

# **CITY OF HAYWARD**

Hayward City Hall  
777 B Street  
Hayward, CA 94541  
[www.Hayward-CA.gov](http://www.Hayward-CA.gov)



CITY OF  
**HAYWARD**  
HEART OF THE BAY

## **Agenda**

**Wednesday, May 17, 2017**

**4:00 PM**

**City Hall, Conference Room 4A**

**Council Budget and Finance Committee**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

*(The Public Comment section provides an opportunity to address the City Council Committee on items not listed on the agenda as well as items on the agenda. The Committee welcomes your comments and requests that speakers present their remarks in a respectful manner, within established time limits, and focus on issues which directly affect the City or are within the jurisdiction of the City. As the Committee is prohibited by State law from discussing items not listed on the agenda, any comments on items not on the agenda will be taken under consideration without Committee discussion and may be referred to staff.)*

**REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

1.      **MIN 17-074**      Approval of Meeting Minutes April 17, 2017  
**Attachments:**      Attachment I Draft Minutes April 17, 2017
  
2.      [RPT 17-075](#)      Review of Potential Focus Group Follow-up to 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey  
**Attachments:**      [Attachment I Staff Report](#)  
                                  [Attachment II 2016 RSS Topline Report](#)  
                                  [Attachment III Godbe Proposal](#)
  
3.      **RPT 17-077**      Discuss Potential Strategies to Close the Budget Gap and Review the May 20, 2017 Budget Work Session Schedule  
**Attachments:**      Attachment I Staff Report
  
4.      [RPT 17-078](#)      FY 2017 Meeting Schedule & Work Plan  
**Attachments:**      [Attachment I FY 2017 Meeting Schedule and Work Plan](#)

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**COMMITTEE MEMBER/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REFERRALS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

CANCELED REGULAR MEETING - 4:00PM, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2017

NEXT REGULAR MEETING - 4:00PM, WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2017



# CITY OF HAYWARD

Hayward City Hall  
777 B Street  
Hayward, CA 94541  
[www.Hayward-CA.gov](http://www.Hayward-CA.gov)

---

**File #:** MIN 17-074

---

**DATE:** May 17, 2017

**TO:** Council Budget and Finance Committee

**FROM:** Director of Finance

**SUBJECT**

Draft Meeting Minutes from April 17, 2017 Regular Meeting

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee approves the meeting minutes from the April 17, 2017 Regular Meeting.

**ATTACHMENT**

Attachment I Draft Minutes April 17, 2017




---

**COUNCIL BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Meeting Minutes of April 17, 2017**

**Call to Order:** 4:05 pm

**Members Present:** Mayor Halliday, Councilmember Lamnin and Councilmember Salinas

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff:** Kelly McAdoo, Maria Hurtado, Dustin Claussen, Morad Fakhrai, and Nicole Gonzales

**Guests:** None

**Public Comments:** No public comments.

---

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes March 20, 2017. *Action: unanimous approval as submitted.*
2. Discussion on Mayor & City Council Department Budget including specifically:
  - Reviewed and discussed department budget financial details
  - Reviewed and discussed department budget narrative
    - Discussed development of performance metrics
    - Discussed adding a link in the Budget to the Council Handbook
  - Provision of the highest level of Transparency
3. Discuss the Review of the CIP Plan in Future Years and Review the May 20, 2017 Budget Work Session Schedule.
  - Review of CIP Plan
    - *Action: The Committee reviewed, and agreed that the CIP Plan would be presented to the Council Infrastructure Committee only, and would no longer be presented to the Council Budget and Finance Committee for review.*
  - Reviewed May 20, 2017 Budget Session Schedule
  - Discussed presenting the FY2018 Proposed Operating & Capital Budgets at the Public Hearing with the intent to adopt.

**Committee Members/Staff Announcements and Referrals:** None.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 pm



# CITY OF HAYWARD

Hayward City Hall  
777 B Street  
Hayward, CA 94541  
[www.Hayward-CA.gov](http://www.Hayward-CA.gov)

---

**File #:** RPT 17-075

---

**DATE:** May 17, 2017

**TO:** Council Budget and Finance Committee

**FROM:** City Manager

**SUBJECT**

Review of Potential Focus Group Follow-up to 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council Budget and Finance Committee receives a report from Godbe Research on potential focus group follow-up to the 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey and provides direction to staff on potentially pursuing this option.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment I	Staff Report
Attachment II	2016 RSS Topline Report
Attachment III	Godbe Proposal



DATE: May 17, 2017

TO: Council Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: City Manager

SUBJECT: Review of Potential Focus Group Follow-up to 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the Council Budget and Finance Committee receives a report from Godbe Research on potential focus group follow-up to the 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey and provides direction to staff on potentially pursuing this option.

#### BACKGROUND

Since 2008, the City has contracted with Godbe Research (Godbe) to complete a Biennial Resident Satisfaction Survey (Survey). The City Council approved funding for a fifth survey as a part of the FY2017 budget.

During the fall, staff again, worked with Godbe to draft the survey instrument based on the questions used in the past. However, to provide a wide set of tracking metrics, the survey instrument was mostly unaltered from the previous iterations except for the inclusion of questions regarding a hypothetical \$95 million bond issue ballot measure for the construction of a new police station.

The City Council received a report on the findings from the Fall 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey on January 24, 2017. The topline report from this presentation can be found in Attachment II.

#### DISCUSSION

Following the January 24, 2017 Council work session, several council members indicated the desire to pursue a focus group to provide additional feedback on several trends the Fall 2017 Resident Satisfaction Survey identifies.

The biggest trend shifts for the City over the past two years, from the previous 2014 resident satisfaction survey to the most recent, is a statistically significant drop in satisfaction with quality of life and satisfaction with City services. More specifically, the 2016 survey identified the largest dissatisfaction in traffic circulation, availability of affordable housing, and overall effectiveness of economic development activities (availability of local jobs, attracting new

businesses, and revitalizing older neighborhoods and business districts). While these trends are apparent throughout cities in the Bay Area, Council indicated a desire to take a closer look at these issues through resident focus groups.

Attachment III contains a proposal from Godbe Research with two options to conduct focus groups from which the City can choose. These include:

1. Conduct two focus groups broken down by gender.
2. Conduct four focus groups broken down by gender and location (North/South & East/West)

Each focus group would consist of 8 to 10 individuals and would be held at a neutral location. This work would take between five and six weeks.

Charles Hester from Godbe Research will be present at the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting to discuss these options and the overall methodology for the focus groups.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

The two focus groups option is estimated to cost \$16,020 and the four focus groups option estimated cost is \$26,540.

#### NEXT STEPS

Following feedback from the Committee, City staff will either initiate the focus groups or table this for a later date.

Prepared by: John Stefanski, Management Analyst I

Recommended by: Dustin Claussen, Director of Finance

Approved by:



---

Kelly McAdoo, City Manager



**GODBE RESEARCH**  
Gain Insight

## **CITY OF HAYWARD**

2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey

Topline Report

n=630

22-minutes

Voter File Sample Weighted to ACS

Segmented by Likely Voters

December 6, 2016

**[www.godberesearch.com](http://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:**

- All Voters weighted to 2014 American Community Survey Adults 18+ and Likely November 2018 Voters

**Sample Size:**

- n=630 Adults 18+
- n=311 Likely November 2018

**Data Collection:** Landline, Cell Phone & Online Interviewing from email invitation

**Languages:** English n=614 & Spanish n=16

**Margin of Error:**

- Adults 18+  $\pm$  3.89%
- Likely November 2018 Voters  $\pm$  5.53%

**Interview Dates:** November 12 to November 22, 2016

## LIVING IN HAYWARD

	Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
	Column N %	Count	$\Sigma$ or Mean	Column N %	Count	$\Sigma$ or Mean
1. Now, I'd like to get your overall opinion of living in the City of Hayward. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in Hayward?	Very satisfied	27.1%	170	26.0%	81	
	Somewhat satisfied	49.0%	308	52.8%	164	
	Somewhat dissatisfied	16.5%	104	16.6%	52	
	Very dissatisfied	7.2%	45	3.9%	12	
	DK/NA	0.3%	2	0.7%	2	
	<b>Total Satisfied</b>	<b>76.0%</b>		<b>78.8%</b>		
	<b>Total Dissatisfied</b>	<b>23.7%</b>		<b>20.5%</b>		
	<b>Ratio Sat to Dissat</b>	<b>3.2</b>		<b>3.8</b>		

## SATISFACTION WITH CITY SERVICES

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
2. Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the job the City of Hayward is doing to provide resident services?	Very satisfied	19.4%	123		15.8%	49	
	Somewhat satisfied	42.7%	269		48.9%	152	
	Somewhat dissatisfied	16.6%	104		16.8%	52	
	Very dissatisfied	11.0%	69		8.5%	26	
	DK/NA	10.3%	65		10.0%	31	
	<b>Total Satisfied</b>	<b>62.1%</b>			<b>64.7%</b>		
	<b>Total Dissatisfied</b>	<b>27.6%</b>			<b>25.3%</b>		
	<b>Ratio Sat to Dissat</b>	<b>2.3</b>			<b>2.6</b>		
3A. Police protection	Very Satisfied	27.1%	171	69.4%	32.1%	100	71.7%
	Somewhat Satisfied	42.3%	266		39.6%	123	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	13.4%	85		14.3%	45	
	Very Dissatisfied	10.2%	64		6.3%	20	
	DK/NA	7.0%	44		7.6%	24	
3B. Traffic circulation	Very Satisfied	9.8%	62	39.9%	9.5%	30	37.7%
	Somewhat Satisfied	30.1%	190		28.2%	88	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	23.8%	150		29.8%	93	
	Very Dissatisfied	32.6%	205		28.6%	89	
	DK/NA	3.7%	23		3.9%	12	
3C. Fire protection and emergency services	Very Satisfied	47.6%	300	84.1%	51.5%	160	87.9%
	Somewhat Satisfied	36.6%	230		36.3%	113	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	4.9%	31		2.0%	6	
	Very Dissatisfied	1.3%	8		2.0%	6	
	DK/NA	9.6%	61		8.1%	25	
3D. Street and sidewalk maintenance	Very Satisfied	25.0%	158	68.8%	26.1%	81	69.9%
	Somewhat Satisfied	43.7%	275		43.8%	136	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	15.5%	98		16.3%	51	
	Very Dissatisfied	13.8%	87		12.0%	37	
	DK/NA	2.0%	12		1.8%	6	
3E. Street lighting	Very Satisfied	30.8%	194	72.1%	32.3%	101	73.3%
	Somewhat Satisfied	41.3%	260		40.9%	127	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	15.4%	97		14.5%	45	
	Very Dissatisfied	10.1%	64		9.9%	31	
	DK/NA	2.4%	15		2.3%	7	
3F. Providing parking throughout the City	Very Satisfied	28.7%	181	65.2%	28.1%	87	64.6%
	Somewhat Satisfied	36.4%	230		36.5%	114	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	17.8%	112		19.2%	60	
	Very Dissatisfied	9.7%	61		9.3%	29	
	DK/NA	7.4%	46		6.8%	21	
3G. The job the city does reviewing development applications	Very Satisfied	10.6%	67	33.8%	7.1%	22	31.3%
	Somewhat Satisfied	23.2%	146		24.2%	75	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	7.5%	48		7.8%	24	
	Very Dissatisfied	4.7%	29		3.9%	12	
	DK/NA	54.0%	340		57.0%	177	
3H. Graffiti removal	Very Satisfied	32.4%	204	67.1%	33.3%	104	69.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied	34.7%	218		35.9%	112	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	14.0%	88		15.1%	47	
	Very Dissatisfied	9.4%	60		6.5%	20	
	DK/NA	9.4%	59		9.2%	29	
3I. Protecting open space	Very Satisfied	22.3%	140	58.5%	17.8%	55	55.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied	36.2%	228		37.4%	116	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	10.8%	68		14.5%	45	
	Very Dissatisfied	7.0%	44		3.6%	11	
	DK/NA	23.7%	149		26.7%	83	

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
3J. Attracting new businesses to the City	Very Satisfied	14.4%	91	48.2%	11.9%	37	42.3%
	Somewhat Satisfied	33.8%	213		30.4%	95	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	23.3%	147		25.2%	78	
	Very Dissatisfied	11.5%	73		11.7%	36	
	DK/NA	16.9%	107		20.9%	65	
3K. Increasing the availability of local jobs	Very Satisfied	8.7%	55	40.8%	6.3%	20	32.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied	32.1%	202		25.9%	81	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	21.0%	132		22.2%	69	
	Very Dissatisfied	10.9%	69		10.6%	33	
	DK/NA	27.3%	172		35.0%	109	
3L. Maintaining a strong financial base to fund City programs and services	Very Satisfied	14.1%	89	51.2%	13.9%	43	46.4%
	Somewhat Satisfied	37.1%	234		32.6%	101	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	12.3%	78		14.2%	44	
	Very Dissatisfied	9.0%	57		7.3%	23	
	DK/NA	27.4%	173		32.0%	100	
3M. Revitalizing older neighborhoods and business districts	Very Satisfied	18.1%	114	53.2%	14.1%	44	51.1%
	Somewhat Satisfied	35.1%	221		37.0%	115	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	21.2%	134		21.5%	67	
	Very Dissatisfied	14.4%	91		13.7%	43	
	DK/NA	11.2%	70		13.7%	43	
3N. Revitalizing the downtown area	Very Satisfied	30.7%	193	69.9%	27.8%	86	71.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	39.3%	247		44.1%	137	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	13.8%	87		13.3%	41	
	Very Dissatisfied	9.0%	57		8.9%	28	
	DK/NA	7.2%	46		6.0%	19	
3O. Increasing the availability of affordable housing	Very Satisfied	10.2%	64	33.0%	9.3%	29	32.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	22.7%	143		23.5%	73	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	20.8%	131		25.0%	78	
	Very Dissatisfied	26.5%	167		21.2%	66	
	DK/NA	19.7%	124		21.0%	65	
3P. Library services	Very Satisfied	31.9%	201	67.8%	34.5%	107	68.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	35.9%	226		33.5%	104	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	5.2%	33		3.2%	10	
	Very Dissatisfied	3.4%	22		1.8%	5	
	DK/NA	23.6%	148		27.0%	84	
3Q. Garbage, yard waste, and curb-side recycling	Very Satisfied	45.1%	284	78.6%	54.5%	170	89.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	33.5%	211		34.5%	107	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	12.0%	76		5.9%	18	
	Very Dissatisfied	6.9%	44		2.6%	8	
	DK/NA	2.4%	15		2.5%	8	
3R. Animal services, such as stray animal catching or animal licensing	Very Satisfied	22.5%	142	59.2%	22.3%	69	58.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied	36.7%	231		35.9%	112	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	10.3%	65		9.3%	29	
	Very Dissatisfied	7.1%	45		5.2%	16	
	DK/NA	23.4%	147		27.3%	85	
3S. Retaining existing businesses	Very Satisfied	14.9%	94	54.8%	12.9%	40	51.7%
	Somewhat Satisfied	39.9%	251		38.7%	121	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	16.0%	101		17.6%	55	
	Very Dissatisfied	10.0%	63		10.2%	32	
	DK/NA	19.2%	121		20.5%	64	
3T. The cleanliness of Hayward	Very Satisfied	19.8%	125	66.9%	21.3%	66	71.4%
	Somewhat Satisfied	47.1%	297		50.0%	156	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	19.4%	122		18.9%	59	
	Very Dissatisfied	12.3%	78		8.5%	27	
	DK/NA	1.4%	9		1.2%	4	

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
<b>3U. Landscaping and medians in Hayward</b>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	26.0%	164	71.5%	25.9%	81	
	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	45.5%	287		49.1%	153	
	<b>Somewhat Dissatisfied</b>	13.2%	83		9.3%	29	
	<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	7.5%	47		5.4%	17	
	<b>DK/NA</b>	7.8%	49		10.2%	32	
<b>3V. Increasing the amount of public art</b>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	34.9%	220	73.0%	32.2%	100	71.3%
	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	38.1%	240		39.1%	122	
	<b>Somewhat Dissatisfied</b>	9.0%	57		8.4%	26	
	<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	3.8%	24		4.0%	12	
	<b>DK/NA</b>	14.2%	89		16.4%	51	
<b>3W. Neighborhood police patrols</b>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	20.8%	131	58.6%	18.2%	57	59.2%
	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	37.8%	238		41.1%	128	
	<b>Somewhat Dissatisfied</b>	16.4%	103		17.1%	53	
	<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	13.5%	85		12.3%	38	
	<b>DK/NA</b>	11.6%	73		11.4%	35	
<b>3X. Requiring expansion of existing parks or requiring new parks as part of development approval</b>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	23.7%	149	61.2%	18.2%	57	56.2%
	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	37.5%	236		38.0%	118	
	<b>Somewhat Dissatisfied</b>	12.6%	79		14.4%	45	
	<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	5.3%	33		5.2%	16	
	<b>DK/NA</b>	21.0%	132		24.3%	76	

## SATISFACTION WITH CITY SERVICES – RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
3C. Fire protection and emergency services			1.37			1.45
3P. Library services			1.15			1.31
3V. Increasing the amount of public art			1.07			1.04
3Q. Garbage, yard waste, and curb-side recycling			1.00			1.36
3X. Requiring expansion of existing parks or requiring new parks as part of development approval			0.78			0.66
3U. Landscaping and medians in Hayward			0.75			0.90
3R. Animal services, such as stray animal catching or animal licensing			0.75			0.83
3N. Revitalizing the downtown area			0.74			0.73
3H. Graffiti removal			0.74			0.82
3I. Protecting open space			0.73			0.70
3E. Street lighting			0.69			0.73
3A. Police protection			0.67			0.83
3F. Providing parking throughout the City			0.61			0.59
3G. The job the city does reviewing development applications			0.60			0.53
3D. Street and sidewalk maintenance			0.52			0.57
3L. Maintaining a strong financial base to fund City programs and services			0.48			0.46
3T. The cleanliness of Hayward			0.43			0.57
3S. Retaining existing businesses			0.42			0.33
3W. Neighborhood police patrols			0.41			0.40
3M. Revitalizing older neighborhoods and business districts			0.24			0.19
3J. Attracting new businesses to the City			0.20			0.07
3K. Increasing the availability of local jobs			0.09			-0.08
3O. Increasing the availability of affordable housing			-0.38			-0.32
3B. Traffic circulation			-0.41			-0.41

## HAYWARD IMAGE

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
4. In general, would you say your image of Hayward is very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative?	Very Positive	19.7%	124		19.1%	59	
	Somewhat Positive	56.1%	353		60.9%	190	
	Somewhat Negative	18.6%	117		18.1%	56	
	Very Negative	5.3%	33		1.5%	5	
	DK/NA	0.4%	2		0.3%	1	
	Total Positive	75.8%			80.0%		
	Total Negative	23.8%			19.7%		
	Ratio Pos to Neg	3.2			4.1		

## PUBLIC SAFETY AND POLICE SERVICES

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
5. In your opinion, what is the most serious public safety problem in your neighborhood?	Crime/Drugs/Graffiti/Petty theft	21.0%	132		18.2%	57	
	Homelessness/Camps	13.8%	87		13.4%	42	
	Gang activity	10.5%	66		8.6%	27	
	Lack of police presence/patrols	8.4%	53		7.4%	23	
	Speeding	8.1%	51		10.4%	32	
	None/Nothing	8.1%	51		11.1%	35	
	Traffic/Congestion	7.2%	46		7.1%	22	
	Break Ins/Vehicle/Homes/Burglary	7.1%	45		6.8%	21	
	Lack of street lighting	4.3%	27		5.1%	16	
	Violent crimes/Shootings	3.3%	21		2.7%	8	
	Driving/traffic violations	3.0%	19		3.3%	10	
	Parking	2.9%	18		2.0%	6	
	Trash/Garbage/Dumping	2.3%	15		1.0%	3	
	Public Safety	2.3%	14		0.7%	2	
	Pedestrian safety/Crosswalks	1.8%	12		2.2%	7	
	Blight/Abandoned building	1.7%	11		1.6%	5	
	Auto theft	1.6%	10		2.3%	7	
	Over development	1.5%	9		2.9%	9	
	Road/Street repairs	1.3%	8		1.2%	4	
	Wildlife/Feces/Strays	1.2%	8		1.4%	4	
	Schools/Education	1.1%	7		0.7%	2	
	Sidewalks/Repairs	1.1%	7		1.2%	4	
	Stoplights/Signs	1.1%	7		1.7%	5	
	Housing	1.1%	7		1.2%	4	
	Slow/No police response	1.1%	7		0.1%	0	
	Abandoned cars	0.7%	5		0.5%	2	
	Marijuana smoking in parks/Public	0.6%	4		1.1%	3	
	Noise pollution/Loud cars	0.4%	3		0.7%	2	
	Jobs/Economy	0.4%	3		0.0%	0	
	Other Mention	0.5%	3		1.0%	3	
DK/NA/Refused/Unsure	11.6%	73		10.3%	32		
6A. Fighting crime committed against people	Very Satisfied	20.6%	130	56.2%	21.5%	67	57.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	35.6%	224		35.5%	111	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	12.9%	81		14.9%	46	
	Very Dissatisfied	7.8%	49		6.3%	19	
	DK/NA	23.1%	146		21.8%	68	
6B. Fighting crime involving property damage or theft	Very Satisfied	15.4%	97	51.9%	14.8%	46	51.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	36.6%	230		36.2%	113	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	15.0%	95		19.0%	59	
	Very Dissatisfied	11.4%	72		8.1%	25	
	DK/NA	21.6%	136		21.9%	68	

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
6C. Maintaining traffic safety	Very Satisfied	24.1%	152	66.3%	23.7%	74	68.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	42.3%	266		45.2%	140	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	16.8%	106		16.9%	53	
	Very Dissatisfied	9.5%	60		7.4%	23	
	DK/NA	7.4%	47		6.9%	21	
6D. Working with an ethnically diverse population	Very Satisfied	32.2%	203	65.1%	32.3%	100	67.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	32.9%	208		35.5%	111	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	10.6%	67		9.5%	30	
	Very Dissatisfied	8.8%	55		6.0%	19	
	DK/NA	15.5%	98		16.7%	52	
6E. Officers being courteous to the public	Very Satisfied	35.0%	220	71.2%	37.9%	118	71.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	36.2%	228		34.0%	106	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	7.8%	49		5.8%	18	
	Very Dissatisfied	7.4%	47		7.7%	24	
	DK/NA	13.6%	85		14.6%	45	
6F. 911 operators being courteous to the public	Very Satisfied	33.7%	212	59.4%	35.2%	110	58.1%
	Somewhat Satisfied	25.7%	162		22.9%	71	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	4.0%	25		4.4%	14	
	Very Dissatisfied	1.9%	12		1.6%	5	
	DK/NA	34.8%	219		35.9%	112	
6G. Maintaining adequate neighborhood patrolling	Very Satisfied	16.8%	106	60.1%	19.1%	60	61.7%
	Somewhat Satisfied	43.3%	273		42.6%	133	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	18.9%	119		20.4%	64	
	Very Dissatisfied	12.6%	79		9.8%	31	
	DK/NA	8.4%	53		8.0%	25	
6H. Timeliness of response to police calls	Very Satisfied	26.2%	165	53.7%	27.8%	86	53.6%
	Somewhat Satisfied	27.5%	173		25.9%	80	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	11.3%	71		11.3%	35	
	Very Dissatisfied	7.8%	49		5.1%	16	
	DK/NA	27.2%	171		30.0%	93	
6I. The time it takes to get through to a 911 operator	Very Satisfied	31.8%	200	57.3%	35.6%	111	54.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	25.5%	161		19.3%	60	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	4.5%	28		5.4%	17	
	Very Dissatisfied	3.1%	20		3.2%	10	
	DK/NA	35.1%	221		36.6%	114	
6J. Responsiveness of non-emergency operators	Very Satisfied	27.3%	172	59.3%	26.5%	82	58.3%
	Somewhat Satisfied	31.9%	201		31.9%	99	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	7.1%	45		6.7%	21	
	Very Dissatisfied	6.4%	40		4.9%	15	
	DK/NA	27.2%	171		30.0%	93	

### SATISFACTION WITH POLICE SERVICES – RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
6F. 911 operators being courteous to the public			1.31			1.34
6I. The time it takes to get through to a 911 operator			1.21			1.24
6E. Officers being courteous to the public			0.97			1.03
6J. Responsiveness of non-emergency operators			0.92			0.98
6D. Working with an ethnically diverse population			0.82			0.94
6H. Timeliness of response to police calls			0.73			0.85
6A. Fighting crime committed against people			0.63			0.65
6C. Maintaining traffic safety			0.59			0.65
6B. Fighting crime involving property damage or theft			0.37			0.39
6G. Maintaining adequate neighborhood patrolling			0.36			0.44

## PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
7. To upgrade City of Hayward public safety facilities, including: • replacing the aging police operations center with a seismically safe building; • updating 9-1-1 dispatch and crime lab facilities and technology to provide capacity to quickly respond and improve crime-fighting; shall the City of Hayward issue \$95 million dollars in bonds, requiring an average debt service of \$10 million dollars annually, for 30 years, by assessing \$52 per \$100,000 of assessed value, requiring independent citizen oversight, project audits, and all funds be spent in the City of Hayward?	Definitely Yes	30.8%	194		29.2%	91	
	Probably Yes	28.1%	177		27.0%	84	
	Probably No	13.8%	87		15.7%	49	
	Definitely No	15.5%	98		17.2%	54	
	DK/NA	11.8%	75		10.9%	34	
	Total Yes	58.9%			56.2%		
	Total No	29.3%			32.9%		

## FEATURES OF PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
8A. Provide a police operations center that will be able to survive an earthquake and be up and running in a disaster	Much More Likely	46.0%	290	77.7%	47.6%	148	78.3%
	Somewhat More Likely	31.7%	200		30.7%	96	
	No Effect	10.8%	68		10.3%	32	
	Somewhat Less Likely	3.0%	19		2.8%	9	
	Much Less Likely	4.9%	31		4.5%	14	
	DK/NA	3.6%	22		4.2%	13	
8B. Relocate the police operations center to a more central location in the community	Much More Likely	27.8%	175	52.6%	26.0%	81	51.9%
	Somewhat More Likely	24.9%	157		26.0%	81	
	No Effect	19.9%	125		18.4%	57	
	Somewhat Less Likely	9.7%	61		7.9%	25	
	Much Less Likely	12.2%	77		14.9%	46	
	DK/NA	5.6%	35		6.9%	21	
8C. Provide technology at the new police operations center to better integrate officer location and dispatch technology to more quickly dispatch officers to property crime scenes	Much More Likely	43.2%	134	76.5%	44.4%	67	79.2%
	Somewhat More Likely	33.3%	104		34.8%	52	
	No Effect	12.5%	39		9.9%	15	
	Somewhat Less Likely	0.3%	1		0.6%	1	
	Much Less Likely	6.2%	19		6.6%	10	
	DK/NA	4.5%	14		3.7%	6	
8D. Updating 9-1-1 dispatch and crime lab facilities and technology to provide capacity to quickly respond and improve crime-fighting	Much More Likely	38.4%	119	70.3%	44.9%	67	73.5%
	Somewhat More Likely	31.9%	99		28.6%	43	
	No Effect	14.2%	44		13.5%	20	
	Somewhat Less Likely	3.9%	12		1.0%	1	
	Much Less Likely	6.1%	19		7.3%	11	
	DK/NA	5.4%	17		4.7%	7	
8E. Provide adequate space for holding detainees and safe prisoner transfer	Much More Likely	20.0%	62	51.0%	22.0%	33	53.0%
	Somewhat More Likely	31.0%	96		31.0%	46	
	No Effect	19.7%	61		27.0%	41	
	Somewhat Less Likely	8.9%	28		2.3%	3	
	Much Less Likely	12.3%	38		11.8%	18	
	DK/NA	8.1%	25		5.9%	9	
8F. The up-to-date operations center will improve the Hayward Police Department's anti-drug and gang prevention capabilities	Much More Likely	43.0%	134	76.8%	44.1%	66	75.3%
	Somewhat More Likely	33.8%	105		31.1%	47	
	No Effect	11.5%	36		12.8%	19	
	Somewhat Less Likely	1.3%	4		0.6%	1	
	Much Less Likely	7.1%	22		7.1%	11	
	DK/NA	3.3%	10		4.3%	6	



		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
8G. Provide a modern operations center that includes up-to-date crime fighting technology and is flexible to adapt to new technology and operational necessities	Much More Likely	34.9%	111	73.9%	31.0%	50	72.8%
	Somewhat More Likely	39.0%	124		41.8%	67	
	No Effect	12.0%	38		9.5%	15	
	Somewhat Less Likely	6.9%	22		9.3%	15	
	Much Less Likely	4.1%	13		4.7%	8	
	DK/NA	3.2%	10		3.7%	6	
8H. Provide adequate space in the operations center for a crime lab to analyze and store biological, digital and other evidence that must be kept secure	Much More Likely	39.4%	126	70.8%	39.8%	64	69.9%
	Somewhat More Likely	31.4%	100		30.1%	49	
	No Effect	11.6%	37		9.3%	15	
	Somewhat Less Likely	6.2%	20		10.9%	18	
	Much Less Likely	6.2%	20		3.9%	6	
	DK/NA	5.2%	17		6.0%	10	
8I. Replace the aging police operations center with a seismically safe building	Much More Likely	36.8%	118	72.5%	36.2%	58	70.2%
	Somewhat More Likely	35.6%	114		34.0%	55	
	No Effect	11.6%	37		9.8%	16	
	Somewhat Less Likely	2.9%	9		2.9%	5	
	Much Less Likely	8.5%	27		9.1%	15	
	DK/NA	4.6%	15		8.1%	13	
8J. Replace the police operations and dispatch center to ensure stable communication in times of earthquakes or other disasters and to support the quickest possible emergency response times	Much More Likely	46.0%	147	77.6%	42.8%	69	76.9%
	Somewhat More Likely	31.6%	101		34.1%	55	
	No Effect	9.8%	31		7.0%	11	
	Somewhat Less Likely	3.5%	11		5.1%	8	
	Much Less Likely	5.5%	18		5.5%	9	
	DK/NA	3.5%	11		5.5%	9	

## FEATURES OF PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES – RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
8A. Provide a police operations center that will be able to survive an earthquake and be up and running in a disaster			1.15			1.19
8J. Replace the police operations and dispatch center to ensure stable communication in times of earthquakes or other disasters and to support the quickest possible emergency response times			1.13			1.10
8C. Provide technology at the new police operations center to better integrate officer location and dispatch technology to more quickly dispatch officers to property crime scenes			1.12			1.14
8F. The up-to-date operations center will improve the Hayward Police Department's anti-drug and gang prevention capabilities			1.08			1.09
8D. Updating 9-1-1 dispatch and crime lab facilities and technology to provide capacity to quickly respond and improve crime-fighting			0.98			1.08
8G. Provide a modern operations center that includes up-to-date crime fighting technology and is flexible to adapt to new technology and operational necessities			0.97			0.88
8H. Provide adequate space in the operations center for a crime lab to analyze and store biological, digital and other evidence that must be kept secure			0.97			0.97
8I. Replace the aging police operations center with a seismically safe building			0.94			0.93
8B. Relocate the police operations center to a more central location in the community			0.49			0.43
8E. Provide adequate space for holding detainees and safe prisoner transfer			0.41			0.52

## CONTACTING THE CITY AND CUSTOMER SERVICE

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
9. In the last 12 months, did you contact a City of Hayward department for any reason other than an emergency?	Yes	28.8%	182		29.9%	93	
	No	69.9%	440		68.8%	214	
	DK/NA	1.3%	8		1.3%	4	
10A. Getting your problem resolved or question answered	Very Satisfied	45.9%	83	69.6%	45.7%	43	71.6%
	Somewhat Satisfied	23.7%	43		25.8%	24	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	15.4%	28		17.4%	16	
	Very Dissatisfied	13.9%	25		10.7%	10	
	DK/NA	1.2%	2		0.4%	0	
10B. The customer service you received	Very Satisfied	46.5%	85	73.4%	49.3%	46	74.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	26.9%	49		25.5%	24	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	12.4%	23		12.6%	12	
	Very Dissatisfied	12.2%	22		10.4%	10	
	DK/NA	1.9%	3		2.2%	2	
10C. Courtesy of the City staff	Very Satisfied	48.7%	88	78.1%	50.2%	47	73.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	29.4%	53		22.8%	21	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	5.9%	11		7.3%	7	
	Very Dissatisfied	9.6%	17		10.9%	10	
	DK/NA	6.4%	12		8.8%	8	
10D. Timeliness of the response	Very Satisfied	45.1%	82	72.6%	50.0%	47	73.8%
	Somewhat Satisfied	27.5%	50		23.7%	22	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	9.1%	16		9.7%	9	
	Very Dissatisfied	15.3%	28		12.3%	11	
	DK/NA	3.1%	6		4.2%	4	
10E. Voicing your concerns on major community issues	Very Satisfied	29.6%	54	57.3%	30.6%	28	55.9%
	Somewhat Satisfied	27.7%	50		25.3%	24	
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	10.5%	19		12.9%	12	
	Very Dissatisfied	12.6%	23		9.9%	9	
	DK/NA	19.6%	36		21.3%	20	
10C. Courtesy of the City staff			1.09			1.03	
10B. The customer service you received			0.85			0.93	
10D. Timeliness of the response			0.81			0.94	
10A. Getting your problem resolved or question answered			0.73			0.79	
10E. Voicing your concerns on major community issues			0.64			0.68	
11. Overall, as a resident of the City of Hayward, how much of an opportunity do you feel that you have to voice your concerns on major community issues that affect your life?	A great deal	15.3%	96		13.7%	43	
	Some	34.1%	215		35.4%	110	
	A little	22.0%	139		20.5%	64	
	Not much at all	21.4%	135		21.8%	68	
	DK/NA	7.2%	45		8.6%	27	
12. Are you aware of the community or City Council meetings that are held in your neighborhood?	Yes	42.8%	270		46.3%	144	
	No	54.8%	345		50.7%	158	
	DK/NA	2.4%	15		3.0%	9	
13. In the future, how would you prefer to engage with the City?	Attend City Council meeting(s)	33.5%	211		32.8%	102	
	Participate in an online forum	33.2%	209		30.6%	95	
	Volunteer in a City program	24.3%	153		23.1%	72	
	Attend community workshop(s)	16.8%	106		20.9%	65	
	Join the City's neighborhood liaison program	9.5%	60		9.1%	28	
	Serve on a City board or commission	8.5%	54		9.3%	29	
	Other (Please specify:)	2.6%	17		2.1%	6	
	DK/NA	22.0%	139		25.0%	78	

## COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
14. From what sources do you get information about the local community, local events, and the City government?	Word of mouth-family/friends/colleagues/neighbors	27.7%	174		31.6%	98	
	City website	26.4%	166		24.8%	77	
	Newsletters	21.5%	135		23.3%	72	
	Facebook	19.5%	123		19.3%	60	
	Social media (Generic)	13.9%	87		12.7%	39	
	Newspaper (SPECIFY:)	11.5%	73		15.2%	47	
	TV station (SPECIFY:)	11.0%	69		12.2%	38	
	Public hearing notices / City postcards	10.5%	66		11.7%	36	
	Internet (SPECIFY:)	9.1%	57		10.0%	31	
	Community meetings	7.2%	46		9.6%	30	
	Nextdoor	6.7%	42		9.8%	31	
	Don't ever hear about community / events / city	6.6%	42		4.4%	14	
	City council or commission meetings	6.2%	39		6.9%	21	
	Water bill	5.5%	34		7.8%	24	
	Local community blogs	5.0%	31		5.1%	16	
	City departments or agencies	3.9%	25		4.0%	12	
	Instagram	3.9%	24		4.0%	12	
	Radio station (SPECIFY:)	2.4%	15		2.4%	8	
	Twitter	2.2%	14		3.1%	10	
	Pinterest	0.6%	4		1.2%	4	
Snapchat	0.6%	4		0.4%	1		
Other (SPECIFY:)	7.2%	45		4.5%	14		
DK/NA	2.1%	13		3.3%	10		
15. Are you aware of 'Access Hayward,' on the City website or the mobile App?	Yes	35.4%	223		36.5%	114	
	No	62.0%	391		60.4%	188	
	DK/NA	2.6%	16		3.2%	10	

## DEMOGRAPHICS

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
<b>A. How many members, including yourself, live in your household?</b>	1	8.5%	53		9.5%	30	
	2	25.2%	159		30.4%	94	
	3	19.1%	120		14.7%	46	
	4	23.8%	150		22.9%	71	
	5	11.2%	70		8.2%	26	
	6	5.1%	32		6.1%	19	
	7	1.4%	9		1.1%	3	
	8	1.2%	7		2.1%	6	
	9	0.6%	4		0.7%	2	
	10	0.2%	2		0.0%	0	
	53	0.4%	3		0.8%	3	
99	3.4%	21		3.7%	11		
<b>B. What is the last grade or level you completed in school?</b>	Elementary (8 or fewer years)	0.6%	4		0.4%	1	
	Some high school (9 to 11 years)	2.5%	16		2.4%	8	
	High school graduate (12 years)	16.8%	106		14.0%	44	
	Technical/vocational school	3.7%	23		2.6%	8	
	Some college	30.3%	191		28.9%	90	
	College graduate	31.7%	200		36.3%	113	
	Some graduate school	2.4%	15		1.9%	6	
	Graduate, professional, doctorate degree(DDS, JD, LLM, MA/MS, MBA, MD, Ph.D.)	11.2%	71		12.1%	38	
DK/NA	0.7%	4		1.3%	4		
<b>C. What ethnic group do you consider yourself a part of or feel closest to?</b>	African-American/Black	10.4%	65		9.7%	30	
	American-Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	2		0.5%	1	
	Asian-American	21.7%	137		20.3%	63	
	Caucasian/White	22.9%	144		26.4%	82	
	Latino[a]/Hispanic	36.4%	229		34.1%	106	
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2.1%	13		1.9%	6	
	Two or more races	4.3%	27		4.5%	14	
	Other (SPECIFY:)	0.5%	3		0.7%	2	
	DK/NA	1.4%	9		1.7%	5	
<b>D. What was your total household income before taxes in 2015?</b>	Less than \$20,000	4.5%	28		3.7%	11	
	\$20,000 to less than \$30,000	5.9%	37		5.7%	18	
	\$30,000 to less than \$40,000	6.2%	39		7.5%	23	
	\$40,000 to less than \$50,000	7.2%	45		5.8%	18	
	\$50,000 to less than \$60,000	8.8%	55		6.3%	20	
	\$60,000 to less than \$75,000	7.3%	46		7.3%	23	
	\$75,000 to less than \$100,000	11.0%	70		12.4%	38	
	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	9.3%	58		8.8%	28	
	\$150,000 to less than \$200,000	5.9%	37		8.1%	25	
	\$200,000 or more	8.0%	50		9.4%	29	
	DK/NA	26.0%	164		25.0%	78	
<b>E. Interview Language</b>	English	92.8%	585		94.9%	295	
	Spanish	7.2%	45		5.1%	16	
<b>Respondent's Gender</b>	Male	47.6%	300		44.1%	137	
	Female	52.4%	330		55.9%	174	
<b>F. Age</b>	18-29	23.6%	148		13.8%	43	
	30-39	19.0%	120		12.6%	39	
	40-49	18.0%	114		13.8%	43	
	50-64	24.4%	154		32.0%	100	
	65+	14.9%	94		27.7%	86	
	Not coded	0.0%	0		0.1%	0	

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
<b>G. Ethnic Surname</b>	Japanese	0.4%	3		0.8%	3	
	Chinese	5.0%	31		3.0%	9	
	Hispanic	34.0%	215		32.1%	100	
	Jewish	1.3%	8		1.4%	4	
	Armenian	0.0%	0		0.0%	0	
	Vietnamese	1.8%	11		1.7%	5	
	Italian	0.7%	4		1.0%	3	
	Korean	0.0%	0		0.0%	0	
	African American	5.7%	36		5.5%	17	
	Not Coded	51.0%	321		54.4%	169	
<b>H. Homeownership Status</b>	Owner	50.3%	317		61.1%	190	
	Renter	49.7%	313		38.9%	121	
<b>I. Party</b>	Democrat	60.1%	378		65.9%	205	
	Republican	11.3%	71		13.2%	41	
	Other	4.0%	25		2.7%	8	
	DTS	24.6%	155		18.2%	57	
<b>J. Household Party Type</b>	Dem 1	33.9%	213		33.9%	105	
	Dem 2+	16.9%	107		21.9%	68	
	Rep 1	4.9%	31		4.6%	14	
	Rep 2+	3.0%	19		4.8%	15	
	Other 1	17.6%	111		11.9%	37	
	Other 2+	3.9%	25		3.4%	11	
	Dem & Rep	3.4%	22		3.7%	12	
	Dem & Other	12.4%	78		12.1%	38	
	Rep & Other	2.2%	14		2.5%	8	
	Dem, Rep & Other	1.8%	11		1.2%	4	
<b>K. Registration Date</b>	2013 to 2016	48.3%	304		34.9%	109	
	2009 to 2012	20.2%	127		19.3%	60	
	2005 to 2008	11.1%	70		13.5%	42	
	2001 to 2004	7.8%	49		12.1%	38	
	1997 to 2000	5.2%	33		7.7%	24	
	1993 to 1996	1.4%	9		2.2%	7	
	1981 to 1992	4.4%	28		7.0%	22	
	1980 or before	1.7%	11		3.4%	11	
Not Coded	0.0%	0		0.0%	0		
<b>L. Voting History</b>		see detailed crosstabs					
<b>M. Times Voted in Last Elections</b>	0	17.3%	109		0.0%	0	
	1	16.8%	106		0.0%	0	
	2	12.8%	81		7.5%	23	
	3	5.5%	35		6.3%	20	
	4	6.3%	39		8.6%	27	
	5	7.2%	45		11.3%	35	
	6	6.6%	42		12.4%	39	
	7	5.5%	34		10.4%	32	
	8	2.2%	14		3.7%	12	
	9	4.6%	29		9.3%	29	
	10	4.9%	31		9.7%	30	
	11	0.8%	5		1.7%	5	
	12	2.8%	18		5.6%	18	
	13	6.1%	38		12.4%	38	
	14	0.0%	0		0.1%	0	
	15	0.5%	3		0.9%	3	

		Adults 18+			Likely November 2018 Voters		
		Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean	Column N %	Count	Σ or Mean
<b>N. Absentee Voter</b>	<b>0</b>	52.5%	331		31.9%	99	
	<b>1</b>	14.0%	88		8.5%	26	
	<b>2</b>	4.2%	27		4.9%	15	
	<b>3</b>	4.7%	30		7.5%	23	
	<b>4</b>	2.9%	19		5.1%	16	
	<b>5</b>	3.9%	25		7.3%	23	
	<b>6</b>	3.5%	22		6.8%	21	
	<b>7</b>	2.6%	16		4.6%	14	
	<b>8</b>	1.6%	10		3.3%	10	
	<b>9</b>	2.6%	16		5.2%	16	
	<b>10</b>	1.1%	7		2.0%	6	
	<b>11</b>	0.9%	6		1.8%	6	
	<b>12</b>	0.8%	5		1.6%	5	
	<b>13</b>	4.2%	27		8.5%	27	
	<b>14</b>	0.5%	3		0.9%	3	
	<b>15</b>	0.0%	0		0.0%	0	
<b>O. Permanent Absentee Voter</b>	<b>Yes</b>	57.7%	364		69.8%	217	
	<b>No</b>	42.3%	266		30.2%	94	
<b>P. Likely Absentee Voter</b>	<b>Yes</b>	44.2%	279		70.1%	218	
	<b>No</b>	55.8%	351		29.9%	93	
<b>Interview Type</b>	<b>Online</b>	32.3%	203		32.8%	102	
	<b>Phone</b>	67.7%	427		67.2%	209	



**GODBE RESEARCH**  
Gain Insight

PROPOSAL TO CONDUCT A SERIES  
OF FOCUS GROUPS WITH CITY  
RESIDENTS

Presented to the City of Hayward

February 14, 2017

## BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

---

Godbe Research, a State of California certified small business enterprise (SBE), was founded in January of 1990. The firm is a full-service public opinion research agency that offers its clients extensive experience in public opinion research to support resident and community satisfaction, general and strategic planning, revenue and ballot measure feasibility, community needs assessments, public education and outreach strategies, public sector marketing, and other customized client needs. Our offices in Burlingame, CA (Corporate), Reno, NV (Southwest), and Bellevue, WA (Northwest) house a staff of highly trained and experienced researchers, and a commitment to providing superior quality research and client services.

The firm has been employed by public and private sector clients, throughout California and the western United States. The combined expertise of the Godbe Research team spans over 50 years in the field of public opinion research. The Godbe Research Team consists of the President (Bryan Godbe), Vice President (Charles Hester), and a staff of Senior Research Managers, Senior Statistical Analysts, Research Analysts, and Research Associates. Each team member has the education and experience commensurate with their position at Godbe Research, and the team regularly teaches, authors, and speaks in the field of public opinion research. In short, you will not find a more experienced and educated team in our field.

Since our founding in 1990, Godbe Research has conducted more than 2,500 resident, voter, property owner, and user opinion studies for our diverse array of public clients. Our focus is almost exclusively on public policy and revenue measure research for California local government agencies, including cities, counties, school districts, park and recreation districts, transportation planning agencies and transit providers, special districts, and other public sector agency clients. Within our extensive local government agency experience, Godbe Research has conducted or is in the process of conducting focus group research on a variety of topics for clients such as the Town of Moraga, City of Redwood City, City of San Jose, City of El Cerrito, County of San Mateo, Napa Valley Community College District, City of Sacramento, Peninsula Healthcare District, County of Marin, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, County of Solano, City of Manteca, City of San Bruno, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, City of Temecula, University of California at Santa Cruz, Stanislaus Council of Governments, Southern California Regional Rail Authority/Metrolink, City of Lake Forest, King County Library System (WA State), City of Fullerton, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, Community Transit (WA State), City of Newport Beach, San Diego State University, and even for private entities, such as Facebook, Google, and the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital.

As an organization, Godbe Research is a small business (less than 10 employees) and we manage our commitments wisely. This means managing our project load so that our President (Bryan Godbe) or Vice President (Charles Hester) can be directly involved in each project we conduct at the project manager level. Similarly, we do not take on so many projects that we need to move team members or remove team members from current projects. Thus, Godbe Research is committed to having Bryan Godbe act as the project manager and day-to-day contact for the duration of this focus group project for the City of Hayward (Hayward or City) based on his extensive research experience in the Hayward community for a variety of local agencies as well as previous studies managed by Bryan for the City.



## PROPOSED PROJECT WORK PLAN

---

Godbe Research is a recognized leader in public opinion and voter research for California local government agencies. As such, we believe that any project's success depends on recognizing the individual and unique needs of each client and creating a project work plan to address those specific needs. To this end, Godbe Research has crafted the following work plan for the City of Hayward to illustrate the types of considerations that go into each of our research studies.

### Research Objectives

Before beginning any research project, Godbe Research spends significant time reviewing the client's research objectives to choose the most appropriate research design. Based on preliminary discussions with Hayward, Godbe Research understands that there are several potential research objectives to be addressed by this current research study, the most important of which include evaluating the opinions and attitudes of residents in the City on issues and topics including quality of life, satisfaction with the City in general, satisfaction with City-provided services, further explore the results of a recent resident survey in the City, and other topics of interest to the City of Hayward. Formal research objectives will be defined and refined between Godbe Research and the City at the project kick-off meeting and will be the basis for our final project work plan.

### Proposed Scope of Work

Based on our preliminary understanding of the needs of the City of Hayward for this potential focus group study, Godbe Research has provided our recommended scope of work below. This scope of work is based on a series of two to four total focus groups of City of Hayward residents, segmented by gender, and potentially area of residence within the City, to make the groups as homogenous as possible for this qualitative exercise. Specific tasks under the scope of services for this focus group project are thus envisioned to include:

- Conducting a project kick-off meeting for the focus group study with the City of Hayward as well as additional meetings and correspondence throughout the focus group process, as needed.
- Reviewing background materials, demographic and voter registration data for the City of Hayward, recent resident and voter surveys in the City, as well as other information that will aid in the development of recruitment strategy and discussion guide for the focus group process.
- Developing a listed sample of City of Hayward residents for recruitment of participants for the focus group process. We are proposing to segment the focus groups by gender as well as potentially by area of residence within the City to conduct either two or four total focus groups of City of Hayward residents.
  - ❖ In the scenario for two focus groups, we are recommending that the City conduct one group each of male and female residents without any geographical stratification.
  - ❖ In the scenario for four focus groups, we are recommending that the City conduct one focus group each of female and male residents in the eastern portion of the City, as well as one focus group each of female and male residents who live in the western portion of Hayward.

- Recruiting/scheduling of two to four total focus groups of 12 to 14 participants each so that we can ideally seat 8 to 10 residents for each individual focus group. Focus groups will be conducted two per evening one or two evenings at a local venue provided by the City of Hayward such as the Hayward Public Library or the Hayward Area Historical Society (HAHS) Museum of History and Culture.
  - ❖ There is no professional focus group facility or suitable hotel-type venue within the City of Hayward based on our experience, thus the need for another suitable venue to accommodate the groups in a professional setting familiar to City residents.
  - ❖ We would look to the City to secure the venue at the Library or HAHS Museum of History and Culture as part of the focus group process.
- Development of a discussion guide for the focus groups through an iterative process with the City of Hayward, which could include exercises and/or visuals for participants based on project needs and research objectives.
  - ❖ Similar to previous research studies conducted for the City, the guide (and any exercises) will have multiple points for input, review, and approval prior to conducting the focus groups.
- Conducting/moderating two to four total focus groups over one to two evenings (two groups per evening, 12 to 14 recruited for 8 to 10 to attend per group, groups at 6:00 and 8:00 pm), where groups are taped for later review, respondents are provided with basic snacks (if allowed at the venue), and each respondent that attends the groups is given an appropriate incentive for their time (\$100 each).
  - ❖ As previously stated, groups will be conducted at a venue provided by the City of Hayward such as the Hayward Public Library or the HAHS Museum of History and Culture. We can also have a live feed of the focus groups provided in a second viewing room, where the City can view the groups in 'real time' should the venue have two adjoining rooms and this be of interest to the City. Regardless of a viewing room, the groups will be taped for later analysis and reporting.
- Reviewing the focus group data (e.g. tapes, notes, exercise, etc.) and development of a summary report of findings to submit to the City of Hayward. The report will be in PowerPoint format and will be approximately 10 to 20-pages/slides in length.
- Presenting the findings from the focus groups to the City of Hayward for up to two unique presentations to the City. The length and content of the presentations will be developed between the City and Godbe Research.
- Providing post-project consulting on the results and recommendations from the focus groups, as needed by the City, during planning, education and outreach, and/or other activities that will be informed by the focus groups (no charge).

## Project Time Line Discussion

Because of our experience in conducting public opinion research studies for a wide range of public sector clients, as well as community-based organizations, Godbe Research can generally conduct a focus group project in about five to six weeks, depending on the length of time it takes to develop the discussion guide and recruit participants for the groups. A formal time line with calendar dates will be provided to the City of Hayward after the project kick-off meeting, where we can discuss meeting schedules, deliverable needs, and other project-related topics.

## PROJECT COSTS

---

Godbe Research takes great pride in delivering usable research projects on-time and on-budget. In doing so, we prefer to price our proposals using a firm and fixed-fee format rather than hourly rates. We feel that this pricing model provides the most flexibility and accuracy to our clients, and most accurately portrays the main parameters of any focus group process (the number of focus groups conducted, the number of participants recruited for each focus group, and the topics to be covered in the focus groups).

Below we have provided costs to conduct a series of either two or four total focus groups with City of Hayward residents. Groups will be segmented by gender where the focus group scenario for two total focus groups will consist of one group each of male and female residents. The focus group scenario for four focus groups would be segmented by gender and geography/area of residence and consist of one group each of female and male residents in eastern Hayward and one focus group each of male and female residents who live in the western portion of the City.

As part of the process Godbe Research will recruit 12 to 14 respondents for each focus group with the goal of seating 8 to 10 respondents per group. Groups will be conducted at a local Hayward area venue to be secured by the City. Each respondent that shows for the groups will be incentivized in the amount of \$100 dollars and groups will last approximately 1.5 hours each. Respondents will be provided with basic snacks (if the venue allows for this) and groups will be audio and video taped for later review and analysis by Godbe Research. Finally, we can also have a live video feed of the focus groups to a second viewing room so that City of Hayward representatives can watch the groups in 'real time' should this be available at the selected venue and of interest to the City.

The prices below include all Godbe Research time, tasks, materials, and travel for the overall study and will not increase beyond those listed below, so long as the actual scope of work for the focus group process corresponds to the scope of work outlined in this proposal. Should Hayward needs change, we will be happy to provide a revised proposal prior to proceeding.

<b><u>Focus Group Project Task - Two Focus Groups</u></b>	<b><u>Cost Per Task</u></b>
Facility Rental (2 focus groups over 1 evening)	Hayward
Recruitment and Scheduling (12 to 14 to get 8 to 10 per group or 24 to 28 to get 16 to 20 total)	\$3,920.00
Incentive to Participate (\$100 x 28)	\$2,800.00
Audio/Video Taping (2 groups)	\$500.00
Participant Refreshments (2 groups)	\$400.00
Research Fee	\$6,000.00
Project Management	\$2,000.00
<u>Misc/Travel Expenses</u>	<u>\$400.00</u>
<b>Total for Two Focus Groups</b>	<b>\$16,020.00</b>

<b><u>Focus Group Project Task - Four Focus Groups</u></b>	<b><u>Cost Per Task</u></b>
Facility Rental (4 focus groups over 2 evenings w/ 2 focus groups per evening)	Hayward
Recruitment and Scheduling (12 to 14 to get 8 to 10 per group or 48 to 56 to get 32 to 40 total)	\$7,840.00
Incentive to Participate (\$100 x 56)	\$5,600.00
Audio/Video Taping (4 groups)	\$1,000.00
Participant Refreshments (4 groups)	\$800.00
Research Fee	\$7,500.00
Project Management	\$3,000.00
<u>Misc/Travel Expenses</u>	<u>\$800.00</u>
Total for Four Focus Groups	\$26,540.00



**GODBE RESEARCH**  
Gain Insight

GODBE RESEARCH  
[www.godberesearch.com](http://www.godberesearch.com)

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

Southwest/Reno Office  
59 Damonte Ranch Parkway  
Suite B-309  
Reno, NV 89521

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



# CITY OF HAYWARD

Hayward City Hall  
777 B Street  
Hayward, CA 94541  
[www.Hayward-CA.gov](http://www.Hayward-CA.gov)

---

**File #:** RPT 17-077

---

**DATE:** May 17, 2017

**TO:** Council Budget and Finance Committee

**FROM:** Director of Finance

**SUBJECT**

Discuss Potential Strategies to Close the Budget Gap and Review the May 20, 2017 Budget Work Session Schedule

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee reviews and provides comment on this report.

**ATTACHMENT**

Attachment I Staff Report



**DATE:** May 17, 2017

**TO:** Council Budget & Finance Committee

**FROM:** Director of Finance

**SUBJECT** Discuss One-Time Options to Close the Budget Gap and Review the May 20, 2017 Budget Work Session Schedule

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee discusses one-time options to close the budget gap and reviews the May 20, 2017 Budget Work Session Schedule.

### **BACKGROUND**

The FY 2018 proposed operating budget includes the use of \$10.4M from the General Fund Reserve Fund to balance the budget. As discussed at the May 9<sup>th</sup> budget work session, the upcoming Council retreat this Fall will focus on discussing a combination of recommended strategies that will include revenue generation, expenditure control shifts, service delivery model options, and if necessary, possible service reductions and ways to do so that will be the least impactful to the Hayward community. This conversation will result in the development of a multi-year strategy to eliminate the General Fund structural deficit.

Because the development of these strategies will be completed after the adoption of the FY 2018 budget, the FY 2018 proposed budget includes the use of reserves to address the budget gap. This report presents five one-time options to close the projected FY 2018 budget gap for the Committee's consideration, as an alternative to the use of General Fund reserves.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### *DISCUSS ONE-TIME OPTIONS TO CLOSE THE PROJECTED FY 2018 BUDGET GAP:*

On May 9, 2017, the City Council discussed the FY 2018 Proposed Operating Budget, which includes the use of \$10.4M of General Fund reserves to balance the budget. The use of \$10.4M would leave a FY 2018 ending General Fund Reserve Balance of \$17.9M.

For the Committee's consideration, below are five one-time options to close the projected FY 2018 budget gap as an alternative to the use of General Fund reserves. These options were developed as one-time considerations for this coming year, until this Fall, when the Council can deliberate on a multi-year strategy to eliminate the General Fund structural deficit long-term.



The five one-time options below exceed the \$10.4 million budget gap, but are intended to provide the Council with options to consider: These include the following:

OPTIONS	ONE-TIME STRATEGY	GF SAVINGS
1	Reduce General Fund allocation to Internal Service Funds	\$6.7M
2	Deferral of filling Vacant Positions	\$1.82M
3	Pre-payment of FY 2018 PERS ARC	\$ 700k
4	Deferral of OPEB ARC Contribution	\$1M
5	Lease financing large equipment purchases	\$2.7M
<b>POTENTIAL SAVINGS TO GENERAL FUND:</b>		<b>\$12.72 MILLION</b>

**1. Reduce General Fund allocation to Internal Service Funds (\$6.7 Million):**

Internal Service Departments (ISF) are designed to serve the needs of the City's departments (Recipient) on a cost-reimbursement basis. Annually department service needs are identified, and the costs associated with provision of those services are allocated by the ISF to the department receiving the services or the Recipient. These are done through an allocation to the recipient department. Most recipient departments are in the General Fund.

Many of the City's internal service funds have managed their resources in such a way that they have built substantial fund balance reserves.

This option enables a one-time reduction of the General Fund allocation to three of the ISF funds (Fleet, Facilities and IT) in FY 2018 in the amount of \$6.7 million. Reducing the General Fund allocation for one fiscal year does not reduce the ISF budgets nor the ability to fund FY 2018 needs because this strategy recommends funding expenses using ISF reserves rather than allocating the costs to the General Fund.

Table 1 below delineates the projected 2017 fund balance for Fleet, Facilities and IT Internal Service funds, the recommended one-time use of ISF fund balance this year, and the projected fund balance in FY 2018, if no General Fund allocation is budgeted.

**Table 1: ISF Fund Balance Reserve for FY 2018**

Internal Service Fund (ISF)	Projected FY 2017 Fund Balance Reserve Amount	Recommended Usage Amount from ISF Fund Balance Reserves	Projected FY 2018 Fund Balance Reserves (With No FY 2018 GF Allocation)
Fleet	\$12.9M	\$5.9M	\$7M
Facilities	\$700k	257k	\$443k
IT	\$3.8 M	\$529k	\$3.27M
Total Use of (ISF) Fund Balance Reserves/Savings to General Fund:		\$6.7 Million	

The use of Fleet, Facilities and IT ISF fund balance reserves to cover the costs of operations and replacement capital, while reducing the ISF fund balance does not alter the FY 2018 operations. This one-time option, however, is not a recommended strategy as an ongoing remedy and is only recommended to be used this fiscal year. Utilizing this approach would reduce the General Fund's use of reserves by \$6.7 million.

**2. Defer filling Vacant Non-Sworn Positions for three months & new Library positions for six months (\$1.82 Million Savings):**

This one-time option recommends deferring filling current vacant non-sworn positions for 3 months through October 1, 2017 and any new authorized and budgeted Library positions for six months through January 2018. Deferring these positions would result in a projected one-time savings to the General Fund of approximately \$1.82 million. If Council chose to defer filling current vacant non-sworn positions for six-months, rather than three, it would result in a projected reduction to the FY2018 General Fund budget of approximately \$3.25 million. Staff recommends that a three-month deferral for current vacant non-sworn positions and a six-month deferral for new library positions be considered.

**3. Pre-payment of FY 2018 PERS ARC (\$700k Savings):**

CalPERS provides agencies with two payment options: annual prepayment based on budgeted positions or monthly installment payments. The City currently makes payments monthly to CalPERS based on actual earnings of its employees. If the City were to execute an annual prepayment to CalPERS, it is projected to yield a savings of approximately \$700K.

**4. Deferral of OPEB ARC Contribution (\$1 Million):**

Many cities are still pay as you go and this could be a temporary solution. The FY 2018 budget fully funds the City's pay as you go obligation (approximately \$2.9 million) and staff had proposed to fund \$1 Million of the City's unfunded OPEB liability in this budget as well. The disadvantage of deferring payment towards the City's unfunded OPEB liability is that the unfunded liability will continue to grow, and may increase in the City's next actuarial valuation. Staff would normally advise against this approach, but the Council can consider this as a one-time option for this coming fiscal year as has been done in prior years.

**5. Lease financing large equipment purchases (\$2.7 Million savings):**

Lease financing is a way to stabilize costs, spread the costs associated with the purchasing of large pieces of equipment over multiple fiscal years, and allow for more regular replacement of aging equipment. This approach, however, would result in added debt service costs and additional financing charges.

Staff requests that the Committee discuss these one-time options to close the budget gap in lieu of using General Fund reserves and provide staff feedback.

REVIEW THE MAY 20, 2017 BUDGET WORK SESSION SCHEDULE:

**Attachment II** provides the planned schedule for the May 20, 2017 all day Budget work session, which delineates the various department presentation times.

**NEXT STEPS**

- May 20, 2017: Saturday Budget Work Session
- June 6, 2017: CIP Work Session
- June 13, 2017: Budget Work Session #2 & Presentation of Three Strategic Initiatives
- June 20, 2017: Public Hearing on Operating & CIP budgets (and possible adoption of both documents)
- June 27, 2017: Adoption of Three Strategic Initiatives

*Prepared by:* Nicole Gonzales, Budget Officer  
Dustin Claussen, Director of Finance

*Recommended by:* Dustin Claussen, Director of Finance

Approved by:



---

Kelly McAdoo, City Manager



# CITY OF HAYWARD

Hayward City Hall  
777 B Street  
Hayward, CA 94541  
[www.Hayward-CA.gov](http://www.Hayward-CA.gov)

---

**File #:** RPT 17-078

---

**DATE:** May 17, 2017

**TO:** Council Budget and Finance Committee

**FROM:** Director of Finance

**SUBJECT**

FY 2017 Meeting Schedule & Work Plan

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee receives and comments on the FY 2017 Council Budget and Finance Committee Meeting Schedule & Work Plan.

**ATTACHMENT**

Attachment I Meeting Schedule & Work Plan



**COUNCIL BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**  
**FY 2017 Meeting Schedule & Workplan**  
**May 17, 2017**

**Meeting Location:** 777 B STREET - CITY HALL - 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM 4A  
HAYWARD, CALIFORNIA

**Meeting Time:** 4:00 P. M.

**Meeting Dates:** The Council Budget & Finance Committee generally meet monthly on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month, except for August, due to City Council Break. Special meetings will be scheduled as determined necessary by the Committee or the City Manager.

DATE	SUGGESTED TOPICS (subject to change)
September 28, 2016	FY 2016 annual audit process (external auditor) User Fee Study Update
October 26, 2016	Investment portfolio update (external investment manager) Review of the 2016 Community Survey Questionnaire (external consultant)
<del>November 23, 2016</del> November 16, 2016 (special)	FY 2017 Statement of Investment Policy Review and Delegation of Authority General Fund Ten-Year Plan Review incl FY 2016 Preliminary YE Results FY 2018 Budget Process Plan and Development Calendar
<del>December 28, 2016</del> <del>December 21, 2016 (special)</del>	FY 2018 Budget Development Process
January 25, 2017	Review of Proposal from Management Partners to Update General Fund Ten-Year Plan Model Discussion of FY 2018 Budget Process and Worksession Framework Update on CalPERS
<del>February 22, 2017</del> March 1, 2017	FY 2017 Mid-Year Review & General Fund Ten-Year Plan Update Update FY 2018 Financial Policies FY 2018 Proposed Budget Discussion
<del>March 22, 2017</del> March 20, 2017 (Monday)	Annual Review of City Issued Debt Annual City Benefit Liabilities and Funding Plan Review FY 2018 budget framework
<del>April 26, 2017</del> April 17, 2017 (Monday)	Discussion on Mayor & City Council Department Budget FY 2018 Budget process update
<del>May 24, 2017</del> May 17, 2017	Review of Potential Resident Satisfaction Focus Group Discuss Potential Strategies to Close the Budget Gap and Review the May 20, 2017 Budget Work Session Schedule
<del>June 28, 2017</del> <del>June 21, 2017</del>	Canceled
July 26, 2017 July 19, 2017	FY 2018 budget process debrief Biennial budget process discussion Measure C Annual Report

**Non-scheduled future agenda topics:**

- Performance Measurement
- Affordable Care Act – Health Care Exchange