116,762,651	Stadium	Passed	512	346
Navarro ISD	C	\$10,800,000	\$24,722,159	\$35,522,159	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	518	340
Navasota ISD	A	\$71,000,000	\$66,117,250	\$137,117,250	School Building	Passed	462	378
Navasota ISD	B	\$3,040,000	\$187,028	\$3,227,028	Refunding Notes	Passed	460	375
New Braunfels ISD	A	\$267,500,000	\$243,830,710	\$511,330,710	School Building & Security	Passed	2,701	1,306

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
New Braunfels ISD	B	\$42,500,000	\$38,740,515	\$81,240,515	Stadium	Passed	2,801	946
New Braunfels ISD	C	\$3,000,000	\$337,500	\$3,337,500	Technology	Passed	2,469	1,268
New Diana ISD	A	\$28,250,000	\$26,167,790	\$54,417,790	School Building & Security	Passed	390	382
Olney ISD	A	\$8,350,000	\$5,352,813	\$13,702,813	School Building	Passed	398	158
Onalaska ISD	A	\$42,000,000	\$34,118,750	\$76,118,750	School Building	Passed	386	147
Panhandle ISD	B	\$3,000,000	\$1,261,350	\$4,261,350	School Building/ Athletic Improvements	Passed	140	266
Panhandle ISD	A	\$2,000,000	\$840,900	\$2,840,900	Stadium	Rejected	184	220
Pearland ISD	A	\$75,000,000	\$52,775,900	\$127,775,900	School Building & Security	Passed	2,054	1,618
Pearland ISD	B	\$30,000,000	\$2,936,675	\$32,936,675	Technology	Passed	2,068	1,589
Penelope ISD	A	\$4,130,000	\$1,926,972	\$6,056,972	School Building	Passed	68	24
Pittsburg ISD	A	\$74,400,000	\$70,473,913	\$144,873,913	Security	Passed	1,396	924
Pittsburg ISD	B	\$19,400,000	\$18,376,262	\$37,776,262	School Building & Security	Passed	1,367	946
Plains ISD	A	\$15,495,628	\$6,152,947	\$21,648,575	School Building & Buses	Passed	177	45
Plains ISD	B	\$29,284,372	\$11,616,928	\$40,901,300	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	166	59
Poteet ISD	A	\$65,000,000	\$54,711,675	\$119,711,675	School Building & Security	Passed	348	264
Rivercrest ISD	A	\$23,000,000	\$15,293,704	\$38,293,704	School Building & Buses	Passed	433	144
Rochelle ISD	A	\$6,750,000	\$5,625,063	\$12,375,063	School Building	Passed	163	55
Rosebud-Lott ISD	A	\$22,029,765	\$15,048,396	\$37,078,161	School Building & Buses	Rejected	175	241
Rosebud-Lott ISD	B	\$1,565,000	\$152,033	\$1,717,033	Refunding Notes	Rejected	184	228
Rosebud-Lott ISD	C	\$405,235	\$357,762	\$762,997	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	162	250
San Diego ISD	A	\$1,752,420	\$1,525,886	\$3,278,306	School Building	Passed	192	75
San Diego ISD	B	\$3,500,000	\$3,047,558	\$6,547,558	Multi-Purpose Center	Passed	103	82
San Diego ISD	C	\$247,580	\$215,576	\$463,156	Stadium	Passed	104	78
Sanford-Fritch ISD	A	\$6,000,000	\$4,685,175	\$10,685,175	School Building & Buses	Passed	125	50
Sanford-Fritch ISD	B	\$500,000	\$390,375	\$890,375	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	124	51
Seagraves ISD	A	\$6,000,000	\$4,267,400	\$10,267,400	School Building & Buses	Passed	170	118
Sivells Bend ISD	A	\$19,900,000	\$16,475,625	\$36,375,625	School Building	Rejected	63	144
Sonora ISD	A	\$17,900,000	\$3,687,628	\$21,587,628	School Building	Passed	257	175
Stafford MSD	A	\$45,000,000	\$41,073,500	\$86,073,500	School Building & Buses	Rejected	347	446
Stafford MSD	B	\$15,000,000	\$12,112,750	\$27,112,750	Technology	Rejected	362	446
Sulphur Bluff ISD	A	\$6,000,000	\$4,127,222	\$10,127,222	School Building & Buses	Passed	111	42
Sulphur Springs ISD	A	\$157,150,000	\$123,826,513	\$280,976,513	School Building	Passed	-	-
Sweeny ISD	A	\$21,000,000	\$12,604,500	\$33,604,500	Stadium	Passed	410	341
Sweeny ISD	B	\$21,000,000	\$12,604,500	\$33,604,500	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Passed	412	336
Sweet Home ISD	A	\$6,000,000	\$5,431,956	\$11,431,956	School Building	Passed	117	69
Taft ISD	A	\$47,900,000	\$45,093,250	\$92,993,250	School Building	Passed	308	83
Tarkington ISD	A	\$59,000,000	\$52,355,736	\$111,355,736	School Building & Security	Rejected	441	452

School District	Prop. #	Principal Amount	Interest Cost	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Result	Votes For	Votes Against
Thorndale ISD	A	\$34,500,000	\$21,739,972	\$56,239,972	School Building	Passed	467	131
Three Way ISD	A	\$7,500,000	\$6,390,979	\$13,890,979	School Building	Rejected	14	64
Tioga ISD	A	\$26,305,000	\$42,726,616	\$69,031,616	Refunding	Passed	182	155
West Orange-Cove CISD	A	\$72,000,000	\$51,887,375	\$123,887,375	School Building	Passed	333	244
West Rusk County CISD	A	\$26,403,037	\$28,511,125	\$54,914,162	School Building	Rejected	159	235
West Sabine ISD	A	\$12,335,000	\$14,219,625	\$26,554,625	School Building & Buses	Rejected	191	233
Whitesboro ISD	A	\$100,000,000	\$95,680,843	\$195,680,843	School Building & Security	Passed	767	524
Whitesboro ISD	B	\$18,000,000	\$17,216,907	\$35,216,907	Multi-Purpose Center	Passed	652	635
Willis ISD	A	\$102,700,000	\$102,065,819	\$204,765,819	School Building Improvements	Passed	2,350	1,868
Willis ISD	B	\$68,800,000	\$68,383,449	\$137,183,449	Athletic Facilities Improvements	Rejected	1,995	2,208
Willis ISD	C	\$19,600,000	\$19,485,490	\$39,085,490	Aquatic Center	Rejected	1,931	2,264
Willis ISD	D	\$27,000,000	\$26,811,513	\$53,811,513	School Building	Rejected	1,969	2,215
Yorktown ISD	A	\$20,000,000	\$10,547,861	\$30,547,861	School Building	Passed	97	244
TOTAL		\$10,182,754,820	\$5,941,250,768	\$16,124,005,588				

Consider that McDade ISD’s proposition A, with a total repayment of \$7.7 million, passed by only four votes. New Diana ISD’s proposition A, with a total repayment of \$54.4 million, won by just eight votes. Tarkington ISD’s \$111.4 million proposal lost by only 11 votes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The rate of local debt accumulation continues to be a major source of concern and, if left unchecked, its heightened state could pose a significant threat to the Texas Model of low taxes and limited government.

While there is no silver bullet solution, there are legislative reforms that can propel localities in a better, more fiscally responsible direction. The next Legislature should give serious consideration to making the following changes.

Greater Government Disclosure. A provision in HB 3 (2019, p. 13) requires school districts to include the following disclosure on every bond proposition: “THIS IS A PROPERTY TAX INCREASE.” The intent of this provision is to help voters make the connection between new debt and new taxes. Policymakers

should expand upon this concept by applying it to all other taxing unit types, i.e. cities, counties, and special districts. In addition, the Legislature should also accentuate this disclosure statement to make it more obvious for the public. This might include bolding the statement, making the font size larger, requiring it to be in a different color, or some combination of the three.

- **Require Bond Elections to Be Held in November.** Bond elections should be held on the uniform election date in November to draw input from the maximum number of voters and ensure that a small minority of special interests are not unduly influencing an election’s outcome.
- **Establish Minimum Voter Turnout Requirements.** Establish a minimum voter turnout threshold for the approval of new bond propositions and tax ratification elections. This will help prevent the process from being dominated by a relatively small percentage of voters.
- **Strengthen the Voter Information Document.** Despite the Legislature’s attempt to improve debt

transparency through VIDs, some problems have emerged with how the information is determined and relayed due to statistical manipulation and questionable assumptions related to “value growth, interest rates, and the application of the homestead exemption” (Quintero, 2022, para. 8). To remedy these issues and improve a VID’s accuracy and utility, the Legislature should amend state law to eliminate the arbitrary \$100,000 appraised value estimate (HB 477, 2019, p. 6) and replace it with the current year’s average taxable value for a residence homestead in the jurisdiction; force political subdivisions to disclose all

underlying data used to develop their estimates; and require VIDs to be prominently posted online, either on the political subdivision’s home page or its bond election website, if it has one. These adjustments will improve what information is communicated to the public and enable voters to make decisions that are better informed.

These reforms, as well as others, promise to make important process changes that will bring about greater government transparency and accountability with the goal of reducing the burden of increased local government debt across Texas. ■

REFERENCES

- HB 3. Enrolled. 86th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2019). <https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/86R/billtext/pdf/HB00003F.pdf>
- HB 477. Enrolled. 86th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2019). <https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/86R/billtext/pdf/HB00477F.pdf#navpanes=0>
- HB 477 Bill Analysis. House Research Organization. 86th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2019, April). <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba86r/hb0477.pdf#navpanes=0>
- KCBD Digital. (2024, May 4). *Voters reject Lynn County hospital bond*. <https://www.kcbd.com/2024/05/05/voters-reject-lynn-county-hospital-bond/>
- Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board. (n.d.). *Refundings and redemption provisions*. Retrieved May 31, 2024, from <https://www.msrb.org/sites/default/files/Refundings-and-Redemption-Provisions.pdf>
- Quintero, J. (2022, November 1). *Are you using this taxpayer tool?* Texas Public Policy Foundation. <https://www.texaspolicy.com/are-you-using-this-taxpayer-tool/>
- Reeves, P. (2024, April 25). *Lynn Co. residents divided on \$23 million hospital bond*. <https://www.everythinglubbock.com/news/local-news/lynn-co-residents-divided-on-23-million-hospital-bond/>
- Texas Bond Review Board. (n.d.-a). *Bond review board database search: Texas local government bond elections*. Retrieved May 31, 2024, from https://debtsearch.brb.texas.gov/bond_elections_search.aspx
- Texas Bond Review Board. (n.d.-b). *Bond review board database search: Texas local governments*. Retrieved May 31, 2024, from https://debtsearch.brb.texas.gov/local_debt_search.aspx
- Texas Bond Review Board. (2023). *2022 Local government annual report*. <https://www.brb.texas.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/2022LocalARFinal.pdf>
- Texas Public Policy Foundation. (2018). *Legislator's guide to the issues 2017-18: Special purpose districts*. <https://www.texaspolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Special-Purpose-Districts-copy.pdf>
- Texas Senate Research Center. (2014). *Invisible government: Special purpose districts in Texas*. https://senate.texas.gov/_assets/srcpub/Spotlight_Special_Purpose_Districts.pdf

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



James Quintero is the policy director for the Texas Public Policy Foundation's Taxpayer Protection Project. He joined the Foundation in 2008 and his work has generally focused on local government matters, especially where it involves taxes, spending, and debt. His work has been featured in the *New York Times*, *Forbes*, *Fox News*, *Breitbart*, and more.

Quintero received a B.A. from the University of Texas at Austin and an M.P.A. from Texas State University. He is currently seeking a Ph.D. in public policy from Liberty University. In 2022, he was appointed to serve a three-year term on the Commission for Lawyer Discipline.

Quintero and his wife, Tricia, are blessed with five beautiful children and faithfully attend Bannockburn Baptist Church.

