



COLD SPRING SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD

SPECIAL SESSION BOARD WORKSHOP

**FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 2019
8:45 AM**

**COLD SPRING SCHOOL LIBRARY
2243 SYCAMORE CANYON ROAD, SANTA BARBARA, CA, 93108**

Welcome to the meeting of the Cold Spring School District Governing Board.

Public Comments – Members of the public are encouraged to attend Board meetings and to address the Board concerning any item on the agenda or within the Board's jurisdiction. In order to conduct district business in an orderly and efficient manner, the Board requires that public presentations to the Board comply with the following procedures:

Persons wishing to address the Board must turn in a Request to Address the Board form prior to the agenda item or prior to the Public Comments period if the item is not on the agenda.

During the Public Comments agenda item (Item 4), members of the public may bring before the Board matters that are not listed on the agenda. The Board shall take no action or discussion on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except as authorized by law. (Education Code 35145.5, Government Code 54954.2)

Members of the public may address the Board on any item on the agenda either before or during the Board's consideration of the item. A Request to Address the Board must be turned in prior to the agenda item.

Individual speakers shall be allowed three (3) minutes to address the Board on each agenda or non-agenda item. The Board shall limit the total time for public input on each item to 15 minutes.

Accessibility – In compliance with the American Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in the meeting or need this agenda provided in disability-related alternative format, please contact the [Superintendent/Principal's Office](#). Notification 6 hours prior to the meeting will enable the District to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accommodation and accessibility to this meeting. Upon request, the District shall also make available this agenda and all other public records associated with the meeting in appropriate alternative formats for persons with a disability.

Reports/Attachments – Members of the public may request a copy of the agenda, or a copy of the documents constituting the agenda packet, of any meeting of the Governing Board.

Cell Phones / Electronic Devices – As a courtesy to all meeting attendees, please set cell phones and electronic devices to silent mode and engage in conversations outside the meeting room.

**COLD SPRING SCHOOL DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD
SPECIAL SESSION BOARD WORKSHOP

AGENDA**

**FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 2019
8:45 AM**

**COLD SPRING SCHOOL LIBRARY
2243 SYCAMORE CANYON ROAD, SANTA BARBARA, CA, 93108**

SPECIAL SESSION / CALL TO ORDER

1. CALL TO ORDER 8:45 AM

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

[Motion:_____Second:_____Ayes:_____Noes:_____Absent:_____Abstain:_____]

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

During this time, the Board President may acknowledge requests to speak on a topic not on the agenda. Persons wishing to address the Board should make a written request prior to this agenda item.

5. BOARD COMMENTS – COMMUNICATION/CORRESPONDENCE

Individual Board Members may share information or correspondence with the Board, staff and the public.

6. APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSAL FROM FM3 TO PROVIDE PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH FOR A 2020 G.O. BOND MEASURE AND PARCEL TAX

[Motion:_____Second:_____Ayes:_____Noes:_____Absent:_____Abstain:_____]

7. ADJOURNMENT

[Motion:_____Second:_____Ayes:_____Noes:_____Absent:_____Abstain:_____]

Proposal to Provide Public Opinion Research for the Cold Spring School District *G.O. Bond Measure Viability Assessment*



Contact:
John Fairbank
Partner



OPINION
RESEARCH
& STRATEGY



TO Dr. Amy Alzina, Superintendent/Principal
Cold Spring School District

FROM John Fairbank & Adam Sonenshein
FM3 Research

RE: Proposal to Provide Public Opinion Research for a 2020 G.O. Bond Measure

DATE July 17, 2019

It was a pleasure meeting with you in person a few weeks ago. Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) is pleased to submit this proposal to conduct research evaluating the viability of a G.O. bond measure for the Cold Spring School District in the March or November 2020 elections. In addition to assessing the viability of a bond measure, this survey research would assess Cold Spring School District voters' views toward a variety of issues related to the District, and would help inform and maximize the effectiveness of the marketing, communications, and outreach work you may undertake with Mary Rose & Associates.

As you know, **FM3 was honored to be selected by the Cold Spring School District as your pollster in 2017 to support the District's effort to evaluate the viability of a potential school bond measure in 2018** – an effort which was put on hold after the devastating mudslides of January 9, 2018. As part of this project, FM3 has drafted and edited a survey questionnaire for the District that remains ready to field when the District is ready, and for which FM3 was happy to waive all charges to the District given the severity of the disaster in Montecito.

FM3 also has a long and successful history of helping public agencies design revenue measures that are aligned with local voter priorities – demonstrated by our firm's **success rate of over 95 percent** since its 1981 inception – with a total of **533 local tax and bond measures approved for California agencies** in every region of the state, including **66 on the November 2018 ballot** alone.

Further, as you may know FM3 served as pollster for the **Santa Barbara Unified School District** as part of the District's successful effort to secure voter approval for two local school bonds on the November 2016 ballot – **Measure I and Measure J**. As SBUSD serves as the junior high and high school district for Cold Spring School District residents, Cold Spring voters were asked to weigh in on Measure I, which provides funding for SBUSD's junior high and high schools. On Election Day, the Cold Spring community gave Measure I a decisive win, supporting the bond measure by a margin of 60 to 40 percent on its way to a districtwide victory. **FM3 would incorporate the lessons learned during this recent successful experience – both what worked well for communicating with Cold Spring voters about the school bond and what could be improved – into the research we would conduct for your District.**

This proposal is organized into three sections: **Section 1** discusses FM3's relevant experience; **Section 2** summarizes methodological considerations for the research; and **Section 3** outlines FM3's proposed research specifications and estimated costs. A complete listing of the successful education funding ballot measures passed



using FM3's research is provided as an **Appendix** to this proposal. We would be happy to provide any additional information that would be helpful in your consideration.

1.1 School Bond Measure Experience

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) is a leading provider of public opinion research for California's K-12 local school districts seeking voter approval for revenue-enhancing ballot measures. More than **95 percent of local school finance measures placed on the ballot at our recommendation have been approved by voters**, and our research has helped secure the passage of **137 successful local school bond measures in California, generating more than \$51 billion for the state's K-12 school districts**—including more than \$4.7 billion for 13 such districts throughout the state in the 2018 elections alone. Districts for whom we regularly provide research and consulting services include some of the largest and most ethnically and socioeconomically diverse in California, such as **Los Angeles Unified (\$20.5 billion in bonds)**, **San Diego Unified (\$9.9 billion)**, and **Long Beach Unified (\$2.7 billion)**, as well as dozens of mid-size and smaller districts like Cold Spring School District.

We approach each new research project with an extensive base of knowledge about the kinds of broad themes and specific school facilities improvements that tend to motivate voters to support local school bonds. At the same time, our experience has given us a healthy respect for the many ways in which communities and districts differ. In addition to testing core concepts such as **bond measure viability, voters' tax tolerance, optimal election timing, and voters' sense of the District's financial needs**, our approach to local school bond measures starts with achieving four key objectives:

- FM3 quantitatively tests voters' **sense of urgency and priority for dozens of potential projects and expenditures**, and then works collaboratively with District legal counsel to draft a 75-word ballot label that meets legal requirements while emphasizing as many of your voters' top priorities as possible.
- At the same time, our research assesses **the relative efficacy of a range of non-advocacy public education messages** to identify which themes and information will resonate most with voters in the context of public outreach efforts.
- FM3's research also tests the **impact of finance measure opponents' messages** to provide the District a quantitative assessment of which opposition arguments may be most damaging to a finance measure's standing among the electorate.
- Finally, FM3 also assesses which sources voters use to get information about the District, and **which public figures and organizations would prove the most credible as messengers** about the District's finance measure.

In addition to our expansive work helping to secure additional voter-approved funding for public education in California at the local level, FM3 has also been a leader in evaluating public perception of education funding issues at the statewide level for many years. We serve as the primary research firm for the **Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH)**, and our research has led to **voter approval of seven statewide school bonds** since 1990,



including **Proposition 51** in 2016 – raising a combined total of **\$34.6 billion for public school and community college facilities and capital needs**. Previously, FM3’s research was used to pass the original **Proposition 98** in 1988 – the initiative that created the “Prop. 98 funding guarantee” for local school and community college districts within the state budget – as well as **Proposition 39** in 2000, which reduced the vote threshold for passing local school bonds from two-thirds to 55 percent.

Currently, FM3 is conducting research for a statewide coalition which includes the **Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH)**, the **California School Boards Association (CSBA)**, the **Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)**, **California School Employees Association (CSEA)**, the **California State PTA**, the **California Charter School Advocates**, and the **Community College League of California** to examine the viability of statewide bond (\$13 billion) and tax (\$11-\$14 billion) measures that would benefit local school and community college districts throughout California - and which may appear on the November 2020 ballot. We would leverage this body of institutional knowledge regarding how California’s education funding system works and how voters perceive it to improve the research we conduct for this project.

1.2 Experience in Santa Barbara County

FM3 has extensive experience conducting research throughout Santa Barbara County. Our firm has conducted research throughout Santa Barbara County for more than three decades. Some brief highlights from our past research among Santa Barbara County residents and voters are provided below:

- In 2018, FM3 provided survey research for the **City of Carpinteria** which assessed support for a local sales tax ballot measure. Based on our recommendation, the City placed a 1.25-cent sales tax, **Measure X**, on the November 2018 ballot, where it was approved with 56 percent support.
- In 2017, FM3 conducted focus group and survey research on behalf of the **City of Santa Barbara** that assessed support for a revenue generating ballot measure. Our recommendation was that voters were likely to support a full one-cent transaction and use tax increase, with strict accountability and no sunset clause. The Santa Barbara City Council acted on our recommendation, placing the sales tax on the November 2017 ballot as **Measure C**, where it was approved with 56 percent support.
- In 2016, FM3 provided research for the **Santa Barbara Unified School District** in support of SBUSD’s two successful bond measures on the November 2016 ballot - **Measure I** and **Measure J**. Measure I, a \$135 million bond which is focused on improving the District’s high schools, was approved with more than 69 percent support; Measure J, a \$58 million bond that provides funding for improvements to elementary schools, received more than 71 percent support.
- In 2014, FM3 provided research for the **Carpinteria Unified School District** that informed the District’s decision-making process in the drafting of **Measure U**, the District’s \$90 million local school bond measure that was approved with more than 66 percent of the vote in the November 2014 election.



- In both 2014 and 2009, FM3 conducted surveys on behalf of Santa Barbara County and the **City of Goleta** to test the viability of an increase in the current Goleta Library Parcel Tax to maintain and restore services and perform needed building repairs. In both surveys, the results showed that support fell short of the required two-thirds threshold for passage, resulting in the City and County delaying placing the measure before voters while additional work was done to inform the public about the financial needs of the library.
- Also in 2014, FM3 conducted survey research for the **City of Goleta** among voters in **Santa Barbara County's 2nd Supervisorial District** to assess local voter support for various proposed changes to the City of Goleta's Revenue Neutrality Agreement with Santa Barbara County.
- In 2013 and in 2011, FM3 conducted countywide research for Santa Barbara County's **Project Clean Water** to assess voters' awareness of storm water pollution and to measure behaviors that contribute to the contamination of local rivers, lakes, streams, beaches, and bays. The research was also used to help determine the viability of a countywide Clean Water, Clean Beaches revenue measure to fund stormwater and other water quality improvement projects throughout the County's unincorporated communities, and helped inform a public relations campaign to educate voters about the need for additional funds to protect local water resources.
- For more than a decade, FM3 has provided quarterly public image tracking research for **Southern California Edison**, Santa Barbara County's electric utility provider, within Santa Barbara County and the balance of SCE's service area.
- In 2012, FM3 conducted research for the **City of Carpinteria** to gauge the viability of a measure that would raise the City's transient occupancy tax (TOT, or hotel bed tax) from 10 to 12 percent. The resulting measure, **Measure E** was approved by 77.8 percent of Carpinteria voters in November 2012.
- In 2009, the firm conducted survey research on behalf of **Santa Barbara County** to determine the feasibility of a Jail Expansion ballot measure to address overcrowding issues. Within the survey, voters were asked to assess funding priorities for various government programs given limited public resources.
- In 2008, FM3 conducted baseline survey research on behalf of the **Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG)** for the renewal of a one-half cent sales tax for transportation maintenance and enhancements throughout the County (**Measure A**). The County's previous attempt to renew the dedicated sales tax had failed two years prior (only receiving 54.47% support). FM3 was retained to provide a fresh look at public opinion relating to the measure. The firm's research was used to develop an expenditure package of transit, freeway, and road improvements that would satisfy both North and South County voters, as well as an educational outreach plan which helped secure passage of the measure with almost 79 percent of the vote in November 2008. FM3's research identified projects and services valued by North and South County voters. In many cases, there was universal support for certain specific activities such as repairing potholes and increasing public transit access for seniors and the disabled.



However, there were also clear regional differences within the County; those in South County assigned much greater importance than North County voters to preventing polluted toxic runoff from entering storm drains and flowing into County waterways and onto beaches. Further, specific regional projects were tested exclusively in the area they most affected in order to determine whether those voters would be willing to pay for such projects. In the case of North County voters, repairing and widening the Highway 101 Santa Maria River Bridge was one such highly valued project. Similarly, large percentages of South County voters were willing to pay to improve safety on rural highways such as the 166 and 246.

- Also in 2008, FM3 conducted survey research on behalf of the **City of Santa Barbara** that helped pass a ballot measure (**Measure G**) reauthorizing and modernizing its Utility User Tax (UUT) ordinance. The survey results suggested that although 72 percent supported the simple majority measure, intensity of support was somewhat soft. The City, after consultation with FM3 therefore decided to reduce the tax rate from 6% to 5.75% while modernizing and reauthorizing its UUT. The measure was approved with 70.79 percent support in the November 2008 Presidential Election – a result well within the +/-4.4% margin of error of FM3's survey.
- FM3 conducted a **City of Santa Barbara General Plan** community survey in 2008 to test residents' awareness of and concerns about various general plan issues. The research also examined support for a number of general plan update proposals to help elected officials and city planners revise and update Santa Barbara's general plan. The research helped city planners quantify public attitudes expressed in community meetings and determine strategies to engage more residents in the general plan update process.
- In 2008, FM3 was retained to conduct survey research among City of Santa Barbara voters, and voters in surrounding zip codes, to measure support for the **University of California, Santa Barbara's** expansion plans and their attitudes towards the plans' projected impact on County services.
- In 2000, FM3 provided research for the **City of Santa Barbara** to assess the type of local finance measure – what mechanism, and whether a general or special tax – that would be most viable to address the City's need for an ongoing source of funding for local creek protection and clean water programs. Our research determined that support was strongest for a transient occupancy (hotel) special tax measure, and the City responded by placing **Measure B**, a special tax increasing the City's TOT tax rate from ten to 12 percent, on the November 2000 Presidential Election ballot. Measure B was approved by Santa Barbara voters with more than 70 percent of the vote.
- In addition to our extensive portfolio of work for public agencies throughout Santa Barbara County, FM3 has also served as campaign pollster for a variety of Santa Barbara County elected officials, including Congressman **Salud Carbajal** (during his tenure as a Santa Barbara County Supervisor), Supervisors **Das Williams** and **Joan Hartmann**, and former Supervisor **Doreen Farr**.



A complete listing of the successful local finance measures that have been passed in Santa Barbara County using FM3's research is provided by **Figure 1** below.

Figure 1: FM3 Successful Local Finance Measures in Santa Barbara County

Agency	Measure Name	Mechanism	Election
City of Carpinteria	Measure X	1.25-Cent Sales Tax	November 2018
City of Santa Barbara	Measure C	1-Cent Sales Tax	November 2017
Santa Barbara USD	Measure I	\$135 Million Bond	November 2016
Santa Barbara USD	Measure J	\$58 Million Bond	November 2016
Carpinteria USD	Measure U	\$90 Million Bond	November 2014
City of Carpinteria	Measure E	2% TOT Increase	November 2012
Santa Barbara CAG	Measure A	½-Cent Sales Tax	November 2008
City of Santa Barbara	Measure G	UUT Modernization	November 2008
City of Santa Barbara	Measure B	2% TOT Increase	November 2000

In addition to the agencies shown in **Figure 1**, FM3 is also proud to have provided research for Santa Barbara County public agencies including the **Goleta Union School District**, **Santa Maria-Bonita School District**, **Montecito Union School District**, the **City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division**, and the **Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District**, among others.

Our experience in Santa Barbara County also includes focus groups on behalf of **The Nature Conservancy** to understand sentiments regarding the restoration of Santa Cruz Island. Additionally, our firm provided survey and focus group research to the **Milken Foundation** to gauge support for the creation of a museum complex in Santa Barbara County. We have also conducted countywide research on energy issues for **Breitbart Energy** and others.

1.3 Experience with Elementary School District Finance Measures

FM3 has a thorough understanding of the unique needs and opportunities faced by elementary school districts seeking voter approval for a local revenue measure. Since 1997, our research and strategic consulting services have given rise to 21 successful local school bond measures for Elementary School Districts throughout the state, totaling more than \$1.7 billion. We understand that California's **elementary school districts are a distinct category of educational agency with a unique role and public profile – both of which are important to quantify and leverage when asking voters to increase taxes.**

While it is common for voters in jurisdictions served by separate, independent elementary and high school districts to report some confusion as to whether their local elementary and high schools are administered by the same district, establishing a unique brand for your elementary school district can be very powerful. **Voters are overwhelmingly sympathetic to the younger children served by elementary schools, a positive emotional connection that transcends the usual political boundaries of party, ideology, and identity.**



Over the course of more than two decades providing research that helps pass elementary school district bond measures, FM3 has developed a portfolio of highly effective themes that leverage voters' deeply held concern for the wellbeing of young children which we test as part of our survey research. Some key thematic elements for successful elementary school district bond measures include: **(1)** ensuring school safety; **(2)** ensuring safe drinking water; **(3)** conducting basic health and safety repairs such as replacing leaky roofs and removing asbestos; **(4)** providing classroom space for reducing class sizes; and **(5)** providing access to computers, information technology, and STEM instruction. It is also crucial to find themes that resonate with voters who do not have children at Cold Spring School, such as the impact of quality schools on property values and the fiscal accountability provisions that will be built into the measure.

Figure 2 below illustrates FM3's successful bond measures for California elementary school districts over the past two decades.

Figure 2: FM3 Successful Elementary School District Bond Measures

Agency	Measure	Total Authorization	Election
Del Mar Union School District	Proposition MM	\$186 million	November 2018
Grass Valley School District	Measure D	\$18.8 million	June 2018
Ravenswood City School District	Measure S	\$70 million	June 2018
Bakersfield City School District	Measure N	\$110 million	November 2016
Etiwanda School District	Measure I	\$137 million	November 2016
Mountain View School District	Measure SS	\$57 million	November 2016
Ontario-Montclair School District	Measure K	\$150 million	November 2016
Ravenswood City School District	Measure H	\$26 million	June 2016
Mountain View School District SFID-2	Measure W	\$171 million	April 2015
Central School District	Measure N	\$35 million	November 2014
Evergreen School District	Measure M	\$100 million	November 2014
Rosemead School District	Measure RS	\$30 million	November 2014
Merced City School District	Measure M	\$60 million	June 2014
Spreckles Union School District	Measure B	\$7 million	November 2012
Helendale School District	Measure X	\$20 million	November 2008
Victor Elementary School District	Measure E	\$150 million	November 2008
Westminster School District	Measure O	\$130 million	November 2008
Alisal Union School District	Measure A	\$90 million	November 2006
Perris Elementary School District	Measure S	\$25 million	November 2006
Chula Vista Elementary School District	Proposition JJ	\$95 million	November 1998
South Bay Union School District	Proposition B	\$8.5 million	March 1997



1.4 Overcoming Uncertainty Regarding AB-195

In 2018, California school districts and other local agencies needed to follow strict new requirements when drafting ballot label language for bond measures. Those requirements remain in place today, but there is a possibility they will be suspended or ended for the 2020 election cycle. Assembly Bill 195 (AB-195), a state law enacted in 2017, mandates that ballot labels for local bonds include detailed figures about not only the total authorization amount, but also the rate and duration of the resulting property tax increase – information that, when displayed so prominently, can prove confusing to voters and adversely impact bond measure viability (see Figure 3 below).

Figure 3: AB195 Compliant Ballot Language vs. Pre-AB195 Ballot Language

Pre-AB195: <i>(Tested July 2016)</i>	AB-195 Compliant: <i>(Tested January 2018)</i>
<p>To expand science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) classrooms throughout the District; improve fire safety and security systems; acquire, construct/ repair classrooms and school facilities; replace deteriorating roofs; and upgrade electrical systems for modern technology; shall XXX Unified School District issue \$165.3 million of bonds with interest rates below legal limits, annual audits, independent citizen oversight and all funds spent locally and not taken by the State and spent elsewhere?</p>	<p>To improve neighborhood schools by upgrading academic, vocational/career, engineering, science, technology classrooms; Improving school fire/safety systems; Repairing deteriorating classrooms, plumbing, roofs; Shall XXX Unified School District issue \$150 million dollars in bonds at legal rates under a no-tax-rate-increase financing plan, estimated repayment of \$650,000 to \$16.5 million raised annually for approximately twenty-two years, projected tax rates of point six to six cents per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation, independent audits/citizens' oversight, no money for administrators?</p>
<p>Polling Result: <u>66% Yes</u></p>	<p>Polling Result: <u>55% Yes</u></p>

However, **whether AB-195 will continue to be in effect long enough to impact the 2020 election is, as of this writing, the subject of significant uncertainty.** In our capacity as the primary research firm for California's Coalition for Adequate School Housing, FM3 is currently assisting with an intense, ongoing advocacy effort aimed at securing repeal of AB-195 through the state legislature. To mitigate against this uncertainty, particularly in light of the significant negative impact on electoral viability produced by adopting AB-195-compliant ballot label language (as demonstrated by FM3's research), **some of our clients opted to develop—and secure Board approval for—two parallel versions of the 75-word ballot label language for their 2018 and/or 2020 bond measures: one version that is compliant with AB-195, and the other non-compliant—to be used in the event of a timely AB-195 repeal.**

In this environment, **FM3's research will help the Cold Spring School District overcome potential obstacles by identifying the strongest possible ballot label language for the District's bond measure (maximizing its public support and electoral viability) under both legal scenarios.** Our team provided research for more than a dozen



successful local bond measures using AB-195-compliant ballot language in 2018; we are currently working with numerous school districts and other local agencies throughout the state that are facing this same challenge regarding anticipated 2020 bond measures. Therefore, Cold Spring School District will benefit from our knowledge of the types of AB-195-compliant ballot label language that have been demonstrated to maximize bond measure viability in other jurisdictions.

1.5 Experience Conducting Accurate Research in Modestly Sized Electorates

With a total of just 1,738 registered voters in the Cold Spring School District, conducting a voter opinion survey that is both statistically reliable and generalizable to the broader electorate will require the research team to overcome a specific set of challenges. In the current communications environment, securing adequate participation from respondents presents an ever-growing challenge for research organizations of all types – a challenge that is exacerbated in instances when the population of interest presents a relatively small number of potential respondents to begin with. To overcome this, FM3 uses a set of protocols developed by our firm to ensure that our surveys achieve a high response rate and a sufficient level of valid responses.

FM3 has successfully conducted research in dozens of communities and school districts similar in size to Cold Spring School District. Over the course of more than three decades working in these communities, our firm has developed a unique set of protocols which ensure that our surveys achieve an adequate sample size even when the pool of registered voters in the subject jurisdiction is small. Some of these protocols are very simple (such as arranging call-back appointments for potential respondents who are willing to take the survey but are unable to do so when initially reached); some are slightly more involved, such as matching residents' names with current email addresses and telephone numbers (landline and cellular) that are accessible through commercially obtainable consumer records so that residents who have recently changed their email address or telephone number are able to participate in the survey; and others are more complex, such as utilizing FM3's innovative dual-mode internet-telephone data collection methodology which is described in detail in **Section 2** of this proposal. These protocols have enabled FM3 to maintain incidence rates—the willingness of eligible respondents to take our surveys—that are above the industry standard since the firm's inception.

A partial listing of California school districts with electorates roughly similar in size to that of Cold Spring School District (or smaller) which have utilized FM3's research services to pass a school finance measure since 2008 includes: **Barstow Unified School District, Carpinteria Unified School District, Caruthers Unified School District** (two measures), **Duarte Unified School District, Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified School District, Golden Plains Unified School District, Helendale School District, Los Banos Unified School District, Rosemead School District, Spreckels Union School District, and St. Helena Unified School District.** Similarly, California cities of analogous size that have utilized FM3's research and consulting services to help pass local finance measures include **Big Bear Lake, Canyon Lake** (two measures), **Capitola** (two measures), **Carpinteria** (two measures), **Clearlake, Cloverdale, Commerce, Cotati** (two measures), **Delano** (two measures), **East Palo Alto** (two measures), **Grover Beach** (three measures), **Healdsburg, Kingsburg, Lakeport, Larkspur** (two measures), **Marina, Morro Bay, San Anselmo, Sanger** (two measures), **Santa Fe Springs** (two measures), **Santa Paula** (two measures), **Seaside** (three measures), **St. Helena,** and **Wasco,** among other communities.



1.6 Experience with Cumulative Finance Measures

FM3 specializes in helping our school district and other public agency clients secure voter approval for multiple local finance measures over a relatively short period of time – including in many cases (most recently for the **South Monterey County Joint Union High School District** and the **Santa Barbara Unified School District**) **passing multiple measures on the same ballot**. Strategies we have successfully deployed on behalf of other school district clients include using **unique messaging language, such as framing sequential finance measures as part of a multi-phase strategy by the District** to address its facility and/or operational funding needs. **Given that Cold Spring School District property owners are continuing to pay off the bonded debt authorized in 2008 by Measure C, we anticipate that these specialized capabilities are likely to prove both relevant and useful for the District's research.** FM3's K-12 local school district clients in California that have utilized our research and consulting services to help pass multiple local finance measure are listed by **Figure 4** below.

Figure 4: FM3 Multiple Finance Measure School District Clients

District	Measures
Los Angeles USD	Five Bonds
Santa Monica-Malibu USD	Three Parcel Taxes & Two Bonds
San Diego USD	Four Bonds
Evergreen SD	Three Parcel Taxes, One Bond
Tahoe Truckee USD	Two Parcel Taxes, Two Bonds
Arcadia USD	Two Parcel Taxes, One Bond
Ravenswood City SD	Two Bonds, One Parcel Tax
Fresno USD	Three Bonds
Sanger USD	Three Bonds
Alhambra USD	Two Bonds
Norwalk La Mirada USD	Two Bonds
Salinas Union HSD	Two Bonds
Healdsburg USD	Two Bonds
San Bernardino City USD	Two Bonds
Clovis USD	Two Bonds
Walnut USD	Two Bonds
Corona-Norco USD	Two Bonds
Modesto City USD	Two Bonds
Long Beach USD	Two Bonds
Caruthers USD	Two Bonds
Paramount USD	Two Bonds
Santa Barbara USD	Two Bonds
Placer UHSD	Two Bonds
Hemet USD	Two Bonds
Natomas USD	Two Bonds
South Monterey County JUHSD	Two Bonds
Berkeley USD	One Parcel Tax, One Bond



2 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Dual Mode Interviewing

Our team recommends the adoption of a **dual-mode, online and telephone (landline and wireless) interviewing methodology**, as the last several years have ushered significant changes in the ways many Americans use telephones and other communication technologies. The dramatic rise in the use of caller I.D. and similar features has led to an unprecedented increase in individuals screening their calls. At the same time, the use and prevalence of the internet has exploded as an ever-increasing proportion of the population has access through their smartphone or another mobile device. These changes have had a significant impact on the discipline of public opinion research. While the traditional methodology of conducting randomized telephone surveys continues to provide highly accurate data on public sentiments in a cost-effective manner, the rise of call-screening behavior presents growing challenges.

The contemporary approach for gathering statistically reliable data is to employ the traditional telephone survey methodology alongside the latest online survey applications. Combining the data from the telephone and online surveys produces an **all-inclusive, representative sample of the population of interest**. Though a relatively recent innovation, FM3's dual mode surveys demonstrated their precision over the course of the 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 election cycles, helping guide **more than 100 local ballot measures to victory for agencies throughout California – with the final results for nearly every measure falling within the margin of sampling error designated by our survey.**

2.2 Survey Sample

With a total of just 1,738 registered voters, the Cold Spring School District has a modestly sized electorate. **For an electorate your size, given current survey participation rates, FM3 believes a survey with a sample size of between 100 and 300 interviews is realistic** for the District. FM3 will make every effort - and leverage our considerable expertise in surveying jurisdictions with modestly sized populations - to complete as many survey interviews possible, as a larger sample size will provide a greater degree of accuracy for the survey results.



3 PROPOSED RESEARCH SPECIFICATIONS AND ESTIMATED COSTS

Research Methodology	Dual-mode voter survey
Data Collection Mode	Telephone and online interviews
Respondent Contact Method	Telephone calls & Email invitations
Sample	100-300 Cold Spring School District registered voters
Margin of Sampling Error	<p>±5.7 percent in 95 out of 100 cases for a sample of 300 interviews</p> <p>±6.9 percent in 95 out of 100 cases for a sample of 200 interviews</p> <p>±9.8 percent in 95 out of 100 cases for a sample of 100 interviews</p>
Questionnaire	15- to 20-minute survey, featuring between 45 and 70 unique questions (including battery question items)
Language	Interviews will be conducted in English
Deliverables	<p>Following the completion of the survey, we will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A questionnaire with the topline results of the survey for easy reference ➤ A complete set of crosstabs in an easy-to-read, comprehensive format ➤ Verbatim responses to any open-ended questions ➤ A complete analysis of survey results in PowerPoint ➤ A presentation of the survey results

FM3 will also be available for ongoing consultation and any further analysis of the research.

Cost **Figure 5** below contains the total estimated costs for this research. These prices are comprehensive, and include all costs for questionnaire design, sample acquisition and preparation, programming, email invitations, survey hosting, telephone interviewing, data entry and analysis, and reporting.

Figure 5: Estimated Survey Costs

Survey Length	100 Interviews	200 Interviews	300 Interviews
15 minutes	\$20,850	\$22,500	\$24,500
20 minutes	\$21,750	\$23,850	\$25,850



We would welcome the opportunity to work with you on this research. If you have any questions or if there is any further information we can provide, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your consideration, and you may reach us in our Los Angeles office as follows:

John Fairbank, Partner

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3)
12100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 350
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 828-1183 (Office)
John@FM3Research.com

Adam Sonenshein, Vice President

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3)
12100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 350
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 828-1183 (Office)
Adam@FM3Research.com



APPENDIX:

FM3 SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION FUNDING BALLOT MEASURES



SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION FINANCING MEASURES

Statewide Education Measures

"Yes" on Proposition 51 (CA)	\$9 Billion K-14 Bond	November 2016
"Yes" on Proposition 55 (CA)	\$12.3 Billion K-12 Bond	March 2004
"Yes" on Proposition 39 (CA)	Lowered vote threshold for education bonds to 55%	November 2000
"No" on Proposition 38 (CA)	School Vouchers	November 2000
"Yes" on Proposition 1A (CA)	\$9.2 Billion K-12 Bond	November 1998
"No" on Proposition 8 (CA)	Governor Pete Wilson's Education Finance Initiative	November 1998
"Yes" on Proposition 155 (CA)	\$900 Million School Facility Bond Act	November 1992
"Yes" on Proposition 152 (CA)	\$1.9 Billion School Facility Bond	June 1992
"Yes" on Proposition 153 (CA)	\$900 Million Higher Ed. Bond Act	June 1992
"Yes" on Proposition 121 (CA)	\$450 Million School Facility Bond	June 1990
"Yes" on Proposition 98 (CA)	Guarantees state funding for schools and community colleges	June 1988

Community College Measures

Mount San Antonio Community College District (CA), Measure GO	\$750 Million Bond	November 2018
Chaffey Community College District (CA), Measure P	\$700 Million Bond	November 2018
Butte-Glenn Community College District (CA), Measure J	\$190 Million Bond	November 2016
Glendale Community College District (CA), Measure GC	\$325 Million Bond	November 2016
Kern Community College District (CA), Measure J	\$502.8 Million Bond	November 2016
Los Angeles Community College District (CA), Measure CC	\$3300 Million Bond	November 2016
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District, Measure X	\$748 Million Bond	November 2016
Southwestern Community College District, Proposition Z	\$400 Million Bond	November 2016
State Center Community College District (CA), Measure C	\$485 Million Bond	June 2016
Long Beach Community College District (CA), Measure LB	\$850 Million Bond	June 2016
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CA), Measure A	\$950 Million Bond	June 2016
Compton Community College District (CA), Measure C	\$100 Million Bond	November 2014
Lake Tahoe Community College District (CA), Measure F	\$55 Million Bond	November 2014
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (CA), Measure AA	\$295 Million Bond	November 2014
North Orange County Community College District (CA), Measure J	\$574 Million Bond	November 2014
San Luis Obispo Community College District (CA), Measure L-14	\$275 Million Bond	November 2014
Santa Rosa Jr. College District (CA), Measure H	\$410 Million Bond	November 2014
Coast Community College District (CA), Measure M	\$698 Million Bond	November 2012
Solano Community College District (CA), Measure Q	\$348 Million Bond	November 2012
Fox Valley Technical College District (WI)	\$66.5 Million Bond	April 2012
Madison Area Technical College District (WI)	\$133.7 Million Bond	November 2010
Ohlone Community College District (CA), Measure G	\$349 Million Bond	November 2010
Los Angeles Community College District (CA), Measure J	\$3500 Million Bond	November 2008
Mount San Antonio Community College District (CA), Measure RR	\$353 Million Bond	November 2008
Southwestern Community College District (CA), Proposition R	\$389 Million Bond	November 2008
College of the Canyons Community College District (CA) Measure M	\$160 Million Bond	November 2006
College of the Sequoias Community College District (CA) Measure C	\$22 Million Bond	November 2006
San Diego Community College District (CA): Proposition N	\$870 Million Bond	November 2006
Yosemite Community College District, Measure E	\$326 Million Bond	November 2004
West Valley Mission Community College District, Measure H	\$235 Million Bond	November 2004
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CA), Measure B	\$498 Million Bond	March 2004
Gavilan Joint Community College District (CA), Measure E	\$108 Million Bond	March 2004
Rio Hondo Community College District (CA), Measure A	\$245 Million Bond	March 2004
San Joaquin Delta Community College District (CA), Measure L	\$250 Million Bond	March 2004
Los Angeles Community College District (CA), Proposition AA	\$980 Million Bond	May 2003
Coast Community College District (CA), Measure C	\$370 Million Bond	November 2002
Compton Community College District (CA), Measure CC	\$100 Million Bond	November 2002

SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION FINANCING MEASURES**Community College Measures (Continued)**

San Diego Community College District (CA), Proposition S	\$685 Million Bond	November 2002
El Camino Community College District (CA), Measure E	\$394.5 Million Bond	November 2002
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (CA), Proposition R	\$207 Million Bond	November 2002
Hartnell Community College District (CA), Measure H	\$131 Million Bond	November 2002
Kern Community College District (CA), Measure G	\$180 Million Bond	November 2002
Napa Valley Community College District (CA), Measure N	\$133.8 Million Bond	November 2002
Rancho Santiago Community College District (CA), Measure E	\$337 Million Bond	November 2002
State Center Community College District (CA), Measure E	\$161 Million Bond	November 2002
Butte-Glenn Community College District (CA), Measure A	\$84.9 Million Bond	March 2002
Contra Costa Community College District (CA), Measure A	\$120 Million Bond	March 2002
Fremont-Newark Community College District (CA), Measure A	\$150 Million Bond	March 2002
Glendale Community College District (CA)	\$98 Million Bond	March 2002
Sonoma County Junior College District (CA), Measure A	\$251 Million Bond	March 2002
Santa Monica Community College (CA), Measure U	\$160 Million Bond	March 2002
Ventura County Community College District (CA), Measure S	\$356 Million Bond	March 2002
Los Angeles Community College District (CA), Proposition A	\$1200 Million Bond	April 2001
Waukesha County Technical College District (WI)	\$30 Million Bond	April 1999
Southwestern Community College District (CA), Proposition AA	\$89.3 Million Bond	November 2000
Maricopa Community College District (AZ)	\$380 Million Bond	November 1994
Santa Monica Community College (CA)	\$23 Million Bond	November 1992

K-12 School Bonds and Parcel Tax Measures

El Monte Union High School District (CA), Measure HS	\$190 Million Bond	November 2018
Sanger Unified School District (CA), Measure B	\$70 Million Bond	November 2018
Placer Union High School District (CA), Measure G	\$42.1 Million Bond	November 2018
Placer Union High School District (CA), Measure D	\$40.3 Million Bond	November 2018
Natomas Unified School District (CA) Measure L	\$172 Million Bond	November 2018
South Monterey County Joint Union High School District (CA), Measure R	\$20 Million Bond	November 2018
South Monterey County Joint Union High School District (CA), Measure Q	\$20 Million Bond	November 2018
Hemet Unified School District (CA), Measure X	\$150 Million Bond	November 2018
San Diego Unified School District (CA), Proposition YY	\$3500 Million Bond	November 2018
Del Mar Union School District (CA), Proposition MM	\$186 Million Bond	November 2018
Vallejo City Unified School District (CA), Measure S	\$194 Million Bond	November 2018
Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District (CA) Measure AA	\$148/parcel tax	November 2018
Evergreen School District (CA), Measure EE	\$125/parcel tax	November 2018
Grass Valley School District (CA), Measure D	\$18.8 Million Bond	June 2018
Ravenswood City School District (CA), Measure S	\$70 Million Bond	June 2018
Ravenswood City School District (CA), Measure Q	\$196/parcel tax	June 2018
Manhattan Beach Unified School District (CA), Measure MB	\$225/parcel tax	June 2018
Westside Community Schools (NE)	\$8.75 Million Override	September 2017
Arcadia Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$288/parcel tax	March 2017
Alhambra Unified School District (CA), Measure AE	\$110 Million Bond	November 2016
Alhambra Unified School District (CA), Measure HS	\$149 Million Bond	November 2016
Bakersfield City School District (CA), Measure N	\$110 Million Bond	November 2016
Barstow Unified School District (CA), Measure F	\$39 Million Bond	November 2016
Caruthers Unified School District (CA), Measure V	\$6 Million Bond	November 2016
Chino Valley Unified School District (CA), Measure G	\$750 Million Bond	November 2016
El Paso Independent School District (TX)	\$668.7 Million Bond	November 2016
Etiwanda School District (CA), Measure I	\$137 Million Bond	November 2016
Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified School District (CA), Measure H	\$17 Million Bond	November 2016
Fresno Unified School District (CA), Measure X	\$225 Million Bond	November 2016
Hacienda-La Puente Unified School District (CA), Measure BB	\$148 Million Bond	November 2016
Kern High School District (CA), Measure K	\$280 Million Bond	November 2016
Lodi Unified School District (CA), Measure U	\$281 Million Bond	November 2016
Long Beach Unified School District (CA), Measure E	\$1500 Million Bond	November 2016
Mountain View Elementary School District (CA), Measure SS	\$57 Million Bond	November 2016

SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION FINANCING MEASURES

K-12 School Bonds and Parcel Tax Measures (Continued)

Nevada Joint Union High School District (CA), Measure B	\$47 Million Bond	November 2016
Ontario-Montclair School District (CA), Measure K	\$150 Million Bond	November 2016
Paramount Unified School District (CA), Measure I	\$106 Million Bond	November 2016
Red Bluff Joint Union High School District (CA), Measure J	\$26 Million Bond	November 2016
Sanger Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$60 Million Bond	November 2016
San Juan Unified School District (CA), Measure P	\$750 Million Bond	November 2016
Santa Barbara Unified School District (CA), Measure I-2016	\$135 Million Bond	November 2016
Santa Barbara Unified School District (CA), Measure J-2016	\$58 Million Bond	November 2016
Ravenswood City School District (CA), Measure H	\$26 Million Bond	June 2016
Montebello Unified School District (CA), Measure GS	\$300 Million Bond	June 2016
Central Union High School District (CA), Measure K	\$30 million Bond	June 2016
Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District (CA), Measure J	\$245 Million Bond	June 2016
Phoenix Union High School District (AZ), Question 210	\$15.3 Million Override	November 2015
Westside Community Schools (NE)	\$79.9 Million Bond	May 2015
Mountain View School District (CA) SFID2, Measure W	\$171 Million Bond	April 2015
Anaheim Union High District (CA), Measure H	\$249 Million Bond	November 2014
Carpinteria Unified School District (CA) Measure U2014	\$90 Million Bond	November 2014
Central School District (CA) Measure N	\$35 Million Bond	November 2014
Downey Unified School District (CA) Measure O	\$248 Million Bond	November 2014
Evergreen School District (CA) Measure M	\$100 Million Bond	November 2014
Golden Plains Unified School District (CA) Measure G	\$13 Million Bond	November 2014
Madison School District (AZ) Measure 38	\$95 Million Bond	November 2014
Manteca Unified School District (CA) Measure G	\$159 Million Bond	November 2014
Natomas Unified School District (CA) Measure J	\$129 Million Bond	November 2014
Norwalk La Mirada Unified School District (CA) Measure G	\$375 Million Bond	November 2014
Rosemead School District (CA) Measure RS	\$30 Million Bond	November 2014
Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District SFID2 (CA) Measure E	\$62 Million Bond	November 2014
Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District SFID1 (CA) Measure U	\$117 Million Bond	November 2014
Evergreen School District (CA) Measure H	\$100/parcel tax	June 2014
Merced City School District (CA) Measure M	\$60 Million Bond	June 2014
Caruthers Unified School District (CA) Measure M	\$12 Million Bond	November 2012
Chaffey Joint Union High School District (CA) Measure P	\$848 Million Bond	November 2012
Kings Canyon Unified School District (CA) Measure K	\$40 Million Bond	November 2012
Perris Union High School District (CA) Measure T	\$153.42 Million Bond	November 2012
San Bernardino Unified School District (CA) Measure N	\$250 Million Bond	November 2012
San Diego Unified School District (CA), Proposition Z	\$2800 Million Bond	November 2012
San Dieguito Union High School District (CA), Proposition AA	\$449 Million Bond	November 2012
Sanger Unified School District (CA) Measure S	\$50 Million Bond	November 2012
Santa Paula Unified School District (CA) Measure M	Reorganization	November 2012
Spreckels Union School District (CA) Measure B	\$7 Million Bond	November 2012
St. Helena Unified School District (CA) Measure C	\$30 Million Bond	November 2012
Clovis Unified School District (CA) Measure A	\$298 Million Bond	June 2012
Arcadia Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$228/parcel tax	March 2012
San Francisco Unified School District (CA), Proposition A	\$531 Million Bond	November 2011
Tahoe Truckee Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$135/parcel tax	March 2011
Duarte Unified School District (CA), Measure E	\$62 Million Bond	November 2010
Fresno Unified School District (CA), Measure Q	\$280 Million Bond	November 2010
San Marcos Unified School District (CA), Measure K	\$287 Million Bond	November 2010
Sonoma Valley Unified School District (CA), Measure H	\$40 Million Bond	November 2010
Coalinga-Huron Joint Unified School District (CA), Measure E	\$16.1 Million Bond	November 2010
Milpitas Unified School District (CA), Measure B	\$84/parcel tax	June 2010
Beaumont Unified School District (CA) Measure Z	\$125 Million Bond	November 2008
Ceres Unified School District (CA) Measure U	\$60 Million Bond	November 2008
Colton Unified School District (CA) Measure G	\$225 Million Bond	November 2008
Evergreen School District (CA) Measure T	\$90/parcel tax	November 2008
Franklin-McKinley School District (CA) Measure U	\$72/parcel tax	November 2008

SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION FINANCING MEASURES

K-12 School Bonds and Parcel Tax Measures (Continued)

Helendale School District (CA) Measure X	\$20 Million Bond	November 2008
Long Beach Unified School District (CA) Measure K	\$1200 Million Bond	November 2008
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA) Measure Q	\$7000 Million Bond	November 2008
Manhattan Beach Unified School District (CA) Measure BB	\$67.48 Million Bond	November 2008
San Diego Unified School District (CA), Proposition S	\$2100 Million Bond	November 2008
Victor Elementary School District (CA), Measure E	\$150 Million Bond	November 2008
Victor Valley Union High School District (CA), Measure V	\$500 Million Bond	November 2008
Westminster School District (CA) Measure O	\$130 Million Bond	November 2008
Hayward Unified School District (CA) Measure I	\$205 Million Bond	June 2008
East Side Union High School District (CA) Measure E	\$349 Million Bond	February 2008
Los Banos Unified School District (CA) Measure K	\$44 Million Bond	February 2008
Walnut Unified School District (CA) Measure S	\$64.6 Million Bond	November 2007
Walnut Unified School District (CA) Measure Y	\$15.2 Million Bond	November 2007
Alisal Union School District (CA) Measure A	\$90 Million Bond	November 2006
Arcadia Unified School District (CA) Measure I	\$218 Million Bond	November 2006
Corona-Norco Unified School District (CA) Measure U	\$250 Million Bond	November 2006
Madera Unified School District (CA) Measure U	\$32.5 Million Bond	November 2006
Paramount Unified School District (CA) Measure AA	\$100 Million Bond	November 2006
Perris Elementary School District (CA) Measure S	\$25 Million Bond	November 2006
San Jacinto Unified School District (CA) Measure V	\$150 Million Bond	November 2006
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (CA) Measure BB	\$268 Million Bond	November 2006
Sweetwater Union High School District (CA) Proposition O	\$644 Million Bond	November 2006
Fontana Unified School District (CA), Measure C	\$275 Million Bond	June 2006
Grant Joint Union High School District, Measure G	\$230 Million Bond	June 2006
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA) Measure Y	\$3985 Million Bond	November 2005
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District (CA), Measure R	\$100/parcel tax	November 2004
Hanford Joint Union High School District (CA), Measure K	\$196 Million Bond	November 2004
Fowler Unified School District (CA), Measure L	\$21 Million Bond	November 2004
Albany Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$13 Million Bond	November 2004
Clovis Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$168 Million Bond	March 2004
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (CA), Measure B	\$180 Million Bond	March 2004
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA), Measure T	\$140 Million Bond	March 2004
Huntington Beach Union High School District (CA), Measure C	\$238 Million Bond	March 2004
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA), Measure R	\$3870 Million Bond	March 2004
Compton Unified School District (CA), Measure I	\$80 Million Bond	November 2002
Healdsburg Unified School District (High School Bond) (CA), Measure G	\$3.9 Million Bond	November 2002
Healdsburg Unified School District (Elementary School Bond) (CA), Measure H	\$18.8 Million Bond	November 2002
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA), Measure K	\$3300 Million Bond	November 2002
Norwalk La Mirada Unified School District (CA), Measure S	\$165 Million Bond	November 2002
Salinas Union High School District (Middle School) (CA), Measure M	\$37 Million Bond	November 2002
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District (CA), Measure C	\$100 Million Bond	March 2002
Hemet Unified School District (CA), Measure E	\$60 Million Bond	March 2002
Placentia Yorba Linda Unified School District (CA), Measure Y	\$102 Million Bond	March 2002
Salinas Union High School District (High School Bond) (CA), Measure F	\$52 Million Bond	March 2002
Vista Unified School District (CA), Measure O	\$140 Million Bond	March 2002
West Contra Costa Unified School District (CA), Measure D	\$300 Million Bond	March 2002
Modesto City Schools (High School Bond) (CA), Measure T	\$65 Million Bond	November 2001
Modesto City Schools (Elementary School Bond) (CA), Measure S	\$17 Million Bond	November 2001
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (CA), Measure Y	\$98/parcel Tax	November 2000
Capistrano Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$85 Million Bond	November 1999
Santa Ana Unified School District (CA), Measure C	\$145 Million Bond	November 1999
Chula Vista Elementary School District (CA), Proposition JJ	\$95 Million Bond	November 1998
Conejo Valley Unified School District (CA), Measure R	\$88 Million Bond	November 1998
San Diego Unified School District (CA), Proposition MM	\$1500 Million Bond	November 1998
Dodge City Unified School District (KS), Question 443	\$45.5 Million Bond	May 1998
Corona-Norco Unified School District (CA), Measure C	\$65 Million Bond	April 1998

SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION FINANCING MEASURES

K-12 School Bonds and Parcel Tax Measures (Continued)

Elk Grove Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$205 Million Bond	March 1998
Burbank Unified School District (CA), Measure B-97	\$112 Million Bond	April 1997
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA), Proposition BB	\$2400 Million Bond	April 1997
South Bay Union School District (CA), Proposition B	\$8.5 Million Bond	March 1997
Culver City Unified School District (CA), Measure T	\$40 Million Bond	November 1996
Jefferson Union High School District (CA), Measure G	\$30 Million Bond	November 1995
Scotts Valley Union School District (CA), Measure H	\$22.7 Million Bond	November 1994
Fresno Unified School District (CA) Measure A	\$215 Million Bond	March 1995
Berkeley Unified School District (CA), Measure B	\$.95/ft ² residential; \$.14/ft ² commercial Tax	November 1994
Oakland Unified School District (CA) Measure C	\$170 Million Bond	November 1994
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (CA), Measure K	\$68/parcel Tax	November 1994
Berkeley Unified School District (CA), Measure A	\$158 Million Bond	November 1992
Palm Springs Unified School District (CA) Measure P	\$70 Million Bond	November 1992
Washoe County Unified School District (NV), School Bond Question	\$155 Million Bond	June 1992
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (CA) Proposition ES	\$75 Million Bond	November 1990
Miami-Dade County Public Schools (FL), Educational Facilities Bond	\$980 Million Bond	November 1988
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (CA), Measure TT	\$58/parcel Tax	November 1988