



2016 MAR II AMAGENDA REPORT

TO:	Sabrina B. Landreth City Administrator	FROM:	Christine Daniel Assistant City Administrator
SUBJECT:	Potential Infrastructure Bond Measure	DATE:	March 11, 2016
City Administrator Approval		Date:	3/9/16

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council:

Receive Two Informational Presentations Regarding A Potential November 2016 Infrastructure Bond Measure.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-17 Adopted Policy Budget, the City Council approved onetime funding for the development of a potential ballot measure related to improving City infrastructure. On Tuesday, March 22, 2016, the Finance and Public Works Committees will be hearing two informational presentations regarding a potential infrastructure bond measure for the November 2016 Election.

The first is a staff presentation that will outline the background, planning and proposed structure and features of a potential infrastructure bond measure (Attachment A).

The second presentation will summarize the results of public polling conducted by EMC Research during February 14 through February 18, 2016 (Attachment B).

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTINE DANIEL ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Attachments (2): A: Potential November 2016 Bond Measure PowerPoint Presentation B: Summary of Polling Results Conducted by EMC Research PowerPoint Presentation

> Item: _____ Finance & Public Works Committees March 22, 2016





City of OAKLAND California

November 2016 Infrastructure Bond

Finance & Public Works Committees - March 22, 2016

Oakland's Infrastructure

- 806 miles of Paved Streets
- 1,000 miles of Sidewalks
- 929 miles of Sanitary Sewers
- 400 miles of Storm Drains
- 80 miles of Creek and Channels
- 150 blocks of Pedestrian Pathways
- 304 Public Buildings
- 134 Parks and Public Spaces



Why an Infrastructure Bond?

Over \$2.5 Billion in Unfunded Capital Needs

Current Pavement Condition Index: 59

- Oakland ranks 89th out of 109 Bay Area cities
- Costs rise rapidly as streets deteriorate
- \$2M + annually in claims
- Scarce Resources for Parks and Buildings
- Need to Prevent Housing Displacement



Project Priorities

FY 15-17 Capital Improvement Program; adopted 6/2015

- Five Year Paving Plan; adopted 10/21/2014
- Park Prioritization Plan; adopted 2/16/2016
- Pedestrian Master Plan; adopted 11/12/2002 update ETA 4/2016
- Complete Streets Policy; adopted 2/5/2013
- Oakland Housing Cabinet Report; released 3/3/2016
- 2012 Infrastructure Report Card; released 1/2013



Existing Resources

Grant Funds:

- \$32M obtained for transportation projects since 2014
- \$25.8M obtained for capital parks projects in the last 5 years
- Measure BB: +\$10M per year for 30 years
- Gas Tax (volatile based on economy)



High Ranking CIP Priorities

- Streets/Roads
- Sidewalks
- Bike/Ped Plan Improvements
- Fire and Police Facilities, e.g. Crime Lab, PAB
- Library
- Parks & Recreation Facilities
- Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program



Principles for Bond Projects

- Fix it First (no new facilities)
- Improve Quality of Life
- Investments to Stabilize Operational Needs
- Equity



Proposed Bond

Not to exceed \$ 600M (assessed value per \$100K - \$69/ year)

- Streets, Sidewalks and Pedestrian, Bicycle \$400M and Traffic Safety
- Public Safety and Improving Quality of Life \$150M Library / Parks & Rec / Fire / Police
- Housing Anti-Displacement \$50M Acquisition & Rehab



Cost to Average Homeowner

Annual costs per Assessed Value (A/V):

	\$600M GOs	
Estimated Project Fund	\$596,500,000	
Average Annual Debt Service	\$33,281,061.00	
Estimated Cost per Average A/V (\$434,028)	\$311.38	
Estimated Cost per Median A/V (\$250,000)	\$179.36	

Based on Total Gross Assessed Valuation (\$47,800,581,080) for taxable property within the City of Oakland, less Other Exemptions, as provided in the Alameda County Auditor-Controller's 2015-16 Fiscal Year Assessed Valuation Report, dated July 31, 2015. Also, based on market as of March 1, 2016.



Streets/Roads/Sidewalks

- Proposed Allocation \$400M
- Current Pavement Backlog \$443M
- Sidewalks, Stairs, Curb Ramps Backlog
- Bike Plan and Ped Plan Unfunded Implementation
- Current PCI 59 (zero to 100 point scale)
- Opportunity to re-set the PCI to a level that will be easier to maintain at current funding levels
- Largest Impact Worst Residential Streets

Projects:

- Re-paving and Reconstructing Streets
- Rebuilding Cracked and Deteriorating Sidewalks
- Accessibility Curb Ramps and Associated Work
- Enhancing Bike/Pedestrian Safety

City of OAKLAND California

Quality of Life - Infrastructure & Safety

Proposed allocation - \$150M

CIP Projects:

- Restoring Playgrounds, Play Fields, Neighborhood Parks, Recreation Centers -\$ 35M
- Renovating Fire Facilities \$40M
- Modernizing Libraries \$12M
- Water, Energy and Seismic for Facilities \$23M
- Public Safety Infrastructure Improvements \$40M (Crime Lab + Site Acquisition for PAB)



Housing Anti-Displacement

Proposed Allocation - \$50M

Based on Oakland Housing Cabinet Report:

"Create and pass a City Infrastructure Bond that includes potentially \$50 million funding for buying, fixing up and converting homes to permanent affordability."

Projects:

- Acquisition and Rehabilitation
 - Properties with Affordability Restrictions Soon to Expire
 - Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH)



Timeline

- > 3/22 Present Poll Results to Committee
- 5/10 Present Draft Ballot Measure Language to Committees
- 6/14 Committees Final Discussion of Draft Ballot Measure Language
- ▶ 6/21 City Council Discussion
- ▶ 7/5 City Council Discussion
- 7/19 City Council Approval of Ballot Measure Language
- ▶ 8/12 88 Day Deadline to County







MARKET & OPINION RESEARCH SERVICES

www.emcresearch.com



POLITICAL STRATEGY | COMMUNICATIONS | PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Telephone Survey Regarding Facilities Improvement Bond

> Executive Summary March 2016

Methodology

- Telephone Survey of Likely November 2016 Voters in Oakland
- Survey conducted February 14 18, 2016
- 606 total interviews conducted citywide
- Margin of Error = <u>+</u> 3.98 percentage points
- Interviews conducted by trained, professional interviewers in English, Spanish and Chinese
- Respondent demographics reflect those of likely November 2016 voters

Please note that due to rounding, some percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.



Key Findings

- A majority of Oakland voters are feeling optimistic about the direction of the City.
- Support for a potential \$600 million bond measure is above the two-thirds threshold needed for passage.
- Voters are supportive of the many projects that the bond would pay for, and would allow the City to invest in neighborhoods throughout Oakland, including public safety, affordable housing, infrastructure improvements, and more.
- Support for the bond is vulnerable to opposition arguments about its cost and complexity.



Direction of Oakland

A majority of Oakland voters remain optimistic about the direction of the City despite a minor drop since last fall.



Q4. Do you think things in the City of Oakland are generally going in the right direction, or do you feel that things are pretty seriously off on the wrong track?

EMC 16-5910 Oakland 2016 Bond | 4

Initial Vote

Initial support for a \$600M bond measure is above the two-thirds threshold needed for passage.

To improve public safety and invest in neighborhoods throughout Oakland by fixing potholes and repaving streets, rebuilding cracked and deteriorating sidewalks, improving bicycle and pedestrian safety, protecting affordable housing for Oaklanders, and renovating neighborhood recreation centers, playgrounds, playing fields and libraries, shall the City of Oakland issue \$600 million in bonds, subject to annual audits?



Q6. If the election were held today, would you vote yes to approve or no to reject this measure?



Vote After Cost

As is typically seen in surveys, solid support for the measure drops below the threshold after voters hear what it would cost homeowners.

And if you knew this measure would cost homeowners \$85 per \$100,000 of assessed value per year – <u>NOT market value</u> – would you vote yes to approve or no to reject the measure?



Initial

After Cost



Q7. ... Would you vote yes to approve or no to reject the measure?

Funding Priorities

There is strong support for all priorities included in the bond measure.



Q8-25. Now I'm going to read you a list of priorities that could be funded by a bond measure. On a scale of one to seven, where one is not at all important and seven is very important, please tell me how important each of the items is to you.

CliffordMoss.

EMC 16-5910 Oakland 2016 Bond | 7

Funding Priorities, cont.

Oakland voters see a need for improvements in a number of diverse areas.



Q8-25. Now I'm going to read you a list of priorities that could be funded by a bond measure. On a scale of one to seven, where one is not at all important and seven is very important, please tell me how important each of the items is to you.



EMC 16-5910 Oakland 2016 Bond | 8

Support Messages

Infrastructure and housing needs are among the most compelling reasons to support the bond.

This measure would protect Oakland residents from being forced to move out of affordable housing so we can keep long term residents here in our community.

Our city faces a number of needs: infrastructure, schools, crime, housing, libraries, and more. This is the 1st step in a comprehensive plan to invest in our quality of life and the long-term health of Oakland.

This measure will help make Oakland a safe, vibrant community to live, work, and raise a family by investing in our crumbling infrastructure so it's safer and easier to drive, walk, and bike around our beautiful city.

Q26-Q33. Now I'm going to read you some statements that SUPPORTERS of the proposed bond measure have said. After each one, please tell me if that statement makes you much more likely to <u>support</u> the measure, somewhat more likely to <u>support</u> the measure, or if it does not make a difference to you





Support Messages, cont.

More than two-thirds of Oakland voters found the prospect of cost-savings from road and sidewalk repairs to be a compelling reason to support the bond.



Q26-Q33. Now I'm going to read you some statements that SUPPORTERS of the proposed bond measure have said. After each one, please tell me if that statement makes you much more likely to <u>support</u> the measure, somewhat more likely to <u>support</u> the measure, or if it does not make a difference to you



Vote After Support

Support for the bond grows after voters hear more information.



Initial

After Cost

After Information



Q34. ... Would you vote yes to approve or no to reject the measure?

Opposition Messages

All potential opposition messages are compelling to at least a third of voters.

This measure includes too many priorities. There is no way to ensure that the City has the capacity to make sure everything gets done, and gets done well.

Alameda Co. just passed a sales tax measure in 2014...We don't need another nfrastructure tax when we have so many other pressing priorities.

We just can't trust the City of Oakland government to spend our tax dollars fairly and where they are really needed.

There are likely to be other tax measures on the ballot for BART, AC Transit, affordable housing and schools. It's just too much. The extra taxes have to stop.

This is just too expensive. Cost of living is already too high and this will cost most homeowners hundreds of dollars a year.

Q35-Q39. On the other side of the coin, I'd like to read you some things that OPPONENTS of the proposed bond measure have said. After each one, please tell me if that statement makes you much more likely to <u>oppose</u> the measure, somewhat more likely to <u>oppose</u> the measure, or if it does not make a difference to you.





Vote After Opposition

An organized and vocal opposition effort could drive support for a measure below two-thirds.





Q40. ...Would you vote yes to approve or no to reject the measure?

Conclusions

- Oakland residents recognize the need for infrastructure improvements in the city.
- There is strong support for a revenue bond.
- Polling indicates that the city should consider a measure for November 2016.



Contacts



MARKET 8 OPTNION RESEARCH SERVICES

Ruth Bernstein Ruth@EMCresearch.com 510.550.8922

Emily Kirby Goodman Emily@EMCresearch.com 510.550.8932