



City of Sacramento City Council

1

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA, 95814
www.CityofSacramento.org

Meeting Date: 5/22/2012

Report Type: Staff/Discussion

Title: Results of Citizen Services and Revenue Options Survey

Report ID: 2012-00480

Location: Citywide

Recommendation: Receive and file.

Contact: Mark Prestwich, Special Projects Manager, (916) 808-5380, City Manager's Office

Presenter: Mark Prestwich, Special Projects Manager, (916) 808-5380, City Manager's Office

Department: City Manager

Division: Executive Office

Dept ID:

Attachments:

- 1-Description/Analysis
- 2-Key Findings Memo
- 3-Top Line Results

City Attorney Review

Approved as to Form
Gerald Hicks
5/17/2012 10:49:47 AM

City Treasurer Review

Reviewed for Impact on Cash and Debt
Janelle Gray
5/16/2012 3:26:40 PM

Approvals/Acknowledgements

Department Director or Designee: Max Fernandez - 5/16/2012 4:22:46 PM

Description/Analysis

Issue: Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz and Associates (FM3), a California-based public opinion policy research firm, recently completed a survey of 800 likely voters in the City of Sacramento to assess their support for a variety of potential revenue measures that would restore City services in several areas. The telephone survey was conducted between April 22, 2012 and April 25, 2012. A key findings memorandum and top-line results of the survey are attached to this report.

Policy Considerations: “General tax” measures provide revenue for general governmental purposes and require majority voter approval. A tax imposed for specific purposes is a “special tax” and requires approval by 2/3 of the electorate.

Environmental Considerations: Not applicable.

Sustainability: Not applicable.

Commission/Committee Action: Not applicable.

Rationale for Recommendation: The survey results provide the City Council with community feedback on potential revenue measures that have the opportunity to restore City services if approved by voters.

Financial Considerations: The revenue options evaluated range from \$13 million to \$26 million in new revenue annually.

Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD): Not applicable



TO: John Shirey and Mark Prestwich
City of Sacramento

FROM: David Metz & Curtis Below
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates

RE: Brief Summary of Key Findings from Recent Ballot Measure Survey

DATE: April 30, 2012

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) recently completed a survey of 800 likely November 2012 voters in the City of Sacramento to assess voter support for variety of potential revenue measures.¹ One of the goals of this research was to identify which, if any, potential revenue measures voters might be willing to support in November. Should the City wish to consider placing a measure on the November ballot based upon the results from this survey, another survey could be conducted later this summer focusing specifically on that measure to more rigorously assess its viability.

In total, nine alternative measure structures were tested in the survey, though by using a split-sampling technique respondents were only asked about roughly one-half of the different options. Four of the measures (a general purpose ½ cent sales tax, a special purpose ¼ cent sales tax dedicated to youth programs, a soda tax dedicated to childhood obesity, and a \$29 annual parcel tax decided to City parks) were presented with full ballot language; variations of these measures were addressed in follow-up questions.

¹ **Methodology:** From April 22-25, 2012, FM3 completed 800 telephone interviews with City of Sacramento voters likely to cast ballots in the November 2012 election. Interviews were conducted on landline and wireless phones. The margin of sampling error for the full sample is +/- 3.5% at the 95% confidence level; the margin of sampling error for one-half of the sample is +/- 4.9%; margins of sampling error for smaller subgroups within the sample will be higher. Not all percentages sum to 100% due to rounding.

FM3 is currently working on a detailed analysis of the survey results. However, this brief memo presents our initial key findings and observations.

- **While majorities of voters appear willing to support all of the potential measures tested, the general purpose sales tax measures benefit significantly from lower vote thresholds.** Of the nine measures tested, seven of them require support from two-thirds of the electorate to secure passage. Only the ½ and ¼ cent general purpose sales tax measures require support from 50% plus one to pass. Consequently, while the results in **Figure 1** show that strong majorities of survey respondents supported all nine of the different measures, many fell below the two-thirds vote threshold or only barely exceeded it. However, the ¼ cent general purpose sales tax measure exceeded the majority vote threshold by 21 percent (71% “yes”) and the ½ cent general purpose sales tax exceeded the same vote threshold by 18 percent (68% “yes”), suggesting that these two measures have the best electoral viability of the measures tested. Additionally, two of the ½ cent special purpose measures did enjoy support notably higher than then two-thirds vote threshold (police at 78% “yes” and fire at 76% “yes”), suggesting they have the best electoral viability of the two-thirds measures.

FIGURE 1.
Support of Potential Finance Ballot Measures in the City of Sacramento*

Potential Measure	Yes	No	Und	Vote Threshold	Difference from Threshold
General Purpose ¼ Cent Sales Tax	71%	25%	4%	50%	+21%
General Purpose ½ Cent Sales Tax	68%	27%	5%	50%	+18%
Special Purpose (Police) ½ Cent Sales Tax	78%	21%	1%	67%	+11%
Special Purpose (Fire) ½ Cent Sales Tax	76%	22%	2%	67%	+9%
Special Purpose (Youth Investment) ¼ Cent Sales Tax	72%	24%	4%	67%	+5%
Special Purpose (Parks) ½ Cent Sales Tax	69%	29%	2%	67%	+2%
\$19 Parks Parcel Tax	64%	33%	3%	67%	-3%
\$29 Parks Parcel Tax	61%	37%	2%	67%	-6%
Special Purpose Soda Tax	59%	39%	2%	67%	-8%

*For all measures, the margin of sample error is +/- 4.9%

- **Pro and con messaging slightly eroded support for all but the general purpose ½ cent sales tax measure.** For the four measures in which full ballot language was presented – a general purpose ½ cent sales tax, a special purpose ¼ cent sales tax dedicated to youth programs, a soda tax dedicated to childhood obesity, and a \$29 annual parcel tax decided to City parks – survey respondents were also provided with potential statements from measure supporters and opponents. After hearing this pro and con information, respondents were asked again to indicate how they might vote on the measures. As shown in **Figure 2**, support for all of the measures – except the soda tax – did not change significantly. (Support for general purpose sales tax increased by two points, support for the youth investment sales tax decreased by three points, and support for the parks parcel remained unchanged). However, support for the soda tax decreased by nine points – to 50 percent – bringing it far below the two-thirds vote threshold. This left only the general purpose sales tax comfortably above the vote threshold required for passage. (+20%).

FIGURE 2.
Support of Potential Finance Ballot Measures in the City of Sacramento After Potential Statements from Supporters and Opponents*

Potential Measure	Initial	After Pro/Con	Δ	Vote Threshold	Difference from Threshold
General Purpose ½ Cent Sales Tax	68%	70%	+2%	50%	+20%
Special Purpose (Youth Investment) ¼ Cent Sales Tax	72%	69%	-3%	67%	+2%
\$29 Parks Parcel Tax	61%	61%	-	67%	-6%
Special Purpose Soda Tax	59%	50%	-9%	67%	-17%

**For all measures, the margin of sample error is +/- 4.9%*

Taken together, these results suggest that a general purpose sales tax measure is the most electorally viable option of the different measures considered in the survey. While support for a special purpose sales tax measure supporting either police or fire services may actually be supported by a larger portion of the electorate, the two-thirds vote threshold required to pass such measures makes them somewhat more challenging to pass in comparison to a majority vote threshold measure like a general purpose sales tax.



**2012 CITY OF SACRAMENTO FINANCE MEASURE SURVEY
220-3300-WT
N=800
A/B & C/D & E/F SPLITS**

Hello, I'm _____ from F-M-3, a public opinion research company. We're conducting a public opinion survey about local issues that interest residents of the City of Sacramento. We have nothing to sell and are simply interested in your opinions. May I speak to _____? **(YOU MUST SPEAK TO THE VOTER LISTED. VERIFY THAT THE VOTER LIVES AT THE ADDRESS LISTED, OTHERWISE TERMINATE.)**

A. Before we begin, I need to know if I have reached you on a cell phone, and if so, are you in a place where you can talk safely?

Yes, cell and can talk safely ----- 37%
 Yes, cell and cannot talk safely ----- **TERMINATE**
 No ----- 63%
(DON'T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED----- TERMINATE

1. In November there will be a general election for President, Congress, the State Legislature, and state and local ballot measures. I know it is a long way off, but how likely are you to actually vote in this election? Will you definitely vote, probably vote, are the chances 50-50 that you will vote, will you probably not vote, or will you definitely not vote?

Definitely vote ----- 85%
 Probably vote ----- 10%
 50-50 ----- 5%
 Probably not vote ----- **TERMINATE**
 Definitely not vote ----- **TERMINATE**
(DON'T KNOW/NA)----- TERMINATE

2. **(T)** Next, generally speaking, how would you rate Sacramento as a place to live: is it an excellent place to live, a pretty good place, just fair, or a poor place to live?

Excellent ----- 22%
 Good ----- 60%
 Only fair ----- 14%
 Poor ----- 2%
(DON'T READ) DK/NA ----- 1%

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT SEVERAL DIFFERENT MEASURES THAT MAY APPEAR ON A FUTURE CITY OF SACRAMENTO BALLOT. KEEP IN MIND THAT ONLY ONE IS LIKELY TO APPEAR ON ANY GIVEN FUTURE BALLOT.

ROTATION INSTRUCTIONS:
 • **FOR SPLIT SAMPLE C ASK GENERAL PURPOSE SALES TAX FIRST Q3-Q5**

- **FOR SPLIT SAMPLE D ASK YOUTH INVESTMENT SALES TAX FIRST Q6**
- **READ ALL RESPONDENTS TEXT BOX AFTER Q6**
- **FOR SPLIT SAMPLE E ASK SODA TAX SECOND Q7**
- **FOR SPLIT SAMPLE F ASK PARKS PARCEL TAX SECOND Q8-Q9**
- **RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS STARTING WITH Q10**

(SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)

3. **(GENERAL PURPOSE SALES TAX)** The first potential measure might read as follows:

“The City of Sacramento Essential City Services Protection Measure. To restore eliminated police and unfilled firefighter positions and maintain essential City services, including 9-1-1 emergency response; gang and youth violence prevention, investigation of robberies and burglaries; park maintenance and safety; youth and senior services; and other city services, shall the City of Sacramento enact a one-half cent sales tax with all revenue for the City and none for the State, subject to public, annual, independent audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES ----- 68%

Definitely yes ----- 30%

Probably yes ----- 32%

Undecided, lean yes----- 6%

TOTAL NO ----- 27%

Undecided, lean no----- 2%

Probably no ----- 10%

Definitely no ----- 15%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA ----- 5%

(SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)

(ASK Q4 IF NOT “DEFINITELY YES” – CODE 1 – IN Q3)

4. Next, if instead of raising the City sales tax by one-half cent this measure raised the City sales tax by one-quarter cent, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES ----- 51%
 Definitely yes ----- 15%
 Probably yes ----- 32%
 Undecided, lean yes ----- 5%

TOTAL NO ----- 44%
 Undecided, lean no ----- 2%
 Probably no ----- 19%
 Definitely no ----- 23%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA ----- 5%

Q3/Q4 COMBINED

TOTAL YES ----- 71%
 Definitely yes ----- 40%
 Probably yes ----- 25%
 Undecided, lean yes ----- 5%

TOTAL NO ----- 25%
 Undecided, lean no ----- 2%
 Probably no ----- 9%
 Definitely no ----- 13%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA ----- 4%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS IN SPLIT SAMPLE C)

5. Next, the funds generated by this measure could be spent on any essential City services. However, the measure could also be structured so that the funds it generates are spent only on certain specific services. Now I am going to read to you several different types of services. For each one, please tell me whether you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it if the funds were dedicated entirely to that specific type of city service. **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)** **(RANDOMIZE)**

		<u>DEF</u>	<u>PROB</u>	<u>LEAN</u>	<u>LEAN</u>	<u>PROB</u>	<u>DEF</u>	<u>(DK/</u>
		<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NA)</u>
[]a.	Fire protection-----	51%	22%	4%	1%	8%	13%	2%
[]b.	Police protection-----	55%	21%	3%	0%	8%	12%	1%
[]c.	Parks and recreation-----	41%	25%	2%	3%	12%	14%	2%

(SPLIT SAMPLE D ONLY)

6. **(YOUTH INVESTMENT SALES TAX)** The first potential measure might read as follows:

“The City of Sacramento Gang Prevention and Youth Investment Measure. To provide at-risk school-aged youth with job skills, training, and work experience, by restoring eliminated gang and drug prevention programs, after-school and weekend programs, and youth sports and recreation programs, and restoring local recreation center hours in high-risk areas, shall the City of Sacramento enact a one-quarter cent sales tax with all revenue for the City and none for the State, subject to public, annual, independent audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES-----72%
 Definitely yes----- 34%
 Probably yes----- 30%
 Undecided, lean yes----- 8%

TOTAL NO -----24%
 Undecided, lean no----- 2%
 Probably no----- 7%
 Definitely no----- 15%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----4%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS IN ALL SAMPLES)

NOW I AM GOING TO READ YOU A SECOND MEASURE THAT COULD APPEAR ON A FUTURE CITY OF SACRAMENTO BALLOT INSTEAD OF THE ONE WE WERE JUST DISCUSSING.

(SPLIT SAMPLE E ONLY)

7. **(SODA TAX)** This potential measure might read as follows:

“The City of Sacramento Childhood Obesity and Diabetes Prevention Measure. To fund recreation and school-based programs that fight and prevent childhood obesity and diabetes, such as after school recreation activities and healthy lunch programs, shall the City of Sacramento amend its business operations tax to require distributors of sugar sweetened beverages to pay a penny per ounce tax on the sodas and other sweetened beverages they distribute, with all revenue subject to public, annual, independent audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES -----	59%
Definitely yes -----	34%
Probably yes -----	22%
Undecided, lean yes-----	4%

TOTAL NO -----	39%
Undecided, lean no-----	1%
Probably no -----	12%
Definitely no -----	26%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA ----- 2%

(SPLIT SAMPLE F ONLY)

8. **(PARK PARCEL TAX)** This potential measure might read as follows:

“The City of Sacramento Neighborhood Parks Protection Measure. To maintain neighborhood parks by restoring reduced or eliminated park maintenance, cleaning facilities and restrooms, and mowing park fields, and to restore eliminated youth sports and recreation programs, shall the City of Sacramento establish a residential parcel tax of 29 dollars per year, and comparable amounts for non-residential and multi-unit residential properties, with all revenue for the City and none for the State, subject to public, annual, independent audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES -----	61%
Definitely yes -----	26%
Probably yes -----	30%
Undecided, lean yes -----	5%
 TOTAL NO -----	 37%
Undecided, lean no -----	2%
Probably no -----	14%
Definitely no -----	20%
 (DON’T READ) DK/NA -----	 2%

(SPLIT SAMPLE F ONLY)

(ASK Q9 IF NOT “DEFINITELY YES” – CODE 1 – IN Q8)

9. Next, if instead of establishing a residential parcel tax of 29 dollars per year this measure established a residential parcel tax of 19 dollars per year, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES -----	52%
Definitely yes -----	10%
Probably yes -----	38%
Undecided, lean yes -----	4%
 TOTAL NO -----	 44%
Undecided, lean no -----	3%
Probably no -----	18%
Definitely no -----	24%
 (DON’T READ) DK/NA -----	 4%

TOTAL YES -----	64%
Definitely yes -----	33%
Probably yes -----	28%
Undecided, lean yes -----	3%
 TOTAL NO -----	 33%
Undecided, lean no -----	2%
Probably no -----	13%
Definitely no -----	18%
 (DON'T READ) DK/NA -----	 3%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS IN ALL SAMPLES)

10. Next, I am going to read you a list of ways in which the funds generated by any City of Sacramento ballot measure could be spent. As I read each one, please tell me how important it is to you that each service be provided: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. **(RANDOMIZE)**

	<u>EXT.</u>	<u>VERY</u>	<u>S.W.</u>	<u>NOT</u>	<u>(DON'T</u>
	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>READ)</u>
					<u>DK/NA</u>
(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)					
[]a. Stopping the practice of not staffing or “browning out” three of the City’s fire engines on a rotating basis -----	20%	32%	33%	10%	5%
[]b. Expanding paramedic services to ensure emergency response times come closer to national standards -----	28%	44%	19%	7%	2%
[]c. Enabling the police department to address its backlog of crime investigations and keep up with future demand -----	24%	45%	26%	5%	0%
[]d. Restoring the eliminated vice unit that investigates and prevents prostitution -----	12%	23%	37%	25%	2%
[]e. Restoring eliminated community policing and neighborhood watch programs -----	21%	38%	31%	9%	2%
[]f. Restoring eliminated programs to investigate property crimes like home and business burglaries -----	20%	39%	32%	8%	2%
[]g. Restoring eliminated programs to investigate auto thefts -----	12%	22%	48%	17%	1%
[]h. Restoring reduced or eliminated park maintenance -----	13%	33%	44%	8%	2%
[]i. Restoring Community Center programs and hours of operation -----	11%	34%	40%	14%	2%
[]j. Mowing park fields -----	8%	26%	49%	15%	2%
[]k. Building new City parks -----	8%	16%	38%	37%	1%
[]l. Providing funds to local community based organizations with proven track records of running successful anti-gang and after-school programs -----	22%	44%	24%	9%	1%

	<u>EXT.</u>	<u>VERY</u>	<u>S.W.</u>	<u>NOT</u>	<u>(DON'T</u>
	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>IMP.</u>	<u>READ)</u>
					<u>DK/NA</u>
[]m. Restoring eliminated youth sports and recreation programs -----	20%	34%	33%	12%	1%
[]n. Increasing apprenticeship programs with local businesses and industries to provide students first hand experiences in the job market -----	24%	36%	27%	12%	1%
[]o. Increasing funding for safe passage programs that provide students with escorts to and from school safely in high crime and gang areas -----	19%	29%	32%	16%	4%
[]p. (T) Maintaining street paving and pothole repair -----	19%	44%	32%	5%	1%

(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)

[]q. Ensuring that all of the City’s fire engines are fully staffed and operational seven days a week, 24 hour a day -----	38%	39%	17%	6%	1%
[]r. Restoring 9-1-1 emergency response services to come closer to national standards -----	47%	37%	11%	4%	1%
[]s. Restoring three previously eliminated fire engine companies -----	25%	33%	27%	10%	5%
[]t. Providing sufficient resources for the police department to use D-N-A evidence to solve crimes -----	32%	40%	21%	6%	1%
[]u. Restoring the eliminated narcotics team that investigates and prevents illegal drug sales -----	24%	35%	27%	13%	1%
[]v. Restoring reduced police traffic enforcement and safety teams -----	21%	35%	30%	12%	2%
[]w. Restoring eliminated problem-oriented policing and neighborhood watch programs -----	23%	30%	33%	11%	2%
[]x. (T) Maintaining neighborhood parks -----	22%	40%	32%	5%	0%
[]y. Restoring local recreation center hours in high-risk areas -----	25%	36%	29%	9%	0%
[]z. Restoring tree maintenance to preserve a healthy tree canopy in neighborhood parks -----	16%	30%	40%	13%	0%
[]aa. Keeping neighborhood parks safe -----	34%	44%	16%	5%	1%
[]bb. Cleaning park facilities and restrooms -----	21%	41%	30%	8%	0%
[]cc. Restoring eliminated gang and drug prevention programs -----	30%	37%	22%	10%	1%
[]dd. Restoring eliminated after-school and weekend programs that target at-risk youth -----	31%	36%	24%	9%	1%
[]ee. Improving coordination between local school districts, local and county government, and local law enforcement to better identify and track at-risk students and known gang members -----	28%	35%	29%	8%	1%
[]ff. Developing recreation and school-based programs that fight childhood obesity and diabetes -----	25%	32%	28%	14%	1%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

NOW I AM GOING TO READ YOU SOME STATEMENTS FROM BOTH SUPPORTERS AND OPPONENTS OF THE FIRST POTENTIAL MEASURE WE WERE DISCUSSING:

(SPLIT C ONLY – GENERAL PURPOSE SALES TAX)

THE MEASURE TO RESTORE ELIMINATED POLICE AND UNFILLED FIREFIGHTER POSITIONS AND MAINTAIN ESSENTIAL CITY OF SACRAMENTO SERVICES, INCLUDING 9-1-1 EMERGENCY RESPONSE; POLICE AND FIRE PROTECTION; AND PARK MAINTENANCE AND SAFETY, BY ENACTING A ONE-HALF CENT SALES TAX.

(SPLIT D ONLY – YOUTH INVESTMENT SALES TAX)

THE MEASURE TO PROVIDE AT-RISK YOUNG ADULTS AND SCHOOL-AGED YOUTH WITH JOB SKILLS, TRAINING, AND WORK EXPERIENCE AND RESTORE ELIMINATED GANG AND DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAMS, BY ENACTING A ONE-QUARTER CENT SALES TAX.

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

11. First, I am going to read you some statements from people who support this ballot measure. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to support such a measure. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. **(RANDOMIZE)**

VERY CONV. SMWHT CONV. NOT CONV. DON'T BELIEVE (DK/NA)

[]a. **(ACCOUNTABILITY)** This measure includes tough accountability provisions such as requiring annual independent audits and publishing of expenditure reports. These fiscal safeguards will ensure funds are spent as promised to voters. -----24%----- 40% -----22%----- 12% ----- 1%

(SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)

[]b. **(GENERAL SERVICES)** Sacramento is facing several years of major budget deficits – including a 23 million dollar deficit over the next two years – and has already cut over 100 million dollars from its budget. Without additional revenue the City could be forced to make deeper cuts to essential city services like police and fire protection, youth and senior programs, and park maintenance. -----35%----- 39% -----16%----- 8% ----- 2%

VERY SMWHT NOT DON'T
CONV. CONV. CONV. BELIEVE (DK/NA)

(SPLIT SAMPLE A/C ONLY)

- []c. **(RESPONSE TIMES)** The national standard for responding to fires or medical emergencies is four minutes. However, recent budget cuts have increased the City’s response times and they currently only meet the national standard 65 percent of the time. This measure will ensure people caught in fires or suffering from medical emergencies receive immediate attention critical for survival. -----44%----- 32% -----15% ----- 8% ----- 0%
- []d. **(POLICE SERVICE CUTS/DEMAND)** Despite population growth in Sacramento, the police department has had its budget slashed by 35 million dollars and 127 police officers since 2008. This means that only 8 percent of home burglaries are investigated, and community policing programs, the vice unit, the narcotics team and traffic safety teams have all been eliminated or severely reduced. This measure will restore these critical services and keep Sacramento safe. -----46%----- 33% -----15% ----- 7% ----- 0%
- []e. **(YOUTH SERVICES)** Since 2008, youth services staffing and services have been cut by more than half, eliminating programs that supported thousands of youth, including sports programs, summer camps, employment programs, and after-school programs for at-risk youth. This measure will restore those programs and keep community centers open, ensuring safe and healthy places for youth to engage in positive and productive activities. -----44%----- 32% -----17% ----- 7% ----- 0%

(SPLIT SAMPLE B/C ONLY)

- []f. **(FIRE SERVICE CUTS/DEMAND)** Recent budget cuts have reduced fire department staffing levels to pre-1980 levels, even though the City’s population has nearly doubled during this time period and call volume has increased 220 percent since 1985. This measure will help address Sacramento’s increasing fire protection and emergency medical response needs. -----46%----- 33% -----13% ----- 8% ----- 0%

VERY SMWHT NOT DON'T
CONV. CONV. CONV. BELIEVE (DK/NA)

[]g. **(POLICE STATISTICS)** There are nearly 47 hundred gang members in Sacramento – nearly seven gang members per police officer – and the City has the second highest violent and property crime rates in California, trailing only Oakland. This measure will restore cuts to police services and address these critical public safety problems. -----42%----- 29% -----16%----- 12% ----- 0%

[]h. **(PARKS/MAINTENANCE)** Since 2008, park maintenance services and staffing have been cut by more than half. Mowing and sports field maintenance have suffered, leaving weeds high and fields unsafe and far more difficult to use. This measure will restore cuts to badly needed park maintenance and allow us all to safely enjoy our neighborhood parks, trees and sports fields. -----36%----- 36% -----20%----- 8% ----- 1%

(SPLIT SAMPLE D ONLY)

[]i. **(YOUTH SERVICES)** Since 2008, youth services staffing and services have been cut by more than half, eliminating programs that supported thousands of youth, including sports programs, summer camps, employment programs, and after-school programs for at-risk youth. This measure will restore those programs and keep community centers open, ensuring safe and healthy places for youth to engage in positive and productive activities. -----41%----- 43% -----13%----- 3% ----- 0%

[]j. **(GANG VIOLENCE INCREASE)** Gang violence and gang membership has greatly increased in Sacramento over the past several years. This measure is desperately needed to stop and ultimately reverse the increase in gang violence by preventing at-risk youth from joining gangs in the first place. -----33%----- 41% -----18%----- 7% ----- 1%

[]k. **(EARLY INTERVENTION)** Most education and crime experts agree that teaching students about the dangers of gangs is an effective way to prevent and reduce gang activity, juvenile crime and imprisonment. This measure will fund in-school and after-school anti-gang, mentoring and job-training programs recognized as successful in preventing anti-social behavior. -----31%----- 42% -----19%----- 6% ----- 1%

<u>VERY</u>	<u>SMWHT</u>	<u>NOT</u>	<u>DON'T</u>
<u>CONV.</u>	<u>CONV.</u>	<u>CONV.</u>	<u>BELIEVE (DK/NA)</u>

(SPLIT SAMPLE D/A ONLY)

[]l. **(COST SAVINGS - PER CHILD)** It costs 88 thousand dollars a year to put a kid in juvenile detention or in prison. By preventing kids and teens from joining gangs we save money and lives for years to come. It will be cheaper in the long-run to provide additional funds for anti-gang and after-school programs that keep kids out of trouble and prevent them from joining gangs. -----50%----- 26% -----17% -----6% ----- 1%

(SPLIT SAMPLE D/B ONLY)

[]m. **(COST SAVINGS - COMMUNITY)** Gangs and juvenile crime are costing our communities billions of dollars each year, and the lives of our children. Studies show that diverting 200 kids away from crime and gangs saves nearly 18 million dollars a year. This measure will not only save lives, but it will also save money. -----45%----- 29% -----18% -----7% ----- 0%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

12. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about:

(SPLIT C ONLY – GENERAL PURPOSE SALES TAX)

The potential measure to restore eliminated police and unfilled firefighter positions and maintain essential City of Sacramento services, including 9-1-1 emergency response; police and fire protection; and park maintenance and safety, by enacting a one-half cent sales tax.

(SPLIT D ONLY – YOUTH INVESTMENT SALE TAX)

The potential measure to provide at-risk school-aged youth with job skills, training, and work experience, and restore eliminated gang and drug prevention programs, by enacting a one-quarter cent sales tax.

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

	SPLIT C: GENERAL PURPOSE	SPLIT D: YOUTH INVESTMENT	TOTAL
TOTAL YES -----	72% -----	73% -----	72%
Definitely yes-----	42%-----	41%-----	42%
Probably yes-----	26%-----	27%-----	26%
Undecided, lean yes-----	4%-----	5%-----	4%
 TOTAL NO -----	 25% -----	 26% -----	 25%
Undecided, lean no-----	2%-----	2%-----	2%
Probably no-----	10%-----	10%-----	10%
Definitely no-----	13%-----	14%-----	14%
 (DON'T KNOW/NA) -----	 3% -----	 1% -----	 2%

13. Now I am going to read you some statements from people who oppose this ballot measure. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to oppose such a measure. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. (RANDOMIZE)

	<u>VERY CONV.</u>	<u>SMWHT CONV.</u>	<u>NOT CONV.</u>	<u>DON'T BELIEVE (DK/NA)</u>	
[]a. (ECONOMY - GENERAL) We're still stuck in the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, gas prices reaching all-time highs, and local families are struggling to make ends meet. Now is not the time to pass more tax measures.	33%	27%	28%	11%	1%
[]b. (WASTE) Instead of raising taxes, the City should just cut unnecessary spending, such as overpaid management staff and expensive, out-of-town consultants. We don't need to raise taxes again and allow bureaucrats and politicians to waste our tax dollars.	45%	25%	22%	8%	1%
[]c. (ARENA) Somehow the City is managing to come up with millions of dollars to try and replace Power Balance Arena without raising taxes. They should be able to do the same to maintain and restore essential City services instead of raising taxes on hard working Sacramento residents.	39%	27%	22%	10%	2%

(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)

[]d. (PENSIONS - GENERAL) Most of the money raised by this tax would go to pay for public employee pensions and retirement benefits. It is not fair to ask Sacramento taxpayers to pay for gold-plated, guaranteed retirement benefits for City employees in this economy.	25%	24%	26%	22%	3%
[]e. (UTILITY RATES) Our sewer and water rates are going to increase by double digit figures for the next three years. We can't afford another tax on top of those large annual rate increases.	32%	28%	30%	9%	1%

(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)

[]f. (PENSIONS – CONTRIBUTIONS) Even though some City employees are paying the full employee share of retirement, most are not. It is not fair in this economy to ask Sacramento taxpayers to pay more in taxes before <u>all</u> city employees are contributing their fair share to their retirement.	32%	32%	25%	9%	2%
--	-----	-----	-----	----	----

**VERY SMWHT NOT DON'T
CONV. CONV. CONV. BELIEVE (DK/NA)**

[]g. **(STATE TAXES)** With the state preparing to raise sales and income taxes this fall, we simply can't afford another local tax on top of those tax increases. -----29%----- 28% -----28%----- 13% ----- 1%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

14. Sometimes over the course of a survey like this, people change their minds. Let me ask you one last time about:

(SPLIT C ONLY – GENERAL PURPOSE SALES TAX)

The potential measure to restore eliminated police and unfilled firefighter positions and maintain essential City of Sacramento services, including 9-1-1 emergency response; police and fire protection; and park maintenance and safety, by enacting a one-half cent sales tax.

(SPLIT D ONLY – YOUTH INVESTMENT SALE TAX)

The potential measure to provide at-risk school-aged youth with job skills, training, and work experience, and restore eliminated gang and drug prevention programs, by enacting a one-quarter cent sales tax.

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON'T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

	<u>SPLIT C:</u> <u>GENERAL</u> <u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>SPLIT D:</u> <u>YOUTH</u> <u>INVESTMENT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TOTAL YES -----	70% -----	69% -----	69%
Definitely yes-----	42%-----	39%-----	41%
Probably yes-----	25%-----	25%-----	25%
Undecided, lean yes-----	3%-----	4%-----	4%
 TOTAL NO -----	 27% -----	 28% -----	 28%
Undecided, lean no-----	1%-----	1%-----	1%
Probably no-----	9%-----	9%-----	9%
Definitely no-----	17%-----	18%-----	17%
 (DON'T KNOW/NA) -----	 3% -----	 3% -----	 3%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO QUICKLY RETURN TO SECOND POTENTIAL MEASURE WE WERE DISCUSSING:

(SPLIT E ONLY – SODA TAX)

THE MEASURE TO FUND SCHOOL-BASED RECREATION AND SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS THAT FIGHT AND PREVENT CHILDHOOD OBESITY AND DIABETES BY AMENDING THE CITY'S BUSINESS OPERATIONS TAX TO REQUIRE DISTRIBUTORS OF SUGAR SWEETENED BEVERAGES TO PAY A PENNY PER OUNCE TAX ON THE SODAS AND OTHER SWEETENED BEVERAGES THEY DISTRIBUTE.

(SPLIT F ONLY – PARK PARCEL TAX)

THE MEASURE TO MAINTAIN NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS AND KEEP THEM SAFE BY RESTORING REDUCED OR ELIMINATED PARK MAINTENANCE, CLEANING FACILITIES AND RESTROOMS, MOWING FIELDS, AND ENSURING PARK SAFETY STAFFING LEVELS MEET NATIONAL STANDARDS, BY ESTABLISHING A RESIDENTIAL PARCEL TAX OF 29 DOLLARS PER YEAR.

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS IN SPLIT SAMPLE E)

15. **(SODA TAX)** I am going to read you short statements from both supporters and opponents.
(RANDOMIZE)

[] Supporters say childhood obesity is a local, state, and national epidemic and a recent California Physical Fitness Report found that 30 percent of students in Sacramento County are overweight. Furthermore, increased consumption of sodas – which have 16 teaspoons of sugar in each 20 ounce bottle – is responsible for half of the obesity epidemic, making sodas the single largest contributor to obesity. This measure is needed to reduce soda consumption, to help fund critically important programs that fight childhood obesity, and to help Sacramento youth live healthy and active lives.

[] Opponents say that while fighting childhood obesity is important, this is a deeply flawed measure. It will hurt local business, increase costs for consumers – particularly lower-income consumers – and encourage local politicians to impose more taxes on things they don’t like, such as fast food and alcohol. Instead of raising taxes and punishing local businesses – and interfering with people’s personal choice of what they eat or drink – we should just cut wasteful City spending to pay for important programs to fight childhood obesity.

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES -----	50%
Definitely yes -----	35%
Probably yes -----	12%
Undecided, lean yes-----	3%

TOTAL NO -----	47%
Undecided, lean no-----	1%
Probably no -----	16%
Definitely no -----	30%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA ----- 3%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS IN SPLIT SAMPLE F)

16. **(PARK PARCEL TAX)** I am going to read you short statements from both supporters and opponents. **(RANDOMIZE)**

[] Supporters say since 2008 Sacramento has severely reduced funding for park maintenance and has eliminated many youth programs. Mowing and sports field maintenance have suffered, leaving weeds high and fields unsafe and far more difficult to use, restrooms are insufficiently cleaned, and programs that supported thousands of youth – including sports programs, summer camps, employment programs, after-school programs for at-risk youth – no longer exist. For just 29 dollars a year, this measure would help maintain our quality of life by allowing the City to restore badly needed maintenance to our neighborhood parks and to restore these eliminated youth programs.

[] Opponents say that while our parks are important, there are plenty of far more important government services in need of additional revenue. If we are going to raise taxes on ourselves, that money ought to first to go our public schools, and police and fire services, before we start worrying about mowing our parks more frequently. If we want to improve our parks during this economy, that money has to come from cutting wasteful City spending and unnecessary programs, and not from the taxpayers.

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, ASK: “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”)**

TOTAL YES -----	61%
Definitely yes -----	26%
Probably yes -----	31%
Undecided, lean yes-----	4%
 TOTAL NO -----	 36%
Undecided, lean no-----	3%
Probably no -----	16%
Definitely no -----	16%
 (DON’T READ) DK/NA -----	 3%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**HERE ARE MY FINAL QUESTIONS. THEY ARE JUST FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES.**

17. Do you live in a single-residence detached home, or do you live in a multi-family apartment, mobile home park, or condo building?

Single family detached house----- 77%
 Multi-family apt/condo----- 18%
 Mobile home park-----2%
(DON'T READ) Don't know/Refused --- 3%

18. Do you own or rent the house or apartment where you live?

Own ----- 66%
 Rent ----- 29%
(DON'T READ) Don't know/Refused --- 5%

19. Do you have any children? **(IF YES, ASK:)** "Are they under the age of 19?"

Yes, children under 19----- 26%
 Yes, children both under and over 19---- 4%
 Yes, children over 19 ----- 27%
 No ----- 40%
(DON'T READ) DK/Refused ----- 3%

20. **(T)** What was the last level of school you completed?

Grades 1-8-----0%
 Grades 9-11 -----3%
 High school graduate (12)----- 16%
 Some college----- 24%
 Business/vocational school -----6%
 College graduate (4) ----- 29%
 Post-Graduate work/
 Professional school----- 19%
(DON'T READ) DK/Refused----- 3%

21. (T) Please stop me when I come to the category that best describes the ethnic or racial group with which you identify yourself. Is it....?

Hispanic/Latino-----	15%
African-American -----	10%
Asian/Pacific Islander -----	9%
Caucasian/White-----	57%
Native American/Indian -----	2%
Some other group or identification-----	0%
(DON'T READ) Refused-----	7%

22. (T) In what year were you born?

1994-1988 (18-24) -----	8%
1987-1983 (25-29) -----	7%
1982-1978 (30-34) -----	9%
1977-1973 (35-39) -----	7%
1972-1968 (40-44) -----	7%
1967-1963 (45-49) -----	9%
1962-1958 (50-54) -----	8%
1957-1953 (55-59) -----	9%
1952-1948 (60-64) -----	9%
1947-1938 (65-74) -----	11%
1937 or earlier (75 & over)-----	11%
(DON'T READ) DK/Refused-----	4%

THANK AND TERMINATE

Gender by observation:

Male----- 48%
Female----- 52%

Party Registration:

Democrat----- 54%
Republican----- 23%
Decline-to-state----- 18%
Other party----- 5%

Name _____

Page # _____

Address _____

Voter ID # _____

City _____

Precinct _____

Zip _____

Interviewer _____

FLAGS

R03-----55%
P04-----46%
G04-----61%
N05-----52%
P06-----43%
G06-----58%
F08-----60%
P08-----47%
G08-----82%
M09-----43%
P10-----55%
G10-----81%
BLANK----- 7%

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT

1----- 11%
2-----9%
3----- 15%
4----- 15%
5----- 14%
6----- 13%
7----- 14%
8-----9%

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT

1----- 57%
2----- 37%
3-----6%

VOTE BY MAIL

1----- 12%
2----- 8%
3+----- 34%
BLANK----- 46%

HOUSEHOLD PARTY TYPE

Dem 1----- 30%
Dem 2+----- 15%
Rep 1----- 11%
Rep 2+----- 7%
Ind 1+----- 17%
Mix----- 20%

PERMANENT ABSENTEE

Yes----- 55%
No----- 45%