



MEMORANDUM

Date: December 14, 2015

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "CH", is written over the printed name "C.H. Huckelberry".

Re: **Summary of Pima County Bond Election Results**

As the Board is aware, voters rejected all seven County bond propositions in the November 3, 2015 election. The attached report does not attempt to provide a reason, but it reflects a review of available data of where geographical approval rates were higher or lower. Voter turnout, demographics and political affiliation were also considered.

Voter turnout overall was 39 percent, which is higher than the previous odd-year/off-year election held in November 2013. Precincts with higher turnout were generally in areas with higher income households and older residents. As is typical, the well-known retirement communities in Green Valley and Oro Valley had some of the highest rates of voter turnout and number of votes cast. In comparing Supervisorial districts, turnout was highest in District 4 and lowest in District 2. Almost 83 percent of ballots cast were early ballots, which is a record for a Countywide election.

Proposition 425 Road and Highway Improvements and Proposition 431 Flood Control and Drainage were defeated by the least number of votes; whereas Proposition 427 Facilities Promoting Tourism failed by the highest number of votes. Project locations and the individual bond proposition amounts do not appear to have had an impact on approval rates.

Voters in District 5 approved a majority of the bond propositions, while voters in District 4 had the lowest approval rates for each bond proposition when compared to the other districts. Voters in Marana, Oro Valley and Sahuarita rejected all seven propositions. City of South Tucson voters approved four of the seven propositions. City of Tucson voters approved Proposition 425 Road and Highway Improvements and Proposition 431 Flood Control and Drainage. Overall, four geographical areas supported the majority of the bond propositions: central Tucson, part of the Catalina Foothills, part of Tucson Mountain foothills, and the tribal nations. The majority of registered voters in these four geographic areas are Democrats. The bond propositions failed outside of these four areas. There appears to be no common prevalent political party amongst the areas in which the bond propositions failed.

That said, voter turnout was very low in the only majority Democrat area to oppose the bonds (south and southwest of Tucson), so it is likely there were significantly more votes

The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Re: **Summary of Pima County Bond Election Results**
December 14, 2015
Page 2

from majority Republican and majority Other areas that opposed the bonds. "Other" is the category the Recorder's Office uses for voters registered with the Green Party, Libertarian Party, Independents and others. In fact, all of the high no-vote precincts were majority Republican or Other.

More voters in precincts adjacent to the City of Tucson supported the 2014 Animal Care bond election than this 2015 bond election. However, both bond elections lacked support in the outlying suburban communities.

School district bond and budget override elections in Pima County had mixed results, as did the City of Scottsdale's bond election and bond elections across the nation.

CHH/dr

Attachments

c: Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator

**November 3, 2015 Pima County Bond Election
Summary of Results**

On November 3, 2015 Pima County held a county-wide bond election that included seven separate ballot propositions that would have funded a variety of new and improved public facilities throughout the region. Voters rejected all seven propositions. Voters in some areas of the County had only the County bond propositions on their ballots. In other areas, voters also had the opportunity to vote on school district bonds and budget overrides; City of Tucson Mayor and Council candidates, red light cameras, and charter changes; Oro Valley Mayor and Council recalls; and Sahuarita’s General Plan update.

This report summarizes data available from the Pima County Election Department and the Pima County Recorder’s Office concerning overall voter turnout, rate of early voting, and more specifically how voters voted on the County’s bond propositions at the voter precinct level and within larger geographic areas. Demographic data at the census tract level was also compared to bond proposition approval rates in various geographical areas to see if any trends were apparent, as were political affiliations of registered voters. The maps referenced in the report are available online via links in the report or by visiting www.pima.gov/bonds2015. Summary data for all of the November 3, 2015 election results is available at www.pima.gov/elections. Precinct level election results data can be made available in an Excel spreadsheet for anyone who wishes to conduct additional research.

I. Overall Election

A. Number of Registered Voters, Ballots Cast and Voter Turnout

Almost 39 percent of registered voters turned out for this November’s election (Table 1). Voter turnout was higher than the last odd-year/off-year election held in November 2013 that included mostly school district elections and the Vail incorporation effort, but lower than even-year elections as expected (Table 2). The County’s 2004 and 2006 elections were held in the month of May, which is no longer possible as the State Legislature passed legislation in 2006 preventing counties from holding bond elections at any date other than the November election.

Table 1 – Registered Voters, Ballots Cast & Voter Turnout

Number of registered voters	493,885
Ballots cast	190,173
Blank ballots cast	70
Voter turnout	38.51%

Table 2 – Voter Turnout Compared to Previous Elections

2015 November: General County bond, schools, Tucson Council, Tucson Charter, Oro Valley Council recall, red light cameras	39%
2014 November: Gubernatorial/statewide, Animal Care County bond	55%
2013 November: School districts, Vail incorporation	30%
2012 November: Presidential, City of Tucson road bonds	78%
2006 May: Psychiatric County bonds, Regional Transportation Authority	26%
2004 May: General County Bonds, Oro Valley Council	22%

B. Percent of Registered Voters that Turned Out by Precinct

As shown on [Map 1](#), Turnout was generally lower in Tucson west of Campbell Avenue, Tucson south of 22nd Street, areas south and west of Tucson including most of Sahuarita, within Marana west of Interstate 10, Picture Rocks and Avra Valley, southeast of Vail, the tribal areas, and western Pima County including Ajo. Turnout was generally higher in Tucson east of Campbell Avenue, the Catalina Foothills, the Tucson Mountains, Oro Valley, Marana east of Interstate 10 (Dove Mountain) and Green Valley.

C. High Vote Precincts

[Map 2](#) indicates the number of ballots cast per precinct. Some precincts cover large geographic areas, but contain a low number of registered voters. For that reason, it is also important to consider the number of ballots cast per precinct. For the 248 voter precincts, the average number of ballots cast was 767, and number of ballots cast ranged from two to 3034. Six precincts had more than 2,000 ballots cast: Dove Mountain area in Marana (precinct 127), Rancho Vistoso in Oro Valley (precinct 145), southeastern Oro Valley (precinct 12), a precinct in east/central Tucson (precinct 69), northern Green Valley (precinct 141), and southern Sahuarita (precinct 84).

D. Demographics, Political Party Affiliation and Voter Turnout

The Pima County Recorder's Office has data on the age and political affiliation of those who actually voted in November's election. However, that data may not be available until January. In the meantime, the number of registered voters per precinct by political party affiliation is available on the Recorder's website, but does not break out registered Independents separately. The 2013 American Community Survey includes a variety of demographic data at census tract level. Census tract boundaries do not match voter precinct boundaries, but data concerning age and median household income was reviewed considering general geographic areas. Keep in mind that this demographic data is for all people residing in a particular census tract, not just for those that voted in the November 3 election.

Median Age

[Map 3](#) shows median age by census tract. With some exceptions, areas of higher median age generally had higher voter turnout than areas of lower median age.

Median Household Income

[Map 4](#) shows median household income by census tract. Similarly, with some exceptions, areas of higher median household incomes generally had higher voter turnout than areas of lower median household incomes. Areas with lower median incomes are generally located within the central areas of the City of Tucson, north/south along Interstate 10 and 19, in Tucson's south and south west sides, as well as the tribal areas.

Political Party Affiliation

[Map 5](#) shows the most prevalent political party for each precinct as Democrat, Republican or Other (other includes Independents, Green Party, Libertarian Party and others). In comparing this map to [Map 1](#) voter turnout, there does not appear to be much of a connection between voter turnout in this election and political party affiliation of registered voters. However, data on the political affiliation of those that actually voted, which is not currently available, could result in a different conclusion.

E. Early Voting

Almost 83 percent of the ballots cast for the November 3, 2015 election were by early ballot (Table 3). According to Chris Roads, Chief Deputy Recorder for Pima County, the percentage of early ballots cast in recent even-numbered election years (2010, 2012, and 2014) ranged between 63 percent to 75 percent. The percentage is typically higher for odd-number/off-year elections. This November election was a record for a countywide election.

Table 3 – Early Voting

Early ballots cast	157,782
Early ballots cast as % of total cast	82.9%
Early ballots requested	311,780
Early ballots returned	50.6%

II. Pima County Bond Propositions

A. Results by Proposition

Voters rejected all seven County bond propositions, but the flood control and road propositions failed by the least number of votes (Table 4).

Table 4 – County Bond Proposition Results by Highest Percent Yes Vote

Proposition	Yes	No	%Yes	%No
431: Flood Control & Drainage	87,594	93,289	48	52
425: Road & Highway Improvements	87,445	98,051	47	53
428: Parks & Recreational Facilities	78,057	108,122	42	58
429: Public Health, Welfare, Safety, Neighborhoods & Housing	77,156	109,144	41	59
430: Natural Area Conservation & Historic Preservation	71,746	108,735	40	60
426: Economic Development, Libraries & Workforce Training	73,080	112,954	39	61
427: Facilities Promoting Tourism	63,041	122,887	34	66

As required by State Statute, propositions follow candidate races on ballots. For voters outside of the City of Tucson and Oro Valley, ballots were one-sided and the County bond propositions preceded any other propositions. Within Oro Valley, all of the County

bond propositions were on the back of the ballot following one of the recalls. Within the City of Tucson, the County bond propositions followed City candidate races, red light camera proposition, and City charter change propositions, which resulted in five of the seven County bond propositions being on the front of the ballot and the last two County bond propositions on the back with no other ballot items. Propositions 430 and 431 were on the back. Based on the number of under votes for all of the bond propositions, it appears that approximately 5,000 voters may not have turned over their ballots to vote on Propositions 430 and 431. Again, this only occurred with City of Tucson ballots.

B. Bond Proposition Results by Board of Supervisor District

Voter turnout was highest in District 4 and lowest in District 2 (Table 5). Voters in District 5 approved Proposition 425, 428, 429 and 431, and almost approved 426. The lowest bond proposition approval rates were consistently from voters in District 4.

Table 5 – Bond Propositions Results by Board of Supervisor District

BOS District	Registered Voters	Ballots Cast	Voter Turnout	Prop. 425 Roads Yes %	Prop. 426 Economic Develop. Yes %	Prop. 427 Tourism Yes %	Prop. 428 Parks, Rec. Yes %	Prop. 429 Health, Safety, etc. Yes %	Prop. 430 Natural Areas, Historic Yes %	Prop. 431 Flood Control Yes %
1	126,420	55,659	44.03%	48.49%	37.28%	33.21%	40.91%	39.00%	38.13%	47.21%
2	76,328	22,981	30.11%	43.76%	40.05%	33.90%	41.70%	43.27%	38.08%	45.21%
3	89,315	29,800	33.37%	44.11%	37.60%	32.13%	39.98%	40.32%	37.52%	45.19%
4	119,295	55,773	46.75%	41.70%	33.98%	28.48%	36.42%	35.20%	32.07%	41.98%
5	82,527	25,960	31.46%	53.92%	49.95%	43.56%	51.92%	53.38%	48.94%	54.12%
TOTALS	493,885	190,173	38.51%	45.98%	38.43%	33.15%	41.05%	40.57%	37.73%	46.06%

[Maps 6-12](#) show, for each of the seven bond propositions, the percent yes vote per precinct, along with Board of Supervisor district boundaries, incorporated city and town boundaries, and location of bond projects that were proposed for funding as part of each proposition.

C. Bond Proposition Results within Cities and Towns

[Maps 6-12](#) show that all seven bond propositions were rejected within the precincts that fall all or partially within the towns of Marana, Oro Valley and Sahuarita. Voters in the single precinct that is partially within the City of South Tucson approved four of the seven bond propositions. [Map 1](#) shows that voter turnout in Oro Valley, Marana’s Dove Mountain area east of Interstate 10, and southern Sahuarita, was higher than the average overall turnout. Voter turnout in Marana west of Interstate 10, northern Sahuarita and South Tucson was lower than the average overall turnout.

Propositions 425 Road and Highway Improvements and 431 Flood Control Drainage were approved by City of Tucson voters (Table 6). City voters approved the Flood Control proposition even though there were no flood control projects proposed to be funded within the City limits. The central corridor within the City from about 22nd Street to River Road, west of Wilmot (excluding an area from Speedway Boulevard to River Road,

between Interstate 10 and 1st Avenue) generally supported the majority of the bond propositions. The east and south sides of Tucson generally did not support the bond propositions. Voter turnout within the City of Tucson was slightly lower than overall turnout.

Table 6 – Bond Propositions Results within City of Tucson

Registered Voters	Ballots Cast	Voter Turnout	Prop. 425 Roads Yes %	Prop. 426 Economic Develop. Yes %	Prop. 427 Tourism Yes %	Prop. 428 Parks, Rec. Yes %	Prop. 429 Health, Safety, etc. Yes %	Prop. 430 Natural Areas, Historic Yes %	Prop. 431 Flood Control Yes %
225,767	82,418	36.50%	50.72%	45.12%	39.18%	47.49%	48.19%	46.02%	53.49%

D. Bond Proposition Results by Other Geographic Areas

1. Areas within Eastern Pima County Supporting the Majority of Bond Propositions (Precincts voting over 50 percent to approve the bonds)

All or part of four geographical areas of eastern Pima County, east of the Tohono O’odham Reservation, supported the majority of the seven County bond propositions:

- Central corridor within the City of Tucson from about 22nd Street to River Road, west of Wilmot (excluding an area from Speedway Boulevard to River Road, between Interstate 10 and 1st Avenue);
- Catalina Foothills;
- Eastern foothills of the Tucson Mountains, south of Sweetwater Drive; and
- San Xavier District of the Tohono O’odham Nation and adjacent Pascua Yaqui lands.

2. Areas within Eastern Pima County with Precincts Voting 40 to 50 Percent in Support of the Majority of Bond Propositions

All or part of five geographical areas of eastern Pima County include precincts where more than 40 percent but less than 50 percent of voters supported at least four of the seven bond propositions.

- Northeastern Foothills of the Tucson Mountains, north of Sweetwater Drive (Propositions 425, 428, 429, 430, 431)
- Casas Adobes area between Tucson and Oro Valley (Propositions 425, 428, 429, 430, 431)
- Tucson’s northeast side and the eastern Catalina Foothills (Propositions 425, 428, 429, 430, 431)
- Tucson’s south side, east of Interstate 10 (Propositions 425, 428, 429, 431)
- Tucson’s south side, west of Interstate 10 (Propositions 425, 429, 430, 431)

In short, the geographic areas that supported a majority of the County bond propositions, or contained precincts where at least 40 percent voted in support of a majority of the proposition, were generally within the City of Tucson or bordering the City of Tucson.

3. High No Vote Areas

[Maps 13-19](#) show precincts where a high number of no votes were cast on the bond propositions. All or part of 10 geographic areas of eastern Pima County include high voting precincts (1,000 or more ballots cast) where more than 60 percent of voters opposed five of the bond propositions (Propositions 426, 427, 428, 429, 430):

- Marana west of I-10
- Marana east of I-10 (Dove Mountain)
- Oro Valley
- Flowing Wells
- Northeast Tucson
- Southeast Tucson
- Corona de Tucson
- Sahuarita
- Green Valley
- Picture Rocks

All or part of five geographic areas of eastern Pima County include high voting precincts (1,000 or more ballots cast) where more than 60 percent of voters opposed Proposition 425 Road and Highway Improvements:

- Marana west of I-10
- Corona de Tucson
- Sahuarita
- Green Valley
- Picture Rocks

All or part of four geographic areas of eastern Pima County include high voting precincts (1,000 or more ballots cast) where more than 60 percent of voters opposed Proposition 431 Flood Control and Drainage:

- Marana west of I-10
- Corona de Tucson
- Northern Green Valley
- Picture Rocks

4. Central and Western Pima County

The Tohono O'odham Nation is located in central Pima County. Western Pima County includes the town of Ajo. The land surrounding Ajo is predominantly Federal. Voter turnout was low for both areas. Voters in many of the precincts within the Tohono O'odham Nation voted in support of the bond propositions, whereas the majority of voters in Ajo voted against all of the bond propositions.

E. Compared to 2014 Animal Care Bond Election

[Map 20](#) shows percent yes votes by precinct for the County's 2014 Animal Care bond election. In reviewing this map compared to the 2015 bond proposition results maps, voters in several geographic areas supported the Animal Care bonds but did not support the 2015 bond propositions: Precincts northwest of Tucson, the northern Tucson Mountain foothills, and precincts south and south east of Tucson. The outlying suburban communities including Marana, Oro Valley, Vail, Green Valley, Sahuarita, and Picture Rocks did not support either bond elections.

F. Project Location and Approval Rate

[Maps 6-12](#) also show the location of the projects that would have been funded if voters had approved the propositions. There appears to be no connection between the location of projects and voter approval rates.

Areas where a high number of proposed projects were to be located included Oro Valley, the Flowing Wells area south to Miracle Mile, central/downtown Tucson, Vail/southeast Tucson, Sahuarita/Green Valley, and Tucson's south side. The only precincts to approve propositions where there were several projects that would have been constructed, were the central Tucson/downtown Tucson precincts. Flowing Wells precincts opposed the Parks and Recreation Proposition 428 even though Flowing Wells was to receive the greatest number of park and recreation improvements compared to other areas in the region. As was stated above, City of Tucson voters approved Flood Control Proposition 431 even though there were no flood control projects proposed to be funded within the City limits.

G. Demographics, Political Party Affiliation and Bond Proposition Approval Rates

In comparing 2013 American Community Survey data for median age and median household income to the bond proposition results, there does not appear to be much of a connection.

But in comparing [Map 5](#), which shows prevalent political party by precinct, to the bond proposition results maps, it appears that the majority of registered voters in the precincts that supported the majority of the bond propositions are Democrats. The areas that opposed the majority of the bond propositions, however, have no common majority political party. It is worth noting, though, that the majority Democrat precincts that opposed the bond propositions were generally located on Tucson's south and south west sides, which had low voter turnout in comparison to most of the majority Republican and "Other" precincts that opposed the bond propositions. Again "Other" includes Green Party, Libertarian Party, Independents and others. The high no vote precincts were all majority Republican or majority Other.

H. Bond Proposition Purpose, Funding Amount and Approval Rate

Table 7 – County Bond Proposition Results by Most Yes Votes to Least

Proposition	Amount	%Yes	%No
431: Flood Control & Drainage	\$16,935,000	48	52
425: Road & Highway Improvements	\$200,000,000	47	53
428: Parks & Recreational Facilities	\$191,500,000	42	58
429: Public Health, Welfare, Safety, Neighborhoods & Housing	\$105,300,000	41	59
430: Natural Area Conservation & Historic Preservation	\$112,050,000	40	60
426: Economic Development, Libraries & Workforce Training	\$91,375,000	39	61
427: Facilities Promoting Tourism	\$98,600,000	34	66

The bond propositions that received the most support appear to be those that would have authorized spending bond funding for the purposes of flood control and road improvements, which are basic functions of government.

The funding amount per individual bond proposition does not appear to have had an impact on voter approval levels as the proposition receiving the highest support would have authorized the sale of \$16.9 million of bonds, whereas the next highest would have authorized the sale of \$200 million of bonds, followed by lesser amounts.

I. Approval Rates Compared to County General Obligation Bond Elections in 2004, 2006 and 2014

While the recent County bond propositions were rejected by voters with approval rates of only 34 to 48 percent, prior County general obligation bond questions on the ballot in 2004, 2006 and 2014 were approved at rates ranging from 58 to 65 percent (Table 8). Since 1974, voters have approved 54 County bond ballot questions at 12 separate elections, and rejected four (computer systems 1985, sewer improvements 1984, and two road improvement questions in 1979).

Table 8 – Approval Rates of Other County Bond Elections

Election Date	Ballot Question	Amount	Approved By
May 18, 2004	Sonoran Desert Open Space & Habitat Protection; Preventing Urban Encroachment of Davis-Monthan AFB	\$174,300,000	65%
May 18, 2004	Public Health and Community Facilities	\$81,800,000	59%
May 18, 2004	Public Safety and Justice Facilities	\$183,500,000	61%
May 18, 2004	Parks and Recreational Facilities	\$96,450,000	61%
May 18, 2004	River Parks and Flood Control Improvements	\$46,200,000	58%
May 16, 2006	Psychiatric Urgent Care Facilities	\$18,000,000	64%
May 16, 2006	Psychiatric Inpatient Hospital Facilities	\$36,000,000	63%
November 4, 2014	Animal Care Facilities	\$22,000,000	59%

III. Results of Other Jurisdiction's Bond Propositions

A. School Bond Propositions and Budget Overrides in Pima County

Five school districts held bond elections and budget override/override continuation elections on November 3, 2015 (Table 9). Catalina Foothills School District (CFSD) had two propositions – one for bonds and one for a budget override. Of the two school bond propositions, the CFSD bonds were approved, while the Sahuarita Unified School District bonds were not. Of the four budget override propositions, two were approved and two were not.

Table 9 – Approval Rates for School Bonds, Budget Overrides & Continuations

Proposition	School District	Approved	Yes Vote
432	Catalina Foothills School District – \$22 million Bonds	Yes	62.3%
433	Catalina Foothills School District – Budget Override	Yes	60.7%
434	Continental Elementary School District – Budget Override Continuation	No	49.9%
435	Flowing Wells Unified School District – Budget Override Continuation	Yes	57.7%
436	Sahuarita Unified School District – \$40 million Bonds	No	48.1%
437	Sunnyside Unified School District – Budget Override	No	45.1%

B. City of Scottsdale's Bond Election

The City of Scottsdale appears to be the only other local government in Arizona that held a general bond election on November 3, 2015 (Table 10). Two of Scottsdale's six ballot questions were approved; \$12.5 million for street repaving and \$16.35 million for two new fire stations, relocation of a station, and renovation of a station.

Table 10 – Approval Rates for Scottsdale's Bond Election

Ballot Question	Amount	Approved	Yes Vote	Notes
1. Parks & Community Facilities	\$31,900,000	No	48%	Specific projects provided
2. Transportation	\$16,540,000	No	49%	Road segments provided
3. Citywide Technology	\$6,870,000	No	49%	Upgrades to public buildings; not specified
4. Street Pavement Replacement	\$12,500,000	Yes	53%	No streets pre-identified
5. Public Safety – Fire	\$16,350,000	Yes	55%	Specific projects provided
6. Public Safety – Police	\$11,800,000	No	49%	Specific projects provided

C. Municipal Bond Elections Nationwide

According to an online article citing data compiled by a company called Ipreo, voters approved the sale of \$18.9 billion of about \$23 billion of bonds placed on the November 3, 2015 ballot by schools and municipalities (<http://reut.rs/1kxIVgn>). The largest single ballot measure approved was \$1.6 billion in bonds for the Dallas Independent School District. The largest single ballot measure to be rejected by voters was \$287 million in bonds for a courthouse in Travis County, Texas. The article referenced the rejection by voters of Pima County's seven bond measures.

D. Open Space Bond Measures Nationwide

The Trust for Public Land, a non-profit conservation organization, consistently tracks the status of open space acquisition related funding measures across the country via an application called TPL LandVote. There were 22 ballot questions on the November 3, 2015 ballots nationwide, including Pima County's Proposition 430. Of those, 17 or 77 percent were approved. These included sales tax measures, property tax measures not related to bonding, income tax measures, and a resort tax measure. Seven of the 22 were property tax related bond measures, of which four or 57 percent were approved. Pima County and San Carlos, California were by far the largest open space bond measures at \$95 million and \$45 million and both failed.

IV. Summary

- Voter turnout for the overall election, at 39 percent, was reasonable for an off-year/odd-year election.
- Precincts with higher voter turnout tended to be in areas with higher median household incomes and a higher median age; and conversely areas with lower voter turnout tended to be in areas with lower median household incomes and a lower median age.
- Voter turnout was highest in Supervisorial District 4 and lowest in District 2.
- Almost 83 percent of ballots cast were by early ballot, which is a record high for County-wide election.
- All seven County bond propositions were rejected, with Propositions 425 Road and Highway Improvements and 431 Flood Control and Drainage losing by the least number of votes and Propositions 426 Economic Development and 427 Tourism Facilities losing by the highest number of votes.
- Voters in District 5 approved Proposition 425, 428, 429 and 431, and almost approved 426. The lowest bond proposition approval rates were consistently from voters in District 4.
- Voters within the City of Tucson approved Propositions 425 Road and Highway Improvements and 431 Flood Control and Drainage.
- The geographic areas that supported a majority of the County bond propositions, or contained precincts where at least 40 percent voted in support of a majority of the propositions, were generally within the City of Tucson or bordering the City of Tucson.
- The Central corridor of Tucson, parts of Catalina Foothills and the Tucson Mountain foothills south of Sweetwater, and the tribal areas supported a majority of the bond propositions; and these same areas contained precincts where registered voters are more likely to be Democrats.
- The areas that opposed the majority of the bond propositions have no common majority political party; although areas that opposed with higher numbers of no votes were majority Republican or Other.
- There appears to be no connection between project location and approval rate.
- The funding amount per individual bond proposition does not appear to have had an impact on voter approval levels.

- The bond propositions that received the most support appear to be the most basic functions of government (Flood Control and Drainage; Road and Highway Improvements).
- While the recent County bond propositions were rejected by voters with approval rates of only 34 to 48 percent, prior County general obligation bond questions on the ballot in 2004, 2006 and 2014 were approved at rates ranging from 58 to 65 percent.