

Date of Hearing: April 7, 2021

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION  
Patrick O'Donnell, Chair  
AB 75 (O'Donnell) – As Amended March 29, 2021

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

**SUBJECT:** Education finance: school facilities: Kindergarten-Community Colleges Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2022

**SUMMARY:** Places the Kindergarten-Community Colleges Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2022 on the 2022 statewide ballot, to be operative only if approved by voters at the election. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Establishes the 2022 State School Facilities Fund and authorizes the State Allocation Board (SAB) to apportion funds to school districts from funds transferred to the 2022 State School Facilities Fund from any source for the purposes specified in the School Facility Program (SFP).
- 2) Authorizes an unspecified amount of general obligation (GO) school facilities bond to be placed on an unspecified statewide election in 2022 and allocates the funds as follows:
  - a) An unspecified amount for kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) allocated to the following programs:
    - i) New Construction;
    - ii) Modernization;
    - iii) Replacement of facilities older than 75 years;
    - iv) Remediation of Lead in Water;
    - v) Charter School Facilities; and
    - vi) Career Technical Education (CTE).
  - b) An unspecified amount for California Community Colleges (CCC) facilities.
- 3) Requires the Department of General Services (DGS) to process all applications received on and after an unspecified date within 90 days and present the applications to the SAB within 120 days.
- 4) Requires an applicant to submit the following information to the California Department of Education (CDE) once for each school in the school district for projects funded with bonds approved by voters after January 1, 2022:

- a) The year each building at the school currently used for instructional purposes was constructed;
  - b) The square footage of each building that is currently used for instructional purposes;
  - c) The year, if any, each building that is currently used for instructional purposes was last modernized;
  - d) The pupil capacity of the school;
  - e) The age and number of portable buildings at the school; and
  - f) Whether the school has any of the following:
    - i) A cafeteria or multipurpose room;
    - ii) A library; or
    - iii) A gymnasium.
- 5) Establishes points based on a district's gross bonding capacity per enrollment and a district's unduplicated pupil percentage (UPP), used to determine a district's state and local match requirements.
- a) Requires the DGS to divide a district's gross bonding capacity by total enrollment and assign points as follows:
    - i) Between 0 - \$9,999: 4 points
    - ii) Between \$10,000 - \$19,000: 3 points
    - iii) Between \$20,000 - \$54,999: 2 points
    - iv) More than \$55,000: 1 point
  - b) Requires the DGS to assign points based on a district's UPP as follows:
    - i) Between 75% - 100%: 8 points
    - ii) Between 50% - 74.99%: 6 points
    - iii) Between 25% - 49.99%: 4 points
    - iv) Less than 24.99%: 2 points
  - c) Provides a district that has a pupil enrollment of 200 pupils or fewer with 1 additional point.

- d) Requires the DGS to draft regulations for consideration by the SAB to further clarify the requirements of this provision.
- 6) Modifies the 50% state and 50% local match requirement for new construction funding as follows:
  - a) A score between 11 - 13: 55% state and 45% local match
  - b) A score between 9 - 10: 53% state and 47% local match
  - c) A score of 8: 52% state and 48% local match
  - d) A score between 6 - 7: 51% state and 49% local match
  - e) A score of less than 6: 50% state and 50% local match
- 7) Modifies the 60% state and 40% local match requirement for modernization funding as follows:
  - a) A score between 11 - 13: 65% state and 35% local match
  - b) A score between 9 - 10: 63% state and 37% local match
  - c) A score of 8: 62% state and 38% local match
  - d) A score between 6-7: 61% state and 39% local match
  - e) A score of less than 6: 60% state and 40% local match
- 8) Expands the types of costs for which a grant for new construction may be used, including the following:
  - a) Technology, including schoolsite-based infrastructure necessary to provide access to broadband internet within the school;
  - b) Seismic mitigation purposes; and
  - c) Construction of a kitchen, a transitional kindergarten (TK) classroom, a facility to support a local educational agency (LEA)-administered preschool program that is operated by a school district and located on a schoolsite operated by the district, or a facility to support school nurses and counselors to increase access to health care and mental health services.
- 9) Requires the CDE, in developing guidelines and regulations for consideration by the SAB, to provide a school district with maximum flexibility in the design and new construction of school facilities.
- 10) Authorizes a school facility located on a military installation that is the recipient of a federal grant for facilities modernization that requires a local matching share to be eligible to receive modernization funds for a permanent or portable building that is at least 10 years old, or is at

least 10 years old after the date of the previous modernization. Requires a portable building to be replaced with a permanent structure.

11) Establishes a supplemental grant program as follows:

- a) Authorizes a school district that is eligible for modernization funding to receive a supplemental grant for either of the following:
  - i) Expanding an existing gymnasium, multipurpose room, library, or school kitchen, if the facility is 60% or less than the CDE's recommended size needed to serve the enrollment of the school; or
  - ii) Constructing a new gymnasium, multipurpose room, library, or school kitchen if the site is lacking one or more of the specified facilities.
- b) Specifies that a site may receive a supplemental grant for only one project.
- c) Specifies that the funding provided shall be in addition to any other funding.
- d) Requires the SAB, in consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), to develop regulations to implement this program.

12) Expands the types of costs for which a grant for modernization may be used, including the following:

- a) Technology, including schoolsite-based infrastructure necessary to provide access to broadband internet within the school;
- b) Seismic mitigation purposes;
- c) To remediate any water outlet used for drinking or preparing food with lead levels in excess of 15 parts per billion;
- d) The control, management, or abatement of lead; and
- e) Modernization of a school kitchen, a TK classroom, a facility to support a LEA-administered preschool program that is operated by a school district and located on a schoolsite operated by the district, or a facility to support school nurses and counselors to increase access to health care and mental health services.

13) Repeals the hardship assistance provisions in current law and establishes funding for health and safety projects due to unacceptable risk in the event of a seismic event and threat to the health and safety of pupils. Requires the DGS to develop regulations for consideration by the SAB to define eligible health and safety projects.

- a) Provides that a project is eligible for modernization funding if the minimum cost is less than 50% of the current replacement cost of the classroom or facility, and replacement of the facility if a cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that the cost to remain in the classroom or related facility and mitigate the problem is at least 50% of the replacement value.

- 14) Establishes a program allowing school districts to receive new construction grant levels to demolish and construct a new building on an existing schoolsite for buildings that are at least 75 years old if the school district provides a cost-benefit analysis that indicates the total cost to modernize the building is at least 50% of the current replacement cost.
- 15) Modifies eligibility for financial hardship assistance by increasing the total bonding capacity from below \$5 million to below \$15 million and provides an annual inflation adjustment beginning 2023-24.
- 16) Authorizes the SAB to provide interim housing assistance, including, but not limited to, the leasing or acquisition of portable classrooms, to school districts and county offices of education (COEs) impacted by a natural disaster for which the Governor has declared a state of emergency:
  - a) Specifies that the allocated funds shall supplement funding from insurance or any other local, state, or federal government disaster assistance;
  - b) Authorizes school districts and COEs to retain savings from a project for use for other high priority capital outlay purposes; and
  - c) Specifies that grants provided shall not affect the applicant's eligibility for any other program in the SFP.
- 17) Increases the state grant for a new construction or modernization project from 5% to 10% for the state's share of costs associated with design and other plan components that exceed the nonresidential building energy-efficiency standards specified in Title 24 regulations by an amount not less than 15% for new construction projects and not less than 10% for modernization projects.
- 18) Establishes the Testing and Remediation of Lead Levels of Water at Schoolsites program as follows:
  - a) Requires the SAB to provide a grant to test for lead in water outlets used for drinking or preparing food on schoolsites serving kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, that were constructed before January 1, 2010, and for the remediation of any water outlets with lead levels in excess of 15 parts per billion.
  - b) Requires the school district applying for funds to do all of the following:
    - i) Test lead levels in all water fountains and faucets on the schoolsite, except outlets that have been tested or replaced since January 1, 2010; and
    - ii) Provide the test results to the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) and the school district's local community water system.
  - c) Authorizes a school district to request a grant for the replacement of a water outlet used for drinking or preparing food if the test results indicate lead levels for that water outlet exceeds 15 parts per billion.

- d) Requires additional testing upon completion of the remediation efforts to ensure that lead levels have fallen below 15 parts per billion.
- e) Requires the SAB to establish funding cycles for allocation of funds. If funds are available at the conclusion of the funding cycles, authorizes the SAB to adopt regulations to provide grants to replace any pipes or fixtures that are contributing to the elevated lead levels if lead levels do not fall below 15 parts per billion after additional testing has been performed.
- f) Authorizes the SAB to consider setting a maximum amount on the grant to be provided for testing and remediation.

19) Establishes assistance to small school districts as follows:

- a) Defines a “small school district” as a school district with an enrollment of less than 2,501.
- b) Authorizes a small school district to receive a design apportionment from funds made available for this purpose.
- c) Authorizes a small school district to apply to the SAB for a preliminary apportionment and provides up to five years for the school district to request an apportionment.

20) Establishes the 2022 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund. Authorizes proceeds from the sale of bonds issued and sold to be used to fund construction on existing campuses, including the construction of buildings and the acquisition of related fixtures, construction of facilities that may be used by more than one segment of public higher education (intersegmental), the renovation and reconstruction of facilities, site acquisition, the equipping of new, renovated, or reconstructed facilities, which equipment shall have an average useful life of 10 years, and to provide funds for the payment of preconstruction costs, including, but not limited to, preliminary plans and working drawings for CCC facilities.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Requires, under the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the SAB to allocate to applicant school districts prescribed per-unhoused-pupil state funding for construction and modernization of school facilities, including hardship funding, and supplemental funding for site development and acquisition.
- 2) Provides that a school district's ongoing eligibility for new construction funding is determined by making calculations related to certain factors, including, but not limited to, enrollment projections by utilizing a cohort survival enrollment projection system, the number of students that may be adequately housed in the existing school building capacity of the district, and increases or decreases in enrollment resulting from receipt of funding from the Year-Round School Grant Program.
- 3) Provides that a school district is eligible to receive an apportionment for the modernization of a permanent school building that is more than 25 years old or a portable classroom that is at

least 20 years old. A school district is eligible to receive an additional apportionment for modernization of a permanent school building every 25 years after the date of the previous apportionment or a portable classroom every 20 years after the previous apportionment.

- 4) Establishes specified per pupil grants for new construction and modernization and requires an annual inflation adjustment based on a construction cost index.
- 5) Establishes fees for residential development projects to enable school districts to build schools to house new students in the district.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:**

***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “As a long-time teacher who has taught in a portable classroom, I know firsthand that a school’s physical environment impacts student achievement and motivation. AB 75 will provide much needed funds to repair and upgrade our schools, and increase the number of classrooms for vocational/career technical education. The School Facility Program is a partnership between the state, school districts and developers. Voters have historically supported bonds as the state’s commitment for our children’s schools. I believe that they will again with a modified proposal.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2) \$2 billion for CCC facilities.

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

Researchers estimate that California public schools have over \$100 billion in K-12 new construction and modernization facilities needs while the Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office projects a \$41.4 billion capital facilities need over five years. While the full amount of bonds authorized by Proposition 51 has still not been sold, K-12 allocations for new construction



funds have been depleted since September 2018 while modernization funds were fully allocated in February 2019. According to the OPSC, as of January 31, 2021, \$916 million in new construction applications and \$1.245 billion in modernization applications have been submitted beyond Proposition 51 funding availability. Bond funds for CCC are administered through the budget process and are now exhausted.

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

***Small school districts assistance.*** Small school districts, defined as those with an enrollment of less than 2,501 pupils, face additional challenges in navigating the school construction and facility funding processes. Small school districts may not have facility staff. In many districts, facilities may be handled by the district superintendent, who may also be the principal of a school. Over the last several years, the SAB has seen a number of school districts appealing denial of funds due to various errors and challenges. This bill proposes to assist small school districts by providing advance funding for design and providing small school districts with an opportunity to reserve eligible funds and extra time (up to five years) to develop the project, including receiving necessary approvals from various agencies. This is similar to the extended time given to charter schools. Small school districts may request a construction management grant equal to 5% of the state share of the estimated (preliminary) apportionment that can be used for technical assistance provided by another LEA with expertise on school construction or a state agency. In addition, of the amount to be allocated to new construction and modernization, up to 10% would be set aside for small school districts.

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

***Replacement of 75 year old facilities.*** Under the SFP, districts are eligible for modernization funds if a permanent building is 25 years old and a portable building is 20 years old. A district receiving funds due to a health and safety problem (facility hardship) can receive the higher new construction dollar levels for a modernization project if it is determined that the cost to mitigate the health and safety threat is greater than 50% of the cost of replacement. This bill establishes a program to allow buildings at least 75 years old to receive the higher new construction funds to enable a district to demolish and replace the building rather than rehabilitate a building that may have excessive repairs and does not meet 21<sup>st</sup> century educational needs.

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

AB 746 (Gonzalez), Chapter 746, Statutes of 2017, requires a community water system that serves a schoolsite with a building constructed before January 2010 to test for lead in up to five drinking water sources of the schoolsite by July 1, 2019. According to the State Water Resources Control Board, 8,027 schools were tested with approximately 1.1% of schoolsites sampled found with lead levels that exceed the federal United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) recommended level of 15 parts per billion.

This bill provides an unspecified amount of funding for testing and replacement of water fountains and faucets. The bill requires a school district that receives funds to test all sources of water for drinking and cooking at a schoolsite and replace any fountain or faucet with lead levels in excess of the recommended level by the US EPA. The bill requires retesting following replacement of drinking fountains or faucets to ensure lead levels are below 15 parts per billion. The SAB is authorized to develop regulations to allocate funds to replace pipes or fixtures if funds remain after the established funding cycles have been completed. According to the author, this program is necessary because AB 746 did not test all 10,000 public schools in California and testing was only done on a handful (up to five) of drinking water sources at each schoolsite.

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

***Supplemental grant.*** The SFP provides funding based on classroom need. Schools also need other essential facilities such as gymnasiums, libraries, and school kitchens. This bill authorizes a school district to request a supplemental grant to expand or construct a gymnasium, multipurpose room, library, or school kitchen if the existing facility is 60% or less than the CDE's recommended size needed to serve the enrollment of the school.

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

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

Points would be awarded based on a formula using the aforementioned factors. A district's state matching share would range from 50% to 55% for new construction and 60% to 65% for

modernization based on the total score of gross bonding capacity plus UPP, and if applicable, an extra point for a district with under 200 enrollment.

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

<b>Gross Bonding Capacity (AV x bonding capacity)</b>	
\$0-\$9,999	4 points
\$10,000 - \$19,999	3 points
\$20,000 - \$54,999	2 points
\$55,000+	1 point

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

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

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

**Authorized uses of state bond funds.** Current law authorizes state bond funds to be used for a number of facility-related purposes, including design; purchasing a site, furniture and equipment; construction; and construction-related costs. AB 75 allows funds to additionally be used for technology, including schoolsite-based infrastructure necessary to provide access to broadband

internet; and to support the construction or modernization of a school kitchen, TK classroom, facility to support a LEA-supported preschool program located on a schoolsite, or a facility to support school nurses and counselors.

***Difference between AB 75 and Proposition 13.*** The last bond on the state ballot was Proposition 13, which received 47% of the votes on the March 3, 2020 ballot. This was the first time since 1994 that voters rejected a state school facilities bond. There are likely a number of reasons the bond failed, including the number 13, which caused confusion with Proposition 13 from 1978, which changed the assessment of property taxes, and fear of the potential impact of COVID-19 on the economy. The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association argued that passage of the bond would raise property taxes. Proposition 13 would have increased the bonding capacity of school districts, but only if voters approved the increase through a local bond initiative.

AB 75 is similar, but not identical to Proposition 13. AB 75 is a facilities GO bond for K-12 and CCC, while Proposition 13 included the University of California and California State University. AB 75 is more similar to the proposals that were in earlier versions of AB 48 (O'Donnell) from the 2019-20 Session.

***Arguments in support.*** The California School Boards Association states, "... the COVID-19 pandemic has placed a dramatic burden on school facilities. Access to safe, clean, and functional classrooms will be essential as schools reopen. To allow for social distancing and to meet safety requirements, schools will need to adjust how they currently use their physical space, clean and disinfect school buildings, and improve ventilation and air quality. As a result, significant construction, upgrades, and repairs are needed to create larger classrooms, improve ventilation systems, and reduce the risk of transmission in shared spaces. Students deserve to be in safe, healthy, and sustainable environments. A long-term plan that includes a robust discussion of the key role of capital finance is essential to the lasting success of California's education systems – and the students they serve. This bill alleviates the financial burden on both the institutions and students, while also constructing facilities that reflect the needs of the 21st century students. AB 75 is a needed measure to ensure that students are housed in facilities that meet their educational needs."

***Related legislation.*** SB 22 (Glazer) of this Session would place the \$15 billion Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2022 on an unspecified statewide election in 2022.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

American Council of Engineering Companies, California  
Anaheim Union High School District  
Association of California Construction Managers  
California Builders Alliance  
California Association of School Business Officials  
California Association of Suburban School Districts  
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office  
California County Superintendents Educational Services Association  
California Retailers Association  
California Building Industry Association  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Federation of Teachers  
Central Valley Education Coalition  
Coalition for Adequate School Housing  
Community College Facility Coalition  
Corona-Norco Unified School District  
California School Boards Association  
California Teachers Association  
County School Facilities Consortium  
Kern Community College District  
Long Beach Unified School District  
Los Alamitos Unified School District  
Los Angeles Unified School District  
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District  
Peralta Community College District  
Riverside County Superintendent of Schools  
Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange  
San Bernardino Community College District  
San Diego Unified School District  
San Francisco Community College District  
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District  
School Energy Coalition  
State Building and Construction Trades Council  
Yuba Community College District  
Western Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.

**Opposition**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Sophia Kwong Kim / ED. / (916) 319-2087