

TAXPAYER PROTECTION PROJECT

NOVEMBER 2023 BOND ELECTION REPORT

WRITTEN BY
James Quintero
February 2024



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bond Election Summary | Page 3

City Bond Elections | Page 4

County Bond Elections | Page 6

ISD Bond Elections | Page 8

SPD Bond Elections | Page 14

Recommendations | Page 14

References | Page 19

NOVEMBER 2023 BOND ELECTION REPORT

WRITTEN BY James Quintero

KEY POINTS

- **Texas voters** were asked to decide on more than 300 bond propositions in November 2023. Of those items, 225 measures were approved while 82 were defeated.
- **Including principal and interest**, the total potential cost of this election cycle's bond propositions was \$64.7 billion.
- **School districts** sought the most amount of new debt followed by special districts, counties, and cities.

BOND ELECTION SUMMARY

On November 7, 2023, Texas voters decided on a host of bond propositions put forward by cities, counties, independent school districts (ISDs), and special purpose districts (SPDs). In public finance terms, a bond may be defined 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 percent), 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 statewide considered 307 separate bond propositions seeking to authorize \$42.8 billion in new principal debt ([Texas Bond Review Board, n.d.-a](#)). Including the cost of interest, the total potential repayment for those bonds was \$64.7 billion.¹

Of the several hundred items proposed, voters approved 225 propositions worth \$37.6 billion (principal only) and rejected the other 82 bids valued at \$5.1 billion (principal only). With the interest component included, the 225 approved items could cost as much as \$56.7 billion when fully repaid while the other 82 defeated items were valued at \$7.9 billion.

Among all taxing unit types, the passage rate for bond propositions this election cycle was 73.3%, meaning that voters statewide approved more than 7 in 10 items. While that is a relatively high passage rate in isolation, it is on par with historical trends.²

The remainder of this report examines various aspects of November bond propositions presented to voters by taxing unit type, that is, by soliciting cities, counties, ISDs, and SPDs. The analysis combines

¹ Author's calculation is based on the sum of the estimated combined principal and interest required to pay the debt obligations proposed by cities (\$2,235,920,775), counties (\$5,673,955,457), ISDs (\$33,732,903,442), and SPDs (\$23,031,275,545).

² The 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%.

key data from the Bond Review Board’s searchable bond election database and each entity’s Voter Information Document (VID) to provide a more complete review of the results. A VID is a debt disclosure document that must be prepared by a taxing unit with at least 250 registered voters and present the following information for each bond proposition ([HB 477 Bill Analysis, 2021, p. 2](#)):

- “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.”

By gathering and analyzing information from these two sources—the searchable database and VIDs—this report is well-positioned to provide an overview of each proposition, its result, its cost, its purpose, and its margin of victory or defeat. The analysis is largely communicated on the basis of local debt service outstanding or the total possible cost, which includes principal and interest, rather than focusing on principal debt alone, as is common. In doing so, this report seeks to avoid understating the actual amount of indebtedness that was contemplated in November 2023 and instead communicate the full effect of those propositions considered.

CITY BOND ELECTIONS

Last November, a small number of municipalities sought voter-approval for new debt. In all, 14 city governments proposed 47 bond propositions that could have cost as much as \$2.2 billion. Of those, only 8 items were rejected while 39 items successfully passed. Those 39 approved items authorize the issuance of almost \$2 billion in new debt. The passage rate for city bonds during this election cycle was 83%.

The largest single-item bond proposition to be approved by voters was the city of Princeton’s \$199.5 million proposal for parks and recreation. The cost of Princeton’s bond represents slightly more than 10% of all city bond debt considered. The largest single-item proposition to be rejected by voters was the city of Justin’s \$64.3 million proposal for public safety buildings.

The city of Denton proposed the greatest number of bond propositions this election cycle. Overall, it sought voter-approval for 8 items with a total possible cost of \$492.6 million. It subsequently received support for 7 items estimated to cost \$463.6 million. As the city of Denton issues these bonds incrementally over time, it will add to its existing local debt service outstanding, which totaled approximately \$2 billion in fiscal year 2023 ([Texas Bond Review Board, n.d.-b](#)).

The proposal to win passage with the narrowest margin was the city of Jersey Village’s proposition C (about \$32 million) which was carried by only 37 votes.

Table 1

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

Municipality	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Abilene	A	Carried	\$15,000,000	\$8,240,000	\$23,240,000	Zoo	5,989	4,117
Abilene	B	Carried	\$28,000,000	\$15,380,000	\$43,380,000	Recreation	5,087	4,903
Abilene	C	Defeated	\$9,000,000	\$4,940,000	\$13,940,000	Park	4,584	5,433
Allen	A	Carried	\$47,000,000	\$22,166,845	\$69,166,845	Street	8,010	2,287
Allen	B	Carried	\$17,000,000	\$8,017,795	\$25,017,795	Parks & Recreation	5,754	4,416
Allen	C	Defeated	\$1,500,000	\$707,453	\$2,207,453	Art Project	4,520	5,620
Allen	D	Carried	\$8,000,000	\$3,773,080	\$11,773,080	Mobility Projects	6,392	3,816
Allen	E	Carried	\$83,000,000	\$39,145,706	\$122,145,706	Police Station	6,467	3,817
Denton	A	Carried	\$45,125,000	\$26,672,389	\$71,797,389	Street	10,416	4,523
Denton	B	Carried	\$58,860,000	\$34,807,200	\$93,667,200	Flood Control	10,606	4,348
Denton	C	Carried	\$33,450,000	\$19,763,667	\$53,213,667	Park	9,649	5,276
Denton	D	Carried	\$42,015,000	\$24,835,883	\$66,850,883	Public Safety	10,157	4,770
Denton	E	Carried	\$15,000,000	\$8,862,167	\$23,862,167	Affordable Housing	8,712	6,213
Denton	F	Carried	\$47,360,000	\$28,003,672	\$75,363,672	Event Center	8,264	6,606
Denton	G	Carried	\$49,545,000	\$29,289,650	\$78,834,650	Library	8,341	6,591
Denton	H	Defeated	\$18,235,000	\$10,771,561	\$29,006,561	City Hall	7,210	7,603
Georgetown	A	Carried	\$56,000,000	\$54,588,500	\$110,588,500	City Building	7,472	7,164
Georgetown	B	Carried	\$49,000,000	\$30,573,000	\$79,573,000	Parks & Recreation	8,682	6,040
Georgetown	C	Carried	\$15,000,000	\$9,362,000	\$24,362,000	Animal Care & Control	9,893	4,843
Georgetown	D	Carried	\$10,000,000	\$6,240,000	\$16,240,000	Sports Complex	7,564	7,135
Greenville*	A	Carried	\$65,000,000	\$55,554,263	\$120,544,263	Recreation	1,947	1,701
Jersey Village	A	Defeated	\$19,000,000	\$12,977,700	\$31,977,700	Park	701	1,020
Jersey Village	B	Carried	\$15,855,000	\$10,829,549	\$26,684,549	Water & Sewer	948	771
Jersey Village	C	Carried	\$18,045,000	\$12,325,400	\$30,370,400	Road & Bridge	878	841
Justin	A	Defeated	\$33,370,000	\$30,920,344	\$64,290,344	Public Safety Building	347	769
Justin	B	Defeated	\$23,410,000	\$23,965,702	\$47,375,702	Community Center	316	801
Justin	C	Defeated	\$9,650,000	\$9,713,215	\$19,363,215	Municipal Building	335	781
Justin	D	Carried	\$21,790,000	\$21,021,958	\$42,811,958	Fire Station Improvements	681	442
Manor	A	Carried	\$15,000,000	\$12,045,500	\$27,045,500	Economic Development	564	250
Manor	B	Carried	\$61,695,000	\$51,184,000	\$112,879,000	Parks & Recreation	572	245
Manor	C	Carried	\$90,105,000	\$75,000,000	\$165,105,000	City Hall	497	321
Meadowlakes	A	Carried	\$7,500,000	U/A	U/A	Golf Course	558	186
Nacogdoches	A	Carried	\$7,300,000	\$3,961,950	\$11,261,950	Airport Improvements	1,784	1,003
Nacogdoches	B	Carried	\$16,730,000	\$12,314,810	\$29,044,810	Fire Station Improvements	1,777	1,020
Nacogdoches	C	Carried	\$5,900,000	\$4,345,142	\$10,245,142	Drainage	2,435	364
Nacogdoches	D	Carried	\$425,000	\$312,095	\$737,095	Public Improvements	1,534	1,230
Nacogdoches	E	Carried	\$2,200,000	\$1,195,350	\$3,395,350	Park	1,803	980
Nacogdoches	F	Carried	\$10,000,000	\$5,429,850	\$15,429,850	Street & Bridge	2,424	370
Nacogdoches	G	Carried	\$1,435,000	\$778,031	\$2,213,031	Sidewalks	2,047	742
Northlake	A	Carried	\$45,000,000	\$49,131,113	\$94,131,113	Sports Complex	786	436

Note. *Figures may not add properly but have been recorded exactly from the Voter Information Document.

Table 1, continued

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

Municipality	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Princeton	A	Carried	\$108,100,000	\$91,439,133	\$199,539,133	Parks & Recreation	1,149	462
Princeton**	B	Carried	\$1,000,000	\$1,073,000	\$2,073,033	Library	1,133	491
Rosenberg	A	Carried	\$18,500,000	\$10,074,979	\$28,574,979	Public Safety	1,361	782
Rosenberg	B	Carried	\$33,000,000	\$17,973,888	\$50,973,888	City Building	1,130	1,006
Seabrook	A	Defeated	\$27,800,000	\$22,674,582	\$50,474,582	Public Safety Facilities	371	464
Seabrook	B	Carried	\$2,400,000	\$1,957,518	\$4,357,518	Public Safety	519	316
Seabrook	C	Carried	\$1,905,000	\$1,376,134	\$3,281,134	Fire Station Improvements	535	299
TOTAL	-	Pass: 39; Fail: 8	\$1,310,205,000	\$925,715,774	\$2,228,410,807	-	-	-

Note. **Figures may not add properly but have been recorded exactly from the Voter Information Document.

COUNTY BOND ELECTIONS

Likewise, a relatively small number of counties petitioned voters for additional borrowing capacity in November. Statewide, seven counties proposed 14 bond propositions whose total repayment neared \$5.7 billion. Every bond proposition put forward by counties was approved by voters, putting the passage rate at 100%. No other type of taxing unit enjoyed this level of success.

For counties, the largest single-item proposition approved by voters was Fort Bend County's nearly \$1.6 billion proposal for mobility projects. That lone item represents more than 27% of the total amount sought.

The county government to propose the greatest number of propositions was Collin County. In total, it offered up to 5 items with an estimated principal and interest cost of \$1.1 billion.

Waller County's sole \$440.4 million proposition won passage by the thinnest margin, with only 859 votes separating success and failure. The proposition with the largest margin of victory was Travis County's proposition B, with an estimated cost of \$425 million, which was approved by more than 3-to-1.

Table 2

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

County	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Collin County*	A	Carried	\$261,864,179	\$169,179,821	\$431,044,000	Justice Center	49,873	44,152
Collin County	B	Carried	\$5,700,000	\$3,384,000	\$9,084,000	Animal Care & Control	61,271	33,272
Collin County	C	Carried	\$13,360,685	\$7,949,148	\$21,309,833	Criminal Justice Center	51,791	41,338
Collin County	D	Carried	\$22,450,000	\$13,352,083	\$35,802,083	Park	59,525	34,492
Collin County	E	Carried	\$380,000,000	\$233,889,917	\$613,889,917	Road	70,742	24,099
Fort Bend County	A	Carried	\$712,630,000	\$844,606,650	\$1,557,236,650	Mobility Projects	52,220	28,900
Fort Bend County	B	Carried	\$153,000,000	\$174,350,400	\$327,350,400	Parks & Recreation	41,318	38,797
Gregg County	A	Carried	\$19,000,000	\$10,844,100	\$29,844,100	Parking Garage	5,944	4,987
Lubbock County	A	Carried	\$35,485,000	\$17,735,186	\$53,220,186	County Building	16,170	11,858
Travis County	A	Carried	\$233,060,000	\$125,273,025	\$358,333,025	Road, bridge, drainage and intersection improvement projects	106,797	34,141
Travis County	B	Carried	\$276,440,000	\$148,592,700	\$425,032,700	Park	108,876	32,323
Waller County	A	Carried	\$280,000,000	\$160,350,500	\$440,350,500	Street & Bridge	1,801	942
Williamson County	A	Carried	\$825,000,000	\$459,778,088	\$1,284,778,088	Road	42,310	25,678
Williamson County	B	Carried	\$59,000,000	\$28,579,975	\$87,579,975	Park	40,770	27,306
TOTAL	-	Pass: 14; Fail: 0	\$3,276,989,864	\$2,397,865,593	\$5,674,855,457	-	-	-

Note. *At the time of publication, Collin County's Voter Information Documents were no longer available online; however, key information was included in Appendix A.

ISD BOND ELECTIONS

In comparison to the other taxing unit types, ISDs represented the majority of governments seeking to borrow, both in terms of sheer number and amount sought. In all, 76 school districts proposed 138 different propositions worth \$33.7 billion. Of these propositions, voters approved 75 items while rejecting the remaining 63 measures. On the surface, this might seem like a major setback for ISD debt-driven agendas; however, there is something important to note in this instance. Though numerous propositions were discarded by voters, their value was relatively small. Consider that the total potential cost of the items refused was \$5.7 billion whereas the items carried had a price tag of \$28 billion.

Such a discrepancy signals that school districts pitched voters on a variety of wants and needs, but were less successful with the former than the latter. That is, voters appeared more willing to defeat recreational items, like stadiums and multi-purpose centers, while also being quite receptive to core infrastructure needs, like school buildings. Thus, while the passage rate for school district bonds was just 54.3% in November, ISDs were still quite successful in convincing the public to go into debt as 84% of every dollar proposed was approved.

By far, the largest single-item proposition to pass was Prosper ISD's \$4.5 billion proposal for school buildings and buses. That item alone represented more than 13% of all ISD debt considered this election

cycle. The largest single-item proposition to fail was Goose Creek CISD's \$690 million proposal for school buildings and security. The measure was defeated by 819 votes.

Altogether, 8 ISDs petitioned voters to approve single-item bond propositions that will cost more than \$1 billion when complete. Those ISDs include Prosper ISD (\$4.5 billion); Aldine ISD (\$3.3 billion); Conroe ISD (\$3.2 billion); Midland ISD (\$2.9 billion); Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD (\$1.9 billion); Lewisville ISD (\$1.5 billion); Eagle Mt.-Saginaw ISD (\$1.2 billion); and Katy ISD (\$1.2 billion).

Lewisville ISD proposed the greatest number of bond propositions. All told, district officials proposed 6 different measures with a total combined cost of \$1.9 billion. Voters endorsed 2 of the 6 items, which authorize Lewisville ISD to take on an additional \$1.6 billion in new debt.

Several items were approved by very small margins. Abernathy, Como-Pickton, and Granbury ISDs each won passage of a bond proposition by one vote. Big Sandy, Covington, and Tuloso-Midway ISD each won support by 6, 7, and 8 votes, respectively. The school district to be defeated by the smallest margin was Poolville ISD, which lost its bond election by 3 votes.

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

ISD	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Abernathy ISD	A	Carried	\$2,600,000	\$935,457	\$3,535,457	School Building & Buses	90	59
Abernathy ISD	B	Carried	\$750,000	\$269,843	\$1,019,843	Stadium	74	73
Abernathy ISD	C	Defeated	\$5,900,000	\$3,622,275	\$9,522,275	Community Center	69	79
Aldine ISD	A	Carried	\$1,622,325,676	\$1,663,542,151	\$3,285,867,827	School Building & Security	8,707	4,034
Aldine ISD	B	Carried	\$67,547,500	\$13,989,412	\$81,536,912	Technology	8,208	4,456
Aldine ISD	C	Carried	\$122,282,967	\$125,389,663	\$247,672,630	Performing Arts	6,911	5,623
Aquila ISD	A	Defeated	\$11,400,000	\$9,879,138	\$21,279,138	School Building & Security	218	239
Azle ISD	A	Carried	\$151,500,000	\$172,421,850	\$323,921,850	School Building & Security	3,111	2,729
Bandera ISD	A	Defeated	\$40,000,000	\$31,887,150	\$71,887,150	School Building & Security	1,474	2,412
Big Sandy ISD	A	Carried	\$13,000,000	\$6,307,482	\$19,307,482	School Building & Athletic Improvements	171	165
Bowie ISD	A	Defeated	\$65,800,000	\$51,218,717	\$117,018,717	School Building	855	1,079
Brackett ISD	A	Defeated	\$49,000,000	\$44,029,694	\$93,029,694	School Building & Athletic Improvements	209	716
Bridgeport ISD	A	Defeated	\$128,000,000	\$121,758,472	\$249,758,472	School Building & Buses	653	623
Bridgeport ISD	B	Defeated	\$11,000,000	\$4,894,722	\$15,894,722	Stadium	570	698
Bridgeport ISD	C	Defeated	\$6,000,000	U/A	U/A	Technology	646	619
Burkeville ISD	A	Carried	\$5,000,000	\$4,491,519	\$9,491,519	School Building & Buses	219	199
Calhoun Co ISD	A	Carried	\$25,000,000	\$6,628,777	\$31,628,777	School Building	1,087	929
Canton ISD	A	Carried	\$102,625,000	\$98,072,000	\$200,697,000	School Building	1,331	1,074
Canton ISD	B	Carried	\$12,075,000	\$11,542,000	\$23,617,000	Multi-Purpose Center	1,251	1,146
Chapel Hill ISD	A	Defeated	\$9,300,000	\$8,338,148	\$17,638,148	School Building	334	340
Clear Creek ISD	A	Carried	\$265,000,000	\$175,949,976	\$440,949,976	School Building & Security	11,455	8,896
Clear Creek ISD	B	Carried	\$37,000,000	\$7,356,207	\$44,356,207	Technology	11,120	9,234
Cleveland ISD	A	Defeated	\$125,000,000	\$157,281,622	\$282,281,622	School Building	497	784
College Station ISD	A	Carried	\$284,975,000	\$226,745,967	\$511,720,967	School Building & Security	7,470	3,302
College Station ISD	B	Carried	\$14,145,000	\$10,637,587	\$24,782,587	Technology	6,623	4,110
College Station ISD	C	Defeated	\$38,475,000	\$28,934,892	\$67,409,892	Stadium	5,089	5,630
College Station ISD	D	Defeated	\$13,270,000	\$9,978,838	\$23,248,838	Athletic Facilities Improvements	5,088	5,615
Collinsville ISD	A	Carried	\$16,000,000	\$15,173,417	\$31,173,417	School Building & Security	349	324
Comanche ISD	A	Defeated	\$36,700,000	\$35,096,521	\$71,796,521	School Building & Security	492	668
Como-Pickton ISD	A	Carried	\$29,580,000	\$18,994,120	\$48,574,120	Educational Center	2	1

ISD	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Conroe ISD	A	Carried	\$1,820,000,000	\$1,366,765,521	\$3,186,765,521	School Building & Security	25,835	16,460
Conroe ISD	B	Carried	\$40,000,000	\$29,876,556	\$69,876,556	Technology	24,569	17,542
Conroe ISD	C	Carried	\$112,877,000	\$82,929,038	\$195,806,038	School Building & Athletic Improvements	24,707	17,351
Conroe ISD	D	Defeated	\$22,900,000	\$17,923,398	\$40,823,398	Natatorium	20,662	21,303
Covington ISD	A	Carried	\$9,970,000	\$9,011,246	\$18,981,246	School Building	143	136
Crosby ISD	A	Defeated	\$85,000,000	\$79,457,750	\$164,457,750	School Building	1,072	1,989
Dawson ISD	A	Carried	\$13,300,000	\$11,927,660	\$25,227,660	Stadium	58	45
Decatur ISD	A	Defeated	\$54,910,075	\$22,504,198	\$77,414,273	School Building	637	818
Decatur ISD	B	Defeated	\$5,771,700	\$2,365,458	\$8,137,158	Stadium	382	1,071
Decatur ISD	C	Defeated	\$7,379,000	\$3,024,395	\$10,403,395	Technology	630	817
Devine ISD	A	Carried	\$11,255,000	\$10,870,789	\$22,125,789	School Building & Security	550	460
Duncanville ISD	A	Carried	\$161,177,000	\$198,442,875	\$359,619,875	School Building & Security	1,931	927
Duncanville ISD	B	Carried	\$8,823,000	\$2,953,888	\$11,776,888	Technology	1,844	1,015
Eagle Mt-Saginaw ISD	A	Carried	\$540,900,000	\$637,805,650	\$1,178,705,650	School Building & Security	5,281	4,859
Eagle Mt-Saginaw ISD	B	Carried	\$20,200,000	\$6,599,175	\$26,799,175	Technology	5,181	4,909
Eagle Mt-Saginaw ISD	C	Defeated	\$47,000,000	\$50,011,775	\$97,011,775	Athletic Facilities Improvements	4,035	6,044
Eagle Mt-Saginaw ISD	D	Defeated	\$51,000,000	\$54,267,950	\$105,267,950	Natatorium	4,193	5,865
Ector County ISD	A	Carried	\$424,263,000	\$383,899,825	\$808,162,825	School Building & Buses	5,557	4,222
Ector County ISD	B	Defeated	\$8,096,000	\$3,022,106	\$11,118,106	Stadium	4,670	5,072
Ector County ISD	C	Defeated	\$3,750,000	\$1,403,456	\$5,153,456	Athletic Facilities Improvements	4,465	5,269
Edcouch-Elsa ISD	A	Defeated	\$40,000,000	\$34,750,741	\$74,750,741	School Building & Security	371	417
Edna ISD	A	Defeated	\$19,000,000	\$12,060,125	\$31,060,125	School Building, Athletic Improvements	360	1,147
Gainesville ISD*	A	Defeated	\$68,760,000	\$56,093,852	\$124,853,852	School Building & Security	770	1,114
Gainesville ISD	B	Defeated	\$25,000,000	\$20,394,798	\$45,394,798	Auditorium	648	1,242
Gonzales ISD	A	Carried	\$50,600,000	\$37,610,876	\$88,210,876	School Building & Security	1,203	1,181
Gonzales ISD	B	Defeated	\$44,480,000	\$33,061,892	\$77,541,892	Athletic Facilities Improvements	915	1,475
Goose Creek CISD	A	Defeated	\$342,310,000	\$347,738,519	\$690,048,519	School Building & Security	2,872	3,691
Goose Creek CISD	B	Defeated	\$24,000,000	\$24,380,475	\$48,380,475	Stadium	2,247	4,277
Goose Creek CISD	C	Defeated	\$20,000,000	\$4,516,400	\$24,516,400	Technology	2,384	4,110
Graford ISD**	A	Defeated	\$85,250,000	\$93,524,206	\$186,966,351	School Building	3	3

Note. *Gainesville ISD's Voter Information Document is no longer available online. However, interested parties can submit a Public Information Act request to the district for the desired information.

** Figures may not add properly but have been recorded exactly from the Voter Information Document.

ISD	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Granbury ISD	B	Carried	\$151,725,000	\$161,141,781	\$312,866,781	School Building & Buses	6,187	6,186
Greenville ISD	A	Defeated	\$120,000,000	\$119,319,095	\$239,319,095	School Building, Athletic Improvements	2,432	2,519
Greenville ISD	B	Defeated	\$36,400,000	\$36,193,459	\$72,593,459	School Building	2,347	2,551
Greenville ISD	C	Defeated	\$32,600,000	\$32,415,021	\$65,015,021	School Building Improvements	2,275	2,633
Greenwood ISD	A	Carried	\$198,770,000	\$225,667,200	\$424,437,200	School Building	1,383	539
Greenwood ISD	B	Carried	\$87,000,000	\$98,791,825	\$185,791,825	Multi-Purpose Center	1,185	734
Huffman ISD	A	Carried	\$91,835,000	\$77,301,770	\$169,136,770	School Building, Buses & Technology	1,604	1,386
Hurst-Eules-Bedford ISD	A	Carried	\$979,300,000	\$891,019,158	\$1,870,319,158	School Building & Security	9,014	6,717
Hurst-Eules-Bedford ISD	B	Carried	\$18,000,000	\$16,371,850	\$34,371,850	Technology	9,153	6,510
Ingleside ISD	A	Defeated	\$19,000,000	\$18,136,553	\$37,136,553	School Building & Security	329	448
Jim Ned CISD	A	Carried	\$23,480,274	\$19,529,101	\$43,009,375	School Building	722	702
Jim Ned CISD	B	Defeated	\$4,862,217	\$3,345,383	\$8,207,600	Auditorium	648	771
Joshua ISD	A	Defeated	\$107,140,000	\$77,383,350	\$184,523,350	School Building & Security	1,654	1,977
Karnack ISD	A	Carried	\$575,000	\$67,088	\$642,088	Buses	195	129
Karnes City ISD	A	Carried	\$15,000,000	\$4,407,888	\$19,407,888	School Building	364	68
Katy ISD	A	Carried	\$722,992,054	\$451,120,969	\$1,174,113,023	School Building & Buses	18,925	13,261
Katy ISD	B	Carried	\$83,567,360	\$52,143,019	\$135,710,379	Technology	18,210	13,881
Katy ISD	C	Defeated	\$4,195,456	\$2,617,813	\$6,813,269	Natatorium	14,802	17,142
Katy ISD	D	Defeated	\$29,875,472	\$18,641,217	\$48,516,689	Athletic Facilities Improvements	14,132	17,840
Lake Travis ISD	A	Carried	\$143,093,994	\$143,114,713	\$286,208,707	Athletic Facilities Improvements	7,344	5,215
Lamar CISD	A	Defeated	\$15,000,000	\$8,400,340	\$23,400,340	Stadium	8,775	10,660
Lewisville ISD	B	Carried	\$960,577,000	\$548,131,343	\$1,508,708,343	School Building & Buses	20,123	12,399
Lewisville ISD	C	Carried	\$69,600,000	\$11,378,250	\$80,978,250	Technology	17,535	14,966
Lewisville ISD	D	Defeated	\$31,376,000	\$17,903,700	\$49,279,700	Recreation	13,860	18,571
Lewisville ISD	E	Defeated	\$16,250,000	\$9,272,745	\$25,522,745	Natatorium	14,380	17,976
Lewisville ISD	F	Defeated	\$19,999,000	\$11,411,303	\$31,410,303	Stadium	14,380	18,065
Lewisville ISD	G	Defeated	\$131,818,000	\$75,219,480	\$207,037,480	Multi-Purpose Center	14,059	18,252
Lexington ISD	A	Defeated	\$47,700,000	\$43,180,313	\$90,880,313	School Building	202	489
Lexington ISD	B	Defeated	\$3,300,000	\$892,313	\$4,192,313	Stadium	179	509
Longview ISD	A	Defeated	\$291,894,000	\$231,541,934	\$523,435,934	School Building	2,696	2,904
Longview ISD	B	Defeated	\$67,821,000	\$53,798,316	\$121,619,316	Multi-Purpose Center	2,588	3,006
Mart ISD	A	Carried	\$33,000,000	\$32,149,760	\$65,149,760	School Building	252	132
Mart ISD	B	Carried	\$5,000,000	\$4,884,448	\$9,884,448	Stadium	225	157

ISD	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Mart ISD	C	Carried	\$12,000,000	\$11,690,899	\$23,690,899	Multi-Purpose Center	202	181
Merkel ISD	A	Defeated	\$24,700,000	\$20,046,393	\$44,746,393	School Building	320	422
Merkel ISD	B	Defeated	\$2,300,000	\$1,719,974	\$4,019,974	Stadium	311	431
Midland ISD	A	Carried	\$1,415,400,000	\$1,506,237,456	\$2,921,637,456	School Building & Security	12,404	9,669
Moody ISD	A	Carried	\$12,000,000	\$9,932,760	\$21,932,760	School Building	233	163
Nocona ISD	A	Carried	\$19,000,000	\$17,977,300	\$36,977,300	School Building, Athletic Improvements	463	395
Orangefield ISD	A	Carried	\$42,905,000	\$39,540,513	\$82,445,513	School Building	602	266
Panhandle ISD	A	Carried	\$13,144,108	\$5,835,642	\$18,979,750	School Building & Buses	315	130
Panhandle ISD	B	Defeated	\$5,624,305	\$711,873	\$6,336,178	Athletic Facilities Improvements	399	408
Panhandle ISD	C	Carried	\$500,000	\$61,696	\$561,696	Technology	330	123
Patton Springs ISD	A	Defeated	\$8,200,000	\$6,052,656	\$14,252,656	School Building & Buses	72	109
Patton Springs ISD	B	Defeated	\$800,000	\$722,111	\$1,522,111	Housing Facility	76	104
Pine Tree ISD	A	Carried	\$55,000,000	\$37,867,500	\$92,867,500	School Building, Athletic Improvements	1,483	1,031
Poolville ISD	A	Defeated	\$45,000,000	\$43,156,250	\$88,156,250	School Building	282	285
Prosper ISD	A	Carried	\$2,439,575,000	\$2,053,503,199	\$4,493,078,199	School Building & Buses	6,786	3,550
Prosper ISD	B	Carried	\$140,000,000	\$10,628,820	\$150,628,820	Technology	6,676	3,634
Prosper ISD	C	Defeated	\$102,425,000	\$86,215,863	\$188,640,863	Stadium	4,767	5,533
Prosper ISD	D	Carried	\$125,000,000	\$105,218,286	\$230,218,286	Performing Arts	5,860	4,443
Salado ISD	A	Carried	\$235,960,000	\$198,805,020	\$434,765,020	School Building	1,880	1,084
Salado ISD	B	Carried	\$34,490,000	\$29,059,100	\$63,549,100	Stadium	1,511	1,462
San Perlita ISD	A	Carried	\$10,000,000	\$4,750,408	\$14,750,408	School Building & Buses	121	37
Santa Fe ISD	A	Defeated	\$93,000,000	\$71,759,763	\$164,759,763	School Building & Security	2,083	2,231
Santo ISD	A	Carried	\$27,000,000	\$10,127,000	\$37,127,000	School Building	484	397
Schulenburg ISD	A	Carried	\$12,290,000	\$9,490,950	\$21,780,950	Performing Arts	358	274
Schulenburg ISD	B	Carried	\$7,305,000	\$5,716,350	\$13,021,350	Athletic Facilities Improvements	376	263
Silsbee ISD	A	Defeated	\$84,500,000	\$85,463,894	\$169,963,894	School Building & Security	723	1,238
Springtown ISD	A	Defeated	\$120,780,000	\$122,086,213	\$242,866,213	School Building	1,514	1,980
Terrell County ISD	A	Carried	\$5,400,000	\$2,294,279	\$7,694,279	School Building	118	84
Terrell County ISD	B	Carried	\$590,000	\$250,671	\$840,671	Technology	121	82
Three Rivers ISD	A	Carried	\$8,645,000	\$6,875,655	\$15,520,655	School Building	250	115
Three Rivers ISD	B	Defeated	\$8,760,000	\$6,604,496	\$15,364,496	Athletic Facilities Improvements	176	189
Three Rivers ISD	C	Carried	\$600,000	\$101,440	\$701,440	Technology	247	122

ISD	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Tuloso-Midway ISD	A	Carried	\$151,825,000	\$149,594,500	\$301,419,500	School Building & Buses	690	562
Tuloso-Midway ISD	B	Carried	\$7,800,000	\$7,425,250	\$15,225,250	Natatorium	651	591
Tuloso-Midway ISD	C	Carried	\$5,000,000	\$4,761,250	\$9,761,250	Athletic Facilities Improvements	625	617
Utopia ISD	A	Defeated	\$58,000,000	\$53,515,561	\$111,515,561	School Building	126	539
Waelder ISD	A	Defeated	\$5,826,000	\$4,635,540	\$10,461,540	School Building	135	220
Waelder ISD	B	Defeated	\$1,100,000	\$875,231	\$1,975,231	Athletic Facilities Improvements	129	224
Weslaco ISD	A	Carried	\$140,000,000	\$120,612,136	\$260,612,136	School Building & Security	3,363	2,429
Weslaco ISD	B	Carried	\$10,000,000	\$8,613,386	\$18,613,386	School Building Improvements	3,044	2,642
Weslaco ISD	C	Carried	\$10,000,000	\$8,613,386	\$18,613,386	Athletic Facilities Improvements	2,846	2,821
Wylie ISD (Wylie, TX)	A	Carried	\$298,145,000	\$258,827,420	\$556,972,420	School Building & Technology	3,973	3,266
Wylie ISD (Abilene, TX)	A	Carried	\$234,000,000	\$259,664,775	\$493,664,775	School Building, Buses & Technology	2,842	2,062
Wylie ISD	B	Defeated	\$29,000,000	\$36,655,400	\$65,655,400	Community Center	2,145	2,737
Wylie ISD	C	Carried	\$6,000,000	\$980,663	\$6,980,663	Communication System	2,686	2,190
TOTAL***	-	Pass: 75; Fail: 63	\$18,105,559,158	\$15,626,733,636	\$33,740,484,939	-	-	-

Note. *** Figures may not add exactly due to discrepancies in the data.

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 relatively modest, at 34; however, those nearly three-dozen entities asked voters to approve 108 propositions worth more than \$23 billion. That is the second highest amount sought, behind only school districts (\$33.7 billion). Of the 108 propositions put forward, 97 were approved while just 11 were defeated.

SPD bond elections are unique in some respect, in that the number of voters tends to be quite small. In fact, in certain municipal utility district (MUD) contests, the final vote count was 1–0. This outcome is possible due to the unique way that MUDs originate and operate.³

As it relates to all SPDs, much of the information compiled is incomplete in some respect as the law that established VIDs, HB 477 ([2019, pp. 5–7](#)), excluded smaller jurisdictions, that is, those with fewer than 250 registered voters, from having to create and disseminate the disclosure document. As such, the total cost of many of the bonds is not publicly available.

Even still, there is enough information available to provide a few observations. The largest bond proposition to be offered up for a vote was Harris County Hospital District’s \$4.8 billion proposal for new facilities. This one item represented more than 20% of all SPD debt considered. It was approved handily, with a final vote count of 307,309–117,644. Harris County’s hospital bond was the only SPD item to cost more than \$1 billion.

Of the several bonds defeated, all of which were MUD initiatives, 9 were unsuccessful due to a 1–1 vote count. The other two bond elections, both of which

were held by Remington MUD 1, failed by 23 votes and 151 votes.

The total cost of the defeated measures was \$2 billion. The measures authorized provide for \$21 billion in new debt.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the relatively high inflationary environment and punitive property tax environment, Texas’ local governments continue to ask voters to approve vast amounts of new debt, as evidenced by the more than 300 bond propositions considered in November 2023. This seemingly insatiable appetite for new debt threatens to exacerbate existing issues. Consider this: Had voters fully approved the \$64.7 billion in proposed debt this election cycle, that added borrowing capacity would have greatly exacerbated Texas’ existing debt load which was estimated at “\$461.3 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2023, up from \$417 billion in the prior year” ([Quintero, 2023, para. 1](#)).

Given the local debt landscape, it is prudent for future state lawmakers to consider making good government changes to improve transparency and accountability within the bond issuance process. Such changes might include:

Giving Voters Greater Say: Sometimes big borrowing decisions are made by a relative few voters. That is not the ideal way for a community to go into debt. To improve the system, all bond elections should be held in November in order to solicit the greatest amount of input from the largest number of voters as well as to prevent interest groups from dominating low-turnout bond votes. In addition, governments should tell voters what the cost of any initiative is by including the amount of estimated property tax increase for the average homeowner in the area, assuming passage of the bond. Finally, the Texas Legislature should consider reining in the use of certificates of obligation

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 4

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

Special Purpose District	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Blue Meadow MUD 2	B	Carried	\$317,325,000	-	\$317,325,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 2	C	Carried	\$191,450,000	-	\$191,450,000	Road	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 2	D	Carried	\$475,987,500	-	\$475,987,500	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 2	E	Carried	\$287,175,000	-	\$287,175,000	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 3	B	Carried	\$194,070,000	-	\$194,070,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 3	C	Carried	\$121,730,000	-	\$121,730,000	Road	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 3	D	Carried	\$291,105,000	-	\$291,105,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	1	0
Blue Meadow MUD 3	E	Carried	\$182,595,000	-	\$182,595,000	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Chambers Grove MUD 1	B	Carried	\$181,090,000	-	\$181,090,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0
Chambers Grove MUD 1	C	Carried	\$161,195,000	-	\$161,195,000	Road	1	0
Chambers Grove MUD 1	D	Carried	\$271,635,000	-	\$271,635,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	1	0
Chambers Grove MUD 1	E	Carried	\$241,792,500	-	\$241,792,500	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Collin County MUD 10	B	Carried	\$81,698,500	-	\$81,698,500	Utility	1	0
Collin County MUD 10	C	Carried	\$102,123,125	-	\$102,123,125	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	1	0
Collin County MUD 10	D	Carried	\$35,866,100	-	\$35,866,100	Road	1	0
Collin County MUD 10	E	Carried	\$44,832,625	-	\$44,832,625	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Crosby MUD	A	Carried	\$20,000,000	-	\$20,000,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	103	94
Cypress Creek UD	A	Carried	\$12,090,000	\$10,104,150	\$22,194,150	Water, Sewer & Drainage	248	109
Harris County Hospital District	A	Carried	\$2,500,000,000	\$2,273,067,849	\$4,773,067,849	Hospital	307,309	117,644
Harris County MUD 024	A	Carried	\$41,000,000	\$31,729,952	\$72,729,952	Water, Sewer & Drainage	673	300
Harris County MUD 049	A	Carried	\$88,800,000	\$81,087,975	\$169,887,975	Water, Sewer & Drainage	434	133
Harris County MUD 517	B	Carried	\$155,600,000	-	\$155,600,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0
Harris County MUD 517	C	Carried	\$155,600,000	-	\$155,600,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	2	0
Harris County MUD 517	D	Carried	\$106,000,000	-	\$106,000,000	Road	2	0
Harris County MUD 517	E	Carried	\$106,000,000	-	\$106,000,000	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0
Harris County MUD 517	F	Carried	\$65,000,000	-	\$65,000,000	Parks & Recreation	2	0
Harris County MUD 517	G	Carried	\$65,000,000	-	\$65,000,000	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0
Harris County MUD 570C	B	Carried	\$230,200,000	-	\$230,200,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	2	0
Harris County MUD 570C	C	Carried	\$107,400,000	-	\$107,400,000	Parks & Recreation	2	0
Harris County MUD 570C	D	Carried	\$87,400,000	-	\$87,400,000	Road	2	0
Harris County MUD 570C	E	Carried	\$115,100,000	-	\$115,100,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	2	0

Special Purpose District	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Harris County MUD 570C	F	Carried	\$53,700,000	-	\$53,700,000	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0
Harris County MUD 570C	G	Carried	\$43,700,000	-	\$43,700,000	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0
Harris County MUD 582	B	Carried	\$96,000,000	-	\$96,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	1	0
Harris County MUD 582	C	Carried	\$79,500,000	-	\$79,500,000	Road	1	0
Harris County MUD 582	D	Carried	\$64,500,000	-	\$64,500,000	Parks & Recreation	1	0
Harris County MUD 582	E	Carried	\$144,000,000	-	\$144,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	1	0
Harris County MUD 582	F	Carried	\$119,250,000	-	\$119,250,000	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Harris County MUD 582	G	Carried	\$96,750,000	-	\$96,750,000	Parks & Recreation Refunding	1	0
Harris County MUD 588	D	Carried	\$69,200,000	-	\$69,200,000	Road	2	0
Harris County MUD 588	E	Carried	\$241,500,000	-	\$241,500,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	2	0
Harris County MUD 588	F	Carried	\$20,400,000	-	\$20,400,000	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0
Harris County MUD 588	G	Carried	\$69,200,000	-	\$69,200,000	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0
Harris County MUD 588	B	Carried	\$241,500,000	-	\$241,500,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	2	0
Harris County MUD 588	C	Carried	\$20,400,000	-	\$20,400,000	Parks & Recreation	2	0
Harris County UD 15	A	Carried	\$36,000,000	\$24,695,125	\$60,695,125	Water, Sewer & Drainage	250	50
Harris County UD 15	B	Carried	\$10,000,000	\$6,859,757	\$16,859,757	Parks & Recreation	225	69
Meadow Lake WCID 1	A	Carried	\$15,840,000	-	\$15,840,000	Drainage	3	0
Meadow Lake WCID 1	B	Carried	\$15,840,000	-	\$15,840,000	Refunding	3	0
Mission Bend MUD 2	A	Carried	\$44,000,000	\$43,774,000	\$87,774,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	165	38
Mission Bend MUD 2	B	Carried	\$18,900,000	\$17,806,250	\$36,706,250	Parks and Recreation and Refunding	140	60
Montgomery County FWSD 6	A	Carried	\$10,000,000	-	\$10,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	66	26
Montgomery County MUD 136	B	Carried	\$360,360,000	-	\$360,360,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 136	C	Carried	\$78,960,000	-	\$78,960,000	Recreation & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 136	D	Carried	\$157,080,000	-	\$157,080,000	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 159	B	Carried	\$207,960,000	-	\$207,960,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 159	C	Carried	\$39,240,000	-	\$39,240,000	Recreation & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 159	D	Carried	\$86,640,000	-	\$86,640,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0
Montgomery County MUD 193	B	Carried	\$357,600,000	-	\$357,600,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	1	0
Montgomery County MUD 193	C	Carried	\$19,575,000	-	\$19,575,000	Recreation & Refunding	1	0
Montgomery County MUD 193	D	Carried	\$149,400,000	-	\$149,400,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0
Montgomery County MUD 202A	A	Defeated	\$346,200,000	-	\$346,200,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	1	1
Montgomery County MUD 202A	B	Defeated	\$180,500,000	-	\$180,500,000	Road	1	1

Special Purpose District	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Montgomery County MUD 202A	C	Defeated	\$31,200,000	-	\$31,200,000	Parks & Recreation	1	1
Montgomery County MUD 202A	D	Defeated	\$557,900,000	-	\$557,900,000	Refunding	1	1
Montgomery County MUD 224	B	Carried	\$351,000,000	-	\$351,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	1	0
Montgomery County MUD 224	C	Carried	\$149,250,000	-	\$149,250,000	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0
Montgomery County MUD 224	D	Carried	\$62,500,000	-	\$62,500,000	Recreation & Refunding	1	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146C	B	Carried	\$296,000,000	-	\$296,000,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146C	C	Carried	\$32,700,000	-	\$32,700,000	Recreation	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146C	D	Carried	\$14,000,000	-	\$14,000,000	Road	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146C	E	Carried	\$296,000,000	-	\$296,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146C	F	Carried	\$32,700,000	-	\$32,700,000	Recreation & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146C	G	Carried	\$14,000,000	-	\$14,000,000	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146D	B	Carried	\$446,400,000	-	\$446,400,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146D	C	Carried	\$191,800,000	-	\$191,800,000	Recreation	1	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146D	D	Carried	\$427,100,000	-	\$427,100,000	Road	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146D	E	Carried	\$446,400,000	-	\$446,400,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146D	F	Carried	\$191,800,000	-	\$191,800,000	Recreation & Refunding	2	0
Montgomery-Grimes County MUD 146D	G	Carried	\$427,100,000	-	\$427,100,000	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0
Morningstar Ranch MUD 2	A	Carried	\$538,000,000	-	\$538,000,000	Water, Sewer, & Drainage	1	0
Morningstar Ranch MUD 2	B	Carried	\$382,500,000	-	\$382,500,000	Road	1	0
Morningstar Ranch MUD 2	C	Carried	\$807,000,000	-	\$807,000,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	1	0
Morningstar Ranch MUD 2	D	Carried	\$573,750,000	-	\$573,750,000	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Northwest Williamson County MUD 1	A	Carried	\$135,000,000	-	\$135,000,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0
Northwest Williamson County MUD 1	B	Carried	\$21,500,000	-	\$21,500,000	Parks & Recreation	1	0
Northwest Williamson County MUD 1	C	Carried	\$39,200,000	-	\$39,200,000	Road	1	0
Northwest Williamson County MUD 1	D	Carried	\$234,750,000	-	\$234,750,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage and Refunding	1	0
Northwest Williamson County MUD 1	E	Carried	\$58,800,000	-	\$58,800,000	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
Olney-Hamilton Hospital District	A	Carried	\$33,000,000	\$26,118,811	\$59,118,811	Hospital	462	238
Porter MUD	A	Carried	\$85,500,000	\$93,864,676	\$179,364,676	Water, Sewer & Drainage	347	194
Remington MUD 1	A	Carried	\$75,000,000	\$148,384,225	\$223,384,225	Water, Sewer & Drainage	828	690
Remington MUD 1	B	Defeated	\$27,000,000	\$45,530,100	\$72,530,100	Parks & Recreation	670	821
Remington MUD 1	C	Carried	\$75,000,000	\$67,447,375	\$142,447,375	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	790	675
Remington MUD 1	D	Defeated	\$27,000,000	\$20,695,500	\$47,695,500	Parks & Recreation Refunding	715	738

Special Purpose District	Prop. No.	Result	Principal	Interest	Total Repayment	Purpose/Description	Votes For	Votes Against
Ricewood MUD	A	Carried	\$26,000,000	\$21,500,147	\$47,500,147	Water, Sewer & Drainage	201	179
Serenade MUD	B	Carried	\$356,767,143	-	\$356,767,143	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0
Serenade MUD	C	Carried	\$249,487,840	-	\$249,487,840	Road	1	0
Serenade MUD	D	Carried	\$535,150,714	-	\$535,150,714	Water, Sewer, Drainage, & Refunding	1	0
Serenade MUD	E	Carried	\$374,231,760	-	\$374,231,760	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0
West Harris County MUD 01	A	Carried	\$42,650,000	-	\$42,650,000	Water, Sewer, Drainage and Refunding	40	17
Windfern Forest UD	A	Carried	\$40,480,000	\$30,166,423	\$70,646,423	Water, Sewer & Drainage	445	140
Windfern Forest UD	B	Carried	\$40,480,000	\$30,166,423	\$70,646,423	Water, Sewer, Drainage & Refunding	423	143
Woodside MUD 1	C	Defeated	\$199,795,000	-	\$199,795,000	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	1
Woodside MUD 1	D	Defeated	\$100,995,000	-	\$100,995,000	Road	1	1
Woodside MUD 1	E	Defeated	\$11,860,000	-	\$11,860,000	Parks & Recreation	1	1
Woodside MUD 1	F	Defeated	\$317,482,000	-	\$317,482,000	Refunding	1	1
Woodside MUD 1	G	Defeated	\$151,492,000	-	\$151,492,000	Road & Refunding Roads	1	1
TOTAL	-	Pass: 97; Fail: 11	\$20,058,276,807	\$2,972,998,738	\$23,031,275,545	-	-	-

(COs), which are nonvoter-approved debt instruments. Too often, cities and counties authorize the issuance of COs so as to skirt a contentious election or avoid the hassle. Those are poor reasons not to ask voters for permission to go into debt. Legislators should consider limiting what CO proceeds may be spent on and make it easier for the public to challenge controversial issuances by easing the petition requirements.

Curbing Government Excess: There are many ways that local governments game the system so as to borrow more than is reasonable. For instance, sometimes a governmental entity will receive voter permission to go into debt for a particular project or set of projects; however, it may

not necessarily use the entirety of its authorized proceeds to complete a project. Those untapped proceeds become known as authorized-but-unissued funds, which may at some later date be allocated to a project or set of projects that fit within the scope of the earlier approved proposition language. It is something akin to a slush fund. Governments should not be able to use voter-approved monies for projects that were not contemplated when funding was authorized. Unused bond monies should go unspent and be returned to the public. In addition, policymakers would do well to revisit existing life-of-the-asset provisions in state law and tighten those requirements so that long-term debts are being committed only for long-term assets and gains. ■

REFERENCES

- 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. (2021, April). <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba86r/hb0477.pdf#navpanes=0>
- Quintero, J. (2023). *Texas local debt skyrockets to \$461.3 billion*. Texas Public Policy Foundation. <https://www.texaspolicy.com/texas-local-debt-skyrockets-to-461-3-billion/>
- Texas Bond Review Board. (n.d.-a). *Bond Review Board database search: Texas local government bond elections*. https://debtsearch.brb.texas.gov/bond_elections_search.aspx
- Texas Bond Review Board. (n.d.-b). *Bond Review Board database search: Texas local governments*. 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, August). *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, October). *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.

