

#### **CITY OF HAYWARD**

2016 UUT Renewal Feasibility Tracking Survey

Topline Report n=554 15-minutes Likely June 2016 Voters

February 21, 2016

#### www.godberesearch.com

Northern California and Corporate Offices 1575 Old Bayshore Highway, Suite 102 Burlingame, CA 94010

Nevada 59 Damonte Ranch Parkway, Suite B309 Reno, NV 89521

Pacific Northwest 601 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Suite 1900 Bellevue, WA 98004

# **METHODOLOGY**

#### Sample Universe:

- 18,628 Likely June 2016 voters

#### Sample Size:

- Likely June 2016 n=554

Data Collection: Online & Phone Interviewing

Online, n=227Phone, n=327

#### Marin of Error:

- Likely June 2016 + 4.10%

Interview Dates: February 10 to February 20, 2016

Phone Interview Length: 15 minutes

## **UNINFORMED BALLOT TEST**

		Likely Jur	ne 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Definitely Yes	45.5%		
1. Uninformed Ballot Measure: To maintain City of Hayward services including:	Probably Yes	23.2%		
<ul> <li>neighborhood police patrols, fire stations and 911, firefighter, paramedic response times;</li> <li>preserving youth and anti-gang programs;</li> </ul>	Probably No	6.7%	_	
	Definitely No	17.9%		
	DK/NA	6.6%		
emergency and disaster preparedness; and     eith streets, sidewalks and lighting.	Total Yes	68.8%		
<ul> <li>city streets, sidewalks and lighting;</li> <li>shall the City of Hayward renew the existing Utility Users Tax at</li> </ul>	Total No	24.6%		
the current rate of 5.5 percent on gas, electricity, video and telecommunications services, providing \$16 million annually for 20 years from the current end date, with exemptions for low-income lifeline users; and all money used for City of Hayward services?				

## **FEATURES OF THE MEASURE**

		Likely J	une 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Much More Likely	58.2%	75.1%	
	Somewhat More Likely	16.9%		
2A. Police service levels, response times, and neighborhood	No Effect	12.1%		
patrols	Somewhat Less Likely	5.3%		
	Much Less Likely	6.7%		
	DK/NA	0.8%		
	Much More Likely	57.5%	75.4%	
	Somewhat More Likely	18.0%		
2B. Fire protection services	No Effect	14.2%		
zb. Fire protection services	Somewhat Less Likely	2.6%		
	Much Less Likely	6.6%		
	DK/NA	1.2%		
	Much More Likely	49.4%	69.7%	
	Somewhat More Likely	20.3%		
2C Emergency and dispeter property	No Effect	16.7%		
2C. Emergency and disaster preparedness	Somewhat Less Likely	3.8%		
	Much Less Likely	9.0%		
	DK/NA	0.7%		
	Much More Likely	48.9%	74.1%	
	Somewhat More Likely	25.2%		
2D. City streets, sidewalks, and lighting	No Effect	12.6%		
2D. City Streets, Sidewarks, and lighting	Somewhat Less Likely	3.4%		
	Much Less Likely	8.5%		
	DK/NA	1.4%		
	Much More Likely	41.9%	61.8%	
	Somewhat More Likely	19.9%		
25 Local ish and according development are grown	No Effect	18.2%		
D. City streets, sidewalks, and lighting  E. Local job and economic development programs	Somewhat Less Likely	6.6%		
	Much Less Likely	11.3%		
	DK/NA	2.1%		
	Much More Likely	39.1%	61.6%	
	Somewhat More Likely	22.5%		
25 Neighborhood appearance and graffiti removal	No Effect	18.0%		
2F. Neighborhood appearance and graffiti removal	Somewhat Less Likely	8.1%		
	Much Less Likely	10.9%		
	DK/NA	1.4%		
	Much More Likely	38.0%	61.6%	
	Somewhat More Likely	23.6%		
2G. Library hours and access to books, computers, and the	No Effect	20.5%		
internet	Somewhat Less Likely	5.3%		
	Much Less Likely	10.9%		
	DK/NA	1.6%		

		Likely J	une 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Much More Likely	58.7%	78.0%	
	Somewhat More Likely	19.4%		
2H 044 and paramadia corriinas	No Effect	13.1%		
2H. 911 and paramedic services	Somewhat Less Likely	2.4%	58.7% 78.0% 19.4% 13.1%	
	Much Less Likely	5.7%		
	DK/NA	0.8%		
	Much More Likely	33.9%	55.7%	
	Somewhat More Likely	21.8%		
21 Animal central and protection convices	No Effect	22.4%		
. Animal control and protection services	Somewhat Less Likely	8.1%		
	Much Less Likely	12.2%		
	DK/NA	1.6%		
	Much More Likely	59.2%	77.1%	
	Somewhat More Likely	17.9%		
2J. Adequate emergency response times by keeping all	No Effect	13.1%		
Hayward fire stations open	Somewhat Less Likely	2.9%		
	Much Less Likely	5.4%		
	DK/NA	1.5%		_

## FEATURES OF THE MEASURE -- RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Likely Ju	Likely June 2016 Vot		
	%	MML + SML	Mean	
2J. Adequate emergency response times by keeping all Hayward fire stations open			1.24	
2H. 911 and paramedic services			1.24	
2B. Fire protection services			1.19	
2A. Police service levels, response times, and neighborhood patrols			1.15	
2D. City streets, sidewalks, and lighting			1.04	
2C. Emergency and disaster preparedness			0.98	
2E. Local job and economic development programs			0.76	
2G. Library hours and access to books, computers, and the internet			0.74	
2F. Neighborhood appearance and graffiti removal			0.72	
2l. Animal control and protection services			0.58	

## **POSITIVE STATEMENTS**

		Likely J	une 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Much More Likely	46.5%	66.3%	
3A. We need to extend the measure to maintain our current	Somewhat More Likely	19.9%		
levels of public safety	No Effect	31.3%		
	DK/NA	2.3%		
	Much More Likely	52.3%	71.6%	
3B. The measure will maintain response times for police, fire,	Somewhat More Likely	19.3%		
and 911 emergency services	No Effect	26.7%		
	DK/NA	1.7%		
	Much More Likely	50.0%	67.8%	
3C. The measure will generate locally controlled funds for	Somewhat More Likely	17.8%		
critical Hayward needs that cannot be taken by the State	No Effect	30.0%		
	DK/NA	2.2%		
	Much More Likely	56.4%	72.4%	
	Somewhat More Likely	16.0%		
	No Effect	26.4%		
	DK/NA	1.2%		
	Much More Likely	43.9%	62.7%	
	Somewhat More Likely	18.8%		
	No Effect	31.8%		
	DK/NA	5.5%		
	Much More Likely	41.6%	63.5%	
	Somewhat More Likely	21.9%		
	No Effect	33.2%		
	DK/NA	3.2%		
	Much More Likely	39.7%	59.1%	
3G. This measure is good for the environment, as it encourages	Somewhat More Likely	19.4%		
energy conservation and the use of green, alternative power	No Effect	37.3%		
energy conservation and the use of green, alternative power.  H. This measure is fair to all rate payers since it is based on a	DK/NA	3.6%		
	Much More Likely	41.0%	59.9%	
3H. This measure is fair to all rate payers since it is based on an	Somewhat More Likely	19.0%		
individual's actual utility usage	No Effect	35.0%		
	DK/NA	5.1%		
	Much More Likely	44.6%	64.3%	
3I. With this measure, everyone in the City will be paying their	Somewhat More Likely	19.7%		
fair share, not just property owners or businesses	No Effect	33.1%		
	DK/NA	2.6%		
	Much More Likely	49.0%	67.2%	
2 L Pusinesses would now their fair chare too	Somewhat More Likely	18.2%		
3J. Businesses would pay their fair share too	No Effect	30.9%		
	DK/NA	2.0%		

		Likely June 2016 Voter		
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Much More Likely	42.4%	61.8%	
3K. Low income residents and lifeline users can apply for exemptions from the Utility Users Tax	Somewhat More Likely	19.3%	_	
	No Effect	35.0%		
	DK/NA	3.2%		
	Much More Likely	35.5%	58.3%	
3L. The City has reformed employee benefits and pensions to reduce costs to city taxpayers	Somewhat More Likely	22.7%		_
	No Effect	35.9%		
	DK/NA	5.8%		

## **POSITIVE STATEMENTS -- RANKED BY MEAN SCORE**

	Likely J	lune 2016 V	oter
	%	MML + SML	Mean
3D. This measure requires mandatory financial audits and			
yearly reports to the community to ensure the funds are spent			1.30
as promised			
3B. The measure will maintain response times for police, fire,			1.26
and 911 emergency services			1.20
3C. The measure will generate locally controlled funds for			1.20
critical Hayward needs that cannot be taken by the State			1.20
3J. Businesses would pay their fair share too			1.18
3A. We need to extend the measure to maintain our current			1.15
levels of public safety			1.15
3E. Without the measure the City's budget reserves will be			1.13
wiped out and essential services drastically cut			1.10
3I. With this measure, everyone in the City will be paying their			1.12
fair share, not just property owners or businesses			1.12
3F. Over the last 10 years, demand for city services has			
increased. Hayward cannot maintain its current level of			1.09
services to residents without extending the measure			
3K. Low income residents and lifeline users can apply for			1.08
exemptions from the Utility Users Tax			1.00
3H. This measure is fair to all rate payers since it is based on an			1.06
individual's actual utility usage			1.00
3G. This measure is good for the environment, as it encourages			l
energy conservation and the use of green, alternative power			1.03
3L. The City has reformed employee benefits and pensions to			1.00
reduce costs to city taxpayers			1.00

# **NEGATIVE STATEMENTS**

		Likely J	une 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
4A. Voters have passed millions of dollars in city sales taxes,	Much More Likely	34.6%	55.6%	
utility taxes, bonds and parcel taxes. Just last year the City	Somewhat More Likely	20.9%		
passed a sales tax, and the school district is planning on	No Effect	42.8%		
extending a property parcel tax on top of that.	rear the City Inning on  Somewhat More Likely No Effect DK/NA  Much More Likely No Effect DK/NA  Much More Likely No Effect DK/NA  Much More Likely Somewhat More Likely No Effect DK/NA  Much More Likely Somewhat More Likely Somewhat More Likely Somewhat More Likely Somewhat More Likely No Effect DK/NA  Much More Likely Somewhat More Likely No Effect DK/NA	1.6%		
4B. The City is responsible for the current budget problems. If	Much More Likely	30.3%	51.6%	
our tax dollars weren't going to high salaries, benefits, and	Somewhat More Likely	21.3%		
pensions for public employees, we would not need this	No Effect	43.5%		
measure	DK/NA	4.9%		
	Much More Likely	22.5%	39.6%	
4C. Instead of increasing taxes, public services in Hayward should be paid from the City's current revenues and reserves, even if services have to be cut	Somewhat More Likely	17.1%		
	No Effect	55.7%		
	DK/NA	4.7%		
	Much More Likely	39.1%	62.0%	
4D. There are no rules that direct the spending of utility tax	Somewhat More Likely	22.9%		
dollars, and no guarantee that the funds will be spent as promised	r the City ing on No Effect  DK/NA  Problems. If effits, and It this No Effect  DK/NA  Much More Likely  Somewhat More Likely  No Effect  DK/NA  Much More Likely  Somewhat More Likely  No Effect  DK/NA  Much More Likely  No Effect  DK/NA  Much More Likely  Somewhat More Likely  No Effect  DK/NA  Much More Likely  No Effect  DK/NA	36.2%		
	DK/NA	%     SML       34.6%     55.6%       20.9%     42.8%       1.6%     30.3%     51.6%       21.3%     43.5%       4.9%     22.5%     39.6%       17.1%     55.7%       4.7%     39.1%     62.0%       22.9%     36.2%       1.8%     29.1%     51.3%       22.3%     44.1%       4.6%     39.7%     56.1%       16.4%     41.8%		
	Much More Likely	29.1%	51.3%	
4E. The City should not tax residents on fixed incomes for the	Somewhat More Likely	22.3%		
utilities they need to meet basic family needs	No Effect	44.1%		
	DK/NA	4.6%		
	Much More Likely	39.7%	56.1%	
	Somewhat More Likely	16.4%		
of that	No Effect	41.8%		
. The City should not tax residents on fixed incomes for t lities they need to meet basic family needs . The 10 percent sales tax in Hayward is among the highe e county, we can't afford an increase in the utility tax on to	DK/NA	2.1%		

# **NEGATIVE STATEMENTS -- RANKED BY MEAN SCORE**

	Likely June 2016 Voter		
	%	MML + SML	Mean
4D. There are no rules that direct the spending of utility tax			
dollars, and no guarantee that the funds will be spent as			1.03
promised			
4F. The 10 percent sales tax in Hayward is among the highest in			
the county, we can't afford an increase in the utility tax on top			0.98
of that			
4A. Voters have passed millions of dollars in city sales taxes,			
utility taxes, bonds and parcel taxes. Just last year the City			0.92
passed a sales tax, and the school district is planning on			0.92
extending a property parcel tax on top of that.			
4B. The City is responsible for the current budget problems. If			
our tax dollars weren't going to high salaries, benefits, and			0.86
pensions for public employees, we would not need this			0.00
measure			
4E. The City should not tax residents on fixed incomes for the			0.84
utilities they need to meet basic family needs			0.04
4C. Instead of increasing taxes, public services in Hayward			
should be paid from the City's current revenues and reserves,			0.65
even if services have to be cut			

## **INFORMED BALLOT TESTS**

		Likely J	une 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Definitely Yes	44.2%		
5. Informed Ballot Test: To maintain City of Hayward services	Probably Yes	22.9%		
including: • neighborhood police patrols, fire stations and 911, firefighter, paramedic response times; • preserving youth and anti-gang programs; • emergency and disaster preparedness; and • city streets, sidewalks and lighting; shall the City of Hayward renew the existing Utility Users Tax a the current rate of 5.5 percent on gas, electricity, video and	Probably No	7.6%		
	Definitely No	19.7%		
	DK/NA	5.5%		
	Total Yes	67.2%		
	Total No	27.3%		
the current rate of 5.5 percent on gas, electricity, video and telecommunications services, providing \$16 million annually for 20 years from the current end date, with exemptions for low-income lifeline users; and all money used for City of Hayward services?				
	Definitely Yes	47.9%		
	Probably Yes	20.3%		
	Probably No	8.8%		
6. Alternative Ballot Test: 10 Year Sunset	Definitely No	18.3%		
	DK/NA	4.8%		
	Total Yes	68.2%		_
	Total No	27.1%		

## **DEMOGRAPHICS**

		Likely J	une 2016 V	oter
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	Yes	21.9%		
A. Do any children under the age of 18 live in your household?	No	76.9%		
	DK/NA	1.2%		
B. Respondent's Gender	Male	45.9%		
b. Respondent a Gender	Female	54.1%		
	18-29	6.7%		
	30-39	9.5%		
C Ago	40-49	12.2%		
C. Age	50-64	34.0%		
	65+	37.6%		
	No age	0.0%		
	Japanese	0.6%		
	Chinese	2.0%		
D. Ethnic Surname	Hispanic	15.5%		
	Jewish	1.9%		
	Armenian	0.0%		
	Vietnamese	0.9%		
	Italian	1.1%		
	Korean	0.2%		
	African American	6.3%		
	Not Coded	71.4%		
- II 0	Owner	64.8%		
E. Homeownership Status	Renter	35.2%		
	Democrat	62.3%		
	Republican	16.6%		
F. Party	Other party	3.7%		
	Decline to state/no party preference	17.4%		
	Dem 1	29.8%		
	Dem 2+	22.8%		
	Rep 1	6.7%		
	Rep 2+	4.8%		
C. Haveahald Barty Time	Other 1	10.2%		
G. Household Party Type	Other 2+	4.6%		
	Dem & Rep	5.1%		
	Dem & Other	12.0%		
	Rep & Other	3.3%		
	Dem, Rep & Other	0.9%		

		Likely J	Likely June 2016 Vo	
		%	MML + SML	Mean
	2013 to 2016	13.6%		
	2009 to 2012	27.8%		
	2005 to 2008	18.7%		
	2001 to 2004	9.2%		
H. Registration Date	1997 to 2000	5.9%		
	1993 to 1996	4.3%		
	1981 to 1992	11.4%		
	1980 or before	9.2%		
	Not coded	0.0%		
I. Voting History		see det	ailed crosst	abs
	2	3.4%		
	3	5.0%		
	4	4.3%		
	5	5.7%		
	6	5.9%		
	7	4.8%		
. Times Voted in Last Elections	8	6.9%		
	9	7.2%		
	10	13.2%		
	11	15.8%		
	12	27.2%		
	13	0.3%		
	14	0.2%		
	0	23.1%		
	1	6.8%		
	2	4.6%		
	3	6.6%		
	4	4.5%		
	5	4.5%		
	6	4.4%		
K. Absentee Voter	7	4.7%		
	8	4.8%		
	9	4.9%		
	10	7.1%		
	11	9.4%		
	12	14.3%		
	13	0.1%		
	14	0.2%		
I. Daymonant Abasets Vets	Yes	71.0%		
L. Permanent Absentee Voter	No	29.0%		
M. Likely Absentee Veter	Yes	73.4%		
M. Likely Absentee Voter	No	26.6%		

		Likely J	Likely June 2016 Voter		
		%	MML + SML	Mean	
N. Likely June 2016 Voter	Yes	100.0%			
	No	0.0%			
Sample Type	Online	30.0%			
	Phone	70.0%			

Topline Report 2/21/2016 Page 12 of 12 Page 11