



Office of the City Manager

ACTION CALENDAR

April 1, 2014

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From:  Christine Daniel, City Manager

Submitted by: William Rogers, Deputy City Manager

Subject: Discussion and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 4, 2014 General Election

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Provide direction to the City Manager about whether to conduct a second community survey and if so, what to include in that survey;
2. Adopt a Resolution amending Contract No. 9569 with Lake Research and Associates to increase the contract amount by \$2,210 for a total not to exceed the amount of \$51,710 for the purpose of conducting a second survey;
3. Provide direction to the City Manager about possible funding mechanisms and whether to initiate notice requirements for a Community Facilities District.

SUMMARY

On February 11 and 25, 2014 the City Council discussed several possible ballot measures for the November 2014 election. The Council asked staff to undertake a community survey and include questions about the following possible measures: a commercial vacancy tax; a residential vacancy tax, a sugar-sweetened beverage tax, an increase in the business license tax on rental housing, an increase in the existing Parks Tax, and a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District to fund parks operations and capital projects. Lake Research Partners conducted the survey from March 5 through March 9. The top line report of the results from the survey is included as Attachment 5 to this report. The Work Session report on this same date includes a detailed presentation of the survey results.

One of the funding mechanisms that has been considered for Parks is a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). This type of tax requires a number of actions by the City Council that are needed to create the District before the Council's ultimate decision about whether to place such a measure on the ballot. The decision to initiate that notification process needs to be made at this meeting in order to maintain the appropriate schedule moving forward to create the CFD. Further details about the noticing requirements and timing are discussed below and in Attachment 3.

Additionally, staff is requesting direction from the Council regarding whether to undertake a second community survey. Such a survey could further help define the type and language for measures for the November 2014 election. Staff is requesting that the Council provide direction at this meeting about a second community survey, and if such a survey is approved, also approve a contract amendment with the consultant, Lake Research Partners, in order to complete that survey (Attachment 4). The results of a second survey would then be presented during the regular City Council meeting on May 6, 2014.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the contract amendment would increase the contract with Lake Research Partners by \$2,210 to an amount not to exceed a total of \$51,710. Funding for this contract is included in the General Fund budget for this fiscal year.

The cost of placing a measure on the ballot varies depending on the total number of measures on the ballot. The following graphic shows the costs associated with past elections.

ELECTION COSTS, INCLUDING NUMBER OF MEASURES AND CANDIDATES					
	Nov. 2006	Nov. 2008	Jun-10	Nov. 2010	Nov. 2012**
Total Cost*	\$272,580.89	\$224,575.61	\$191,732.46	\$164,815.65	\$367,884.11
No. of Measures	6	7	1	3	10
No. of Candidates	23	25	0	31	26

* Excludes RCV-specific costs (RCV costs are candidate specific only)

**The high number of measures on the 2012 election required an additional ballot card.

The estimated cost of preparing a Mello Roos CFD is approximately \$20,000, including legal and other consultant time. Should the measure ultimately not be approved by the voters, the City’s General Fund would absorb this cost.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The City has successfully resolved substantial budget issues in recent years while also minimizing cuts to services important to the Berkeley community. Unfortunately, there are still areas of City infrastructure and service that continue to face substantial funding challenges. Some funds face an annual structural deficit, for example, meaning that annual expenditures exceed annual revenue. Situations such as this are not sustainable and absent new revenue, programs or services will likely need to be reduced in those areas.

On February 11 and February 25, 2014 the City Council discussed possible ballot measures for the November 2014 ballot and provided direction about what to include in a community survey. The intent of the survey was to better understand residents’ priorities and their interest in paying for various improvements and services while also gauging their interest in enacting various taxes.

The possible measures finalized by the Council on Feb. 25 were: an increase of the Business License Tax on residential buildings of 3 or more units; a Commercial Vacancy Tax for ground floor vacancies; a Residential Vacancy Tax assessed on properties with more than 4 units; an increase of the Parks Tax; a general tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages; a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District to pay for Parks infrastructure and maintenance.

Mello-Roos Community Facilities District v. General Obligation Bond

There are two possible funding mechanisms to address capital infrastructure needs: a *General Obligation Bond* which can fund capital projects; and a *Mello Roos Community Facilities District* which can fund both capital and operations costs. Both types of funding mechanisms require 2/3 voter approval.

General Obligation (GO) Bonds

A General Obligation (GO) Bond Issue is a form of long-term borrowing to finance capital improvements to real property such as buildings, roads and school facilities. Under a GO bond structure, all tax requirements are shared proportionally based on assessed value.

Key features of a GO Bond are:

- May be used only for capital improvements, not for ongoing operational costs;
- Requires 66.7% voter approval to pass;
- The principal and interest are paid with the proceeds of tax levies made upon taxable property;
- Bonds are repaid by the taxpayers based on their property’s assessed value;
- Bonds are generally repaid over 30 years.

The table below indicates the annual cost to the average homeowner for various GO bond amounts. If the City were to fund projects with a General Obligation bond tax, the annual cost to the average Berkeley homeowner -- \$350,000 Assessed Value (AV)) would be as follows:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND COSTS		
Bond Sizes	\$25,000,000	\$40,000,000
Annual Debt Service	\$1,816,223	\$2,905,956
1st Year Tax Rate (per \$100,000 AV)	\$12.89	\$20.62
Projected Maximum Tax for \$350,000 AV	\$45.10	\$72.16
Average Tax (30-Year on \$350,000 AV)	\$33.67	\$53.87

Mello – Roos Community Facilities District

A Mello Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) can fund both infrastructure improvements and operations. The City currently has one CFD (Measure Q), which was approved in 2000 by Berkeley voters to fund the Emergency Above Ground Water System. Creating a CFD requires additional steps that are different than those for a GO

bond (Attachment 4 provides steps and a timeline for creating a CFD). In order to comply with the timelines necessary to create a CFD prior to Council going on recess for the summer, the "Rate and Method of Apportionment" of the CFD taxes would need to be completed by approximately May 20th

A CFD can finance any public improvement with a useful life of 5 years or more, and can fund "Maintenance and operation of any real property or other tangible property with an estimated useful life of five or more years that is owned by the local agency or by another local agency pursuant to an agreement entered into under Section 53316.2." The legislation also defines "maintenance" to include "replacement, and the creation and funding of a reserve fund to pay for a replacement."

Key features of a Mello-Roos CFD are:

- Can be used to pay for facilities and services, and for debt service on bonds used to finance facilities.
- Requires 66.7% voter approval to pass.
- Special taxes paid by property owners within the district are used to pay the debt service on the bonds and the ongoing operational costs or services of the public facility constructed.
- For a Mello-Roos CFD tax, the cost per homeowner is determined based upon the square footage of the home.
- A special tax in a Mello-Roos CFD may be divided into two portions on the tax bill – one to cover the debt service on the bond used to fund construction of the facility, and one to cover the cost of operations. The bond portion would be paid off in 30 years. The operational portion would continue unless terminated.
- The tax would be based on building square footage, not assessed value, and could have an inflator.

The table below indicates the annual cost to homeowner for a 1,900 square-foot home for Community Facilities District bond amounts specified in the first Community Survey. The total cost to the homeowner for the Mello-Roos assessment is the sum of the capital cost assessment plus the operational cost assessment.

Mello Roos CFD (Capital and Operations Costs)		
Special Tax (Parcel) Bond Sizes	\$25,000,000	\$40,000,000
Annual Debt Service	\$1,816,223	\$2,905,956
Square Footage Tax Requirement	\$0.0230	\$0.0369
Projected Maximum Tax for 1,900 Sq. Ft. Home	\$43.76	\$70.02
Operational Costs		
	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Cost Per Square Foot	\$0.0254	\$0.0254
Projected Cost for 1,900 Sq. Ft. Home	\$48.19	\$48.19
Total Projected Cost for a 1,900 Sq. Ft. Home		
	\$91.95	\$118.21

Critical Schedule Decisions

Should the Council decide to place a Mello-Roos CFD on the ballot or maintain that option moving forward, a decision must be made at this meeting to initiate the necessary notice process. To meet notice requirements for a CFD in time for the November 2014 election, Council must adopt a Resolution of Intention to Form a District at its May 20, 2014 meeting. Should the Council decide to proceed with a Mello Roos CFD, staff is recommending maximum flexibility for the Council by **setting the amount of the Mello-Roos CFD at the highest possible number for the Resolution to Form a District since Council cannot increase the amount from what is identified in the Resolution of Intention.** However, the City Council can lower the amount when it determines the final elements to be included in a ballot measure.

The timing of the survey schedule was moved earlier in order to complete at least one survey prior decisions to initiate the Mello-Roos CFD process.

Second Survey

If the Council decides to move forward with a second survey at this meeting, the survey would be conducted in early April in order to provide the results at the May 6, 2014 meeting. Actual ballot language would still need to be developed by staff for consideration by the Council in June, in order to meet the deadlines in the Elections Code.

Survey Length: A second survey was included in the original scope of work for Lake Research Partners. In previous years, the City has done two surveys: the first is approximately 20 minutes. It is used to get a broad sense of community preferences and to test potential ballot measures. The second survey is approximately 15 minutes and is used to test a more narrow set of specific ballot measures or to test the proposed measures in more nuanced ways. The sample size of likely voters for each of the polls includes at least 500 respondents, which allows for more complex testing of ballot measures than the 400-respondent sample used in prior community surveys.

Context: Since local measures are not on the ballot in isolation of County and State measures, the second survey can include information about the other proposed sales tax measures that have a strong likelihood of being on the Fall 2014 ballot. Those include the successor to the Alameda County Measure B, the County-wide tax supporting transportation improvements.

Depth: Testing a smaller number of ballot measures will provide time for follow-up questions, allowing for a deeper analysis of the results. For example, there may be time to assess how residents respond to supportive and opposing arguments that they may hear in the months preceding the election. These messages may be specifically about local measures, or be more general arguments about State and County revenue measures on the November ballot.

Language: In order to accurately assess how residents will respond to the revenue measures once they are on the ballot, the Council may want to direct staff to test actual ballot measure language.

Ballot Measure Development Next Steps

In order to meet the deadlines set by the Elections Code to place items on the November ballot, the following timeline has been developed for the Council's consideration:

April 1: Work Session	Survey results presented. Council direction on second survey
April	Second Survey
May 6	Second Survey Results Presented
June 3: Action Calendar	Provide direction on ballot language
June 24: Action Calendar	Final action on ballot measure(s) for Nov. 2014

BACKGROUND

On February 11 and February 25, Council discussed possible ballot measures for the November 2014 ballot and provided direction about what to include in a community survey. The intent of the survey was to better understand residents' priorities and their interest in paying for various improvements and services while also gauging their interest in enacting various other taxes.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identifiable environmental effects or opportunities associated with the subject of this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

A second survey would allow for testing of possible ballot measures in advance of the November 2014 ballot. If the Council wants to maintain the option of establishing a Community Facilities District as part of a ballot measure, the decision to initiate the noticing process for a CFD should be made at this meeting.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

Council could decide not to conduct a second survey.

CONTACT PERSON

Matthai Chakko, Assistant to the City Manager, 981-7008

Attachments:

- 1: General Election Calendar
2. List of measures approved for the November 2014 ballot
3. Timelines for possible GO Bond or Community Facilities District (Mello Roos)
4. Resolution authorizing an amendment to the Contract with Lake Research Partners
5. Topline Results for March 2014 Community Survey

CITY OF BERKELEY - GENERAL ELECTION CALENDAR

Attachment 1

November 4, 2014

Offices to be Elected: Auditor; City Council Districts 1, 4, 7, 8; Rent Board (5 seats); School Board (3 seats)

<u>DAYS PRIOR TO ELECTION</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>
180	May 8, 2014	Suggested Last Day to file petitions for initiative or charter amendment ballot measure. Petitions received after this date will be accepted, but may not be on the November ballot.
158 103	May 30, 2014 July 24, 2014	Signature In-Lieu of Filing Fee Period - Candidates may collect signatures to offset the \$150 filing fee. Charter Art. III, Sec. 6.5
113 88	July 14, 2014 August 8, 2014	FILING PERIOD - CANDIDATE NOMINATION PAPERS EC 10220 et seq., Charter Art. III, Sec. 6.5
90	August 6, 2014	Independent Expenditure Disclosure Period Begins (\$1,000 or more)
90	August 6, 2014	Late Contribution Disclosure Period Begins (\$1,000 or more)
88	August 8, 2014	Deadline to deliver resolution calling ballot measure election to Registrar and request election consolidation. Tax Rate Statement due for bonds. EC 12001, 10002, 1405, 9241; EC 9400-9401
87 83	August 9, 2014 August 13, 2014	Extended candidate filing period. Filing is extended if an incumbent eligible for re-election does not file by 5pm on Aug 8. Incumbents are not eligible to file during the extended period. EC 10225
81	August 15, 2014	Last day to file primary arguments - Deadline is 12:00pm. EC 9280-9287
74	August 22, 2014	Last day to file rebuttal arguments - Deadline is 12:00pm. Impartial Analysis due. EC 9280-9287
74 63	August 22, 2014 September 2, 2014	Public review period for ballot arguments and Impartial Analysis. EC 9295
57 14	September 8, 2014 October 21, 2014	Filing Period for Write in Candidates. EC 8601
40 21	September 25, 2014 October 14, 2014	Voter Information & Sample Ballot Pamphlet mailing period. EC §13303-04, 13306
29 7	October 6, 2014 October 28, 2014	Period to obtain Vote-by-Mail Ballots. After October 28, VBM ballots may be obtained at the Registrar's office. EC §3001
29	October 6, 2014	First Pre-Election Campaign Statement due. GC §84200.7
15	October 20, 2014	Last Day to Register to Vote. EC §§2102, 2107
12	October 23, 2014	Second Pre-Election Campaign Statement due. GC §84200.7
0	November 4, 2014	Election Day - EC §1000; Charter Art. III, Section 4
28	December 2, 2014	Last day for County to certify election results to city. EC §15372
35	December 9, 2014	Council to adopt and certify election results. EC §9217, 10262-10263; Charter Art. III, Sec. 10
	January 31, 2015	Semi-Annual Campaign Statement due. GC 84200

November 2014 Ballot Information

In addition to the national, state and local candidates on the November 2014 ballot, there will also be a number of state propositions and initiatives. The “Cleared for Circulation” list has been abridged to the account for multiple submissions of measures with the same title. The full list can be found at <http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections>

Ballot Measure
State of California: Qualified for Ballot
Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012.
Approval of Healthcare Insurance Rate Changes. Initiative Statute.
Referendum to Overturn Indian Gaming Compacts.
State of California: Cleared for Circulation
Term Limits for County Assessors, District Attorneys, and Sheriffs. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Hospitals. Healthcare Service Charges. Initiative Statute.
Nonprofit Hospitals. Executive Compensation. Initiative Statute.
Elections. Voter Identification Requirements. Initiative Statute.
Abortion Restriction. Parental Notification and Waiting Period for Females Under 18. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Used Vehicles. Buyer Protection. Initiative Statute.
State School Funding. Timing of Distributions to Schools. Initiative Statute.
Firearms Regulation. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Cigarette Tax to Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research, and Law Enforcement. Initiative Statute.
Marijuana Legalization. Initiative Statute.
School Employees. Dismissal or Suspension for Egregious Misconduct. Initiative Statute.
Legislature Expansion. Legislative Process. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Public Assistance Benefits. Eligibility. Initiative Statute.
State Fees on Hospitals. Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds. Initiative Statutory and Constitutional Amendment.
Constitutional Definition of a Person. Fertilized Human Eggs. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Referendum to Reimpose Different Standards on Clinics Providing Abortion Services than on Other Primary Care Clinics.
Referendum to Overturn Law Allowing Specified Licensed Medical Professionals to Perform Early Abortion Procedures.
Tax to Fund Increased Oversight of Timber Industry. Initiative Statute.
Drug and Alcohol Testing of Doctors. Medical Negligence Lawsuits. Initiative Statute.
Bible-Based Speech. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Personally Identifying Information. Confidentiality. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Electricity. Initiative Statute.
State Fees on Community Hospitals. Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.
Nuclear Power. Initiative Statute.
Elections. Presidential Primaries. Political Party Offices. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Attachment 3

The following timelines relate to the actions required for either a GO Bond/Parcel Tax Measure or a CFD. **Please note that the timing of the actions required for a CFD likely preclude the opportunity for a second survey.**

2014: Critical Dates (Continued)	Key Actions: General Obligation (GO) Bond/Parcel Tax Increase	Key Actions: Community Facilities District
April 1	Survey Results from the First Survey and Direction on Second Survey	Survey Results from First Survey
Month of April	Second Survey	
April 29th		Decision on CFD Bond Amounts And Operational Costs in Order to Establish Tax Rates
May 6th	Presentation of Second Survey Results	
May 20th		Resolution of Intention to Establish CFD -- Including Tax Rates
June 3rd	Direction on Ballot Language	Direction on Ballot Language
June 24th		Public Hearing: Resolution of Intention to Establish CFD
July 1	Final Approval on Ballot Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resolution Of Formation, and - Call The Election, and - Final Approval on Ballot

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

CONTRACT NO. 9569 AMENDMENT: LAKE RESEARCH PARTNERS FOR 2014
COMMUNITY SURVEY

WHEREAS, in February 2014, the Council discussed possible ballot measures for the November 4, 2014 election and discussed having two community surveys to gauge community interest in those measures; and

WHEREAS, in February 2014, after a competitive Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and consultant selection process, the firm of Lake Research Partners was the top-ranked polling firm; and

WHEREAS, on Feb. 13, 2014, the City Manager authorized Contract No. 9569 with Lake Research Partners to provide polling services, in an amount not to exceed \$49,500 for the period from February 17, 2014 through February 29, 2016, and

WHEREAS, in March 2014, Lake Research Partners in March conducted a poll of respondents who are likely to vote in the November 4, 2014 election at a cost of approximately \$29,150; and

WHEREAS, conducting a second community survey with a sample size of at least 500 respondents would cost \$22,560, for a total amount not to exceed \$51,710, is to be performed by Lake Research Partners to complete the project; and

WHEREAS, funds are available to perform this work in the current year budget in the General Fund, budget code 010-0701-410-3038 and this contract amendment has been entered in the Citywide contract database and assigned CMS No. HEVMC.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the City Manager is authorized to execute an amendment to Contract No. 9569 with Lake Research Partners for 2014 Community Survey to increase the amount by \$2,210 for a total not to exceed \$51,710 from February 17, 2014 through February 29, 2016.

FINAL TOPLINES

TOTAL
 N= 503

Gender

Men 46
 Women..... 54

Region

City Council District 5, 6, 8 42
 City Council District 3, 4, 7 33
 City Council District 1, 2 25

Party registration

Democrat..... 70
 Republican 4
 DTS 20
 Other 6

1. **[T]** Although it is some time from now, what are the chances of you voting in the general election for Governor, other offices, and ballot measures this November – are you almost CERTAIN to vote, will you PROBABLY vote, are the chances about 50-50, are you probably NOT going to vote, or are you DEFINITELY not going to vote?

almost certain 84
 probably 16
 50-50 TERMINATE
 probably not TERMINATE
 definitely not TERMINATE
 (don't know) TERMINATE

2. **[T]** Generally speaking, do you think that things in the city of Berkeley are going in the right direction, or do you feel things are on the wrong track?

Right direction 63
 Wrong track 13
 (Don't know) 24

3. **[T]** How would you rate the job Berkeley is doing providing city services—excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent..... 14
 Good 55
 Fair 23
 Poor..... 5
 (don't know)..... 3

Excellent/Good..... 70
 Fair /Poor 28

TOTAL
N= 503

4. Now, I am going to read you a list of issues that people may be focused on in Berkeley. Please tell me which one of these is most important to you:

READ AND ROTATE:

Improving education and schools	20
Creating jobs and economic development.....	18
Building affordable housing.....	13
Reducing crime	10
Addressing homelessness	10
Managing the city budget.....	7
Reducing traffic and parking congestion.....	6
Reducing taxes	5
Improving public health	5
Making neighborhoods more bike and pedestrian friendly	3
Improving public transit	2
(Don't know)	2

I'm going to read you some different areas where investment in the City of Berkeley may be needed. Please tell me how important you feel it is for the City of Berkeley to address each of the following project areas: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important. If you are not sure how you feel about a particular item, please say so.

RANDOMIZE

Sorted by "Extremely important"

7.PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING.....	31
8.IMPROVING CHILDREN'S HEALTH.....	29
9.INCREASING HEALTH EDUCATION FUNDING.....	18
6.RENOVATING SWIMMING POOLS	7
5.IMPROVING PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS.....	7

5. Improving parks and playgrounds

Extremely important	7
Very important.....	34
Somewhat important	45
Not too important	12
(Not sure)	2
Extremely /Very important.....	41
Somewhat /Not too important	57

TOTAL
N= 503

6. Renovating swimming pools

Extremely important	7
Very important.....	20
Somewhat important	34
Not too important	36
(Not sure)	4
Extremely /Very important.....	27
Somewhat /Not too important	69

7. Providing affordable housing

Extremely important	31
Very important.....	40
Somewhat important	22
Not too important	6
(Not sure)	2
Extremely /Very important.....	71
Somewhat /Not too important	28

8. Improving children's health

Extremely important	29
Very important.....	46
Somewhat important	18
Not too important	5
(Not sure)	2
Extremely /Very important.....	76
Somewhat /Not too important	23

9. Increasing health education funding

Extremely important	18
Very important.....	36
Somewhat important	30
Not too important	10
(Not sure)	6
Extremely /Very important.....	54
Somewhat /Not too important	40

TOTAL
N= 503

Next, I'd like to tell you about some ballot measures that may be considered for the City of Berkeley. Here's the first one.

[RANDOMIZE FIVE GROUPS: 10 & 11, 12&13, 14 & 15, 16-23, 24 & 25]

- 10. Shall the City of Berkeley increase the Business License Tax from 1% to 3% on residential buildings with three or more units, with exemptions for owner-occupied properties of 10 units or less, historically low-rent units, and buildings built in the last 20 years, with the revenue going toward the City's general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	15
Yes – not so strongly	10
Lean yes.....	14
Undecided	24
Lean no	7
No – not so strongly	8
No – strongly	21
(Refused)	0
Yes	40
No	36

- 11. And, thinking about the same ballot measure, if you knew that the increase in the Business License Tax would be used to fund affordable housing, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	25
Yes – not so strongly	13
Lean yes.....	18
Undecided	20
Lean no	4
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	13
(Refused)	0
Yes	57
No	23

TOTAL
N= 503

Next..

ROTATE Q12-Q13

- 12. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a **Commercial** Vacancy Tax of one dollar per square foot that would be assessed on the ground floor of **commercial** properties that have been vacant for two years, with escalating assessment amounts for subsequent years of vacancy, and with hardship exceptions and the opportunity for appeal, with the revenue going toward the City's general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	27
Yes – not so strongly	16
Lean yes.....	11
Undecided	22
Lean no	5
No – not so strongly	4
No – strongly	15
(Refused)	0
Yes	54
No	23

TOTAL
N= 503

[READ IN BETWEEN Q12 AND Q13/Q13 AND Q12] Now here's a measure about a different kind of vacancy tax.

- 13. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a **Residential** Vacancy Tax of one dollar per square foot that would be assessed on **residential** properties with more than 4 units that have been entirely vacant for one year, with escalating assessment amounts for subsequent years of vacancy, and with hardship exceptions and the opportunity for appeal, with the revenue going toward the City's general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	24
Yes – not so strongly	15
Lean yes.....	11
Undecided	22
Lean no	6
No – not so strongly	6
No – strongly	17
(Refused)	0
Yes	50
No	28

TOTAL
N= 503

Here is another measure that could be on the ballot in Berkeley:

14. **SSA:** Shall the City of Berkeley increase the existing Parks parcel tax by 10%, or 29 dollars per year, for an average 1900 square foot house, indexed for inflation, in order to fund necessary ongoing operations and maintenance of city parks and playgrounds?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	22
Yes – not so strongly	21
Lean yes.....	12
Undecided	13
Lean no	7
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	21
(Refused)	0
Yes	54
No	33

15. **SSB:** Shall the City of Berkeley increase the existing Parks parcel tax by 16%, or 43 dollars per year, for an average 1900 square foot house, indexed for inflation, in order to fund necessary ongoing operations and maintenance of city parks and playgrounds?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	24
Yes – not so strongly	12
Lean yes.....	14
Undecided	18
Lean no	8
No – not so strongly	7
No – strongly	16
(Refused)	1
Yes	50
No	32

TOTAL
N= 503

And here is another measure that could be on the ballot in Berkeley:

16. **SSA:** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a general tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of one cent per ounce, with revenues going to the City’s general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	46
Yes – not so strongly	12
Lean yes.....	8
Undecided	6
Lean no	6
No – not so strongly	4
No – strongly	18
(Refused)	0
Yes	66
No	28

17. **SSB:** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a special tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of one cent per ounce, with revenues dedicated to funding obesity prevention, diabetes prevention, early childhood nutrition, physical activity, nutritional education programs in schools, and/or other health education programs?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	44
Yes – not so strongly	11
Lean yes.....	9
Undecided	7
Lean no	6
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	19
(Refused)	1
Yes	64
No	29

TOTAL
N= 503

18. **SSA:** Now I'm going to ask you the same question with a different level of tax. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a general tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of **two cents** per ounce, with revenues going to the City's general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	39
Yes – not so strongly	11
Lean yes.....	5
Undecided	8
Lean no	5
No – not so strongly	8
No – strongly	25
(Refused)	0
Yes	55
No	37

19. **SSB:** Now I'm going to ask you the same question with a different level of tax. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a special tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of **two cents** per ounce, with revenues dedicated to funding obesity prevention, diabetes prevention, early childhood nutrition, physical activity, nutritional education programs in schools, and/or other health education programs?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	40
Yes – not so strongly	7
Lean yes.....	12
Undecided	6
Lean no	6
No – not so strongly	6
No – strongly	23
(Refused)	1
Yes	59
No	34

TOTAL
N= 503

Next, I'm going to read you some statements that people have made about the measure I just told you about.

[ROTATE]

_Supporters of this measure say that consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages dramatically increases the risk of diabetes and obesity in children. This proposal will generate millions of dollars in needed revenue that can be used to fight the obesity epidemic and improve our children's health.

_Opponents of this measure say that it is a misguided regressive tax that will hurt low-income residents the most while doing nothing to improve their health. Taxing soda will not stop obesity. This is just an example of the government dictating what residents should eat and drink, instead of respecting our right to make our own choices as consumers. The real impact of this tax will be that distributors will pass on the taxes to locally-owned small businesses and restaurants, which will only make it tougher for them to operate on already-tight margins, and could cause many of them to close down. There are much better ways to fund health education and address children's health than a regressive tax that will unfairly impact low-income residents and hurt local small businesses.

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

- 20. **SSA:** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a general tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of one cent per ounce, with revenues going to the City's general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	44
Yes – not so strongly	12
Lean yes.....	7
Undecided	5
Lean no	5
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	22
(Refused)	0
Yes	64
No	31

TOTAL
N= 503

21. **SSB:** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a special tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of one cent per ounce, with revenues dedicated to funding obesity prevention, diabetes prevention, early childhood nutrition, physical activity, nutritional education programs in schools, and/or other health education programs?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	44
Yes – not so strongly	11
Lean yes.....	8
Undecided	7
Lean no	5
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	20
(Refused)	1
Yes	63
No	29

TOTAL
N= 503

22. **SSA:** Now I'm going to ask you the same question with a different level of tax. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a general tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of **two cents** per ounce, with revenues going to the City's general fund?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[**IF YES/NO:** And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[**IF UNDECIDED:** Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	36
Yes – not so strongly	9
Lean yes.....	7
Undecided	7
Lean no	7
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	29
(Refused)	0
Yes	52
No	41

23. **SSB:** Now I'm going to ask you the same question with a different level of tax. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a special tax on distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages of **two cents** per ounce, with revenues dedicated to funding obesity prevention, diabetes prevention, early childhood nutrition, physical activity, nutritional education programs in schools, and/or other health education programs?

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this measure, or are you undecided?

[**IF YES/NO:** And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[**IF UNDECIDED:** Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	40
Yes – not so strongly	9
Lean yes.....	8
Undecided	9
Lean no	4
No – not so strongly	7
No – strongly	22
(Refused)	1
Yes	57
No	33

TOTAL
N= 503

And here is another measure that could be on the ballot in Berkeley:

- 24. Shall the City of Berkeley issue bonds not exceeding 40 million dollars to significantly improve the condition of city parks and pools, including rebuilding and reopening Willard Pool and improving a portion of the Santa Fe right of way for community use, and also levy a special tax at a rate of 2 million dollars to fund operations of city parks and pools?

After the bonds are issued, the tax for an average home would be 70 dollars for the bond and 48 dollars for the operations per year over 30 years.

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this bond measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	23
Yes – not so strongly	15
Lean yes.....	12
Undecided	17
Lean no	6
No – not so strongly	7
No – strongly	20
(Refused)	0
Yes	49
No	33

TOTAL
N= 503

25. Now I'm going to ask you about a similar proposal with a lesser amount of funding. Shall the City of Berkeley issue bonds not exceeding **25 million dollars** to significantly improve the condition of city parks and pools, including rebuilding and reopening Willard Pool and improving a portion of the Santa Fe right of way for community use, **but with a lower level of new funding for deferred maintenance at existing parks**, and also levy a special tax at a rate of 2 million dollars to fund operations of city parks and pools?

After the bonds are issued, the tax for an average home would be 44 dollars for the bond and 48 dollars for the operations per year over 30 years.

If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this bond measure, or are you undecided?

[IF YES/NO: And do you support/oppose this measure strongly or not so strongly?]

[IF UNDECIDED: Well, to which side do you lean?]

Yes – strongly	26
Yes – not so strongly	13
Lean yes.....	13
Undecided	18
Lean no	6
No – not so strongly	5
No – strongly	18
(Refused)	0
Yes	52
No	29

TOTAL
N= 503

Finally, I would like to ask you a few questions for statistical purposes only.

26. **[T]** In terms of local politics, do you consider yourself progressive, liberal, moderate, or conservative?

Progressive	26
Liberal	33
Moderate	31
Conservative	7
(don't know).....	2
(refused)	1

27. **[T]** From which one of these sources do you get most of your news about Berkeley?

[READ AND ROTATE]

Online news sites	29
Newspapers	25
Television news	22
Radio.....	7
Social media like Twitter or Facebook	6
Blogs	3
(Combination: Well, which one do you use the most for local news?).....	6
(Don't know/refused)	3

28. **[T]** What is the last year of schooling that you have completed?

DO NOT READ

1 - 11th grade.....	1
high school graduate.....	5
non-college post H.S.	1
some college	19
college graduate	41
post-graduate school	34
(don't know/refused)	0

TOTAL
N= 503

29. **[T]** Are you currently employed full-time, employed part-time, unemployed, retired, a full-time student and not working, or a homemaker?

Employed full-time	48
Employed part-time	15
Unemployed	5
Retired.....	23
Full-time student and not working.....	7
Homemaker.....	2
(don't know/refused)	0

30. **[T]** Do you have any children 18 years of age or younger living at home with you?

Yes	20
No	80
(don't know/refused)	0

IF Q30=YES

31. **[T]** Are any of your children currently enrolled in Berkeley public schools?

Yes	14
No	5
(don't know/refused)	0
(NA – No child at home).....	80

32. **[T]** Do you own your own home or do you rent?

own.....	58
rent	40
(other).....	1
(don't know/refused)	1

33. **[T]** How long have you lived in Berkeley?

Less than two years	3
Two to five years	12
Five to ten years	20
Ten to twenty years.....	20
More than twenty years.....	37
All your life.....	7
(don't know/refused)	1

TOTAL
N= 503

34. **[T]** Just to make sure we have a representative sample, could you please tell me whether you are from a Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish-speaking background? **[IF "NO", ASK:]** What is your race--white, black, Asian or something else?

White / Caucasian	67
Black / African American.....	10
Latino / Hispanic	7
Asian / Pacific Islander.....	9
Native American.....	0
(other).....	3
(don't know/refused).....	3

Age

18-24	13
25-29	7
30-34	5
35-39	7
40-44	6
45-49	9
50-54	9
55-59	6
60-64	12
65-69	6
70-74	8
75 & over.....	13
(Don't know)	0