

Date of Hearing: July 12, 2023

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION  
Al Muratsuchi, Chair  
SB 28 (Glazer) – As Introduced December 5, 2022

**[Note: This bill is double referred to the Assembly Higher Education Committee and was heard by that Committee as it relates to issues under its jurisdiction.]**

**SENATE VOTE:** 33-4

**SUBJECT:** Education finance: school facilities: Public Preschool, K–12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024

**SUMMARY:** Authorizes a \$15 billion bond measure for the construction and modernization of public preschool, K-12, California Community Colleges (CCC), University of California (UC), and California State University (CSU) facilities to be placed on the ballot for the March 2024 primary election. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Establishes the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2024 totaling \$15.5 billion to be allocated as follows:
  - a) \$9 billion for Preschool to Grade 12 school facilities as follows:
    - i) \$2.8 billion for new construction; and,
    - ii) \$5.2 billion for modernization; \$500 million for charter schools; and, \$500 million for career technical education.
  - b) \$6 billion for higher education (the CCC, the CSU, and the UC) facilities as follows:
    - i) \$2 billion for the CCC;
    - ii) \$2 billion for the CSU; and,
    - iii) \$2 billion for the UC and the College of the Law, San Francisco, with \$50 million specifically earmarked to fund the construction of facilities that support the Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Sciences' (CDU) new, four-year medical school program.
- 2) Increases local bonding capacities for non-unified school districts from 1.25% to 2%, and for unified school districts from 2.5% to 4% of the taxable property in the district.
- 3) Requires a school district, as a condition of participating in the SFP, to submit to the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) a five-year facilities master plan approved by the governing board of the school district and to update the plan as appropriate.
- 4) Requires OPSC to prioritize, on a quarterly basis, the processing of modernization applications as follows:

- a) First, for health and safety projects;
  - b) Second, for school districts requesting financial hardship assistance;
  - c) Third, for projects addressing lead remediation;
  - d) Fourth, for projects that were submitted, but not reviewed in the two immediately preceding quarters, based on the order of those projects from the immediately preceding quarter;
  - e) Fifth, for projects addressing severe overcrowding; and
  - f) Sixth, based on a district's gross bonding capacity and the percentage of students that are low-income, English learners (EL), or foster youth.
- 5) Requires OPSC to prioritize, on a quarterly basis, the processing of modernization applications as follows:
- a) First, for health and safety projects;
  - b) Second, for school districts requesting financial hardship assistance;
  - c) Third, for projects that were submitted, but not reviewed in the two immediately preceding quarters and those applications shall be moved to the top of the list and shall be processed based upon the date order of their submittal;
  - d) Fourth, for projects addressing severe overcrowding; and
  - e) Fifth, based on a district's gross bonding capacity and the percentage of students that are low-income, ELs, or foster youth.
- 6) Requires, for purposes of determining the points used to compute the adjustments applied for new construction or modernization grants, the CDE to compute the sum of the following point computations applicable to each school district:
- a) Requires, for each school district, the CDE to divide the district's gross bonding capacity by the district's total enrollment, as specified;
  - b) Requires, for each school district, the CDE identify each district's unduplicated pupil percentage as determined for purposes of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF);
  - c) Requires a school district that has a pupil enrollment of 200 pupils or fewer to receive one point; and
  - d) Requires the CDE to draft regulations for consideration by the SAB to further clarify the requirements of this section.

- 7) Repeals the requirement to require the school district to make all necessary repairs, renewals, and replacements to ensure that a project is at all times maintained in good repair, working order, and condition by January 1, 2025.
- 8) Requires school districts electing to participate in the SFP to submit an updated report of the district's existing school building capacity to the OPSC.
- 9) Authorizes grant funding for new construction projects to be used for infrastructure necessary to provide access to broadband internet, seismic mitigation, construction of a school kitchen, transitional kindergarten classroom, public preschool facility, or a facility to support school nurses and counselors.
- 10) Prohibits grant funding for new construction projects to be used for electronic devices with a useful life of less than three years.
- 11) Allows a school district with a facility located on a military installation to receive a modernization grant to replace portables that are at least ten years old.
- 12) Allows for grant funding under the program to be increased by up to 10% to reflect the costs to remediate any water outlet used for drinking or preparing food with lead levels in excess of 15 parts per billion (ppb).
- 13) Expands school district eligibility for financial hardship assistance by increasing the total bonding capacity limit from \$5 million to \$15 million, adjusted annually for inflation.
- 14) Requires the SAB to provide a grant to test for lead in water outlets used for drinking water or preparing food that were constructed before January 1, 2010, and for remediation of any water outlet used for drinking or preparing food with lead levels in excess of 15 ppb.
- 15) Authorizes grant funding for modernization projects to be used for infrastructure necessary to provide access to broadband internet, seismic mitigation, specified lead remediation, demolition and construction of buildings on specified, existing schoolsites, construction of a school kitchen, transitional kindergarten classroom, public preschool facility, or a facility to support school nurses and counselors.
- 16) Authorizes the State Allocation Board (SAB) to provide assistance to districts procuring interim housing to school districts and county offices of education (COEs) impacted by a natural disaster.
- 17) Requires the SAB to accept a preliminary application from, and make a preliminary apportionment to, a small school district for new construction or modernization grants, as specified. Authorizes, if requested, the SAB to provide a preliminary apportionment of a project and construction management grant equal to 5% of the state share of the preliminary apportionment. Defines a "small school district" to mean a school district with an enrollment of fewer than 2,501 pupils.
- 18) Establishes the 2024 Charter School Facilities Account within the 2024 State School Facilities Fund. Requires the proceeds of bonds, as specified and if approved by the voters at

the March 5, 2024, statewide primary election, to be deposited into the 2024 Charter School Facilities Account for purposes of this article.

- 19) Increases the threshold for implementing unused site fees on school districts from sites valued at \$20,000 to sites valued at \$40,000.
- 20) Requires the Board of Trustees of the CSU and the Regents of the UC, as a condition of receiving funds from the 2022 bond fund, to adopt a five-year affordable student housing plan for each campus.
- 21) Requires the Regents of the UC and Board of Trustees of the CSU, in developing a list of capital projects for consideration in the annual Budget Act, to use each campus's student housing plan as a key input for project prioritization.
- 22) Repeals various obsolete code sections related to the SFP.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Requires, under the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the SAB to allocate to applicant school districts prescribed per-unhoused-pupil state funding for construction and modernization of school facilities, including hardship funding, and supplemental funding for site development and acquisition.
- 2) Provides that a school district's ongoing eligibility for new construction funding is determined by making calculations related to certain factors, including, but not limited to, enrollment projections by utilizing a cohort survival enrollment projection system, the number of students that may be adequately housed in the existing school building capacity of the district, and increases or decreases in enrollment resulting from receipt of funding from the Year-Round School Grant Program.
- 3) Provides that a school district is eligible to receive an apportionment for the modernization of a permanent school building that is more than 25 years old or a portable classroom that is at least 20 years old. A school district is eligible to receive an additional apportionment for modernization of a permanent school building every 25 years after the date of the previous apportionment or a portable classroom every 20 years after the previous apportionment.
- 4) Establishes specified per pupil grants for new construction and modernization and requires an annual inflation adjustment based on a construction cost index.
- 5) Establishes fees for residential development projects to enable school districts to build schools to house new students in the district.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The authorization of \$15 billion in general obligation bonds is expected to result in General Fund costs of approximately \$25.2 billion to repay, including \$10.2 billion in interest, at an annual cost of \$841 million. This estimate assumes an interest rate of 3.75 percent and a 30-year maturity.

- This measure would result in one-time General Fund costs to the Secretary of State (SOS) in the range of \$738,000 to \$984,000, likely in 2023-24, for printing and mailing costs to place the measure on the ballot in a statewide election. Actual costs may be higher or lower, depending on the length of required elements and the overall size of the ballot.
- The California Department of Education (CDE) indicates that requiring school districts to submit a 5-year school facilities master plan could have a significant local impact depending on the scope. These plans have a lifespan of about ten years and can cost anywhere from \$80,000 to \$300,000. However, the master plans would only be required if a district elects to seek state funding for a project.
- This bill increases local bonding capacities for non-unified school districts to 2 percent and 4 percent for unified school districts of the taxable property in the district. This could potentially lead to school districts incurring an unknown increase in local debt for facilities projects.

#### COMMENTS:

***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Senate Bill 28 authorizes a \$15.5 billion bond on the 2024 ballot for facilities for K-12 through higher education. This measure alleviates the financial burden on both the institutions and students, while also constructing facilities that reflect the needs of the 21st century students. The last K12 and higher education bond passed in 2006. However, by 2012 all of those funds were exhausted. Reflecting the grave need for these funds, between 2015 and 2019, 108 schools in California closed at least once due to poor facility conditions. The majority of these deteriorating schools are in high-need districts, in which more than 55% of students are low income, English Learners, experiencing homelessness, or foster youth. Additionally, the University of California’s existing backlog of deferred maintenance totals \$7.3 billion. The California State University’s totals \$6.5 billion. These include addressing fire, safety, and seismic deficiencies, and modernizing and constructing facilities to keep pace with current technology and workforce needs. This bond is crucial for bringing all of our public schools, K-12 through higher education, into the 21st century – and ensuring students are learning in a safe, healthy and suitable environment.”

***The voters rejected a substantially similar measure.*** In 2020, Proposition 13, the \$15 billion school construction bond that went before voters on the March 3 ballot, failed passage with only 47% voter support. This bill is substantially similar to Proposition 13.

Supporters of Proposition 13 claim that the specific circumstances surrounding the bond—potential confusion with Proposition 13 of 1978, tax fatigue, and the COVID-19 pandemic—are to blame for its failure. Supporters do not believe that the measure’s result is an indication of changing voter sentiment regarding school bonds, interest in investing in education generally, or a fundamental flaw with the SFP.

Opponents of Proposition 13, such as the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, appear to interpret the measure’s defeat differently. Because the measure would have raised the cap on how much school districts can raise through property taxes, the opponents argued that the measure itself would have raised property taxes. However, the measure would not have raised property taxes upon being approved. Only after school districts subsequently passed their own

local construction bonds and received matching funds from the state would property taxes be increased at the local level.

***Impact of school facilities on student learning.*** Studies have found a positive relationship between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. A 2017 report by the California Policy Lab analyzing the impact of newly constructed schools on student achievement in the Los Angeles Unified School District found significant student improvements in standardized test scores, attendance rates, and student effort following attendance at a new school facility.

According to the CDE, facility condition, design and utilization affect student and staff attendance, retention of teachers, student behavior, time teachers and students spend on instruction/learning activities, curriculum offerings, teacher and student time in school (school calendar), participation by staff and students in extra-curricular activities, parent visits, and extent of local school program innovations.

***Background on the School Facilities Program (SFP).*** The construction and rehabilitation of public K-12 facilities are funded by a combination of state and local general obligation (GO) bonds, developer's fees and local assessments such as Mello-Roos community facilities districts.

State bond funds are allocated pursuant to the SFP and administered by the OPSC under the direction of the SAB, a ten member body comprised of the Department of Finance, the Director of the DGS, the SPI, three Senators, three Assemblymembers, and a Governor’s appointee. Under the SFP, the New Construction program requires a 50% match from LEAs, unless the LEA qualifies for financial hardship, which pays up to 100% of project costs. Modernization funds are awarded at 60% with a 40% match. Since the inception of the SFP in 1998, voters have approved \$54 billion in state GO bonds for K-12 schools.

Ballot	Measure	Amount	% Support
November 1998	Proposition 1A	\$ 9.2 billion (\$6.7 billion K-12 + \$2.5 billion Higher Ed)	62.5
November 2002	Proposition 47	\$13.05 billion (\$11.4 billion K-12 + \$1.65 billion Higher Ed)	59.1
March 2004	Proposition 55	\$12.3 billion (\$10 billion K-12 + \$2.3 billion Higher Ed)	50.9
November 2006	Proposition 1D	\$10.416 billion (\$7.329 K-12 + \$3.087 billion Higher Ed)	56.9
November 2016	Proposition 51	\$9 billion (\$7 billion K-12 + \$2 billion California Community Colleges (CCC))	55.2
March 2020	Proposition 13	\$15 billion (\$9 billion K-12 + \$6 billion Higher Ed)	47.0

The last bond passed by voters, Proposition 51 on the November 2016 statewide ballot, provided \$9 billion for K-12 and CCC facilities through the following allocations:

- 1) \$7 billion for K-12 facilities allocated as follows:

- a) \$3 billion for new construction projects;
  - b) \$3 billion for modernization projects;
  - c) \$500 million for career technical education (CTE) facilities; and
  - d) \$500 million for charter school facilities.
- 2) \$2 billion for CCC facilities.

**Facilities need.** The CDE estimates that approximately 30% of the state’s K-12 classrooms are at least 50 years old and 10% are 70 years old. In addition to health and safety and normal wear and tear, schools need to be updated to meet 21<sup>st</sup> century educational needs and environmental efficiencies.

Researchers from the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) estimate that California public schools have over \$100 billion in K-12 new construction and modernization facilities needs while the Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office projects a \$41.4 billion capital facilities need over five years. While the full amount of bonds authorized by Proposition 51 has still not been sold, K-12 allocations for new construction funds have been depleted since September 2018 while modernization funds were fully allocated in February 2019. According to the OPSC, as of March 31, 2023, \$1.547 billion in new construction applications and \$2.084 billion in modernization applications have been submitted beyond Proposition 51 funding availability. Bond funds for CCC are administered through the budget process and are now exhausted.

In addition to funds for new construction, modernization, CTE, and charter facilities, this bill establishes several new programs, modifies the state/local match and financial hardship eligibility, and expands the costs that can be covered by state bond funds.

**Local bonding capacity.** This bill would increase local bonding capacities for non-unified school districts from 1.25% to 2%, and for unified school districts from 2.5% to 4% of the taxable property in the district. As noted previously, this provision is believed to be one of the primary reasons Proposition 13 (2020) was not passed by the voters.

**Quarterly application processing.** This bill would require the OPSC to prioritize, on a quarterly basis, the processing of modernization applications for the SFP as follows:

- First, for health and safety projects;
- Second, for school districts requesting financial hardship assistance;
- Third, for projects addressing lead remediation;
- Fourth, for projects that were submitted, but not reviewed in the two immediately preceding quarters, based on the order of those projects from the immediately preceding quarter;
- Fifth, for projects addressing severe overcrowding; and

- Sixth, based on a district's gross bonding capacity and the percentage of students that are low-income, ELs, or foster youth.

Moving to quarterly application processing is a significant departure from the current first in, first out processing process. Concern has been expressed that a school district applying for a new construction or modernization project may not receive funding, or may result in a longer waiting period.

This bill would further require the OPSC to prioritize, on a quarterly basis, the processing of new construction applications for the SFP as follows:

- First, for health and safety projects;
- Second, for school districts requesting financial hardship assistance;
- Third, for projects that were submitted, but not reviewed in the two immediately preceding quarters and those applications shall be moved to the top of the list and shall be processed based upon the date order of their submittal;
- Fourth, for projects addressing severe overcrowding; and
- Fifth, based on a district's gross bonding capacity and the percentage of students that are low-income, ELs, or foster youth.

***Small school districts assistance.*** Small school districts, defined as those with an enrollment of less than 2,501 pupils, face additional challenges in navigating the school construction and facility funding processes. Small school districts may not have facility staff. In many districts, facilities may be handled by the district superintendent, who may also be the principal of a school. Over the last several years, the SAB has seen a number of school districts appealing denial of funds due to various errors and challenges. Small school districts may request a construction management grant equal to 5% of the state share of the estimated (preliminary) apportionment that can be used for technical assistance provided by another LEA with expertise on school construction or a state agency. In addition, of the amount to be allocated to new construction and modernization, up to 10% would be set aside for small school districts.

***Financial hardship.*** Many small school districts and districts located in lower wealth areas are eligible for financial hardship assistance, which provides up to 100% of funding to school districts that are unable to provide their local match. Eligibility is based on a number of factors, including whether the school district's debt level is at 60% of bonding capacity or the district's total bonding capacity is less than \$5 million. These factors have not been adjusted for 20 years. This bill increases total bonding capacity from \$5 million to \$15 million and provides an annual inflation adjustment, which will expand the number of LEAs eligible for financial hardship assistance.

***Testing and remediation of lead levels of water at schoolsites.*** Research shows that long-term exposure to high levels of lead can cause irreversible damage to the brain, red blood cells, and kidneys. Exposure at low levels of lead can cause low IQ, hearing impairment, reduced attention span, and poor classroom performance. The most prevalent sources of lead in drinking water are from pipes, fixtures, and associated hardware from which the lead can leach.



AB 746 (Gonzalez), Chapter 746, Statutes of 2017, requires a community water system that serves a schoolsite with a building constructed before January 2010 to test for lead in up to five drinking water sources of the schoolsite by July 1, 2019. According to the State Water Resources Control Board, 8,027 schools were tested with approximately 1.1% of schoolsites sampled found with lead levels that exceed the federal United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) recommended level of 15 parts per billion. This bill authorizes the SAB to increase modernization grants by up to 10% to reflect the costs to remediate any water outlet used for drinking or preparing food with lead levels in excess of 15 ppb, and sets aside \$150 million for specified testing of lead in water.

**Disaster assistance.** The state has experienced the most devastating wildfires in state history over the last few years. According to the CDE, the main and most immediate need following a disaster is finding temporary locations for schools. Insurance and federal funds will cover repair and replacement of buildings. This bill authorizes the SAB to provide interim housing in the form of portables in districts affected by a disaster, upon a declaration of emergency by the Governor. This includes a district where the disaster occurred and a district that may temporarily house students from a neighboring district, such as those that occurred in the 2018 Camp Fire in Paradise, California, and the 2023 flooding in Planada, California.

**Local match for schoolsites on military bases.** The federal Department of Defense provides grants to school districts for the repair and construction of schools located on military bases. With a required local match of 20%, some school districts have been at risk of not being able to accept the funds. This bill authorizes a school facility located on a military installation to receive modernization funds to meet the local match requirement.

**Changes to the state/local match requirements.** In an effort to provide more support to low wealth districts and those that serve a greater number of low income, foster care, and EL students, this bill modifies the current 50% and 60% state match for new construction and modernization projects, respectively, to provide a greater state share to those districts. Under the proposal, a district’s match would be based on four factors: the wealth of the district (assessed valuation (AV)), bonding capacity, enrollment and the percentage of low income, foster care and EL students as measured by the district’s unduplicated pupil percentage (UPP) (used to determine a district’s percentage of unduplicated low income, foster care and EL students under the Local Control Funding Formula).

Points would be awarded based on a formula using the aforementioned factors. A district’s state matching share would range from 50% to 55% for new construction and 60% to 65% for modernization based on the total score of gross bonding capacity plus UPP, and if applicable, an extra point for a district with an enrollment of fewer than 200 students.

**Formula: Gross Bonding Capacity (AV x bonding capacity)/enrollment + UPP**

<b>Gross Bonding Capacity (AV x bonding capacity)</b>	
\$0-\$9,999	4 points
\$10,000 - \$19,999	3 points
\$20,000 - \$54,999	2 points

\$55,000+	1 point
-----------	---------

Unduplicated Pupil Percentage	
75% – 100%	8 points
50% – 74.99%	6 points
25% – 49.99%	4 points
Under 24.99%	2 points

Districts with an enrollment of under 200 are awarded an extra point. The total score of gross bonding capacity and UPP determines a district’s match as follows:

Total Score	New Construction State Match	Modernization State Match
11-13	55%	65%
9-10	53%	63%
8	52%	62%
6-7	51%	61%
Under 6	50%	60%

**Authorized uses of state bond funds.** Current law authorizes state bond funds to be used for a number of facility-related purposes, including design; purchasing a site, furniture and equipment; construction; and construction-related costs. SB 27 allows funds to additionally be used for technology, including schoolsite-based infrastructure necessary to provide access to broadband internet; and to support the construction or modernization of a school kitchen, TK classroom, facility to support a LEA-supported preschool program located on a schoolsite, or a facility to support school nurses and counselors.

**Arguments in support.** The California State University, Office of the Chancellor writes, “The CSU has an aging infrastructure in dire need of renovation and replacement, with more than half of our facility space being 40 years or older and a third being over 50 years old. Our five-year capital outlay plan reflects more than \$26.9 billion in academic and self-support infrastructure projects and \$7.8 billion in critical facilities renewal needs. These challenges were highlighted in a recent Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) report entitled, Addressing Capital Renewal at UC and CSU (January 2023), which correctly noted that between 2017–18 to 2022–23, our backlog for academic facilities and infrastructure grew by \$2.4 billion (60 percent).

SB 28 provides essential funding for our campuses to expand student capacity in classrooms and labs; address fire, safety, and seismic deficiencies, and to modernize and construct facilities to keep pace with current technology and workforce needs. It would also require CSU campuses to adopt a five-year affordable student housing plan in order to better meet the needs of our students, especially those who find themselves living in a high-priced housing market such as the San Francisco Bay Area.”

**Arguments in opposition.** The Western Electrical Contractors Association writes, “While a bond measure for education facilities may have merit, WECA and PHCC oppose language in Section 12 of the bill that establishes the prioritization of modernization and new construction projects if the district requires a Project Labor Agreement. WECA and PHCC believe this mandate is discriminatory and increases the cost of school construction. In addition, a study published in August by the Rand Corporation found that a bond measure passed by LA area voters in 2016 failed to deliver its intended results, primarily because of a project labor agreement.

Further, WECA and PHCC believe it is inappropriate for the Legislature to create an incentive for school districts to execute a PLA. WECA and PHCC believe this will become a rallying cry for PLA supporters who will tell school officials that a PLA ‘increases your odds of receiving State school bond funds.’”

**Related legislation.** AB 247 of the 2023-24 Session would place the Transitional Kindergarten-Community Colleges Public Education Facilities Bond Act on an unspecified 2024 statewide ballot for \$14 billion, and would make changes to the SFP.

AB 249 (Holden) of the 2023-24 Session would require a community water system that serves a schoolsite to test for lead in each of the schoolsite’s potable water system outlets on or before January 1, 2027, and if the lead level exceeds five parts per billion, requires the LEA or school to take immediate steps to make inoperable and shut down from use all fountains and faucets where the excess lead levels may exist, and ensure that a potable source of drinking water is provided for pupils.

SB 22 (Glazer) of the 2021-22 Session was substantially similar to this bill. The bill was held in the Assembly Education Committee.

AB 75 (O’Donnell) of the 2021-22 Session would have placed the Kindergarten-Community Colleges Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2022 on the 2022 statewide ballot, to be operative only if approved by voters at the election. This bill was held in the Senate Education Committee.

SB 22 (Glazer) of the 2021-22 Session would have placed the \$15 billion Public Preschool, K–12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2022 on an unspecified statewide election in 2022. This bill was held in the Assembly Education Committee.

AB 48 (O’Donnell and Glazer), Chapter 530, Statutes of 2019, placed the \$15 billion Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020 on the March 2020 statewide ballot.

AB 13 (Eggman) of the 2019-20 Session would have placed the Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 2020 on the November 3, 2020 statewide general election. The bill was held in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

SB 14 (Glazer) of the 2019-20 Session would have placed the Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 2020 on the March 3, 2020 statewide primary election. The bill was held in the Senate Rules Committee.

AB 746 (Gonzalez Fletcher) Chapter 746, Statutes of 2017, requires a community water system that serves a schoolsite with a building constructed before January 2010, to test for lead in the potable water system of the schoolsite by July 1, 2019.

AB 1088 (O'Donnell) of the 2015-16 Session would have placed the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act on an unspecified ballot. This bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 148 (Holden) of the 2015-16 Session would have placed the K-14 School Investment Bond Act of 2016 on the November 8, 2016 statewide ballot. The bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1433 (Gray) of the 2015-16 Session would have placed the Recommitment to Higher Education Bond Act of 2016 on the November 8, 2016 statewide general election. The bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 114 (Liu) of the 2015-16 Session would have placed the Kindergarten Through Grade 12 Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2016 on the November 8, 2016 ballot. The bill was held on the Senate Floor.

AB 2235 (Buchanan) of the 2013-14 Session would have placed the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2014 on the November 4, 2014, statewide general election. The bill was held on the Senate Floor.

AB 41 (Buchanan) of the 2013-14 Session expressed the Legislature's intent to place a Kindergarten-University facilities bond on the 2014 ballot. The bill was held in the Assembly Education Committee.

SB 45 (Corbett) of the 2013-14 Session expressed the Legislature's intent to place a Kindergarten-University facilities bond on a statewide general election. The bill was held in the Senate Rules Committee.

SB 301 (Liu) of the 2013-14 Session expressed the Legislature's intent to place a Kindergarten-University facilities bond on the 2014 ballot. The bill was held in the Senate Rules Committee.

AB 331 (Brownley) of the 2011-12 Session expressed the Legislature's intent to place a Kindergarten-University facilities bond on the 2012 ballot. The bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 822 (Block) of the 2011-12 Session would have placed a higher education facilities bond on the November 2012 ballot. The bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 220 (Brownley) of the 2009-10 Session would have placed a Kindergarten-University facilities bond on the November 2010 ballot. The bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 271 (Ducheny) of the 2009-10 Session would have placed a higher education facilities bond on the November 2010 ballot. The bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

A Voice for Choice Advocacy  
California State University, Office of The Chancellor  
Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science  
Citrus College  
International Interior Design Association Northern California Chapter  
International Interior Design Association Southern California Chapter  
Kedren Health  
Los Angeles Unified School District  
Mt. San Antonio College  
North Orange Community College District  
Office of The Riverside County Superintendent of Schools  
Riverside County Public K-12 School District Superintendents  
South Central Family Health Center  
Southside Coalition of Community Health Centers  
St. Johns Well Child & Family Health Center  
To Help Everyone Health and Wellness Centers  
University of California  
Watts Labor Community Action Committee

**Oppose**

Bizfed Central Valley  
California Taxpayers Association  
Plumbing-heating-cooling Contractors Association of California  
Western Electrical Contractors Association

**Analysis Prepared by:** Marguerite Ries / ED. / (916) 319-2087