

# MEMORANDUM



Public Works Department

**To:** Honorable Mayor and City Council

**Date:** August 18, 2017

**From:** Todd Capurso, Public Works Director *TC*

Margarita Mendoza, Administrative Analyst *mm*

**Via:** Brian Loventhal, City Manager *BL*

**Subject** Information Memorandum – Civic Center Master Plan

---

## PURPOSE

In preparation of the Council Study Session scheduled for September, this information memorandum provides the City Council with a review of the work completed to date related to the Civic Center Master Plan (CCMP).

## BACKGROUND

The CCMP project was identified as a Council priority for FY 2013-14. In December 2013, Anderson Brulé Architects (ABA) was awarded the contract to conduct work related to master planning services for the Civic Center campus, defined as the city block bounded by North First Street, Civic Center Drive, Harrison Street, and Grant Street. At that time, a project Core Team was formed and consisted of one Councilmember (appointed by the Mayor), one Planning Commissioner, one Civic Improvement Commissioner, Campbell Community Librarian, City Manager, City Clerk, and Department Directors from Community Development, Public Works, Recreation and Community Services, and the Police Chief. ABA conducted several meetings and workshops which led to the development of three design options and related cost model information. In 2015, the City retained the services of NHA Advisors to provide analysis and options regarding financing tools to fund implementation of the CCMP.

The City Council has received presentations and updates from City staff and its design and financial consultants on:

- May 6, 2014
- July 1, 2014
- February 3, 2015
- March 25, 2015
- December 23, 2015
- March 1, 2016
- June 7, 2016
- July 19, 2016

A complete listing of previous Council reports, meeting notes and related documents may be accessed at: <http://www.cityofcampbell.com/574/Civic-Center-Master-Plan-Project-14QQ>.

### Design Options and Project Scale

At the March 2016 Study Session, Council was presented with three design options created by ABA, cost model information, and options to finance construction of the selected design option. The scope of all three design options envisioned a major rebuild of our civic center campus. The proposed design options included new facilities for the Library, City Hall, Police Department, and the Historical Museum; new surface and structured parking, (including a parking allocation for downtown patrons); and improvements to the Orchard City Green. ABA's cost model estimates at that time showed a \$151 - \$164 million cost for full build-out of the various design options.

ABA also identified potential construction phases for each of the three design options, which would allow the incremental implementation and funding of the plan. These phase estimates showed that a Phase I project would cost between \$49 - \$62 million dollars (base year – no escalation). Phase I of the preferred design would have resulted in a new library building, new museum and storage, Orchard City Green improvements, and new parking and site improvements. However, the Core Team wanted to ensure that a Phase I project also included improvements that would address the operational needs of the Police Department.

Due to the overall financial magnitude of the various design options, and in order to fund improvements to both the Library and Police Department within a Phase I construction project, the Core Team discussed reducing the proposed square footage (sq. ft.) of the proposed facilities as follows:

- 15% reduction to the Library (50,808 sq. ft. to 43,187 sq. ft.)
- 25% reduction to the Police facility (23,692 sq. ft. to 17,769 sq. ft.)

Both the Library District and Police Department confirm that a reduction of these amounts may be feasible even though these have not yet been reconciled with the space needs that were initially identified during the programming phase of the project.

Using the reduced square footage amounts, ABA developed seven combinations of design variables (Attachment 1). The estimated project costs (base year), ranged from

\$58-90 million dollars. Even at those reduced amounts, the City could not identify a financing mechanism to raise the revenue to pay for a project of this scope.

### Financing Feasibility

To identify funding alternatives and provide an analysis related to potential voter-approved measures the City retained NHA Advisors. A memorandum calculating project bonding capacity based on a potential sales tax measure and issuance of General Obligation (GO) bonds or parcel tax was provided to the City Council in December 2015 (Attachment 2), and at this time, are the most current estimates available to the City. NHA has been asked to provide revised revenue estimates based on recent data. The revised revenue estimates will be provided to the Council as soon as they are available. A brief description of the voter approved measures that may be used to generate funding for a Phase I project is provided below.

- i. Sales tax is the second largest component of the City's budget, making up about 25% of the City's operating revenues. The City's current sales tax rate is 9.25%. The last increase to the City's sales tax rate was on April 1, 2017, as a result of a ½ of a cent increase to sales tax in Santa Clara County (2016 VTA Measure B). The City does not have revenue estimates for the 2016 VTA Measure B sales tax measure, but the City does anticipate that Measure O funds (¼ of a cent) are expected to generate approximately \$2.7 million dollars in FY 2017. The State-allowed cap on sales tax is 2%. With the recent passage of Measure B, the City is at the 2% limit and would require a legislative exception to implement further sales tax.

A general sales tax increase requires a simple majority. Utilizing current revenue estimates, a ¼ cent sales tax measure is estimated to generate between \$2.7 and \$3 million annually. NHA Advisors prepared two separate tables outlining estimated project funds resulting from the generation of either \$2.7 or \$3 million in new annual sales tax revenue. Using the conservative end of the estimated sales tax revenue, the 30-year project bonding capacity (depending on the term and interest rates) results in project funding in the amount of \$41-52 million.

It should also be noted that an increase in sales tax for a specific purpose would require a 2/3 majority for passage – as was the case with the VTA-sponsored Measure B.

- ii. **The Utility User Tax (UUT).** The City of Campbell does not currently impose a UUT. This type of tax may be imposed on the consumption of utility services, such as (but not limited to) electricity, gas, water, sewer, telephone (including cell phone and long distance), sanitation and cable television. The Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act of 2000 (MTSA) expanded the tax to all cellular telephone charges for accounts with a primary place of use in the jurisdiction. However, Proposition 218 requires voter approval of any change in the methodology by which a tax is administered. Therefore, many agencies that rely on UUT's have successfully achieved voter approval of an updated ordinance to reflect the current modern telecommunications industry. As of January 2017, 161 cities in and counties in California imposed a UUT. According to the California Local Government Finance Almanac, City UUT rates range from 1 – 11%, where 5% is the most common rate.
- iii. **Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT).** The City's current TOT rate is 12%, which was last increased in 2010 (from 10%). In Santa Clara County, only the City of Palo Alto has a higher TOT, which is 14%. The City estimates that FY 2017 TOT is expected to raise \$4.6 million. A 1% increase in TOT is estimated to generate an additional \$383,000 in revenue for the City annually.
- iv. **\*A GO bond requires a 2/3 voter-approval which would then authorize an ad valorem property tax to be levied on property owners based on the Assessed Valuation (AV) of each property. The amount levied is based on the AV of the property and is typically referred to in increments of \$100,000.**

Per the analysis provided by NHA, the average residential property in Campbell has an AV of \$462,568 (2015 data). Assuming a comparable GO bond to the annual sales tax revenue target of \$2.7 million, the City could authorize a GO bond to finance a project in the same range of \$41-52 million. This would result in the following estimated property tax impacts (Attachment 3):

<b>General Obligation Bond – Ad Valorem (AV) Property Tax</b>		
Average Campbell Residential Property Assessment - \$462,568*		
	Average Residential Property	Amount per \$100,000 AV
Average Property Tax	\$101	\$22
Maximum Annual Property Tax	\$144	\$31

\* Based on 2015 data

- v. \*A parcel tax, which also requires 2/3 voter approval, can be formulated in a variety of ways. One based on square footage on all building area, and by using a flat special tax regardless of parcel or building size. Applying a flat rate to all parcels in the City, a parcel tax of approximately \$243\* would be required to generate sufficient funds to support a project as defined in the range of \$41-52 million (Attachment 3).

At the March 1, 2016 Study Session, the Council directed staff to conduct public opinion polling to gauge resident support for either a General Obligation (GO) bond or parcel tax measure (each requiring 2/3 voter approval) to fund the implementation of the CCMP. Godbe Research and Analysis conducted an opinion survey from May 4-18, 2016. Results found that likely voters surveyed did not strongly support either a GO bond or parcel tax measure (Attachment 4). Support for a GO bond was slightly higher, but the consultant cautioned that an extensive information and outreach campaign would be required and would need to occur before the election. The City Council was presented with these results at a Study Session on June 7, 2016. After considering and discussing the polling results, design, and construction phasing options, the City Council directed staff to return with information regarding how much funding could be generated and what type of CCMP improvements could be made with these funds. Below is a staff-prepared estimate based on per square foot figures from the ABA 2015 for renovation of City Hall and Library building, a new building for the Police Department.

	Square Footage	Const. Cost/per sq. ft.	Est. Const. Cost
Renovated City Hall	21,808	\$275	\$5,997,200
Renovated Library	24,000	\$275	\$6,600,000
New Library Annex (Admin./Shipping Functions)	5,000	\$450	\$2,250,000
New Police Building	16,000	\$600	\$9,600,000
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>			<b>\$24,447,200</b>
Construction Contingency (5%)			\$1,222,360
Soft Costs Allowance (35%)			\$8,556,520
Project Contingency (10%)			\$2,444,720
Site Work - Site Prep., Development & Utilities			\$1,633,978
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS**</b>			<b>\$38,304,778</b>

\*\*Does not include Parking costs and FF&E

The total estimated project costs do not include allowances for parking improvements or for fixtures, furnishings and equipment (FF&E). In prior discussions, the Santa Clara

\* Based on 2015 data

County Library District has indicated a willingness to bear the FF&E costs which have been previously estimated at \$1.5 million.

Given the results of the public opinion polling, and the tight timeline to place a measure on the ballot, the City Council voted to postpone further consideration of a revenue measure for placement on the November 2016 ballot. Staff was asked to bring the issue of a potential revenue measure to fund CCMP implementation back to the City Council to consider as part of the 2018 General Election ballot.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Items to consider going forward

The significant investments required to build new facilities for all of the Civic Center buildings has triggered an interest in re-evaluating the structural condition of the existing City Hall and Library buildings, with a focus on identifying the required elements needed to extend the useful life of the buildings.

The Library and City Hall buildings were both constructed in the early 1970's. The facilities have become prone to structural and system failures and are in need of various repairs and improvements. Additionally, there are ADA issues that would be required as part of any significant renovation project. Staff has performed a variety of short-term fixes to provide aesthetic improvements; however, these do not adequately address the longer term space requirements of the City nor have they addressed infrastructure deficiencies associated with the current structure.

### Structural Evaluations

In May and November 2015, Biggs Cardoza Associates conducted Tier 1 (life safety) seismic assessments and conceptual seismic retrofit recommendations for both the Campbell Library and City Hall. The findings of these assessments presented helpful information regarding the structural condition and seismic vulnerabilities of the building. The life safety performance level is suitable for most buildings, including office buildings. However, if a building houses a facility such as a police station, fire station, hospital, Emergency Operations Center (EOC), etc. the building is classified as an essential facility and is required to remain operational in an extreme event such as an earthquake. In order to remain operational under earthquake loads, a more stringent performance criterion is required.

The Library life safety assessment found that the building may be vulnerable to seismic damage but is likely to maintain its gravity load-carrying system. The preliminary cost estimate for the required seismic retrofit work identified through the Tier 1 life safety evaluation is \$320,950, including a small allowance for waterproofing of the masonry walls. Further assessment of drainage / waterproofing issues by a specialist firm is recommended. Not included in the estimate were the costs of upgrading or replacing building systems, bringing the building into ADA compliance, or other access issues (these costs have yet to be determined). It must be noted that if the EOC is to remain at its current location, the Library building would then be required to follow the Essential Facility requirements.

The City Hall assessment indicated that while the building has a complete lateral load resisting system, it may have deficiencies in the required continuity and/or strength for some of its structural elements that are necessary for satisfactory seismic behavior. The building may be vulnerable to seismic damage but is likely to maintain its gravity load carrying system after the design level earthquake. The existing Campbell City Hall, however, does not fully meet the requirements for the Life Safety performance level. The conceptual cost estimate for the required seismic retrofit work identified through this Tier 1 life safety evaluation to meet the life safety performance level is \$393,575.

In May 2017, the City Council approved funding for an Essential Facility Study of both the City Hall and Library Buildings. This study is necessary to determine if City Hall is a viable long-term home for the Police Department, and similarly, if the Library building can continue to house the City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC). The findings from this study will be presented to Council at the September Study Session to assist with further discussions of the CCMP.

#### September 2017 Study Session

A Study Session to discuss the CCMP is scheduled to be held in September, 2017. At that Study Session, the Council will be asked to provide feedback on a variety of items that will help staff analyze and refine potential revenue measures and community outreach related to the implementation of the CCMP. There are some areas which need more research and will be discussed in the September staff report, including:

- What services are envisioned to remain on site? (should any functions move off-site?)

- Should the project include additional parking to accommodate civic center and downtown patrons
- Is there an opportunity for collaborative financing with the library district
- Library construction bond (55% approval threshold) – is this viable?
- Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax (SB 797)
- Further facility/design considerations and corresponding timelines
- Project cost and type of financing measure
- Budget and staffing for work going forward

#### 2018 General Election Measure

In particular, staff would like to discuss with Council at the September Study Session, the anticipated timeline to place a revenue measure on the November 2018 general election ballot. At this time, based on known information, below is a suggested timeline for basic next steps:

- Monthly Council Updates to the Council (November 2017 – May 2018)
- November 2017 – April 2018 Community Engagement
- June 5, 2018 – Council resolution placing revenue measure on the ballot.
- June 19, 2018 – For and Against Arguments Due
- June 29, 2018 – Rebuttal Arguments Due

#### **Attachments:**

1. ABA – Civic Center Design Option 2 - Phase I Cost Models (7 scenarios)
2. NHA Financing Memo
3. NHA - \$41-52 Million Project Amount Bond/Parcel Tax Scenario
4. Godbe Public Opinion Poll – May 2016

	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Estimated Project Cost (Base Year )</b>	<b>Total Cost including estimated FF&amp;E and Temporary Space*</b>
1	New Library (15% reduction) New Police (25% reduction) City Hall renovation Surface & Structured Parking No Downtown Parking allocation	\$68,429,729	\$70,429,729
2	New Library (15% reduction) New Police (full size as proposed) City Hall renovation Surface & Structured Parking No Downtown Parking Allocation	\$74,462,155	\$76,462,155
3	New Library (full size as proposed) New Police (25% reduction) City Hall renovation Surface & Structured Parking No Downtown Parking allocation	\$75,418,350	\$77,418,350
4	New Library (full size as proposed) New Police (full size as proposed) City Hall renovation Surface & Structured Parking No Downtown Parking allocation	\$81,450,776	\$83,450,776
5	New Library (full size as proposed) New Police (full size as proposed) City Hall renovation Underground parking No Downtown Parking allocation	\$90,868,646	\$92,868,646
6	New Library (full size as proposed) No New Police Building City Hall renovation Underground Parking	\$58,804,416	\$60,804,416
7	New Library (full size as proposed) No New Police Building City Hall renovation Underground Parking Additional (underground) Downtown Parking	\$67,150,302	\$69,150,302

\* FF&E costs are estimated at \$1,500,000; temporary facilities is being made in the amount of \$500,000

## MEMORANDUM

Date: November 30, 2015

To: Todd Capurso, Public Works Director  
 Jesse Takahashi, Finance Director

From: Craig Hill

RE: City of Campbell – Civic Center Facility Funding Strategy

### **Background**

NHA Advisors, LLC, the City of Campbell's (the "City") municipal advisor, has worked with the City's CORE team and staff over the last ten months to develop funding alternatives and provide quantitative analysis related to the City's property tax base and the potential impact of a voter-approved bond. The options have included both general obligation and bonds backed by a potential sales tax measure.

### **Latest Project Concept**

Based on information provided by City staff, NHA has prepared an analysis calculating the project bonding capacity based on a potential sales tax measure generating between \$2,700,000 and \$3,000,000 for 30 years. A similarly sized general obligation bond analysis was also created to compare the impact of an ad valorem tax to a sales tax.

### **City Sales Tax Base**

A ½ cent sales tax measure is estimated to generate between \$2,700,000 and \$3,000,000 per year to the City if approved by the voters. The approval threshold for a general sales tax measure not dedicated to the repayment of a financing requires a simple majority. Any financing would be a City General Fund obligation with a pledge of all general fund revenues (which would include the new sales tax revenue stream). Assuming a 30-year revenue stream, the City could expect to generate one-time project funds as shown below:

Annual Sales Tax Target	1/4 Cent Increase (\$2,700,000)			
	30 Years	30 Years	30 Years	30 Years
Term	3.00%	3.75%	4.00%	5.00%
Interest Rate	3.00%	3.75%	4.00%	5.00%
Par Amount	\$53,310,000	\$48,590,000	\$47,145,000	\$42,010,000
Project Fund	<b>\$52,820,000</b>	<b>\$48,122,000</b>	<b>\$46,685,000</b>	<b>\$41,575,000</b>
Annual Debt Service	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000
Total Debt Service	\$81,000,825	\$81,014,656	\$81,002,350	\$81,006,875

A \$3,000,000 annual sales tax revenue target will generate financing capacity as shown below:

Annual Sales Tax Target	1/4 Cent Increase (\$3,000,000)			
	30 Years	30 Years	30 Years	30 Years
Term	3.00%	3.75%	4.00%	5.00%
Interest Rate	3.00%	3.75%	4.00%	5.00%
Par Amount	\$59,240,000	\$53,970,000	\$52,365,000	\$46,665,000
Project Fund	<b>\$58,718,000</b>	<b>\$53,475,000</b>	<b>\$51,878,000</b>	<b>\$46,206,000</b>
Annual Debt Service	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
Total Debt Service	\$90,011,450	\$89,987,531	\$89,981,550	\$89,983,188

### **Comparison of General Obligation Bond and Sales Tax**

As previously discussed in prior NHA memorandums, the City has the option to seek voter approval to potentially fund the proposed project (or a portion of the project) through the issuance of general obligation bonds.

A general obligation bond requires 2/3rds voter approval but have different tax characteristics. A summary of those characteristics is shown in the following table.

	General Obligation Bond	General Sales Tax Measure
<b>Voter Approval Required</b>	Yes – 2/3rds	Yes – Simple Majority
<b>Tax Formula</b>	Based on % of Assessed Value	Based on taxable sales
<b>Use of Bond Proceeds</b>	Capital Improvements Only	Any General Fund Expense
<b>Use of Tax Revenue</b>	Debt Service Only	Capital, Debt Service or Operations
<b>Key Benefit</b>	Typically lowest tax to established voters Voters asked to only approve total bond amount	Unrestricted New Revenue Source
<b>Key Negative</b>	Tax based on Assessed Value and may not be equitable	Bonding Capacity based on General Fund Pledge (no direct pledge of new revenue stream only)

### **General Obligation Bond Analysis**

Assuming a comparable general obligation bond to the sales tax capacity as shown above, the City would be looking at a general obligation bond authorization between \$42,000,000 and \$60,000,000 (depending on the interest rate assumption). We have summarized the property tax impact of two scenarios below for comparison purposes between a sales tax measure and general obligation bond.

	General Obligation Bond – Ad Valorem Property Tax			
	\$515,103 A.V.	\$515,103 A.V.	\$100,000 A.V.	\$100,000 A.V.
Average Residential Property	\$515,103 A.V.	\$515,103 A.V.	\$100,000 A.V.	\$100,000 A.V.
Annual Debt Service	\$3,000,000	\$2,700,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,700,000
Maximum Annual Property Tax	\$179	\$160	\$33	\$30
Average Annual Property Tax	\$128	\$115	\$25	\$22

**City of Campbell**  
**Civic Center Project (as of April 27, 2016)**

**Project Amount:** \$46,000,000

**GO Bond Structure**

	<b>A.V.</b>	<b>Max Tax</b>	<b>Average Tax</b>
\$	100,000	\$31.18	\$ 22
\$	462,568	\$144.23	\$ 101

**Citywide Parcel Tax**

<b>Equal Parcel Tax</b>	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>Annual Tax</b>
Residential	10,868	\$ 243
Non-Residential	984	\$ 243

<b>Flat Residential + Sq. Ft.</b>	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>Annual Tax</b>	
Residential	10,868	\$ 290	Hold Residential Parcel Tax Amount @ \$290
Non-Residential	984	\$ (370)	Assumes 10,000 sq. ft. Building

<b>Flat Residential + Sq. Ft.</b>	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>Annual Tax</b>	
Residential	10,868	\$ 240	Hold Residential Parcel Tax Amount @ \$240
Non-Residential	984	\$ 381	Assumes 10,000 sq. ft. Building

<b>Flat Residential + Sq. Ft.</b>	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>Annual Tax</b>	
Residential	10,868	\$ 190	Hold Residential Parcel Tax Amount @ \$190
Non-Residential	984	\$ 1,132	Assumes 10,000 sq. ft. Building



**GODBE RESEARCH**  
Gain Insight

## **CITY OF CAMPBELL**

2016 Civic Center Bond Survey

Topline Report

n=501

19-minutes

Likely November 2016 Voters

May 20, 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:**

- 16,486 Likely November 2016 voters

**Sample Size:**

- Likely November 2016 n=501

**Data Collection: Online & Phone Interviewing**

- Online, n=197

- Phone, n=304

**Margin of Error:**

- Likely November 2016  $\pm$  4.31%

**Interview Dates: May 4 to May 18, 2016**

**Phone Interview Length: 19 minutes**

## UNINFORMED BALLOT TESTS

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>1. Uninformed Ballot Test - Bond Measure: To provide essential Campbell city facilities, including</b> • a 21st century library with safe spaces for seniors, after-school homework programs; a children's area for children's story times; and, public access computers and computer lab; • a seismically safe police operations center; shall the City of Campbell issue \$75 million dollars in bonds at legal rates, providing an average of \$5.1 million dollars annually, for 30 years, by assessing \$39 per \$100,000, requiring financial audits, independent citizen oversight and all funds for the City of Campbell?	Definitely Yes	26.7%	
	Probably Yes	29.4%	
	Probably No	14.0%	
	Definitely No	18.9%	
	Not sure	11.1%	
	Total Yes	56.1%	
	Total No	32.8%	
<b>2. Uninformed Ballot Test - Parcel Tax Measure: To provide essential Campbell city facilities, including</b> • a 21st century library with safe spaces for seniors, after-school teen and homework programs; a children's area for children's story times; and, public access computers and computer lab; • a seismically safe police operations center; shall the City of Campbell levy \$428 per parcel, providing an average of \$5.1 million dollars annually, for 30 years, requiring annual financial audits, independent citizen oversight and all funds be spent only in the City of Campbell?	Definitely Yes	22.3%	
	Probably Yes	32.4%	
	Probably No	15.6%	
	Definitely No	22.0%	
	Not sure	7.6%	
	Total Yes	54.8%	
	Total No	37.6%	

## FEATURES OF THE MEASURES

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>3A. Replace the aging library with a 21st century facility including safe space for after-school homework programs</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	38.0%	70.9%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	32.8%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	11.8%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	8.5%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	8.4%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.5%	
<b>3B. Provide a seismically safe police operations center</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	33.6%	66.1%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	32.5%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	14.3%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	9.6%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	8.8%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.2%	
<b>3C. Provide space for public access computers, a computer learning center, and with free wifi</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	38.2%	69.4%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	31.2%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	11.3%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	7.3%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	11.1%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.0%	
<b>3D. Provide adequate space in the police operations center for analyzing and storing DNA and digital evidence</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	30.2%	61.3%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	31.1%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	17.3%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	8.5%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	10.2%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	2.6%	
<b>3E. Provide space for summer reading programs for school age children</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	34.1%	65.4%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	31.4%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	17.6%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	6.3%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	10.2%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.4%	
<b>3F. Provide a police operations center that meets current seismic safety codes and will survive an earthquake and be up and running in a disaster</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	40.0%	68.9%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	29.0%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	12.2%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	7.5%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	9.9%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.5%	
<b>3G. Provide a modern police operations center that includes up-to-date crime fighting technology and is flexible to adapt to new technology and operational necessities</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	34.1%	64.1%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	30.0%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	13.6%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	10.3%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	9.9%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	2.1%	

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>3H. Retrofit City Hall to meet current seismic codes and improve public service capabilities</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	31.1%	61.7%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	30.6%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	17.4%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	10.1%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	9.4%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.4%	
<b>3I. Provide space for up-to-date reference materials, books, audio-visual materials, and periodicals</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	29.4%	60.3%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	31.0%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	16.7%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	8.9%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	11.6%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	2.4%	
<b>3J. Create space for free family programs, activities, and classes</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	29.8%	64.0%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	34.3%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	13.7%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	10.2%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	11.9%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.2%	
<b>3K. Provide quiet study rooms</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	22.8%	55.2%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	32.3%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	19.0%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	14.3%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	11.1%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.5%	
<b>3L. Provide a separate teen area</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	22.7%	46.6%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	23.9%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	24.4%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	12.7%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	15.6%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.7%	
<b>3M. Provide a children's area with space for children's story times</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	27.9%	59.7%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	31.8%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	16.7%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	9.2%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	13.0%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.5%	
<b>3N. Provide a safe, energy-efficient library that meets earthquake and fire codes</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	42.4%	71.5%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	29.1%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	14.7%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	4.7%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	8.5%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.6%	

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>3O. Provide space for literacy tutoring programs</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	35.7%	66.1%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	30.3%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	16.1%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	7.6%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	8.7%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.5%	
<b>3P. Provide space for community meeting rooms and education classrooms</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	30.7%	61.9%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	31.3%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	17.1%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	8.1%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	11.8%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.0%	
<b>3Q. Provide quiet adult reading areas</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	20.9%	46.2%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	25.3%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	21.9%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	11.6%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	19.1%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.1%	
<b>3R. Include updated wiring to accommodate computers and technology</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	33.0%	62.9%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	29.9%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	16.4%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	9.0%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	10.8%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.9%	
<b>3S. Provide improved access for seniors and disabled residents</b>	<b>Much More Likely</b>	37.2%	69.6%
	<b>Somewhat More Likely</b>	32.3%	
	<b>No Effect</b>	14.0%	
	<b>Somewhat Less Likely</b>	6.3%	
	<b>Much Less Likely</b>	9.2%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.9%	

## FEATURES OF THE MEASURES – RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Likely Nov 2016	
	Column N %	Mean
<b>3N. Provide a safe, energy-efficient library that meets earthquake and fire codes</b>		0.93
<b>3A. Replace the aging library with a 21st century facility including safe space for after-school homework programs</b>		0.84
<b>3F. Provide a police operations center that meets current seismic safety codes and will survive an earthquake and be up and running in a disaster</b>		0.83
<b>3S. Provide improved access for seniors and disabled residents</b>		0.83
<b>3C. Provide space for public access computers, a computer learning center, and with free wifi</b>		0.79
<b>3O. Provide space for literacy tutoring programs</b>		0.78
<b>3B. Provide a seismically safe police operations center</b>		0.73
<b>3E. Provide space for summer reading programs for school age children</b>		0.73
<b>3G. Provide a modern police operations center that includes up-to-date crime fighting technology and is flexible to adapt to new technology and operational necessities</b>		0.69
<b>3R. Include updated wiring to accommodate computers and technology</b>		0.66
<b>3H. Retrofit City Hall to meet current seismic codes and improve public service capabilities</b>		0.65
<b>3D. Provide adequate space in the police operations center for analyzing and storing DNA and digital evidence</b>		0.64
<b>3P. Provide space for community meeting rooms and education classrooms</b>		0.61
<b>3J. Create space for free family programs, activities, and classes</b>		0.60
<b>3I. Provide space for up-to-date reference materials, books, audio-visual materials, and periodicals</b>		0.59
<b>3M. Provide a children's area with space for children's story times</b>		0.53
<b>3K. Provide quiet study rooms</b>		0.42
<b>3L. Provide a separate teen area</b>		0.26
<b>3Q. Provide quiet adult reading areas</b>		0.18

## INFORMATIONAL STATEMENTS

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
4A. The measure will give Campbell local control over local funds for local needs. The money cannot be taken by Sacramento	Much more likely	45.6%	68.6%
	Somewhat more likely	23.0%	
	No effect	31.1%	
	Not sure	0.3%	
4B. The measure requires independent citizen oversight, mandatory financial audits, and yearly reports to the community to ensure that all funds are spent as promised	Much more likely	38.3%	64.3%
	Somewhat more likely	25.9%	
	No effect	34.9%	
	Not sure	0.8%	
4C. Campbell's library is the oldest in the County Library District. Improvements are needed to address dilapidated conditions, poor lighting, and lack of space for seating, book collections, computer stations, and group study or meetings	Much more likely	38.4%	67.9%
	Somewhat more likely	29.5%	
	No effect	31.3%	
	Not sure	0.8%	
4D. Providing updated facilities and space will allow more after-school programs for youth and children, an expanded collection, additional seating and public computers, group study areas, and community meeting rooms	Much more likely	37.2%	63.4%
	Somewhat more likely	26.2%	
	No effect	35.8%	
	Not sure	0.8%	
4E. The Campbell Police Department's crime prevention efforts will be more effective with the technology available in an up-to-date police operations center	Much more likely	36.1%	65.1%
	Somewhat more likely	29.1%	
	No effect	33.4%	
	Not sure	1.5%	
4F. The Campbell library was built in 1974 and does not currently meet the earthquake safety standards for libraries built today. This measure would build a new seismically safe library for residents to use for years to come	Much more likely	40.7%	69.0%
	Somewhat more likely	28.3%	
	No effect	29.5%	
	Not sure	1.4%	
4G. The new library will have enhanced technology for 21st century customer service	Much more likely	29.2%	55.4%
	Somewhat more likely	26.2%	
	No effect	43.0%	
	Not sure	1.5%	
4H. Police officers have been working out of a portable building that is overcrowded and does not provide modern policing technology	Much more likely	42.5%	69.3%
	Somewhat more likely	26.8%	
	No effect	29.1%	
	Not sure	1.6%	
4I. The new library will have the most up to date computer technology for public use, including a wireless network	Much more likely	29.2%	62.7%
	Somewhat more likely	33.5%	
	No effect	37.2%	
	Not sure	0.1%	
4J. The Campbell library helps support the economic vitality of the community by helping residents of all ages and backgrounds learn to read, prepare for jobs, use computers, and succeed in school	Much more likely	35.5%	66.7%
	Somewhat more likely	31.2%	
	No effect	31.5%	
	Not sure	1.9%	

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>4K. The new library will be designed and built to be flexible to meet future needs</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	31.3%	62.3%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	31.1%	
	<b>No effect</b>	37.3%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.4%	
<b>4L. The new library will offer after-school and summer programs for youth and teens to keep them off the streets, out of trouble, and away from drugs and gangs</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	39.7%	69.7%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	29.9%	
	<b>No effect</b>	30.2%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.1%	
<b>4M. The new library will use green building materials, and energy efficient design and cost less to operate</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	35.8%	65.2%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	29.4%	
	<b>No effect</b>	34.8%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.0%	
<b>4N. The measure will maintain the excellent quality of life, the character of the community, and growth in our property values</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	33.2%	60.7%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	27.4%	
	<b>No effect</b>	37.5%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.9%	
<b>4O. The new library will have additional meeting space for City Hall business and community meetings</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	25.5%	50.3%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	24.8%	
	<b>No effect</b>	47.4%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	2.4%	
<b>4P. None of the money raised by the measure would be used for City administrator salaries</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	44.5%	68.8%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	24.3%	
	<b>No effect</b>	31.1%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.1%	
<b>4Q. Many seniors on fixed incomes rely on libraries because buying books is just too expensive</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	32.6%	60.6%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	28.0%	
	<b>No effect</b>	39.2%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.2%	
<b>4R. This new library will provide space for more programs for older and younger adults</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	33.9%	61.6%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	27.7%	
	<b>No effect</b>	37.7%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	0.7%	
<b>4S. Built in 1974, the Campbell Library is outdated. Space is limited for books, programs, and people – these constraints bring the library to a standstill when youth use the library after school</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	38.1%	63.1%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	25.0%	
	<b>No effect</b>	35.7%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.2%	
<b>4T. Library programs for children and teens, including homework help and reading resources, are critical to providing our students with the resources they need</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	41.7%	67.7%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	26.0%	
	<b>No effect</b>	31.1%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.2%	

## INFORMATIONAL STATEMENTS – RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Likely Nov 2016	
	Column N %	Mean
4A. The measure will give Campbell local control over local funds for local needs. The money cannot be taken by Sacramento		1.14
4H. Police officers have been working out of a portable building that is overcrowded and does not provide modern policing technology		1.14
4P. None of the money raised by the measure would be used for City administrator salaries		1.13
4F. The Campbell library was built in 1974 and does not currently meet the earthquake safety standards for libraries built today. This measure would build a new seismically safe library for residents to use for years to come		1.11
4T. Library programs for children and teens, including homework help and reading resources, are critical to providing our students with the resources they need		1.11
4L. The new library will offer after-school and summer programs for youth and teens to keep them off the streets, out of trouble, and away from drugs and gangs		1.10
4C. Campbell's library is the oldest in the County Library District. Improvements are needed to address dilapidated conditions, poor lighting, and lack of space for seating, book collections, computer stations, and group study or meetings		1.07
4J. The Campbell library helps support the economic vitality of the community by helping residents of all ages and backgrounds learn to read, prepare for jobs, use computers, and succeed in school		1.04
4B. The measure requires independent citizen oversight, mandatory financial audits, and yearly reports to the community to ensure that all funds are spent as promised		1.03
4E. The Campbell Police Department's crime prevention efforts will be more effective with the technology available in an up-to-date police operations center		1.03
4S. Built in 1974, the Campbell Library is outdated. Space is limited for books, programs, and people – these constraints bring the library to a standstill when youth use the library after school		1.02
4D. Providing updated facilities and space will allow more after-school programs for youth and children, an expanded collection, additional seating and public computers, group study areas, and community meeting rooms		1.01
4M. The new library will use green building materials, and energy efficient design and cost less to operate		1.01
4R. This new library will provide space for more programs for older and younger adults		0.96
4N. The measure will maintain the excellent quality of life, the character of the community, and growth in our property values		0.96
4K. The new library will be designed and built to be flexible to meet future needs		0.94
4Q. Many seniors on fixed incomes rely on libraries because buying books is just too expensive		0.93

---

	Likely Nov 2016	
	Column N %	Mean
<b>4I. The new library will have the most up to date computer technology for public use, including a wireless network</b>		0.92
<b>4G. The new library will have enhanced technology for 21st century customer service</b>		0.86
<b>4O. The new library will have additional meeting space for City Hall business and community meetings</b>		0.78

## CRITICAL STATEMENTS

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>5A. The City wouldn't need this measure if they hadn't wasted our tax dollars</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	24.8%	41.0%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	16.2%	
	<b>No effect</b>	53.7%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	5.3%	
<b>5B. Public employee salaries, benefits and pensions are out of control. We need to contain these costs before we look at increasing taxes</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	27.6%	50.6%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	23.0%	
	<b>No effect</b>	45.8%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	3.6%	
<b>5C. Other government agencies are considering additional taxes too, we just can't afford all these new taxes</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	29.8%	55.6%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	25.8%	
	<b>No effect</b>	42.8%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	1.6%	
<b>5D. This measure hurts seniors and those on fixed incomes, who can't afford higher property tax bills</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	31.0%	59.0%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	28.0%	
	<b>No effect</b>	38.1%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	2.9%	
<b>5E. With the educational and research resources available on the internet, we don't need a new library building in the 21st century</b>	<b>Much more likely</b>	18.7%	33.6%
	<b>Somewhat more likely</b>	14.9%	
	<b>No effect</b>	64.2%	
	<b>Not sure</b>	2.2%	

## CRITICAL STATEMENTS -- RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Likely Nov 2016	
	Column N %	Mean
<b>5D. This measure hurts seniors and those on fixed incomes, who can't afford higher property tax bills</b>		0.93
<b>5C. Other government agencies are considering additional taxes too, we just can't afford all these new taxes</b>		0.87
<b>5B. Public employee salaries, benefits and pensions are out of control. We need to contain these costs before we look at increasing taxes</b>		0.81
<b>5A. The City wouldn't need this measure if they hadn't wasted our tax dollars</b>		0.70
<b>5E. With the educational and research resources available on the internet, we don't need a new library building in the 21st century</b>		0.53

## INFORMED BALLOT TESTS & TAX THRESHOLDS

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>6. Informed Ballot Test - Bond Measure: To provide essential Campbell city facilities, including</b> • a 21st century library with safe spaces for seniors, after-school homework programs; a children's area for children's' story times; and, public access computers and computer lab; • a seismically safe police operations center; shall the City of Campbell issue \$75 million dollars in bonds at legal rates, providing an average of \$5.1 million dollars annually, for 30 years, by assessing \$39 per \$100,000, requiring financial audits, independent citizen oversight and all funds for the City of Campbell?	Definitely Yes	30.5%	
	Probably Yes	31.3%	
	Probably No	11.0%	
	Definitely No	20.3%	
	Not sure	7.0%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>61.8%</b>	
	<b>Total No</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	
<b>7A. \$39 dollars per \$100,000 of assessed valuation per year</b>	Definitely Yes	31.1%	
	Probably Yes	27.7%	
	Probably No	13.8%	
	Definitely No	20.4%	
	Not sure	7.1%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	
	<b>Total No</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	
<b>7B. \$27 dollars per \$100,000 of assessed valuation per year</b>	Definitely Yes	37.2%	
	Probably Yes	25.6%	
	Probably No	11.6%	
	Definitely No	19.2%	
	Not sure	6.4%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	
	<b>Total No</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	
<b>7C. \$18 dollars per \$100,000 of assessed valuation per year</b>	Definitely Yes	48.9%	
	Probably Yes	22.1%	
	Probably No	9.3%	
	Definitely No	16.3%	
	Not sure	3.4%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	
	<b>Total No</b>	<b>25.6%</b>	

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>8. Informed Ballot Test - Parcel Tax Measure: To provide essential Campbell city facilities, including</b> • a 21st century library with safe spaces for seniors, after-school teen and homework programs; a children's area for children's story times; and, public access computers and computer lab; • a seismically safe police operations center; shall the City of Campbell levy \$428 per parcel, providing an average of \$5.1 million dollars annually, for 30 years, requiring annual financial audits, independent citizen oversight and all funds be spent only in the City of Campbell?	Definitely Yes	31.2%	
	Probably Yes	23.6%	
	Probably No	20.4%	
	Definitely No	21.8%	
	Not sure	3.0%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>54.8%</b>	
	<b>Total No</b>	<b>42.2%</b>	
<b>9A. \$428 dollars per year</b>	Definitely Yes	24.9%	
	Probably Yes	24.8%	
	Probably No	16.4%	
	Definitely No	30.0%	
	Not sure	3.8%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	
<b>9B. \$295 dollars per year</b>	Definitely Yes	38.1%	
	Probably Yes	18.4%	
	Probably No	15.2%	
	Definitely No	25.9%	
	Not sure	2.4%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>56.5%</b>	
<b>9C. \$195 dollars per year</b>	Definitely Yes	44.4%	
	Probably Yes	24.0%	
	Probably No	11.0%	
	Definitely No	19.0%	
	Not sure	1.7%	
	<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>68.3%</b>	
	<b>Total No</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	

## DEMOGRAPHICS

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>A. Do you have any children under the age of 18 live in your household?</b>	Yes	30.7%	
	No	68.8%	
	Not sure	0.5%	
<b>B. Respondents gender</b>	Male	46.6%	
	Female	53.4%	
<b>C. Age</b>	18-29	8.5%	
	30-39	14.7%	
	40-49	18.2%	
	50-64	33.9%	
	65+	23.5%	
	No age	1.3%	
<b>D. Ethnic Surname</b>	Japanese	1.3%	
	Chinese	3.3%	
	Hispanic	7.8%	
	Jewish	2.2%	
	Armenian	0.2%	
	Vietnamese	0.6%	
	Italian	2.3%	
	Korean	0.0%	
	African American	0.3%	
	Not Coded	81.9%	
<b>E. Homeownership Status</b>	Owner	59.9%	
	Renter	40.1%	
<b>F. Phone Type</b>	Cell phone	37.8%	
	Landline	62.2%	
<b>G. Party</b>	Democrat	46.7%	
	Republican	24.2%	
	Other party	4.4%	
	Decline to state/no party preference	24.7%	
<b>H. Household Party Type</b>	Dem 1	25.7%	
	Dem 2+	12.4%	
	Rep 1	10.4%	
	Rep 2+	7.4%	
	Other 1	16.1%	
	Other 2+	5.8%	
	Dem & Rep	6.0%	
	Dem & Other	8.9%	
	Rep & Other	5.8%	
	Dem, Rep & Other	1.4%	

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>I. Registration Date</b>	2013 to 2016	12.3%	
	2009 to 2012	25.7%	
	2005 to 2008	18.9%	
	2001 to 2004	14.2%	
	1997 to 2000	7.7%	
	1993 to 1996	4.3%	
	1981 to 1992	9.7%	
	1980 or before	7.3%	
	Not coded	0.0%	
<b>K. Times Voted in Last Elections</b>	1	6.9%	
	2	7.0%	
	3	6.2%	
	4	9.4%	
	5	9.3%	
	6	6.8%	
	7	6.1%	
	8	5.9%	
	9	6.1%	
	10	8.2%	
	11	6.8%	
	12	8.6%	
	13	11.9%	
	14	0.6%	
	15	0.1%	
<b>L. Absentee Voter</b>	0	21.0%	
	1	10.5%	
	2	6.0%	
	3	6.1%	
	4	6.7%	
	5	5.9%	
	6	6.0%	
	7	4.7%	
	8	4.3%	
	9	4.5%	
	10	7.0%	
	11	5.8%	
	12	4.7%	
	13	6.6%	
	14	0.2%	
<b>M. Likely November 2016 Voter</b>	Yes	100.0%	
	No	0.0%	
<b>N. Permanent Absentee Voter</b>	Yes	73.8%	
	No	26.2%	

		Likely Nov 2016	
		Column N %	Mean
<b>O. Likely Absentee Voter</b>	<b>Yes</b>	75.2%	
	<b>No</b>	24.8%	
<b>P. Interview Type</b>	<b>Online</b>	21.7%	
	<b>Landline</b>	48.7%	
	<b>Cell phone</b>	29.6%	