TAXPAYER PROTECTION PROJECT

MAY 2026 BOND ELECTION REPORT

WRITTEN BY
John Bonura and Sukhadeva Mitta
November 2026




TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction | Page 3
May 2026 Bond Election | Page 3
City Bond Elections | Page 5
ISD Bond Elections | Page 6
SPD Bond Elections | Page 9
Recommendations | Page 15
Challenges | Page 16
Conclusion | Page 17
References | Page 18

MAY 2026 BOND ELECTION REPORT

WRITTEN BY **John Bonura and Sukhadeva Mitta**

KEY POINTS

- **In May 2026,** Texas voters considered 439 bonds. Of those, 276 were approved.
- **The passage rate** for bond propositions for the May 2026 cycle was 63%.
- **Total repayment** for every bond measure passed was $96.7 billion.
- **Denton County Municipal Utility District 7** approved Proposition C with only 1 person voting, approving $5.9 billion in total repayment.
- **The City of Saginaw** approved Proposition B, 767 to 766, a margin of 1 vote, authorizing $9.6 million.

INTRODUCTION

With principal and interest, the debt in Texas's counties, cities, school districts, and special purpose districts now totals $552 billion (Quintero & Solin, 2025). This saddles every man, woman, and child in the state with $18,939 in debt.[1] This debt is driven entirely by unrestrained local government spending. In a time when affordability of everything from groceries to housing is a kitchen table conversation in the homes of Texan families, it is necessary to examine how to relieve cost burdens.

Governments have a variety of tools to issue debt, which can be broken down into tax-supported debt, general obligation (GO) debt, or revenue-supported debt. GO debt is secured by a promise that the borrowing government entity will repay it with money collected through taxation. Those are the ways debt is secured, but debt can also be approved in different ways (Tex. Tax Code § 26.012). The statute that primarily covers bond elections is Chapter 1251 of the Texas Government Code (Texas Government Code Chapter 1251). This research will examine how reforming portions of Texas Government Code Chapter 1251 to spur voter turnout and increase the scrutiny required to pass a bond could reduce the debt local governments incur.

MAY 2026 BOND ELECTION

The following report lists every bond passed in the May 2026 election cycle, organized by taxing entity. It synthesizes information from the BRB's searchable bond election database. The BRB catalogs every bond proposed in a given cycle along with basic data on votes cast, principal amounts, estimated interest, and stated purposes taken from the various Voter Information Documents (VIDs) and financial disclosures provided by individual political subdivisions. These documents contain ballot language, existing debt profiles, projected tax

1 Based on U.S. Census Bureau demographic estimates from July 1, 2025, and author calculations.

impacts, and other legal information. The passage and implementation of House Bill (HB) 3526 mandated the creation of a database that provides consolidated information on bond elections, from which this research drew its data (HB 3526, 2025; Bond Review Board, n.d.).

Below is a high-level analysis of bond elections across cities, school districts, and special purpose districts in May of 2026. Each election is analyzed by issuer, bond purpose, total votes cast, votes for and against each proposition, approval status, total estimated repayment, and, if it passed, the percentage of voters who approved the bond.

Bonds that were "carried," or passed, by voters are highlighted in green, and those carried by a threshold of 60% or greater are highlighted in red. Bonds for refunds, bonds that were canceled, or bonds pending at the time of research were included in the full count of bond elections but removed as the level of analysis increased. Refunding bonds were removed because they are not subject to the same election requirements as other bonds (Texas Government Code § 1251.006 (1), 1999). Canceled or pending elections were removed so that only elections that took place and had observable results were included in conclusions regarding total estimated repayment.

Results At a Glance

In this election cycle alone, 439 bond measures were proposed, worth nearly $133 billion in total repayment. Of those, 276 passed (a 63% passage rate), for a total repayment of $96.7 billion. **Table 1**, below, shows the aggregated bond election information for Cities, School Districts, and Special Purpose Districts. Two fields were added to examine the impact of a 60% voter approval threshold. 233 bonds were passed at the 60% approval threshold, 43 fewer than those approved with a simple majority, resulting in a reduction of $6.4 billion in total repayment.

Table 1

May 2026 Bond Election at a Glance

	City	School District	Special Purpose District	Total
Number of Propositions	26	124	289	**439**
Total Proposed Repayment	$2,978,216,520	$24,572,769,405	$106,240,635,966	**$133,791,621,891**
Number of Propositions Approved	22	95	159	**276**
Total Approved Repayment	$2,787,729,876	$22,154,991,826	$71,806,517,561	**$96,749,239,263**
Number of Propositions Approved at 60% Threshold	13	62	158	**233**
Amount Approved at 60% Threshold	$1,483,973,267	$17,115,293,883	$71,699,159,464	**$90,298,426,614**
Total Repayment Below 60% Threshold	$1,303,756,609	$5,039,697,943	$107,358,097	**$6,450,812,649**

Note. Data from *Local Bond Elections,* by Bond Review Board, n.d. (https://brb.texas.gov/searchable-db.html#/datasets/local_elections) and author's calculations.

CITY BOND ELECTIONS

In this cycle, as described in **Table 2,** 26 city bonds were proposed and considered by voters; Payne Springs, while displayed, was not included in calculations because it was a refunding bond. Of the 25 bonds in the calculation, 22 passed, giving cities an 88% passage rate. However, some of these bonds passed by relatively small margins. For example, 9 of the 25 city bonds passed with less than 60% approval. The bonds that passed will require as much as $2.78 billion to fully repay, $1.3 billion of which passed with less than 60% of the vote.

The defeated bonds included Carrollton's Proposition D, La Grange Proposition A, and McCamey Proposition A. Proposition D sought $7.85 million for improvements to municipal court facilities, the smallest of five bond measures Carrollton placed on the May 2 ballot, which would have resulted in a total repayment of $12.6 million. La Grange Proposition A was defeated with a proposed amount of $90 million, which would have resulted in a total repayment of $159.6 million. McCamey Proposition A was also defeated with a proposed amount of $8 million, which would have resulted in a total repayment of $15.6 million.

The largest city bond passed was Fort Worth's Proposition A, which asked for approval of $511 million and would have resulted in a total repayment of $821 million for street improvements. The City of Fort Worth simultaneously holds the title of the biggest spender in 2026, authorizing just over a billion dollars in total cost, nearly a third of all city bond spending statewide. It was the largest bond program in the city's history, surpassing even the nearly $847 million total repayment package Fort Worth voters approved in 2022 (City of Fort Worth, 2022).

Table 2

City Bond Elections May 2026

Issuer	Prop. Number	Result	Purpose Description	Votes For	Votes Against	Total Votes	Est. Total Debt Service	Approval Threshold
Addison	A	Carried	Police	1,166	923	2089	$87,516,111	56
Carrollton	A	Carried	Street Improvements	4,821	2,145	6966	$264,001,000	69
Carrollton	B	Carried	Public Safety	3,905	3,022	6927	$51,907,500	56
Carrollton	D	Defeated	Court Facilities	3,249	3,641	6,890	$12,601,500	47
Carrollton	E	Carried	Library	4,252	2,662	6914	$6,055,500	61
Carrollton	C	Carried	Parks & Recreation	4,187	2,742	6929	$42,575,000	60
Fort Worth	C	Carried	Library	14,516	8,659	23175	$23,418,552	63
Fort Worth	B	Carried	Recreational Facilities	14,107	9,060	23167	$297,251,527	61
Fort Worth	D	Carried	Housing Facility	13,321	9,835	23156	$16,055,500	58
Fort Worth	A	Carried	Street	13,834	9,340	23174	$821,207,838	60
Fort Worth	E	Carried	Fire Station	14,939	8,170	23109	$102,625,632	65
Fort Worth	F	Carried	Animal Shelter	13,667	9,458	23125	$96,130,701	59
Grand Prairie	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	3,560	3,462	7022	$65,195,191	51
Grand Prairie	A	Carried	Streets	4,177	2,775	6952	$350,215,193	60
Grand Prairie	B	Carried	Public Safety	3,713	3,280	6993	$131,226,218	53
La Grange	A	Defeated	School Building & Buses	333	1,983	2,316	$159,637,500	14
McCamey	A	Defeated	Streets	112	142	254	$15,612,344	44
Payne Springs	A	Carried	Refund	29	6	35	$2,635,300	83
Richardson	E	Carried	Flood Control	3,242	1,172	4414	$25,252,275	73
Richardson	B	Carried	Fire Department	3,184	1,248	4432	$51,808,538	72
Richardson	C	Carried	Parks & Recreation	2,960	1,459	4419	$33,975,225	67
Richardson	D	Carried	Sidewalks	3,076	1,351	4427	$25,252,275	69
Richardson	A	Carried	Streets	3,214	1,214	4428	$202,267,375	73
Saginaw	B	Carried	Parks	767	766	1533	$9,623,625	50
Saginaw	A	Carried	Streets	955	582	1537	$59,275,175	62
Saginaw	C	Carried	Animal Shelter	883	646	1529	$24,893,925	58

Note. Data from *Local Bond Elections,* by Bond Review Board, n.d. (https://brb.texas.gov/searchable-db.html#/datasets/local_elections) and author's calculations.

ISD BOND ELECTIONS

In the May 2026 bond election cycle, the number of Independent School District (ISD) elections dwarfed city bond elections by just over a magnitude of 5. Before filtering out refunding bonds, 124 propositions were on the ballot compared to 26 city bonds. The total repayment amount proposed surpassed $24.7 billion. After removing refunding bonds, 122 bond propositions remained, with a proposed total repayment of $24.2 billion. 95 bonds passed, with a total repayment of $22.1 billion. However, if a 60% threshold were required to pass bonds, 62 bonds would have passed with a total repayment of $17.1 billion, eliminating $5 billion in total debt repayment and removing only one-third of the total bonds approved.

The largest single proposition was Dallas ISD's Prop A, which carries a total repayment burden of more than $12 billion, which is 55% of all ISD bond propositions that passed in this election cycle. It was part of a larger $12.5 billion bond package, the most expensive in Texas history, topping Dallas ISD's previous package approved just six years before (Dallas Independent School District, n.d.). Voters approved all three[2] propositions by wide margins, with Proposition A receiving 74.3% support (Dallas County Elections Department, 2026).

The largest defeated ISD proposition was Pilot Point ISD's $295 million bond, which failed decisively. Of the 1,384 votes cast, 845 were against, and only 539 were in favor, a margin of roughly 61% to 39%. The measure would have funded Phase 1 of a new high school, a new elementary school, and renovations to existing campuses (Garcia, 2026).

Table 3

ISD Bond Elections May 2026

Issuer	Prop. Number	Result	Purpose Description	Votes For	Votes Against	Total Votes	Est. Total Debt Service	Approval Threshold
Alba-Golden ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	296	544	840	$35,634,225	35
Albany ISD	A	Carried	School Building	358	143	501	$50,188,750	72
Arlington ISD	B	Carried	Technology	13,899	9,505	23404	$40,088,141	59
Arlington ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	13,860	9,630	23490	$743,762,802	59
Arlington ISD	C	Defeated	Athletic Facilities	11,267	12,091	23358	$53,507,932	48
Baird ISD	A	Defeated	Housing Facility	114	201	315	$4,386,067	36
Barbers Hill ISD	A	Carried	Athletic Facilities	1,112	583	1695	$168,083,213	66
Bartlett ISD	A	Defeated	School Building & Buses	105	167	272	$24,449,306	39
Bartlett ISD	B	Defeated	Maintenance	104	170	274	$5,307,450	38
Bartlett ISD	C	Defeated	Refund	105	170	275	$1,607,281	38
Birdville ISD	A	Carried	School Building	4,366	3,583	7949	$948,031,558	55
Birdville ISD	B	Carried	Technology	4,335	3,608	7943	$30,945,750	55
Burkburnett ISD	B	Carried	Recreational Facilities	627	476	1103	$14,010,500	57
Burkburnett ISD	A	Carried	School Building	672	434	1106	$37,537,500	61
Burnet CISD	B	Carried	Technology	958	818	1776	$3,136,000	54
Burnet CISD	A	Carried	School Building	915	869	1784	$219,743,750	51
Chireno ISD	A	Carried	School Building	82	74	156	$21,255,505	53
City View ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	49	51	100	$38,550,600	49
Coldspring-Oakhurst CISD	A	Defeated	School Building & Buses	528	854	1382	$77,443,838	38
Comfort ISD	B	Carried	Stadium	360	200	560	$11,595,000	64
Comfort ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	390	200	590	$76,098,000	66

2 Dallas ISD had 4 propositions; however, Proposition C was removed as a refunding bond for consistency throughout the study.

Crane ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	335	122	457	$137,721,413	73
Crane ISD	B	Carried	Athletic Facilities	282	169	451	$26,034,288	63
Daingerfield-Lone Star ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	580	292	872	$85,005,925	67
Dallas ISD	C	Carried	Maintenance	27,566	10,654	38220	$285,253,933	72
Dallas ISD	D	Carried	Swimming Pool	27,216	11,095	38311	$52,236,208	71
Dallas ISD	B	Carried	Technology	28,684	9,661	38345	$287,954,056	75
Dallas ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	28,544	9,869	38413	$12,199,108,651	74
Decatur ISD	B	Carried	Technology	1,379	591	1970	$4,718,075	70
Decatur ISD	A	Carried	School Building	1,454	520	1974	$236,062,385	74
Eagle Pass ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	1,508	1,487	2995	$312,090,775	50
Elkhart ISD	A	Carried	School Building	310	277	587	$57,246,750	53
Evant ISD	A	Carried	School Building	130	127	257	$11,297,467	51
Forsan ISD	A	Carried	School Building	150	67	217	$87,835,433	69
Franklin ISD	B	Carried	Athletic Facilities	628	373	1001	$5,189,300	63
Franklin ISD	C	Carried	Technology	703	322	1025	$1,437,000	69
Franklin ISD	A	Carried	School Building	695	330	1025	$22,445,700	68
Fredericksburg ISD	A	Carried	School Building	2,549	1,201	3750	$338,891,250	68
Friendswood ISD	D	Carried	Technology	2,741	2,689	5430	$2,540,874	51
Friendswood ISD	B	Defeated	School Building	2,680	2,749	5429	$82,535,670	49
Friendswood ISD	A	Carried	School Building	2,862	2,576	5438	$52,822,829	53
Friendswood ISD	C	Carried	School Building	2,829	2,602	5431	$26,208,250	52
Ganado ISD	B	Carried	Athletic Facilities	266	207	473	$23,537,200	56
Ganado ISD	A	Carried	School Building	322	154	476	$66,513,293	68
Gatesville ISD	A	Carried	School Building	533	204	737	$44,696,750	72
Gladewater ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	353	132	485	$10,752,600	73
Hereford ISD	A	Defeated	School Building & Buses	706	713	1419	$277,449,375	50
Hermleigh ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	60	107	167	$18,139,500	36
Hico ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	227	367	594	$41,907,867	38
Hondo ISD	B	Carried	Recreational Facilities	565	224	789	$4,919,250	72
Hondo ISD	C	Carried	Stadium	584	208	792	$3,150,500	74
Hondo ISD	A	Carried	School Building	613	185	798	$50,488,750	77
Hubbard ISDb	A	Carried	School Building	258	79	337	$13,189,958	77
Iola ISD	A	Carried	School Building	422	212	634	$114,487,500	67
Jonesboro ISD	A	Carried	School Building	98	39	137	$18,340,669	72
Keene ISD	B	Defeated	School Building	138	159	297	$31,250,250	47
Keene ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	138	160	298	$20,846,000	46
Kelton ISD	B	Carried	Technology	29	7	36	$224,779	81
Kelton ISD	A	Carried	School Building	27	9	36	$2,808,221	75
Kelton ISD	C	Carried	Housing Facility	26	12	38	$337,000	68
Knippa ISD	A	Carried	School Building	55	54	109	$7,311,000	51
Lampasas ISD	B	Defeated	School Building	968	1,472	2440	$37,809,000	40
Lampasas ISD	C	Defeated	Stadium	931	1,509	2440	$4,377,750	38
Lampasas ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	1,310	1,150	2460	$211,391,250	53
Lancaster ISD	C	Carried	Multi-Pupose Center	1,161	871	2032	$57,609,500	57
Lancaster ISD	B	Carried	Technology	1,259	774	2033	$4,118,250	62
Lancaster ISD	A	Carried	School Building	1,218	804	2022	$650,285,073	60
Lancaster ISD	D	Carried	Stadium	1,156	876	2032	$24,651,500	57
Laneville ISD	A	Carried	School Building	149	133	282	$16,056,617	53
Liberty ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	506	556	1062	$48,865,603	48

Louise ISD	A	Carried	School Building	220	100	320	$12,522,838	69
Lufkin ISD	B	Carried	School Building	1,810	1,360	3170	$83,286,016	57
Lufkin ISD	A	Carried	School Building	2,219	965	3184	$194,829,789	70
Magnolia ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	4,317	2,487	6804	$908,806,000	63
Mason ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	378	635	1013	$66,118,596	37
McAllen ISD	A	Carried	School Building	3,222	2,637	5859	$651,842,185	55
McCamey ISD	A	Carried	School Building	170	143	313	$18,159,800	54
McDade ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	75	114	189	$8,871,377	40
McMullen County ISD	A	Carried	School Building	63	11	74	$16,682,006	85
Mildred ISD	A	Carried	School Building	412	221	633	$81,918,486	65
Mildred ISD	C	Carried	Athletic Facilities	359	272	631	$7,562,005	57
Mildred ISD	B	Carried	School Additions & Renovations	397	235	632	$13,678,333	63
Navarro ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	282	202	484	$164,083,545	58
Oakwood ISD	B	Carried	Multi-Pupose Center	80	46	126	$15,377,550	64
Oakwood ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	110	18	128	$5,747,400	86
Orangefield ISD	A	Carried	School Building	565	257	822	$18,790,725	69
Paducah ISD	A	Carried	School Building	286	112	398	$21,436,110	72
Paducah ISD	B	Carried	Technology	309	95	404	$170,781	77
Pilot Point ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	539	845	1384	$566,938,263	
Plemons-Stinnett-Phillips CISD	B	Carried	Technology	180	26	206	$790,500	87
Plemons-Stinnett-Phillips CISD	A	Carried	School Building	180	27	207	$6,790,000	87
Ponder ISD	C	Carried	Technology	508	437	945	$4,324,182	54
Ponder ISD	A	Carried	School Building	479	468	947	$567,196,473	51
Ponder ISD	B	Defeated	Stadium	414	531	945	$15,936,425	44
Port Aransas ISD	C	Carried	Technology	252	45	297	$1,492,875	85
Port Aransas ISD	A	Carried	School Building	252	46	298	$5,323,750	85
Port Aransas ISD	B	Carried	Athletic Facilities	250	48	298	$3,621,750	84
Prairiland ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	120	106	226	$8,424,065	53
Redwater ISD	B	Carried	Athletic Facilities	371	298	669	$10,700,225	56
Redwater ISD	A	Carried	School Building	372	296	668	$15,014,025	56
Robstown ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	417	542	959	$11,218,250	44
Royal ISD	A	Carried	School Building	332	304	636	$144,551,618	52
Sanger ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	651	1,098	1749	$154,950,050	37
Schertz-Cibolo-U City ISD	B	Carried	Stadium	2,279	1,523	3802	$124,202,040	60
Schertz-Cibolo-U City ISD	A	Carried	School Building	2,564	1,241	3805	$452,526,941	67
Schertz-Cibolo-U City ISD	C	Carried	Technology	2,613	1,185	3798	$10,963,004	69
Scurry-Rosser ISD	A	Carried	School Building	211	88	299	$4,636,164	71
Sharyland ISD	B	Defeated	Technology	1,315	2,062	3377	$8,326,106	39
Sharyland ISD	C	Defeated	Natatorium	1,069	2,306	3375	$68,060,544	32
Sharyland ISD	A	Defeated	School Building & Buses	1,334	2,049	3383	$404,625,633	39
Silverton ISD	A	Defeated	School Building	125	178	303	$17,832,100	41
Slaton ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	380	344	724	$103,034,288	53
Slaton ISD	B	Defeated	Stadium Improvements	349	365	714	$5,578,588	49
Spring Hill ISD	B	Carried	Stadium	508	177	685	$2,711,107	74
Spring Hill ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	511	134	645	$23,641,876	79
Spring Hill ISD	C	Carried	Athletic Facilities	523	160	683	$1,101,267	77
Tuloso-Midway ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	470	110	580	$288,433,213	81
Tuloso-Midway ISD	B	Carried	Technology	462	114	576	$7,580,788	80
Victoria ISD	A	Carried	School Building	3,799	3,690	7489	$437,781,498	51

Waskom ISD	A	Carried	School Building & Buses	293	94	387	$66,826,425	76
Whiteface CISD	A	Carried	School Building	77	32	109	$9,831,775	71
Whiteface CISD	D	Carried	Stadium Improvements	70	38	108	$687,875	65
Whiteface CISD	B	Carried	Housing Facility	71	36	107	$1,029,900	66
Whiteface CISD	C	Carried	Pool Improvements	72	37	109	$687,875	66

SPD BOND ELECTIONS

In Texas, there are thousands of Special Purpose Districts (SPDs), which are independent entities of local government created to provide a specific service such as water and sewer service, toll roads, fire protection, hospital care, or community college education, among dozens of other purposes (Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, n.d.). Despite their narrow scopes, SPDs have broad financial powers, including the authority to impose property taxes to service debt; because they carry taxing authority, SPDs must hold bond elections before taking on new debt, just as cities and ISDs do.

In the May 2026 bond elections, described in **Table 4,** there were 289 SPD propositions, more than twice the number of propositions for ISDs. Before removing refunding bonds, the total proposed repayment was $105.6 billion. After removing refunding bonds, canceled propositions, and elections with pending results, the 187 bonds had a total proposed repayment of $76.4 billion. The 159 bonds that passed had a total repayment of $71.6 billion. Of those 159 that passed, 158 passed with the 60% threshold, and their total repayment was $71.5 billion.

In practice, many SPD elections draw a tiny fraction of the turnout seen in city or ISD races. In the 2026 cycle, for example, only 5 of 289, or 1.7%, of SPD bond elections statewide had more than 250 voters participate, down from 6.3% the year before, meaning relatively few residents can authorize debt obligations worth tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars.

In this cycle, only one of the 289 SPD bonds passed with less than 60% approval: Harris County's Water Control and Improvement District 109's Proposition A, a total repayment of $107.3 million, passed with 56.9% of the vote. The contrast with ISDs is stark, as just over 1/3 of all ISD bonds passed this cycle faced significant voter opposition; SPD elections almost universally pass, often with unanimous margins.

Table 4
SPD Elections May 2026

Issuer	Prop. Number	Result	Purpose Description	Votes For	Votes Against	Total Votes	Est. Total Debt Service	Approval Threshold
290 Betka MMD 1	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$643,209,579	100
290 Betka MMD 1	B	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$21,803,715	100
290 Betka MMD 1	E	Carried	Parking	1	0	1	$316,153,861	100
290 Betka MMD 1	D	Carried	Economic Development	1	0	1	$174,429,716	100
290 Betka MMD 1	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$359,761,290	100
Bainbridge MUD of Collin County	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$418,875,509	100
Bainbridge MUD of Collin County	E	Carried	Road & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$357,737,383	100
Bainbridge MUD of Collin County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$1,214,756,869	100
Bainbridge MUD of Collin County	C	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$1,037,453,693	100
Bastrop County WCID 3	A	Defeated	Other	1	3	4	--	25
Bluebonnet Hills MMD 1	C	Cancelled	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	0	0	0	$583,596,355	0
Bluebonnet Hills MMD 1	B	Cancelled	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	$683,334,288	0
Bluebonnet Hills MMD 1	D	Cancelled	Roads	0	0	0	$794,449,918	0

Bluebonnet Hills MMD 1	E	Cancelled	Roads & Refunding Roads	0	0	0	$678,493,799	0
Brazoria County MUD 31	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	57	209	266	$59,440,692	21
Brazoria County MUD 31	B	Defeated	Roads	61	208	269	$49,941,695	23
Brazoria County MUD 63A	G	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$145,967,855	100
Brazoria County MUD 63A	E	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$212,961,477	100
Brazoria County MUD 63A	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$516,929,237	100
Brazoria County MUD 63A	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$641,106,770	100
Brazoria County MUD 63A	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$935,267,956	100
Brazoria County MUD 63A	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$117,727,843	100
Brazoria County MUD 80	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$182,848,732	100
Brazoria County MUD 80	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$120,419,999	100
Brazoria County MUD 80	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$106,803,414	100
Brazoria County MUD 80	G	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$27,384,254	100
Brazoria County MUD 80	E	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$41,687,637	100
Brazoria County MUD 80	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$24,327,976	100
Brazoria County WCID 10	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$1,318,160,609	100
Brazoria County WCID 10	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$755,693,645	100
Brazoria County WCID 10	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$1,331,687,729	100
Brazoria County WCID 10	E	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$300,248,787	100
Brazoria County WCID 10	G	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$303,305,066	100
Brazoria County WCID 10	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$172,129,598	100
Burks Ranch MUD 1 of Grayson County	E	Pending	Roads and Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Burks Ranch MUD 1 of Grayson County	D	Pending	Water, Sewer & Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Burks Ranch MUD 1 of Grayson County	C	Pending	Roads	0	0	0	--	0
Burks Ranch MUD 1 of Grayson County	B	Pending	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	--	0
Clovercreek MUD	B	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Refunding	44	80	124	--	35
Clovercreek MUD	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	45	79	124	--	36
Cole Ranch ID 1 of Denton County	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	1	0	1	$39,159,471	100
Cole Ranch ID 1 of Denton County	B	Carried	Roads and Refunding	1	0	1	$40,613,052	100
Cole Ranch ID 2 of Denton County	B	Carried	Roads and Refunding	1	0	1	$954,668,373	100
Cole Ranch ID 2 of Denton County	A	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$695,175,099	100
Conroe MUD 1	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	8	66	74	$11,628,648	11
Denton County MUD 7	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$3,936,475,515	100
Denton County MUD 7	C	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$5,904,713,273	100
Denton County MUD 7	B	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$1,750,305,848	100
Denton County MUD 7	D	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$2,625,458,771	100
Ensenadas MUD of Travis County	F	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$7,095,246	100
Ensenadas MUD of Travis County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$123,279,895	100
Ensenadas MUD of Travis County	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$30,598,247	100
Ensenadas MUD of Travis County	G	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	1	0	1	$6,057,484	100
Ensenadas MUD of Travis County	C	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$108,883,279	100
Ensenadas MUD of Travis County	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$26,122,901	100
Far North Fort Worth MUD 1 Def Area A	D	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$434,752,500	100
Far North Fort Worth MUD 1 Def Area A	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$302,697,500	100
Far North Fort Worth MUD 1 Def Area A	C	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$453,531,750	100
Far North Fort Worth MUD 1 Def Area A	B	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$289,835,000	100
Fenske Road MUD	B	Pending	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	--	0
Fenske Road MUD	F	Pending	Parks and Recreation	0	0	0	--	0
Fenske Road MUD	C	Pending	Water, Sewer & Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Fenske Road MUD	G	Pending	Parks & Recreation Refunding	0	0	0	--	0

Fenske Road MUD	D	Pending	Roads	0	0	0	--	0
Fenske Road MUD	E	Pending	Roads and Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Fort Bend County MUD 244	G	Defeated	Roads & Refunding Roads	0	0	0	$32,836,932	0
Fort Bend County MUD 244	D	Defeated	Roads	0	0	0	$142,614,439	0
Fort Bend County MUD 244	C	Defeated	Recreational Facilities	0	0	0	$37,329,862	0
Fort Bend County MUD 244	F	Defeated	Parks & Recreation Refunding	0	0	0	$8,684,147	0
Fort Bend County MUD 244	E	Defeated	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	0	0	0	$114,888,556	0
Fort Bend County MUD 244	B	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	$500,613,932	0
Fort Bend County MUD 274	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$43,607,429	100
Fort Bend County MUD 274	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$115,559,687	100
Fort Bend County MUD 274	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$427,352,805	100
Fort Bend County MUD 277 Def Area North	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$697,718,865	100
Fort Bend County MUD 277 Def Area North	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$216,946,960	100
Fort Bend County MUD 277 Def Area North	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$792,201,628	100
Fort Bend County MUD 277 Def Area South	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$851,798,448	100
Fort Bend County MUD 277 Def Area South	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$888,137,972	100
Fort Bend County MUD 277 Def Area South	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$129,368,706	100
Fort Bend County MUD 286	C	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Fort Bend County MUD 286	E	Carried	Roads and Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Fort Bend County MUD 286	F	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	--	100
Fort Bend County MUD 286	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	--	100
Fort Bend County MUD 286	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	--	100
Fort Bend County MUD 286	G	Carried	Recreation & Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Fort Bend County MUD 291	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$34,541,807	100
Fort Bend County MUD 291	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$230,278,711	100
Fort Bend County MUD 291	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$81,317,170	100
Fort Bend County MUD 292	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$316,706,386	100
Fort Bend County MUD 292	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$107,358,097	100
Fort Bend County MUD 292	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$80,518,573	100
Fort Bend County MUD 293	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$385,198,957	100
Fort Bend County MUD 293	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$209,315,660	100
Fort Bend County MUD 293	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$911,395,268	100
Fort Bend County WCID 13	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$83,619,776	100
Fort Bend County WCID 13	G	Defeated	Roads & Refunding Roads	0	0	0	$187,227,613	0
Fort Bend County WCID 13	E	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	$286,067,656	100
Fort Bend County WCID 13	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$274,031,543	100
Fort Bend County WCID 13	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$418,696,579	100
Fort Bend County WCID 13	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$122,388,231	100
Fountainhead MUD	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	84	4	88	$107,271,610	95
Fountainhead MUD	B	Carried	Refund	81	5	86	$81,014,025	94
Galveston County MUD 12	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	382	170	552	--	69
Galveston County MUD 12	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	356	191	547	--	65
Galveston County MUD 66	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	41	95	136	$48,936,466	30
Galveston County MUD 66	B	Defeated	Recreational Facilities	37	100	137	$14,099,735	27
Galveston County MUD 69	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$88,850,137	100
Galveston County MUD 69	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$438,254,662	100
Galveston County MUD 69	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$754,408,523	100
Galveston County WCID 12	A	Defeated	Water System Improvements	122	161	283	$12,024,107	43
Golden Ranch MUD of Collin County	C	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$3,327,009,536	100
Golden Ranch MUD of Collin County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$6,017,439,235	100

Grand Lakes MUD 2	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	72	148	220	$49,975,194	33
Grayson County MUD 6A	E	Defeated	Roads & Refunding Roads	0	1	1	--	0
Grayson County MUD 6A	D	Defeated	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	0	1	1	--	0
Grayson County MUD 6A	B	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	1	1	$1,748,562,550	0
Grayson County MUD 6A	C	Defeated	Roads	0	1	1	$784,475,300	0
Harris County ID 29	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$158,294,968	100
Harris County ID 29	B	Carried	Recreation & Refunding	2	0	2	$56,689,658	100
Harris County ID 29	C	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$107,056,238	100
Harris County MUD 122	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	148	27	175	$34,270,479	85
Harris County MUD 188	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	45	18	63	$63,830,380	71
Harris County MUD 189	B	Pending	Refund	0	0	0	--	0
Harris County MUD 189	A	Pending	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	--	0
Harris County WCID 036	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	30	0	30	$156,970,725	100
Harris County WCID 109	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	119	90	209	$107,358,097	57
Harris-Fort Bend Counties MUD 3	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	45	12	57	$86,423,268	79
Johnson County MUD 1	D	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$2,834,470,538	100
Johnson County MUD 1	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$379,735,300	100
Johnson County MUD 1	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$1,889,647,025	100
Johnson County MUD 1	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$569,602,950	100
La Cima MMD 1	F	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$106,428,686	100
La Cima MMD 1	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$76,273,892	100
La Cima MMD 1	G	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	1	0	1	$90,862,263	100
La Cima MMD 1	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$168,512,086	100
La Cima MMD 1	C	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$143,865,250	100
La Cima MMD 1	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$65,117,955	100
Lakesong MMD 1A	B	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$512,370,133	100
Lakesong MMD 1A	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$532,519,520	100
Lakesong MMD 1B	B	Defeated	Roads & Refunding Roads	0	0	0	$503,734,681	0
Lakesong MMD 1B	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	$676,443,715	0
Liberty County MUD 16	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$898,945,133	100
Liberty County MUD 16	C	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$378,616,222	100
Liberty Trails MUD	E	Cancelled	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Liberty Trails MUD	F	Cancelled	Roads & Refunding Roads	0	0	0	--	0
Liberty Trails MUD	D	Cancelled	Roads	0	0	0	$1,399,319,535	0
Liberty Trails MUD	C	Cancelled	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	$76,292,512	0
Madera MMD 1	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$593,497,110	100
Madera MMD 1	B	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$421,393,123	100
Massey Road MUD 1 of Denton County	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$159,152,000	100
Massey Road MUD 1 of Denton County	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$238,728,000	100
Massey Road MUD 1 of Denton County	D	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$252,105,000	100
Massey Road MUD 1 of Denton County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$168,070,000	100
Meridian MUD	C	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$1,356,191,045	100
Meridian MUD	B	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$2,640,429,831	100
Montgomery County MUD 226A	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$661,388,504	100
Montgomery County MUD 226A	E	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	$150,613,398	100
Montgomery County MUD 226A	G	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$38,509,107	100
Montgomery County MUD 226A	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$111,723,993	100
Montgomery County MUD 226A	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$25,428,236	100
Montgomery County MUD 226A	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$169,446,863	100

Montgomery County MUD 235	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$73,478,518	100
Montgomery County MUD 235	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$279,087,546	100
Montgomery County MUD 235	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$113,379,316	100
Montgomery County MUD 245	D	Carried	Recreation & Refunding	1	0	1	$7,459,913	100
Montgomery County MUD 245	C	Carried	Road & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$19,894,376	100
Montgomery County MUD 245	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	1	0	1	$84,858,450	100
Montgomery County MUD 246	D	Carried	Recreation & Refunding	2	0	2	$19,900,583	100
Montgomery County MUD 246	C	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$22,959,840	100
Montgomery County MUD 246	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$84,023,922	100
Montgomery County MUD 251	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$565,419,311	100
Montgomery County MUD 251	E	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	$386,313,586	100
Montgomery County MUD 251	G	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$113,693,555	100
Montgomery County MUD 251	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$73,361,366	100
Montgomery County MUD 251	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$166,405,050	100
Montgomery County MUD 251	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$50,122,965	100
Montgomery County MUD 253	B	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	$115,363,454	0
Montgomery County MUD 253	D	Defeated	Roads	0	0	0	$44,646,739	0
Montgomery County MUD 253	C	Defeated	Recreational Facilities	0	0	0	$5,530,876	0
Montgomery County MUD 38	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	--	100
Montgomery County WCID 6	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$83,619,776	100
Montgomery County WCID 6	G	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$60,514,312	100
Montgomery County WCID 6	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$265,675,504	100
Montgomery County WCID 6	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$591,364,185	100
Montgomery County WCID 6	E	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	$286,067,656	100
Montgomery County WCID 6	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$267,813,720	100
North Johnson County MMD 1	A	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	$1,177,400,585	100
North Johnson County MMD 1	B	Carried	Roads and Refunding	2	0	2	$436,074,291	100
Oatman Hill MUD	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$59,298,836	100
Oatman Hill MUD	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$1,364,280,223	100
Oatman Hill MUD	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$594,173,025	100
Oliver Creek Ranch MUD of Denton County	D	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	1	0	1	$1,179,234,000	100
Oliver Creek Ranch MUD of Denton County	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$507,983,000	100
Oliver Creek Ranch MUD of Denton County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$786,156,000	100
Oliver Creek Ranch MUD of Denton County	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$761,974,500	100
Overlook MUD of Hays County	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$62,083,400	100
Overlook MUD of Hays County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	1	0	1	$203,985,781	100
Overlook MUD of Hays County	D	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$53,002,987	100
Overlook MUD of Hays County	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$238,932,400	100
Parklands MUD 1	B	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$217,289,552	100
Parklands MUD 1	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$624,307,175	100
Pilot Knob MUD 01	G	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Pilot Knob MUD 01	H	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Pilot Knob MUD 01	E	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$94,001,924	100
Pilot Knob MUD 01	D	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$83,636,295	100
Pilot Knob MUD 01	F	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$21,054,942	100
Pilot Knob MUD 04	H	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Pilot Knob MUD 04	G	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Pilot Knob MUD 04	D	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$287,402,174	100
Pilot Knob MUD 04	F	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$10,237,922	100

Pilot Knob MUD 04	E	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$232,200,833	100
Prairie Ridge MMD 1B	C	Pending	Roads and Refunding	0	0	0	$2,833,436,312	0
Prairie Ridge MMD 1B	B	Pending	Water, Sewer & Refunding	0	0	0	$2,312,981,646	0
Ranger Ridge MUD of Palo Pinto County	D	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	$77,740,950	100
Ranger Ridge MUD of Palo Pinto County	C	Carried	Refund	1	0	1	$136,942,750	100
Ranger Ridge MUD of Palo Pinto County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$51,827,300	100
Ranger Ridge MUD of Palo Pinto County	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$205,414,125	100
Real Road Special ID	E	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	--	100
Real Road Special ID	J	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Real Road Special ID	F	Carried	Roads and Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Real Road Special ID	G	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	--	100
Real Road Special ID	I	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	--	100
Real Road Special ID	K	Carried	Economic Development	1	0	1	--	100
Real Road Special ID	H	Carried	Recreation & Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Rivina MUD of Williamson County	C	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	$501,204,208	100
Rivina MUD of Williamson County	G	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	$14,111,776	100
Rivina MUD of Williamson County	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$325,494,398	100
Rivina MUD of Williamson County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$524,161,278	100
Rivina MUD of Williamson County	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$311,238,485	100
Rivina MUD of Williamson County	F	Carried	Parks & Recreation	2	0	2	$14,758,148	100
Saint Barts MUD 1	E	Carried	Roads and Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Saint Barts MUD 1	G	Carried	Recreation & Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Saint Barts MUD 1	C	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Saint Barts MUD 1	F	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	--	100
Saint Barts MUD 1	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	--	100
Saint Barts MUD 1	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	--	100
Sandow MUD 1	B	Carried	Recreational Facilities	1	0	1	$10,015,173	100
Sandow MUD 1	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$22,632,256	100
Sandow MUD 1	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$25,677,508	100
Seven Points MUD 1 of Collin County	C	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$897,259,411	100
Seven Points MUD 1 of Collin County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$2,554,647,259	100
Somerset Village MMD of Ellis County	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$150,765,418	100
Somerset Village MMD of Ellis County	B	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$187,642,767	100
Southeast Collin County MUD 1	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$394,218,932	100
Southeast Collin County MUD 1	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$586,282,568	100
Southeast Collin County MUD 1	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	2	0	2	$336,679,625	100
Southeast Collin County MUD 1	C	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	$500,710,086	100
Spanish Cove PUD	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	10	19	29	$10,735,810	34
Tickey Creek MUD 1 of Collin County	D	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Tickey Creek MUD 1 of Collin County	E	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	--	100
Tickey Creek MUD 1 of Collin County	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$26,273,720	100
Tickey Creek MUD 1 of Collin County	C	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$14,305,800	100
Travis County MUD 27	D	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Travis County MUD 27	E	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Travis County MUD 27	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$332,463,552	100
Travis County MUD 27	B	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$10,087,335	100
Travis County MUD 27	C	Carried	Parks & Recreation	1	0	1	$115,245,557	100
Tyler JCD	A	Defeated	Refund	5,679	6,881	12560	$321,819,282	45
Waller County MUD 61	C	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$56,689,658	100
Waller County MUD 61	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$271,456,246	100

Waller County MUD 61	D	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$93,755,973	100
Waterford MUD 1 of Burnet County	B	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$492,205,000	100
Waterford MUD 1 of Burnet County	D	Carried	Roads & Refunding Roads	1	0	1	$738,307,500	100
Waterford MUD 1 of Burnet County	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$497,350,000	100
Waterford MUD 1 of Burnet County	C	Carried	Water, Sewer & Refunding	1	0	1	$746,025,000	100
Weston MUD	A	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	9	11	20	--	45
Williamson County MUD 48	G	Defeated	Parks & Recreation Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 48	B	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Drainage	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 48	F	Defeated	Parks and Recreation	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 48	C	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 48	D	Defeated	Roads	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 48	E	Defeated	Roads and Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 50	G	Carried	Parks and Recreation and Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Williamson County MUD 50	E	Defeated	Roads and Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 50	B	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	--	100
Williamson County MUD 50	C	Defeated	Water, Sewer & Refunding	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 50	D	Defeated	Roads	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 50	F	Defeated	Parks and Recreation	0	0	0	--	0
Williamson County MUD 60	G	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Williamson County MUD 60	F	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	1	0	1	--	100
Williamson County MUD 60	C	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	1	0	1	$452,805,580	100
Williamson County MUD 60	D	Carried	Roads	1	0	1	$354,983,069	100
Williamson County MUD 60	E	Carried	Parks & Recreation	1	0	1	$20,280,277	100
Williamson County WCID 2	E	Carried	Parks & Recreation Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Williamson County WCID 2	D	Carried	Water, Sewer, & Refunding	2	0	2	--	100
Williamson County WCID 2	A	Carried	Water, Sewer & Drainage	2	0	2	$1,486,307,646	100
Williamson County WCID 2	B	Carried	Recreational Facilities	2	0	2	$279,660,518	100
Williamson County WCID 2	C	Carried	Roads	2	0	2	$518,252,008	100

RECOMMENDATIONS

The May 2026 bond election cycle set a record for local bond debt authorized in a single May election. By comparison, May 2024 saw voters approve $33.3 billion in total bond repayment debt, which is less than half of the nearly $71 billion authorized in 2026 (Quintero, 2024). Texas local governments are increasingly willing to bring large debt packages to voters, and voters that show up are increasingly willing to approve them. The key phrase is "voters that show up." As this report documents, many of these elections, especially in SPDs, are decided by a handful of residents, raising serious questions about whether the democratic check that bond elections are meant to provide is functioning as intended.

Legislators in the 90th legislative session should prioritize reforms that ensure voters not only have the opportunity to weigh in on debt but are also equipped to understand what they are approving and what it will cost them over the long term.

1. **Implementing a Supermajority Threshold**
   The first, and perhaps most significant, reform the Legislature should pursue is raising the voter approval threshold required to pass a bond. Under current law, a simple majority is all that is needed to authorize debt (Tex. Educ. Code § 45.003). This report recommends the Legislature raise that threshold to a supermajority of 60%. If the 60% threshold had been in place in 2026, taxpayers would have been spared nearly $6.4 billion in authorized debt. Therefore, it is recommended that legislation similar to HB 96 (2025) be advanced in the 90th legislative session.

2. **Establishing a Minimum Turnout Requirement**
   Along with a supermajority threshold, it is recommended that the Legislature adopt a minimum voter turnout requirement. Especially in SPDs, billions of dollars are adopted usually by just one or two people. For example, one singular person in the Denton County MUD 7 Proposition C election approved more than $5.9 billion in total repayment. This issue was explored briefly in 2017 through SB 702 (2017), which sought to require a minimum 30% participation in bond elections; however, the legislation failed. The 90th Legislature should revive and pass a similar requirement. A minimum turnout floor would ensure that decisions reflect a true community consensus rather than the preferences of a select few.

3. **Uniform November Election Dates**
   Bond elections have notoriously low turnout. Tarrant County reported that only 4.1% of registered voters participated in the May 2026 bond election, yet in the November 2024 general election, 63.8% turned out, more than a 15-fold difference (Tarrant County Elections, 2024). This results from holding consequential fiscal elections in low-visibility, off-cycle windows when most voters are not paying attention. SB 1209 (2025) directly addressed this problem by eliminating the May uniform election date and requiring most elections to be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, aligning with the federal election calendar. The 90th Legislature should revisit similar legislation.

4. **Ballot Transparency**
   The final category of reform concerns what voters actually see when they walk into the voting booth. Current ballot language for bond measures is vague and structured in ways that obscure rather than illuminate the financial commitment being made. A ballot might ask voters to approve the issuance of general obligation bonds in a specific amount without ever telling them the total repayment cost. The 89th Legislature made meaningful progress, including SB 1025 (2025), HB 103 (2025), and SB 843 (2025). But gaps remain: Ballot language still permits significant "bundling" of unrelated projects into single propositions, preventing voters from approving infrastructure they support while rejecting spending they oppose. The 90th Legislature should build on the 89th's foundation by mandating universal VID distribution requirements across all taxing entities, prohibiting the bundling of substantively unrelated projects into a single proposition, and requiring all bond ballot language to include the estimated total repayment cost with interest so that voters understand the full price tag of what they are being asked to approve (Tex. Gov't Code § 1251.052). Additionally, the same section of code should be amended to change the assumed property value used as the basis for estimations from $100,000 to better reflect the value of homes across the state, which is $339,000 according to the Texas Real Estate Research Center (TRERC, 2026).

CHALLENGES

Issues with special purpose districts, particularly Municipal Utility Districts (MUDs), often stem from starting with a very low population. It is entirely possible to create a MUD with the petition of one person (Texas Water Code §54.014; 54.016; 54.016, 1971 and rev. 2023) and approve bonds with one vote. While bonds are necessary for a MUD's development, they are expected to grow, and as they do, the debt is passed on to future residents. If a MUD is annexed before it pays off its debt, the city absorbs that debt, and its residents shoulder it. However, until then, bond debt stays within those districts. Limits on these districts should not prevent MUDs from being lawfully established, but should be enough to protect future residents from debt approved by a few voters.

One way to address this issue would be to exempt districts with a population less than 250 from the turnout or approval thresholds, similar to how districts with fewer than 250 people are exempt from providing a Voter Information Document (Tex. Gov't Code § 1251.052). This would maintain the logical consistency of a reasonable population threshold to ensure MUDs can be created, but as they grow, debt decisions would face higher scrutiny.

One last challenge is whether changes to approval thresholds, turnout thresholds, and election dates would require constitutional amendments. Further research is needed to determine whether these provisions would conflict with Texas Constitution Article VIII, which governs taxation, particularly the prohibition on a state property tax and equity in valuation (Tex. Const. Art. VIII).

CONCLUSION

Debt directly contributes to Texans' property tax bills. Increases in the I&S rate often must occur to service growing debt, or valuations may increase as a result of increasing debt. Changing approval thresholds, turnout thresholds, consolidating elections in November, and providing more transparency are not punitive measures against local governments, but ways to put the decision to incur debt more firmly in voters' hands. The spirit of these changes is to increase voter turnout and ensure overwhelming voter support for bond measures with hefty price tags. ■

REFERENCES

Bonura, J., & Ebert, G. (2025). *May 2025 bond election report*. Texas Public Policy Foundation. https://www.texaspolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025-08-TPP-May-2025-Bond-Election-Report-Bonura-Ebert.pdf

Bonura, J., & Veal, S. (2026). *Supermajority solutions for Texas taxpayers*. Texas Public Policy Foundation. https://www.texaspolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2026-02-TPP-Supermajority-Solutions-for-Texas-Taxpayers-VealBonura.pdf

City of Carrollton. (2026). *An ordinance of the city council of the city of Carrollton, Texas, canvassing the returns and declaring the results of a bond election; providing a savings, an enforcement, and a repealing clause; finding that the meeting in which this ordinance was adopted was held in compliance with state law; and providing for an effective date.* https://www.cityofcarrollton.com/home/showpublisheddocument/41181/639142719242170000

City of Fort Worth. (2022). *Notice of special election.* https://www.fortworthtexas.gov/files/assets/public/v/1/city-secretary/documents/elections/2022-election/2022-election-notices/25326-02-2022-exhibit-english.pdf

City of Fort Worth. (2026). *Notice of special election*. https://www.fortworthtexas.gov/files/assets/public/v/3/city-secretary/documents/elections/2026-election-special-d11-amp-bond/notices/tarrant-county-notice-final.pdf

Dallas County Elections Department. (2026). *Summary results report*: *Joint and special election, May 2, 2026*. https://www.dallascountyvotes.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Upload-2.pdf

Dallas Independent School District. (n.d.). *Bond programs*. Dallas ISD Investor Relations. Retrieved September 18, 2026, from https://www.dallasisdinvestorrelations.com/dallas-independent-school-district-investor-relations-tx/bond-programs/i4803

Garcia, A. (2026, May 2). *Pilot Point ISD asks voters to approve $295 million bond proposal*. NBC 5 Dallas-Fort Worth. https://www.nbcdfw.com/news/politics/lone-star-politics/pilot-point-isd-bond-proposal-may-2026/4002224/

HB 96. Introduced. 89th Texas Legislature. First Called Session. (2025). https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/891/billtext/pdf/HB00096I.pdf

HB 103. Enrolled. 89th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2025). https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/89R/billtext/html/HB00103F.htm

HB 3526. Enrolled. 89th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2025). https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/89R/billtext/pdf/HB03526F.pdf

Quintero, J. (2024). *May 2024 bond election report*. Texas Public Policy Foundation. https://www.texaspolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/2024-08-TPP-May-2024-Bond-Election-Report-Quintero_FINAL.pdf

Quintero, J. & Molina, I. (2025). *Texas local government debt soars to $552 billion.* https://www.texaspolicy.com/texas-local-government-debt-soars-to-552-billion/

SB 702. Introduced. 85th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2017). https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/85R/billtext/pdf/SB00702I.pdf

SB 1025. Enrolled. 89th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2025). https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/89R/billtext/html/SB01025F.htm

SB 1209. Enrolled. 89th Texas Legislature. Regular. (2025). https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/89R/billtext/html/SB01209E.htm

Tarrant County Elections. (2024, November 5). *Cumulative official results: Joint general and special election, November 5, 2024*. https://www.tarrantcountytx.gov/content/dam/main/elections/2024/1124/reports/cumulative.pdf

Texas Bond Review Board. (n.d.). *Local bond elections.* Retrieved September 18, 2026, from https://brb.texas.gov/searchable-db.html#/datasets/local_elections

Texas Bond Review Board. (2024). *Debt primer (FY 2023)*. https://www.brb.texas.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Debt-Primer-w-glossary-FY-2023.docx

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. (n.d.). *Special purpose districts.* Retrieved September 18, 2026, from https://comptroller.texas.gov/transparency/local/special-purpose.php

Tex .Const. Article VIII. https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/?tab=1&code=CN&chapter=CN.8&artSec=

Texas Government Code §1251. (1999 & rev. 2019). https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/?tab=1&code=GV&chapter=GV.1251&artSec=

Texas Public Policy Foundation. (2018). *Special purpose districts*. https://www.texaspolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Special-Purpose-Districts-copy.pdf

Texas Tax Code § 26.012. (1987 & rev. 2025). https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/?tab=1&code=TX&chapter=TX.26&artSec=

Texas Water Code §54.014; 54.016; 54.0161/ (1971 & rev 2023). https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/?tab=1&code=WA&chapter=WA.54&artSec=

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



John Bonura is a Policy Analyst for the Taxpayer Protection Project with Texas Public Policy Foundation.

Prior to joining TPPF John served in the University system as a Graduate Assistant until he was given the opportunity to teach Principles of American Government. John holds a Master of Arts in Political Science from Texas State University and a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Sam Houston State University.



Sukhadeva Mitta is a student at the University of Texas at Austin studying Public Affairs. He has worked on a multitude of political campaigns, engaging over 25,000 voters and helping mobilize youth participation across Texas. As a former fellow and incoming intern at the Texas Public Policy Foundation, he has contributed to policy research on issues such as water sustainability and the impact of emerging technologies on state resources. Sukhadeva has led and scaled student organizations to hundreds of members, connecting young people to real opportunities in public service and policymaking. He plans to pursue a law degree and ultimately serve in roles that shape public policy at the highest levels of government.

Texas Public POLICY FOUNDATION

901 Congress Avenue | Austin, Texas 78701 | (512) 472-2700 | www.TexasPolicy.com