IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING THIS MEETING: To protect our residents, officials, and staff, and in alignment with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N 29-20 in which certain teleconference requirements of the Brown Act have been suspended, including the requirement to provide a physical location for members of the public to participate in the meeting, this meeting will be held by Teleconference.

SPECIAL MEETING
CITIZENS’ INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION AGENDA
Monday, May 4, 2020
4:00 P.M.

AGENDA AND STAFF REPORTS ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW ON THE CITY’S WEBSITE AT WWW.CITYOFORINDA.ORG. SELECT MEETING CALENDAR AND SCROLL DOWN TO CITIZEN’S INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (CIOC) MEETING.

For this meeting, there will be no physical location from which members of the public may observe the meeting. Instead:

- Members of the public are welcome to observe and address the CIOC telephonically, at the appropriate time for public comment during the meeting, following these instructions:
  To listen to the meeting on-line through your web browser: https://tinyurl.com/y7ll3y56
  To listen to the meeting through the Zoom app on your personal device, open the Zoom app, enter the Zoom Meeting ID 926 4510 1746.
  To listen to the meeting on your telephone, dial +1(669) 900-9128 and at the prompt enter the Zoom Meeting ID 926 4510 1746, and press #.

- Please note that due to the remote nature of the meeting, the City of Orinda cannot guarantee that the network or its site will not experience technical interruptions. To ensure that the CIOC receives your comments, we strongly encourage you to submit your comments in writing in advance of the meeting by following instructions below.

- Members of the public are welcome to submit written comments via email to fkhorashadi@cityoforinda.org by 12:00 pm on the day of the meeting. Those e-mails will be forwarded to the commissioners. They will be included in the meeting minutes and be made available upon request to Farah Khorashadi at her email listed above.

- Comments may also be submitted by e-mail during the meeting up until the closure of public comment period on the relevant agenda item. These will be read into the record by staff at their normal cadence and will be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes. To be read into the record, e-mail must contain in the subject line “Public Forum – Not on the Agenda” or “Public Comment –Agenda Item #” with the relevant agenda item indicated.

- During the meeting, the Chair will call for public comment. If you wish to address the CIOC, please so indicate by using the “raise your hand” function at that time and the Chair will add you to the speaker list and call your name when it is your turn.
A. Call to Order

B. Roll Call
Commissioners: Walter Bell, Jerry Condon, Chris Decareau, Jud Hammon, Bill Hurrell, Terry Murphy, Richard Nelson

C. Adoption of Agenda

D. Public Forum
The Public Forum provides an opportunity for members of the public to speak on any item within the jurisdiction of the Commission that does not appear on the agenda. A speaker has the option of addressing an item listed on the agenda if the speaker will not be present when that item is taken up. Public comment is generally limited to 3 minutes per speaker. If you would like to speak during the Public Forum, or on any item listed on the agenda, you are invited to submit a Speaker Card. The optional information you provide on the Speaker Card is made available for public inspection upon request and is subject to disclosure. You will be permitted to speak even if you decline to submit a Speaker Card.

E. Citizens’ Infrastructure Oversight Commission (CIOC) Meeting Minutes
February 12, 2020
Recommendation: Approve

F. Discussion – Future Sales Tax Ballot Measure Recommendation
1. Reference material – April 21, 2020 Staff Report regarding Potential Sales Tax Measure and Polling Results and Overview of Roadway/Drainage Funding Summary
2. Staff Information on State Law on 2% cap on add-on sales tax; current legislation SB1349
3. Discussion of options/alternatives
4. Request CIOC Recommendation for following categories:
   A. Amount: No increase to existing 0.5%, increase 0.25% (total of 0.75%), or increase by 0.5% (total of 1.00%)
   B. Duration of sales tax: 10, 20 or 30 years; “forever”; consider City Council re-authorization every 5, 10 years by majority or 4/5 vote, or unanimous.
   C. Possible expenditures to be considered by the Council for this General Sales Tax increase: roadway rehabilitation, major drainage infrastructure renewal, wildfire prevention measures, emergency response evacuation route improvements

G. Staff Updates (10 Minutes)
1. Update – Public Information and Outreach
2. Update – 2019 Pavement Rehabilitation Project
3. Update – 2020 Pavement Rehabilitation Project
4. Capital Improvement Plan – Council direction from April 15, 2020 meeting

H. Matters Initiated
Consideration of matters Commissioners wish to initiate for placement on a future CIOC agenda

I. Adjournment – The next regularly scheduled CIOC meeting is June 10, 2020

I, Sheri Marie Smith, City Clerk, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this agenda has been posted at least 72 hours in advance at the Orinda City Offices. Additional copies are available at the Orinda Library, the Orinda Community Center, and on the City’s website at www.cityoforinda.org

Sheri Marie Smith, City Clerk
A. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Hammon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

The following document was provided at this meeting:
1. Update – Future Storm Drain Projects, by Paving Program Project Manager Khorashadi, dated February 3, 2019

B. ROLL CALL
COMMISSIONERS: Walter Bell (absent, unexcused), Jerry Condon, Chris Decareau, Jud Hammon, Bill Hurrell (absent, excused), Terry Murphy, Richard Nelson

City Staff: Paving Program Project Manager Farah Khorashadi

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – led by Commissioner Murphy

D. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
MOTION: By Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Nelson, to adopt the agenda. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

E. PUBLIC FORUM - None

F. CITIZENS’ INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Approval of CIOC Meeting Minutes of January 8, 2020

MOTION: By Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Condon, to approve the meeting minutes of January 8, 2020. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

G. UPDATE – STATUS OF MANAGEMENT REPORT ON INFRASTRUCTURE – RESIDENTIAL ROADS (2013 to 2020 PROJECTED)
Commissioner Nelson stated that the Sub-committee had met with Finance Director Paul Rankin; subsequent to that meeting, Director Rankin provided the Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2019. The report is focused on the General Obligation Bond for 2014 and 2016 and the Half Cent Sales Tax through June 30, 2019. The report is
generally good, however, additional information is needed from the Public Works Department for completion of the Management Report; also, confirmation from the City Council should be sought on whether the CIOC should be preparing the report.

Chair Hammon advised that, per the approved 2016 description of the CIOC duties, Commissioners are to review expenditures of the Sales Tax and Bond Measures on an annual basis.

Commissioner Nelson suggested that City Manager Salomon assign staff to assist the Subcommittee in preparing the Management Report.

The Subcommittee will provide an update at the next CIOC meeting.

This item was continued to the next CIOC meeting.

H. UPDATE- STATUS OF DRAFT MANAGEMENT REPORT – ARTERIAL AND COLLECTORS STREETS
Chair Hammon requested that staff forward the CIOC Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2019 to all Commissioners so they can review and provide their comments at the next meeting.

Commissioners agreed that the Subcommittee should schedule another meeting with Finance Director Rankin to discuss the report in detail.

This item was continued to the next CIOC meeting.

I. STAFF UPDATES
Paving Program Project Manager Khorashadi reported on the following items:

1. Update – Public Information and Outreach – Updates have been posted on Nextdoor and the Orinda Outlook.
2. Update – 2019 Pavement Rehabilitation Project – The contractor is adjusting utilities and completing miscellaneous work throughout the City; it is anticipated that the work will be completed by the second week in March.
3. 2020 Annual Pavement Rehabilitation – Notices were sent in January to all residents affected by the upcoming 2020 Annual Paving Project; the consultant’s sub-contractor is assessing the storm drains and design plans are anticipated to be ready by mid-May at the latest.
4. Update – Future Storm Drain Projects – The report was distributed; the Project Manager is scheduled to attend the next CIOC meeting to discuss the upcoming projects in detail.

J. MATTERS INITIATED
Items for the next CIOC Agenda:
- Discussion – Future Storm Drain Projects
- Review – List of Streets for the 2021 and 2022 Pavement Rehabilitation Projects
• Update – Status of Management Report on Infrastructure – Residential Roads (2013 to 2020 Projected);
• Update – Status of Draft Management Report – Arterial and Collectors Streets
• Update – Status of EMBUD Westside Pumping Station on El Toyonal
• Update – Status of Draft Policy for Selecting Arterial and Collector Streets
• Review - Draft Moratorium and Trenching Policy

K. ADJOURNMENT
MOTION: By Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Decareau, to adjourn the CIOC meeting. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The Citizens’ Infrastructure Oversight Commission meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Citizens’ Infrastructure Oversight Commission will be 6:30 p.m., March 11, 2020, in the Sarge Littlehale Community Room, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, California.
Roads, Storm Drains, etc. - - New or Replacement Funding Requirements
Prepared by Chair Hammon; reviewed by Director Theis

Estimated Funding Requirements: Public Roads and Storm Drains

Costs of Deferred Maintenance for Public Roads -

- As can be inferred from profiles a) and b) in the chart, if we are to avoid a dramatic increase in deferred maintenance of our Public Roads, we will need at least $1.6M/year in the near-term, and by 2032, we will need at least $2.6M/year.

- In addition, as shown in the table at the end of this document, we will need ~$10M over the next 5 years, to repair/maintain our Public Storm Drains, and another ~$20M over the following 5 - 10 years.

- The approximate funding that was available for road maintenance in the 2018-2019 fiscal year is described below.  NOTE: Revenue from each of these funding sources could be lower in the next few years, due to impacts of the pandemic.
  - $1.6M/yr from the Gas Tax, County sales tax Return to Source, and garbage-collection fees.
  - $1.2M/yr from the add-on ½-cent sales tax.  NOTE: This sales tax expires in 2023.
  - It is unknown what grants will be available through from MTC (federal/state) and CCTA (local county) funding sources – but it is likely limited to $1-2M every 4-5 years.
Estimated Available Funding, and Three Possible Allocations of the Funds

- If the ½-cent sales tax is NOT renewed, available revenue in 2023 would likely be in the range of ~$1.4M/yr to 1.6M/yr, (depending on residual impacts of the pandemic or long term recession).
  - With this funding profile, the deferred maintenance for our public roads would rise dramatically after 2030 or so, AND we would have no funds to perform needed repairs to our public storm drains.

- Assuming the ½-cent sales tax is renewed, and assuming that the funding available in the next few years drops from the prior level of ~$2.8M to a new level of ~$2.5M (about a 10% drop), one possible approach to allocating available funds would be the following:
  - Allocate ~$1M - $1.25M/year for road maintenance, and allocate the remaining ~$1.25M - $1.5M per year to Storm Drains.
  - With this allocation:
    - We should be able to keep deferred maintenance for our public streets from rising significantly, at least through 2030 or so. However, deferred maintenance would rise rapidly in subsequent years.
    - We should be able to provide a significant fraction of the ~$10M needed to address the public storm drains identified for repair through 2025.
  - NOTE: With this allocation:
    - We will retain backlog of roughly $11-12M deferred repair cost - likely to include arterials and collectors.
    - We likely would NOT be able to build up the reserve fund we have recommended.
    - We likely would NOT be able to address any new infrastructure initiatives.
    - We almost certainly would NOT have funds to even start to develop the roughly $20M needed to address the storm drains which will still need repairs after 2025.
    - By 2030 or so, it is clear that the cost of routine road maintenance will have risen significantly, and may, by itself, consume ALL the available funds - - that is, leaving NO further funds for storm drain repairs, to say nothing of any other activities.

- Assuming the 1-cent sales tax is approved, and assuming that the resulting funding would be in the range of ~$3.4M per year in the near term, (and presumably growing as the economy improves), one possible approach to allocating available funds would be the following:
  - Allocate ~½ of the available funds (~$1.7M/year in the near-term) for road maintenance, and allocate the remaining funds to Storm Drains.
  - With this allocation:
    - We should be able to slowly reduce deferred maintenance for our public streets in the near term, and at least be able to keep deferred maintenance from growing too rapidly in subsequent years.
    - We should be able to provide ~$17M in the next 10 years, to address the public storm drains identified for repair.

Some issues that we will need to address, as we consider future funding requirements and sources:

Private Roads and Storm Drains (LT notes – there is no commitment or discussion from Council to include private road or private drainage improvements in this sales tax measure)

- A significant number of Orinda homeowners live on private streets, and/or have private storm drains under their property, which carry water from public streets or public storm drains.
Private Roads: Orinda has approximately 93 miles of paved publicly-maintained roads and about 30 miles of privately-maintained roads. (Approximately of our roads are 24% private, by length)

- Approximately 24% of homes are located on private streets (1,521 on private streets, by Larry’s 4/10/2018 report, and 6,252 single-family homes in Orinda, by the 2000 census)

Private Storm Drains: Orinda has roughly 17 miles of publicly-maintained storm drain pipes and about 28 miles of privately-maintained storm-drain pipes (Approximately 64% private, by length)

- We need a good estimate of the number of homes in Orinda with private storm drains under their property that carry water from public streets or public storm drains

If we want to ask voters to support a new tax measure to fund road and storm drain repairs/maintenance, we should consider actions/approaches that could increase the support of these homeowners for the new funding measures.

Possible impacts on funding requirements, if the City were to take over responsibility for maintaining private roads and/or storm drains:

- We do not have reliable estimates for the cost to take over private streets, should the City decide to take this step. Rough estimates range from $5 Million to $25 Million.
  - In addition to the initial cost to take over the private streets, the City would need to budget for long-term maintenance/repair costs.

- We do not have ANY estimate for the cost to take over private storm drains, should the City decide to take this step. It is clear, however, that the cost would be several tens of millions of dollars.
  - In addition to the initial cost to take over the private storm drains, the City would need to budget for long-term maintenance/repair costs.

Additional Infrastructure Items

- Additional infrastructure funding needs that should be considered (some of these may be on the CIP list):
  - Slope stabilization, to protect roads and/or storm drains
  - Wildfire management
  - Fire Flow issues (most of this cost borne by EBMUD?)
  - Walkways, sidewalks, and bike paths
Backup summary info, copied from Council briefing on the Roads and Drains Plan Update

We will need about $2.6 Million/Year in the near-term for this maintenance work, increasing to about $3.6 Million/Year by 2032. Maintenance costs will increase over time.

Our available road-maintenance funding in 2022, after expenditure of the Bond Measure funds, will be about $2.8 Million per Year:

- **$1.6 Million/Year**: From the Gas Tax and County Sales Tax Return to Source funds, plus the Road Maintenance Funds from the garbage-collection company.
- **$1.2 Million/Year**: From the add-on ½-cent sales tax.

**Problem: The add-on sales tax expires in 2023**

- A replacement source of about $1 Million/Year will be required by 2023.
- **Additional funding** of about $1 Million/Year in will be required by 2032, as maintenance costs increase.
- Monitoring expenses and revenues on a year-by-year basis will allow the City to effectively manage its resources, and refine its plans for future revenue requirements as needed.

**Approximately $30 Million will be needed for Storm Drain repairs in the next 10 years.**

- **About $10 Million** of that will be needed in the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-5 Preliminary prioritization of storm-drain-pipe repairs; Engineering estimates of costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Replace: Score 4 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Replace: Score 3 to less than 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections, including CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Replace: Score 2 to less than 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Replace: Score less than 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CMP: Capacity improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency, including unknown pipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores listed in the table indicate an estimated relative overall failure risk for each pipe segment. The scores are calculated based on the type of road over the pipe, pipe size, pipe material, and pipe condition.
AGENDA TITLE: Public Opinion Poll - Review of 2020 Survey Results & Discussion/Direction on Pursuing November 2020 Sales Tax Measure

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends the City Council receive a presentation and review the field poll results and analysis memorandum from Fairbank, Maslin, Maulin, Metz & Associates (FM3). The City Council should follow up with any questions to FM3 about the polling information and receive public input.

Timing is important with the presentation of this information if the City Council desires to preserve a path that will allow the placement of a sales tax measure on the November 2020 ballot.

STAFF IS SEEKING DIRECTION ONLY - NO RECOMMENDED FINAL ACTION BY THE COUNCIL IS PROPOSED FOR THIS MEETING.

If there is consensus by the City Council to maintain the ability to pursue a measure for the November 2020 ballot, it is recommended that the City Council:

1) Provide Staff with direction on information to be presented at future meetings; and

2) Authorize the City Manager to work with FM3 on gathering additional tracking data to evaluate any change in results due to pandemic crisis. The results would be reported to the City Council in June or July 2020.

WHY STAFF RECOMMENDS CONSIDERING INFORMATION IN REPORT TO PLAN FOR FUTURE DISCUSSIONS
Prior to the pandemic and subsequent health order the City had commissioned a poll to measure voter support for a range of improvements. Since the polling work is complete, it is appropriate for the results to be presented on a City Council Agenda. The representatives of FM3 will also be available to comment on trends they have observed in other jurisdictions since the Orinda polling was completed. As is discussed later in this report there are limited opportunities for the City to place a ballot measure before the voters. It will be important to have adequate time to develop the necessary action items before the ballot submittal deadlines in early August.

Staff does not recommend any final decisions be made at this meeting. Staff will use the guidance from the City Council from this meeting, to prepare a more detailed analysis of the pros/cons of potential future ballot measures. The future information will include funding projections; types of expenditures; and scope of the expected cost. As
a general tax the types of expenditures are not restricted. It is recommended that the City identify areas most in need in advance of the ballot measure in order to share with the voters why the City needs additional funding. All of these items will be presented at future public meetings with an opportunity for public comment.

If the City Council wants to stay on a path where it could pursue a sales tax ballot measure in November, staff recommends that the City Manager be authorized to secure additional services from FM3, to include a future tracking field poll. The cost of this work is expected to be approximately $15,000 and could be funded by budgeted funds in the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 City Manager Department professional services account. The goal of this work would be to validate that voter support has not substantially changed for a ballot measure and the information would be presented to the City Council before they took the final action to place a measure on the ballot.

A report about the polling was previously included on the March 17, 2020 published City Council meeting agenda, however, the meeting was cancelled. Prior to the cancellation the City did receive comments on the report. These comments have been attached as Attachment E.

**BACKGROUND:**
On June 4, 2019, the City Council authorized an allocation of up to $30,000 in the current fiscal year for polling services from FM3 Consulting Firm. In addition, the Council approved the formation of Revenue and Tax Measure Subcommittee which consists of Mayor Gee and Vice Mayor Worth.

**Current Add-On Sales Tax Measure Will Expire**
The primary reason for establishing the subcommittee and authorizing a public opinion poll is the City’s current 0.5% Add-On General Sales Tax will be expiring within three years. On November 6, 2012, Orinda voters approved Measure L a 0.5% (½ cent) general sales tax increase for a ten year period. Collection of the additional tax began on April 1, 2013 and unless extended by the voters, will end on March 31, 2023.

This Add-On General Sales Tax revenue has been on average approximately $1.2 million annually. The funds generated by this general tax have been budgeted by the City Council primarily for public residential road & some for drainage maintenance/rehabilitation. It should also be noted that the expenditure of Add-On Sales Tax for streets and roads contributes towards a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement tied to increased State Gas Tax funds. In order to continue receiving the higher Gas Tax Road Maintenance Rehabilitation Act Funds it must maintain spending from other local funds.

Before the expiration of the tax there are two opportunities when State law would allow this type of general tax to be presented to the voters (Election in November 2020 and the election in November 2022). State law requires that general taxes be placed before voters with a regularly scheduled general election for members of the governing body, unless there is a special declaration of a fiscal emergency.
Subcommittee Work Prior To Polling

The Revenue and Tax Measure Subcommittee held six public meetings between June 2019 and January 2020. Along with the Mayor and Vice Mayor, FM3, City Staff, and several members of the public participated in these meetings. The primary discussion item was to finalize the content and specific questions included in the poll. The Subcommittee decided the primary question requiring statistical reliable polling was if the registered voters of Orinda would renew the existing half-cent sales tax and increase it by a half-cent. The remainder of the polling questions tested what projects or services they would like to see this additional funding used toward, if the tax was for 10 years or in perpetuity, or simply pursuing an extension of the existing half-cent sales tax.

The Subcommittee agreed that it would be a good opportunity to poll the community about another potential future funding measure for repairing and accepting ownership of private roads and/or private storm drain systems. These questions were asked after the polling questions regarding the increased half-cent sales tax; since funding from the Add-On Sales Tax was not planned to be used toward the acquisition and maintenance of private roads or private storm drains. The Subcommittee approved the final polling questions per their final edits at their January 21, 2020 meeting. Staff was directed to work with FM3 to finalize the polling questions and proceed into the field.

Polling Process Used By FM3

On January 30th, FM3 began contacting registered Orinda voters to obtain feedback on key issues facing the City, identify residents' concerns and priorities, and examine public opinion toward policies currently under consideration. The Orinda Community Issues Survey was sent out via email or discussed over a telephone call with approximately 400 registered voters that are likely to vote and that are statistically representative (such as by gender, party registration, age, etc.) of the Orinda community. This process of using 400 statistically representative responses reduces the margin of sampling error to +/- 4.9%.

Participants cannot be identified and their responses to this survey are kept completely confidential. Due to the high participation from our community, FM3 was able to get the necessary number of responses within only eight days (February 6th). The responses were compiled by FM3, which includes some historical data from past polling results for the last eight years.

Accomplishments of Past Voter Approved Measures

It should be noted that Orinda voters have voted three times in the last decade for tax measures which will total approximately $55 million that is used to improve public roads and drainage. Since that time the roads in Orinda, as measured by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, have improved dramatically from a system wide rating of 46 (“Poor” category) in 2006 to a rating of 85 (“Very Good” category) after the completion of the 2019 pavement project. The voters also approved a special parcel tax to fund expanded Library Services, which are important to the community.
Every public residential road in Orinda has been rehabilitated in the last six years, except for 3 residential streets sections which are on hold for utility mainline replacement. The City is now shifting its focus to the rehabilitation of public arterial and collector roads and major drainage culverts. The City’s infrastructure capital projects and their funds have been continuously monitored with oversight by the Citizens Infrastructure Oversight Committee.

Poll Results - Identification of High Priority Important Issues
City Staff has invited FM3 to provide a presentation during the public City Council meeting, which will include additional analysis and more detailed information. The following attachments have been provided regarding FM3’s interpretation of the polling results:

Attachment A – Survey Questions for the Polling
Attachment B – Survey Results with Data Tracked over past surveys
Attachment C – PowerPoint slides to be presented before the Council
Attachment D – Survey Results Analysis Memo by FM3

The polling results identify a high percentage of voters identify maintaining vital City Services as either Extremely Important or Very Important (76%). Among the top responses were: Ensuring a prompt emergency response as well as preparing for disasters; Wildfire prevention; Repair of collapsing storm drains; Paving streets in poor condition; and Investing in maintenance of roads to minimize future costly repairs.

The focus of the current Add-On Sales Tax was to perform major reconstruction of public streets. In order to protect this investment on-going road maintenance funding also remains a critical need. Further, there is a need for major capital expenditures on the public storm drainage system which has had little investment in the past as evidenced by the Miner Road collapse. Also, based on the polling results, there is strong voter support for the expenditures of the tax on emergency preparedness and planning, flood protection, and fire reduction on public properties. Unlike the streets infrastructure which may have a dedicated restricted revenue source such as Gas Tax, several of these areas have no supplemental revenue source for on-going maintenance.

From a fiscal perspective it is important to recognize that the current $1.2 Million in Add-On Sales Tax adds nearly 10% to the General Purpose General Fund revenue. Without additional resources the City would be severely limited in the services it can provide. This is especially true as the City enters an economic climate where there may already be a need to reduce expenses due to recessionary trends.

DISCUSSION:
Staff recommends a two-step process to address future next steps. The first step occurs with this report discussing the results from FM3, following up with any questions of FM3 and Staff. At this time it is appropriate to confirm that there is a consensus among the City Council Members to continue forward in a manner that will allow for a measure to be placed on the November 2020. Moving forward does not bind the City Council to a final action, although it will provide Staff with direction on how to proceed.
If the City Council desires Staff to continue working on this matter, the second step will be for Staff to bring back a staff report in May 2020. Staff will provide additional financial information, as well as a draft list / plan for funding priorities for a general tax, based on the direction given by the City Council on April 21st. Specific key dates for placing a measure on the November 2020 ballot will also be provided. In general, the last opportunity for the City Council to adopt a measure to be placed on the ballot would be late July 2020, however, there is additional preparation time required, which results in a decision to move forward, needing to occur no later than the second meeting in May.

The City Council may want to indicate if there are preferences on the potential options they wish to have presented in the future report. Among the possible ballot measure structures that can be presented are:

1. Increase the add-on sales tax to 1.0% tax with no expiration until rescinded by the voters.
   a. As a variation, provide for a noticed public hearing every ten years, which the City Council would be required to vote affirmatively by 2/3rds if the collection of the tax was to continue.

2. Increase the add-on sales tax to 1.0% and have a provision that it would sunset after 10 years unless approved by the voters.

3. Extend existing 0.5% add-on sales tax with no expiration until rescinded by the voters.
   a. As a variation, provide for a noticed public hearing every ten years, which the City Council would be required to vote affirmatively by 2/3rds if the collection of the tax was to continue.

4. Extend existing 0.5% add-on sales tax for another 10 years.

5. Do nothing and wait to consider again in 2022; or consider other revenue generation measures.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
No fiscal impact to receiving polling results and FM3 report since no final decision is requested at this time. Long term it is recognized that the current Add-On Sales tax will sunset in March 2023, which will have a significant financial impact, unless there is an action taken by the voters to extend the collection.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
A. 2020 Orinda Ballot Measure Survey Questions
B. 2020 Orinda Ballot Measure Survey Results (with Tracking)
C. Orinda Revenue Measure Survey Analysis - Slideshow Presentation 3-3-20
D. FM3 Orinda Survey Results Analysis Memo - 3-3-20
E. Public Comments Regarding FM3 Polling Results
Hello, I’m calling from ______, a public opinion research company. We are not telemarketers trying to sell anything, or ask for a donation of any type. We’re conducting a public opinion survey about issues that concern people in Orinda (or-IN-da). May I please speak to _______? (MUST SPEAK TO 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 without endangering yourself or others?

   Yes, cell and can talk safely ----------------------------------------------- 1
   Yes, cell but cannot talk safely -------------------------------------------- TERMINATE
   No, not on cell ---------------------------------------------------------- 2
   (DON’T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED --------------------------------------------- TERMINATE

1. (T) Next, would you say the overall quality of life in Orinda (or-IN-da) is excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

   Excellent ---------------------------------------- 1
   Good -------------------------------------------- 2
   Only fair ---------------------------------------- 3
   Poor -------------------------------------------- 4
   (DON’T READ) DK/NA ----------------------------- 5
NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT A MEASURE THAT MAY APPEAR ON A FUTURE CITY OF ORINDA (or-RIN-da) BALLOT.

2. It could read as follows:

“Orinda (or-IN-da) Essential City Services Measure. To help maintain essential City services, including:

- ongoing repairs/maintenance to public roads and storm drains;
- restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek;
- emergency/natural disaster preparedness, including wildfire prevention/evacuation planning;

Shall the City of Orinda renew the existing half-cent sales tax and increase it by one-half cent, providing 2-point-4 million dollars annually (SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY: until ended by voters) (SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY: for 10 years), with financial audits and a citizens oversight committee?”

If the election were held 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, ASK: “What are you leaning towards, voting yes, or voting no?”)

Definitely yes ---------------------------- 1
Probably yes---------------------------- 2
Undecided, lean yes---------------------- 3
Undecided, lean no---------------------- 4
Probably no------------------------------- 5
Definitely no ----------------------------- 6
(DON’T READ) DK/NA --------------------- 7

(ASK Q3 ONLY IF YES/NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q2)

3. In a few words of your own, why would you vote YES/NO on this ballot measure? (OPEN END, RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE BELOW)

a. Yes:

b. No:
(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

4. The structure of this measure has not been finalized. Instead of establishing a one-cent sales tax, it could continue the existing half-cent sales tax with no increase in taxes. If that were the case, 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, ASK: “What are you leaning towards, voting yes, or voting no?”)

   Definitely yes ---------------------------------- 1
   Probably yes----------------------------------- 2
   Undecided, lean yes--------------------------- 3
   Undecided, lean no-------------------------- 4
   Probably no---------------------------------- 5
   Definitely no--------------------------------- 6
   (DON’T READ) DK/NA ------------------------ 7

5. (T) Overall, how would you rate the job being done by the City of Orinda (or-IN-da) in providing basic services and taking care of the needs of Orinda (or-IN-da) residents? Would you say the City of Orinda is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

   Excellent job ----------------------------------- 1
   Above average job ----------------------------- 2
   Average job ------------------------------------ 3
   Below average job----------------------------- 4
   Poor job---------------------------------------- 5
   (DON’T KNOW/NA)------------------------------- 6

6. (T) And how would you rate the job the City of Orinda (or-IN-da) has done spending tax dollars wisely? Would you say the City is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

   Excellent job ----------------------------------- 1
   Above average job ----------------------------- 2
   Average job ------------------------------------ 3
   Below average job----------------------------- 4
   Poor job---------------------------------------- 5
   (DON’T KNOW/NA)------------------------------- 6
7. First, I’m going to read you a brief list of City departments. Please tell me whether you generally approve or disapprove of the job each is doing. (IF APPROVE/DISAPPROVE, ASK: Is that strongly or just somewhat?) (RANDOMIZE)

(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)  
[ ]a. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) City Council --------------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]b. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) Police Department --------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]c. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) Parks and Recreation Department -------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)  
[ ]d. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) Department of Public Works -------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]e. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) Planning Department ----------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]f. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) Library ------------------------------------ 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

8. Now, I am going to read you a list of some specific services provided by the City of Orinda (or-RIN-da). After you hear each one, please tell me whether you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of that service in the City of Orinda. (IF SATISFIED/DISSATISFIED, ASK: Is that very SATISFIED/DISSATISFIED or just somewhat?) (RANDOMIZE)

[ ]a. (T) Repairing potholes ----------------------------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)  
[ ]b. (T*) Maintaining the City’s public streets and roads ----------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]c. (T) Reviewing and issuing permits for new residential construction and home remodels ------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]d. (T) Providing police emergency response services ------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]e. (T) Maintaining local parks ------------------------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)  
[ ]f. (T) Maintaining the cleanliness and general appearance of downtown ----------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]g. (T) Preparing the community for natural disasters ------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]h. (T) Maintaining a reasonable amount of reserve funding in the City budget -- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

[ ]i. Maintaining the City’s public storm drains --------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)
9. In the last few years would you say that the overall quality of public streets and roads in the City of Orinda (or-IN-da) has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same? (IF BETTER/WORSE, ASK: “Is that much BETTER/WORSE, or only somewhat?”)

   Much better ------------------------------------- 1  
   Somewhat better ------------------------------- 2  
   About the same ------------------------------- 3  
   Somewhat worse ------------------------------- 4  
   Much worse ------------------------------------ 5  
   (DON’T KNOW/NA) ------------------------ 6

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO RETURN TO OUR DISCUSSION OF THE BALLOT MEASURE WE WERE PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSING. TO REFRESH YOUR MEMORY, THIS CITY OF ORINDA (or-IN-da) MEASURE WOULD RENEW ORINDA’S EXISTING HALF-CENT SALES TAX AND INCREASE IT BY ONE-HALF CENT TO FUND VITAL CITY SERVICES INCLUDING REPAIRING AND MAINTAINING PUBLIC ROADS AND STORM DRAINS, RESTORING WILDLIFE HABITAT ALONG SAN PABLO CREEK, AND PREPARING FOR NATURAL DISASTERS.

10. First, I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. (RANDOMIZE)

   (DON’EXT VERY SW NOT READ)

   (SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)

[ ]a. Accepting ownership of private storm drains on private property, and making them part of the City’s publicly-maintained storm drain system ------ 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]b. Protecting vital City services --------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]c. Additional police patrol coverage ---------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]d. Repaving public arterial (ar-TEER-EE-ull) and collector streets -------------------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]e. (T) Repairing streets to improve driver, pedestrian, and bicyclist safety ------------------------ 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]f. (T) Repairing collapsing storm drains ----------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]g. Providing safe routes to schools ------------------------ 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]h. (T) Repaving public streets that are in poor condition------------------------------------------ 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]i. Restoring wildlife habitat along San Pablo Creek ------------------------------------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]j. Maintaining local parks --------------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]k. Preparing for natural disasters -------------------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5

[ ]l. Fully investing in the maintenance of public roads to minimize future costly repairs---------------- 1 ------------ 2 ----------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5
(SPLIT SAMPLE D ONLY)

[ ]m. Repaving public residential streets and roads
[ ]n. Maintaining vital City services
[ ]o. Improving traffic safety on local streets
[ ]p. (T) Replacing failing storm drains to prevent road flooding
[ ]q. (T) Repaving major City streets
[ ]r. (T*) Repairing public storm drains at the same time the roads are repaired
[ ]s. Providing recreational opportunities such as a walking trail along San Pablo Creek
[ ]t. Implementing the Community Park Master Plan
[ ]u. Ensuring speedy emergency response
[ ]v. Wildfire prevention

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

NOW I AM GOING TO READ YOU SOME STATEMENTS FROM BOTH SUPPORTERS AND OPPOSITES OF THE CITY OF ORINDA (or-IN-da) MEASURE WHICH WOULD RENEW ORINDA’S EXISTING HALF-CENT SALES TAX AND INCREASE IT BY ONE-HALF CENT TO FUND VITAL CITY SERVICES INCLUDING REPAIRING AND MAINTAINING PUBLIC ROADS AND STORM DRAINS, RESTORING WILDLIFE HABITAT ALONG SAN PABLO CREEK, AND PREPARING FOR NATURAL DISASTER AND EMERGENCIES.

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

[ ]a. (PROPERTY VALUE) By maintaining and improving public street and road conditions, this measure will help to protect property values for Orinda (or-IN-da) homeowners.

[ ]b. (SAFETY) This measure will improve the safety of Orinda’s (or-IN-da’s) main public roads. By fixing deteriorating roads and preventing potholes, it will reduce damage to vehicles and help to prevent accidents that threaten the safety of drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

[ ]c. (CHILDREN) Safer roads mean safer conditions for everyone in our neighborhoods. In particular, this measure will invest in ensuring that children can walk and bike to school safely.

1. VERY CONV. 2. SMWHT CONV. 3. NOT CONV. 4. DON’T BELIEVE (DK/NA)
[ ]d. **(FUTURE COSTS)** Delaying maintenance and repairs to Orinda’s (or-IN-da’s) public roads and drains only increase costs in the long run. This measure will help repair roads and drains while construction costs are still relatively affordable.

[ ]e. **(KEEP IMPROVING)** Orinda’s (or-IN-da’s) overall pavement condition has improved greatly over the last few years as the City has invested in road maintenance and improvements. Without this tax our roads will deteriorate again.

[ ]f. **(EXPIRING)** This measure extends an existing tax the City has been using to pay for vital services. Without this measure, the City will have to find a way to raise more than one million dollars a year just to prevent cuts to essential services.

[ ]g. **(NO OTHER SOURCES)** Unlike many cities in the Bay Area, Orinda (or-IN-da) does not have a utility users tax or business license tax, and has not increased its real property transfer tax on homeowners.

[ ]h. **(TRACK RECORD)** Since local voters first authorized this local sales tax to fund road improvements, it has finished all scheduled repairs on budget and ahead of schedule. This track record of success has been documented by the citizens’ committee overseeing spending from the measure.
12. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about the potential measure to help maintain essential City services, including ongoing repairs to public roads and storm drains; restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek; and providing emergency/natural disaster preparedness by renewing the existing half-cent sales tax and increasing it by one-half cent. If the election were held today, would you vote yes in favor of it, or no to oppose it? (IF YES/NO ASK): “Is that definitely (YES/NO) or just probably (YES/NO)?” (IF UNDECIDED, ASK:) “Well, do you lean towards voting yes or no?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitively yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean no</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably no</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely no</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DON’T READ) DK/NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- [ ]a. **(TRUST)** The City should find money in its existing budget, rather than raising taxes. And we simply can’t trust City government to spend this money effectively and efficiently. --------- 1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 --------- 5
- [ ]b. **(HIDING)** We have already been asked three times in the last decade to fund street improvements, and they are likely to ask again in a few years. This piecemeal approach is designed to hide the true costs from voters. --------- 1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 --------- 5
- [ ]c. **(TAXES)** The cost of living in the Bay Area is too high already, and there may be numerous other tax increases on next year’s ballot, including other measures to fund transportation. We have hit our limit on taxes, and should vote no. --------- 1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 --------- 5

**SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY**

- [ ]d. **(FOREVER)** This measure will create a “forever tax.” Local residents will be paying a one-cent sales tax from now on, whether or not the money is being used effectively or as promised. --------- 1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 --------- 5

**RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS**

14. Sometimes over the course of a survey like this, people change their minds, and sometimes they do not. Let me ask you one last time about the measure to help maintain essential City services, including ongoing repairs to public roads and storm drains; restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San...
Pablo Creek; and providing emergency/natural disaster preparedness by renewing the existing half-cent sales tax and increasing it by one-half cent. Would you vote yes in favor of it, or no to oppose it? (IF YES/NO ASK): “Is that definitely (YES/NO) or just probably (YES/NO)?” (IF UNDECIDED, ASK:) Well, do you lean towards voting yes or no?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean no</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably no</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely no</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DON’T READ) DK/NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOW LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT ANOTHER SUBJECT.

15. As you may know, about 30 miles of Orinda (or-IN-da) roads are privately-owned. These roads are not maintained by the City. Most of these roads do not have gates that physically restrict access to the general public. All local residents, including those living on these privately-owned roads, pay existing City taxes that fund repairs to public roads.

The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DON’T KNOW/NA)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Next, here are statements from supporters and opponents of a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. (ROTATE PARAGRAPHS)

[] Supporters say that people living on privately-owned roads pay the same taxes as their neighbors who live on City-maintained roads, but they do not get the same benefits. Their roads are open to public use. Supporters would like the benefit of regular maintenance and major repairs to their roads, especially in the event of a major disaster.

[] Opponents say that people who choose to live in homes on private roads knew what they were agreeing to when they bought their homes. They should continue to pay their own maintenance costs instead of the City having to take over responsibility and liability for their private roads.

Having heard this, would you support or oppose this ballot measure? (IF SUPPORT/Oppose, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/Oppose or just somewhat?)

Strongly support ------------------------------- 1
Somewhat support ----------------------------- 2
Somewhat oppose ----------------------------- 3
Strongly oppose----------------------------- 4
(DON’T KNOW/NA)------------------------ 5

17. At this time, the potential cost of such a ballot measure is not known, because the City does not know the condition of the 30 miles of privately-owned roads. However, current estimates range from five million dollars to 25 million dollars. These costs would be funded through additional taxes to local residents.

Having heard this, let me ask you again: would you support or oppose a ballot measure to generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system? Does this sound like something you would support or oppose? (IF SUPPORT/Oppose, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/Oppose or just somewhat?)

Strongly support ------------------------------- 1
Somewhat support ----------------------------- 2
Somewhat oppose ----------------------------- 3
Strongly oppose----------------------------- 4
(DON’T KNOW/NA)------------------------ 5
18. On a different, but related subject: typically, storm water runoff from residences is directed to ditches or catch basins within public road rights of way that are maintained by the City. The collected street runoff is usually sent through a storm drainpipe on private property into the nearest creek or water channel. It is the responsibility of the private property owner to maintain the storm drainpipe across their property, unless the City has accepted a drainage easement to maintain that specific storm drainpipe.

The City is considering a bond measure to take over ownership and maintenance of private storm drains. Such a bond measure would likely cost at least 30 million dollars, which equates to approximately 260 dollars annually for the next 20 years for a property assessed at one million dollars. Does this bond measure sound like something you would support or oppose? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?)

- Strongly support ------------------------------- 1
- Somewhat support ----------------------------- 2
- Somewhat oppose ----------------------------- 3
- Strongly oppose----------------------------- 4
- (DON’T KNOW/NA) ------------------------ 5

19. Next, I’m going to read you a list of sources from which people get information about local City of Orinda (or-IN-da) news. For each, I’d like you to tell me how often you use it to get information about local City of Orinda news: frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never. (RANDOMIZE)

(SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)
[ ]a. (T) The weekly Orinda (or-IN-da) Outlook e-mail newsletter from the City ----------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]b. (T) Twitter ----------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]c. (T) City email alerts ------------------------------ 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]d. (T) The Orinda (or-IN-da) News ------------------------------ 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]e. (T) The City of Orinda’s (or-IN-da’s) website-------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]f. (T) The information you receive in the mail -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]g. (T) The Nextdoor dot com website -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5

(SPLIT SAMPLE D ONLY)
[ ]h. (T) Facebook -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]i. (T) The Lamorinda (L.A-more-in-da) Weekly -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]j. (T) Blogs -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]k. (T) The City’s quarterly Orinda (o-IN-da) Way printed newsletter -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]l. The East Bay Times -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
[ ]m. (T) Nixle (nix-ULL) alerts -------------------------- 1 -------------- 2 ------------ 3 ------------- 4 ------------ 5
20. Is your home on a City maintained-road, or a privately-owned road?

City-maintained----------------------------- 1
Privately-owned --------------------------- 2
(DON'T READ) DK/NA ----------------- 3

21. Were you born and raised in Orinda? (IF NO, ASK: How long have you lived in Orinda?)

Born and raised ----------------------------- 1
Less than five years ------------------------ 2
Six to ten years----------------------------- 3
11 to 20 years ----------------------------- 4
21 to 40 years ----------------------------- 5
More than 40 years ------------------------ 6
(DON'T READ) DK/NA --------------------- 7

22. (T) What was the last level of school that you completed?

Less than high school graduate -------------- 1
High School graduate ------------------------ 2
Less than 4 years of college ----------------- 3
College graduate (4) ------------------------ 4
Post graduate work/
Professional school ---------------------- 5
(DON'T READ) Refused--------------------- 6

23. (T) Do you have any children under the age of 19 living at home?

Yes ---------------------------------------- 1
No ---------------------------------------- 2
(DON'T READ) DK/NA ---------------------- 3

24. (T) I’m going to read you some categories for household income. Would you please stop me when I have read the category indicating the total combined income for all the people in your household before taxes in 2019?

Under $50,000 a year ------------------------ 1
$50,001 to $100,000 ------------------------- 2
$100,001 to $150,000 ----------------------- 3
$150,001 to $200,000 ----------------------- 4
$200,001 to $250,000 ----------------------- 5
Over $250,000 ----------------------------- 6
(DON'T READ) Refused--------------------- 7
25. Next, would you like to provide an e-mail address for the City of Orinda (or-RIN-da) to use in contacting you with information about the City?

(RECORD E-MAIL ADDRESS BELOW)

_____________________________________

(ASK ONLINE ONLY)
QX. Are you …?

Male --------------------------------------------- 1
Female ------------------------------------------ 2
Nonbinary -------------------------------------- 3
Rather not say ---------------------------------- 4

THANK AND TERMINATE

GENDER (BY OBSERVATION):

Male --------------------------------------------- 1
Female ------------------------------------------ 2

PARTY REGISTRATION:

Democrat --------------------------------------- 1
Republican ------------------------------------- 2
No Party Preference --------------------------- 3
Other -------------------------------------------- 4

FLAGS

P14 -------------------------------------- 1
G14 -------------------------------------- 2
P16 -------------------------------------- 3
G16 -------------------------------------- 4
P18 -------------------------------------- 5
G18 -------------------------------------- 6
BLANK -------------------------------- 7

HOUSEHOLD PARTY TYPE

Dem 1 ---------------------------------- 1
Dem 2+ -------------------------------- 2
Rep 1 ----------------------------------- 3
Rep 2+ --------------------------------- 4
Ind 1+ ---------------------------------- 5
Mix ------------------------------------- 6

AGE

18-24 ----------------------------------- 1
25-29 ----------------------------------- 2
30-34 ----------------------------------- 3
35-39 ----------------------------------- 4
40-44 ----------------------------------- 5
45-49 ----------------------------------- 6
50-54 ----------------------------------- 7
55-59 ----------------------------------- 8
60-64 ---------------------------------- 9
65-74 ---------------------------------- 10
75+ ------------------------------------ 11

PERMANENT ABSENTEE

Yes -------------------------------------------- 1
No --------------------------------------------- 2
Hello, I’m calling from ______, a public opinion research company. We are not telemarketers trying to sell anything, or ask for a donation of any type. We’re conducting a public opinion survey about issues that concern people in Orinda. May I please speak to __________? (MUST SPEAK TO 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 without endangering yourself or others?

Yes, cell and can talk safely----------------------------- 67%
Yes, cell but cannot talk safely ------------------- TERMINATE
No, not on cell ------------------------------------------ 33%
(DON'T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED ------------------- TERMINATE

1. Next, would you say the overall quality of life in Orinda is excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT/GOOD</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR/POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only fair</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DON'T READ) DK/NA - 0%------------------- 0%------------------- 1%------------------- 1%------------------- 0%
NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT A MEASURE THAT MAY APPEAR ON A FUTURE CITY OF ORINDA BALLOT.

2. It could read as follows:

"Orinda Essential City Services Measure. To help maintain essential City services, including:

- ongoing repairs/maintenance to public roads and storm drains;
- restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek;
- emergency/natural disaster preparedness, including wildfire prevention/evacuation planning;

Shall the City of Orinda renew the existing half-cent sales tax and increase it by one-half cent, providing 2-point-4 million dollars annually (SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY: until ended by voters) (SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY: for 10 years), with financial audits and a citizens oversight committee?"

If the election were held 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, ASK: “What are you leaning towards, voting yes, or voting no?”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPLIT A: ENDED BY VOTERS</th>
<th>SPLIT B: 10 YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL YES</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean yes</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean no</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably no</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely no</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DK/NA)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ASK Q3 ONLY IF YES/NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q2)

3. In a few words of your own, why would you vote YES/NO on this ballot measure? (OPEN END, RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE BELOW)

a. Yes, N=269:

Infrastructure needs repairing/needs to be maintained ---------------------------- 45%
City needs improvement/help maintain the quality of life ------------------------ 16%
It is necessary/important/reasonable ----------------------------------------- 15%
To help in fire control measure ---------------------------------------------- 12%
To help protect the wildlife/natural environment ----------------------------- 11%
City needs the services -------------------------------------------------- 9%
It is just a small cost -------------------------------------------------- 6%
For emergency preparedness/disasters --------------------------------------- 6%
If the money will be spent wisely/oversight -------------------------------- 5%
To help improve safety -------------------------------------------------- 3%
General in favor of the measure/support it ------------------------------- 3%
People will benefit from it ----------------------------------------------- 2%
Need more info/need to know more ---------------------------------------- 2%
It is for a good cause -------------------------------------------------- 2%
City needs the money -------------------------------------------------- 2%
It increases home value -------------------------------------------------- 1%
It is our responsibility/we should pay for our share ---------------------- 1%

None/Against the measure ------------------------------------------------- 1%
Other -------------------------------------------------------------------- 5%
Don't know/Refused ------------------------------------------------------ 2%

b. No, N=137:

Taxes already high/been paying too much taxes/against additional taxes --------- 54%
City needs to spend money wisely/mismanagement of funds ------------------ 23%
City has not figured out how to make private streets public ---------------- 13%
No changes/improvement made within the city/nothing happens -------------- 12%
Should have more transparency on where the money goes ------------------- 6%
Need to know more/need more info ----------------------------------------- 6%
City has enough money -------------------------------------------------- 4%
Do not trust the Government/not doing their job -------------------------- 2%
Do not agree with the measure/unnecessary ------------------------------- 2%
It will hurt local businesses/people will shop elsewhere ------------------ 1%

Other -------------------------------------------------------------------- 6%
(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

4. The structure of this measure has not been finalized. Instead of establishing a one-cent sales tax, it could continue the existing half-cent sales tax with no increase in taxes. If that were the case, 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, ASK: “What are you leaning towards, voting yes, or voting no?”)

   TOTAL YES -------------------------- 72%
   Definitely yes ---------------------- 45%
   Probably yes----------------------- 24%
   Undecided, lean yes --------------- 3%

   TOTAL NO-------------------------- 22%
   Undecided, lean no --------------- 3%
   Probably no---------------------- 5%
   Definitely no --------------------- 14%

   (DON’T READ) DK/NA --------------- 6%

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN ORINDA.

5. Overall, how would you rate the job being done by the City of Orinda in providing basic services and taking care of the needs of Orinda residents? Would you say the City of Orinda is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT/ABOVE AVG</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent job</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average job</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average job</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELOW AVERAGE/POOR</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average job</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor job</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DON’T KNOW/NA)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. And how would you rate the job the City of Orinda has done spending tax dollars wisely? Would you say the City is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent/Above Avg</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent job</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average job</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average job</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average/Poor</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average job</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor job</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Don't Know/NA)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. First, I’m going to read you a brief list of City departments. Please tell me whether you generally approve or disapprove of the job each is doing. (If approve/disapprove, ask: “Is that strongly or just somewhat?”) (Randomize)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Police Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STR APPRV</th>
<th>SMWT APPRV</th>
<th>SMWT DISAP</th>
<th>STR DISAP</th>
<th>(DK/NA)</th>
<th>TOTAL APPRV</th>
<th>TOTAL DISAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. The Orinda Department of Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The Orinda Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The Orinda Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

8. Now, I am going to read you a list of some specific services provided by the City of Orinda. After you hear each one, please tell me whether you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of that service in the City of Orinda. (IF SATISFIED/DISSATISFIED, ASK: “Is that very SATISFIED/DISSATISFIED or just somewhat?”) (RANDOMIZE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY SATIS</th>
<th>SMWT SATIS</th>
<th>SMWT DISSAT</th>
<th>VERY DISSAT</th>
<th>(DK/NA)</th>
<th>TOTAL SATIS</th>
<th>TOTAL DISSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Repairing potholes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. (T*) Maintaining the City’s public streets and roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reviewing and issuing permits for new residential construction and home remodels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Providing police emergency response services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Maintaining local parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Maintaining the cleanliness and general appearance of downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(SPLIT SAMPLE B CONTINUED)

[g. Preparing the community for natural disasters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>SMWT</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Total Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[h. Maintaining a reasonable amount of reserve funding in the City budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>SMWT</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Total Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[i. Maintaining the City’s public storm drains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>SMWT</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Total Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

9. In the last few years would you say that the overall quality of public streets and roads in the City of Orinda has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same? (IF BETTER/WORSE, ASK: “Is that much BETTER/WORSE, or only somewhat?”)

TOTAL BETTER --------------------- 62%
Much better------------------------ 30%
Somewhat better ------------------ 32%
About the same--------------------- 21%

TOTAL WORSE ---------------------- 14%
Somewhat worse-------------------- 9%
Much worse------------------------ 5%
(DON’T KNOW/NA) ------------------ 3%

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO RETURN TO OUR DISCUSSION OF THE BALLOT MEASURE WE WERE PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSING. TO REFRESH YOUR MEMORY, THIS CITY OF ORINDA MEASURE WOULD RENEW ORINDA’S EXISTING HALF-CENT SALES TAX AND INCREASE IT BY ONE-HALF CENT TO FUND VITAL CITY SERVICES INCLUDING REPAIRING AND MAINTAINING PUBLIC ROADS AND STORM DRAINS, RESTORING WILDLIFE HABITAT ALONG SAN PABLO CREEK, AND PREPARING FOR NATURAL DISASTERS.

10. First, I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. (RANDOMIZE)

[a. Accepting ownership of private storm drains on private property, and making them part of the City’s publicly-maintained storm drain system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>SMWT</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Total Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Protecting vital City services</th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>56%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Additional police patrol coverage</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Repaving public arterial and collector streets</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>(T) Repairing streets to improve driver, pedestrian, and bicyclist safety</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>(T) Repairing collapsing storm drains</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Providing safe routes to schools</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>(T) Repaving public streets that are in poor condition</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Restoring wildlife habitat along San Pablo Creek</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Maintaining local parks</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Preparing for natural disasters</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Fully investing in the maintenance of public roads to minimize future costly repairs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (SPLIT SAMPLE D ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Repaving public residential streets and roads</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>49%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>74%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Maintaining vital City services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Improving traffic safety on local streets</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>(T) Replacing failing storm drains to prevent road flooding</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>(T) Repaving major City streets</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>(T*) Repairing public storm drains at the same time the roads are repaired</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Providing recreational opportunities such as a walking trail along San Pablo Creek</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Implementing the Community Park Master Plan</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Ensuring speedy emergency response</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Wildfire prevention</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

NOW I AM GOING TO READ YOU SOME STATEMENTS FROM BOTH SUPPORTERS AND OPPONENTS OF THE CITY OF ORINDA MEASURE WHICH WOULD RENEW ORINDA’S EXISTING HALF-CENT SALES TAX AND INCREASE IT BY ONE-HALF CENT TO FUND VITAL CITY SERVICES INCLUDING REPAIRING AND MAINTAINING PUBLIC ROADS AND STORM DRAINS, RESTORING WILDLIFE HABITAT ALONG SAN PABLO CREEK, AND PREPARING FOR NATURAL DISASTER AND EMERGENCIES.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROPERTY VALUE</th>
<th>SAFETY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
<th>FUTURE COSTS</th>
<th>KEEP IMPROVING</th>
<th>EXPIRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By maintaining and improving public street and road conditions, this measure will help to protect property values for Orinda homeowners.</td>
<td>This measure will improve the safety of Orinda’s main public roads. By fixing deteriorating roads and preventing potholes, it will reduce damage to vehicles and help to prevent accidents that threaten the safety of drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.</td>
<td>Safer roads mean safer conditions for everyone in our neighborhoods. In particular, this measure will invest in ensuring that children can walk and bike to school safely.</td>
<td>Delaying maintenance and repairs to Orinda’s public roads and drains only increase costs in the long run. This measure will help repair roads and drains while construction costs are still relatively affordable.</td>
<td>Orinda’s overall pavement condition has improved greatly over the last few years as the City has invested in road maintenance and improvements. Without this tax our roads will deteriorate again.</td>
<td>This measure extends an existing tax the City has been using to pay for vital services. Without this measure, the City will have to find a way to raise more than one million dollars a year just to prevent cuts to essential services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY CONV</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMWT CONV</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT CONV</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T BEL</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DK/ NA)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY/ SMWT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.1.b Packet Pg. 57
(NO OTHER SOURCES) Unlike many cities in the Bay Area, Orinda does not have a utility users tax or business license tax, and has not increased its real property transfer tax on homeowners.

(TRACK RECORD) Since local voters first authorized this local sales tax to fund road improvements, it has finished all scheduled repairs on budget and ahead of schedule. This track record of success has been documented by the citizens’ committee overseeing spending from the measure.

12. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about the potential measure to help maintain essential City services, including ongoing repairs to public roads and storm drains; restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek; and providing emergency/natural disaster preparedness by renewing the existing half-cent sales tax and increasing it by one-half cent. If the election were held today, would you vote yes in favor of it, or no to oppose it? (IF YES/NO ASK): “Is that definitely (YES/NO) or just probably (YES/NO)?” (IF UNDECIDED, ASK:) “Well, do you lean towards voting yes or no?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL YES</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean yes</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NO</th>
<th>32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecided, lean no</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably no</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely no</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DON’T READ) DK/NA 3%
13. Next, I am going to read some statements from people who oppose the measure. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to oppose it on a future ballot. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. (RANDOMIZE)

**[ ]a. (TRUST)** The City should find money in its existing budget, rather than raising taxes. And we simply can’t trust City government to spend this money effectively and efficiently. ------- 20% ---- 31% ---- 33% ---- 14% ---- 2%  50%

**[ ]b. (HIDING)** We have already been asked three times in the last decade to fund street improvements, and they are likely to ask again in a few years. This piecemeal approach is designed to hide the true costs from voters. 24% ---- 38% ---- 26% ---- 9% ---- 3%  62%

**[ ]c. (TAXES)** The cost of living in the Bay Area is too high already, and there may be numerous other tax increases on next year’s ballot, including other measures to fund transportation. We have hit our limit on taxes, and should vote no. 24% ---- 30% ---- 36% ---- 9% ---- 2%  54%

**(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)**

**[ ]d. (FOREVER)** This measure will create a “forever tax.” Local residents will be paying a one-cent sales tax from now on, whether or not the money is being used effectively or as promised. 29% ---- 33% ---- 26% ---- 11% ---- 1%  62%
(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

14. Sometimes over the course of a survey like this, people change their minds, and sometimes they do not. Let me ask you one last time about the measure to help maintain essential City services, including ongoing repairs to public roads and storm drains; restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek; and providing emergency/natural disaster preparedness by renewing the existing half-cent sales tax and increasing it by one-half cent. Would you vote yes in favor of it, or no to oppose it? (IF YES/NO ASK): “Is that definitely (YES/NO) or just probably (YES/NO)?” (IF UNDECIDED, ASK:) Well, do you lean towards voting yes or no?

TOTAL YES ------------------------ 61%
   Definitely yes ------------------ 35%
   Probably yes-------------------- 22%
   Undecided, lean yes -------------- 4%

TOTAL NO------------------------ 36%
   Undecided, lean no -------------- 4%
   Probably no--------------------- 9%
   Definitely no-------------------- 23%

(DON’T READ) DK/NA -------------- 3%

NOW LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT ANOTHER SUBJECT.

15. As you may know, about 30 miles of Orinda roads are privately-owned. These roads are not maintained by the City. Most of these roads do not have gates that physically restrict access to the general public. All local residents, including those living on these privately-owned roads, pay existing City taxes that fund repairs to public roads.

The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: “Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?”)

TOTAL SUPPORT ----------------- 46%
   Strongly support -------------- 20%
   Somewhat support ------------- 25%

TOTAL OPPOSE ----------------- 50%
   Somewhat oppose------------- 24%
   Strongly oppose----------- 27%

(DON’T KNOW/NA) ----------------- 4%
16. Next, here are statements from supporters and opponents of a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. (ROTATE PARAGRAPHS)

[ ] Supporters say that people living on privately-owned roads pay the same taxes as their neighbors who live on City-maintained roads, but they do not get the same benefits. Their roads are open to public use. Supporters would like the benefit of regular maintenance and major repairs to their roads, especially in the event of a major disaster.

[ ] Opponents say that people who choose to live in homes on private roads knew what they were agreeing to when they bought their homes. They should continue to pay their own maintenance costs instead of the City having to take over responsibility and liability for their private roads.

Having heard this, would you support or oppose this ballot measure? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: “Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?”)

TOTAL SUPPORT --------------------- 45%
Strongly support ------------------- 20%
Somewhat support ------------------- 25%

TOTAL OPPOSE ---------------------- 50%
Somewhat oppose-------------------- 24%
Strongly oppose-------------------- 26%

(DON’T KNOW/NA) ------------------- 5%

17. At this time, the potential cost of such a ballot measure is not known, because the City does not know the condition of the 30 miles of privately-owned roads. However, current estimates range from five million dollars to 25 million dollars. These costs would be funded through additional taxes to local residents.

Having heard this, let me ask you again: would you support or oppose a ballot measure to generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system? Does this sound like something you would support or oppose? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: “Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?”)

TOTAL SUPPORT --------------------- 36%
Strongly support ------------------- 16%
Somewhat support ------------------- 20%

TOTAL OPPOSE ---------------------- 58%
Somewhat oppose-------------------- 25%
Strongly oppose-------------------- 34%

(DON’T KNOW/NA) ------------------- 6%
18. On a different, but related subject: typically, storm water runoff from residences is directed to ditches or catch basins within public road rights of way that are maintained by the City. The collected street runoff is usually sent through a storm drainpipe on private property into the nearest creek or water channel. It is the responsibility of the private property owner to maintain the storm drainpipe across their property, unless the City has accepted a drainage easement to maintain that specific storm drainpipe.

The City is considering a bond measure to take over ownership and maintenance of private storm drains. Such a bond measure would likely cost at least 30 million dollars, which equates to approximately 260 dollars annually for the next 20 years for a property assessed at one million dollars. Does this bond measure sound like something you would support or oppose? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?)

**TOTAL SUPPORT ------------------- 41%**
Strongly support ------------------- 14%
Somewhat support ------------------- 27%

**TOTAL OPPOSE ------------------- 50%**
Somewhat oppose ------------------- 23%
Strongly oppose ------------------- 26%

**(DON'T KNOW/NA) ------------------- 9%**

19. Next, I’m going to read you a list of sources from which people get information about local City of Orinda news. For each, I’d like you to tell me how often you use it to get information about local City of Orinda news: frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never. (RANDOMIZE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SPLIT SAMPLE C ONLY)</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>OCCAS</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>(DK/NA)</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>OCCAS</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]a. (T) The weekly <em>Orinda Outlook</em> e-mail newsletter from the City-------</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]b. (T) Twitter---------------------------</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]c. (T) City email alerts--------------</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]d. (T) The <em>Orinda News</em> ----------------</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]e. (T) The City of Orinda’s website -------</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]f. (T) The information you receive in the mail ----------------</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]g. (T) The Nextdoor.com website--------</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SPLIT SAMPLE D ONLY)</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>OCCAS</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>(DK/NA)</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>OCCAS</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]h. (T) Facebook---------------------------</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]i. (T) The <em>Lamorinda Weekly</em>----------------</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]j. (T) Blogs---------------------------</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]k. (T) The City’s quarterly <em>Orinda</em> Way printed newsletter----------------</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]l. The <em>East Bay Times</em>----------------</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]m. (T) Nixle alerts ----------------</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are my last questions, and they are for statistical purposes only.

20. Is your home on a City maintained-road, or a privately-owned road?

- City-maintained: 72%
- Privately-owned: 24%
- (DON'T READ) DK/NA: 4%

21. Were you born and raised in Orinda? (IF NO, ASK: “How long have you lived in Orinda?”)

- Born and raised: 10%
- Less than six years: 18%
- Six to ten years: 15%
- 11 to 20 years: 20%
- 21 to 40 years: 23%
- More than 40 years: 13%
- (DON'T READ) DK/NA: 2%

22. (T) What was the last level of school that you completed?

- Less than high school graduate: 1%
- High school graduate: 4%
- Less than 4 years of college: 17%
- College graduate (4): 39%
- Post graduate work/Professional school: 37%
- (DON'T READ) Refused: 2%

23. (T) Do you have any children under the age of 19 living at home?

- Yes: 30%
- No: 68%
- (DON'T READ) DK/NA: 2%

24. (T) I’m going to read you some categories for household income. Would you please stop me when I have read the category indicating the total combined income for all the people in your household before taxes in 2019?

- Under $50,000 a year: 3%
- $50,000 to $100,000: 7%
- $100,001 to $150,000: 12%
- $150,001 to $200,000: 12%
- $200,001 to $250,000: 6%
- Over $250,000: 33%
- (DON'T READ) Refused: 26%
25. Next, would you like to provide an e-mail address for the City of Orinda to use in contacting you with information about the City?

(RECORD E-MAIL ADDRESS BELOW)

THANK AND TERMINATE

GENDER: Male ---------------------------- 48%
Female ------------------------------- 52%
Non-binary----------------------------- 0%
Rather not say ----------------------- 0%

PARTY REGISTRATION: Democrat ------------------ 52%
Republican ----------------------------- 22%
No Party Preference ------------------- 21%
Other ------------------------------- 5%

SURVEY MODE: Phone------------------- 50%
Online -------------------------------- 50%

FLAGS
P14 --------------------------------- 47%
P16 --------------------------------- 70%
G14 --------------------------------- 63%
G16 --------------------------------- 86%
P18 --------------------------------- 69%
G18 --------------------------------- 90%
BLANK -------------------------------- 4%

HOUSEHOLD PARTY TYPE
Dem 1 ---------------------------- 21%
Dem 2+ --------------------------- 21%
Rep 1 ---------------------------- 7%
Rep 2+ --------------------------- 6%
Ind 1+ ------------------------- 18%
Mix ---------------------------- 27%

PERMANENT ABSENTEE
Yes ----------------------------- 84%
No ----------------------------- 16%

AGE
18-24 ----------------------------- 8%
25-29 ----------------------------- 1%
30-34 ----------------------------- 3%
35-39 ----------------------------- 7%
40-44 ----------------------------- 10%
45-49 ----------------------------- 7%
50-54 ----------------------------- 10%
55-59 ----------------------------- 11%
60-64 ----------------------------- 10%
65-74 ----------------------------- 17%
75+ ----------------------------- 16%
Blank ----------------------------- 0%
Orinda Voter Views of a Potential Finance Measure

Key Findings from a Survey of Voters Conducted January 30-February 6, 2020
Methodology

• 436 interviews with Orinda voters likely to participate in the November 2020 election
• Conducted January 31-February 6, 2020, online and via landline and cell phones
• Margin of sampling error of ±4.9% at the 95% confidence level; ±6.9% for half-samples
• Due to rounding, some percentages do not add up to 100%
• Selected comparisons to prior research conducted in the city in 2012, 2014, 2016 and 2018
Issue Context and Views of the City
Perceptions of Orinda quality of life are very positive, though intensity has eroded over time.

Would you say that the overall quality of life in Orinda is excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Only Fair/Poor/Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excellence / Good: 96%

Perceptions of Orinda quality of life are very positive, though intensity has eroded over time.
Voters continue to express satisfaction with the City’s delivery of services.

Overall, how would you rate the job being done by the City of Orinda in providing basic services and taking care of the needs of Orinda residents? Would you say the City of Orinda is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three in ten now say the City is doing an “excellent” or “above average” job spending tax dollars wisely.

And how would you rate the job the City of Orinda has done spending tax dollars wisely? Would you say the City is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2020: 31%  
2016: 20%  
2014: 33%  
2012: 30%
Orinda voters overwhelmingly approve of their library, parks and recreation department, and police department.

I’m going to read you a brief list of City departments. Please tell me whether you generally approve or disapprove of the job each is doing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
<th>Somewhat Approve</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Somewhat Disapprove</th>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Total Approve</th>
<th>Total Disapprove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Library</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Police Department</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda City Council</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Department of Public Works</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Planning Department</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval of the police department has declined in the last two years, though nearly four in five still approve.

(Total Approve)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda City Council</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Library</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Police Department</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Department of Public Works</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda Planning Department</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. I’m going to read you a brief list of City departments. Please tell me whether you generally approve or disapprove of the job each is doing. Split Sample
Voters are largely satisfied with the general appearance of downtown and parks; a majority is dissatisfied with pothole repairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining the cleanliness and general appearance of downtown</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining local parks</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing police emergency response services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining the City's public storm drains</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining the City's public streets and roads</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the community for natural disasters</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^Repairing potholes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a reasonable amount of reserve funding in the City budget</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and issuing permits for new residential construction and home remodels</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. I am going to read you a list of some specific services provided by the City of Orinda. Please tell me whether you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of that service in the City of Orinda. ^Not Part of Split Sample
Satisfaction with police emergency response services is down, though a strong majority is still satisfied.

*(Total Satisfied)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Maintaining the City's public streets and roads</em></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^Repairing potholes</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a reasonable amount of reserve funding in the City budget</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the community for natural disasters</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining the cleanliness and general appearance of downtown</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining local parks</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and issuing permits for new residential construction and home remodels</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing police emergency response services</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. I am going to read you a list of some specific services provided by the City of Orinda. Please tell me whether you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of that service in the City of Orinda. ^Not Part of Split Sample, *Wording was Different in Previous Surveys
Three in five believe streets and roads have gotten better over the last few years.

In the last few years would you say that the overall quality of public streets and roads in the City of Orinda has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same?

- Much better: 30%
- Somewhat better: 32%
- About the same: 21%
- Somewhat worse: 9%
- Much worse: 5%
- Don't know: 3%

Total Better: 62%
Total Worse: 14%
The Ballot Measure
Ballot Measure Language Tested

Simple Majority Vote Threshold

Orinda Essential City Services Measure. To help maintain essential City services, including:

- ongoing repairs/maintenance to public roads and storm drains;
- restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek;
- emergency/natural disaster preparedness, including wildfire prevention/evacuation planning;

Shall the City of Orinda renew the existing half-cent sales tax and increase it by half-cent, providing $2.4 million annually (HALF SAMPLE: until ended by voters) (HALF SAMPLE: for 10 years), with financial audits and a citizens oversight committee?
Strong majorities of voters support such a measure, with slightly more intensity behind one that sunsets after 10 years.

Q2 Split A & Split B. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Nearly seven in ten Democrats back the measure, as do three in five independents.

**Combined Initial Vote by Party**

- **Democrats**
  - Def. Yes: 40%
  - Prob. Yes: 25%
  - Und., Lean Yes: 7%
  - Undecided: 8%
  - Und., Lean No: 16%
  - Total Yes: 68%
  - Total No: 26%

- **Independents**
  - Def. Yes: 29%
  - Prob. Yes: 31%
  - Undecided: 5%
  - Und., Lean No: 13%
  - Prob. No: 20%
  - Total Yes: 61%
  - Total No: 33%

- **Republicans**
  - Def. Yes: 20%
  - Prob. Yes: 26%
  - Undecided: 9%
  - Und., Lean No: 11%
  - Prob. No: 28%
  - Total Yes: 48%
  - Total No: 43%

Q2 Total. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Younger voters are more likely to support a measure.

Combined Initial Vote by Gender by Age

- **Men**
  - 18-54: 30% Def. Yes, 38% Prob. Yes, 13% Undecided, 12% Def. No
  - 55+: 34% Def. Yes, 22% Prob. Yes, 10% Undecided, 24% Def. No

- **Women**
  - 18-54: 38% Def. Yes, 27% Prob. Yes, 8% Undecided, 11% Def. No
  - 55+: 32% Def. Yes, 20% Prob. Yes, 11% Undecided, 26% Def. No

Q2 Total. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Those on City-maintained roads are more likely to favor a measure.

Combined Initial Vote by Change in Quality Public Roads & Type of Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Better</th>
<th>Total Worse</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Def. Yes</td>
<td>Prob. Yes</td>
<td>Und. Lean Yes</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Better</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same/Don't Know</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Worse</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City-Maintained
- Def. Yes: 35%
- Prob. Yes: 31%
- Und. Lean Yes: 5%
- Undecided: 9%
- Und. Lean No: 16%

Privately-Owned
- Def. Yes: 27%
- Prob. Yes: 14%
- Und. Lean Yes: 14%
- Undecided: 7%
- Und. Lean No: 34%

Q2 Total. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Higher-income households are more likely to say they would “definitely” back a measure.

**Combined Initial Vote by Household Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Def. Yes</th>
<th>Prob. Yes</th>
<th>Und., Lean Yes</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Und., Lean No</th>
<th>Prob. No</th>
<th>Def. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$150,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$250,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000+</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 Total. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Voters who support a measure broadly recognize the need to invest in infrastructure

In a few words of your own, why would you vote YES on this ballot measure?
(Open-ended; Asked of Yes Voters Only, N=269)

- Infrastructure needs repairing/needs to be maintained: 45%
- City needs improvement/help maintain the quality of life: 16%
- It is necessary/important/reasonable: 15%
- To help in fire control measure: 12%
- To help protect the wildlife/natural environment: 11%
- City needs the services: 9%
- It is just a small cost: 6%
- For emergency preparedness/disasters: 6%
- If the money will be spent wisely/oversight: 5%
- To help improve safety: 3%
- General in favor of the measure/support it: 3%
- People will benefit from it: 2%
- Need more info/need to know more: 2%
- It is for a good cause: 2%
- City needs the money: 2%
- Other: 8%
- Don't know/Refused: 2%
We need to do something about the wildfire problems.

We have roads that need repairs. We have problems with wildfire prevention.

You list some problems and issues that even once fixed, won't go away. They are items whose permanent funding should have been assured years ago. Orinda is worth it!

We maintain the value of our homes by keeping the infrastructure in excellent shape.

It supports the things that caused me to settle in Orinda.

Repairing roads is a high priority.

There are few if any other options to finance the projects listed and maintain or improve Orinda's quality of life.

We have to maintain our creeks to have safe drains to avoid floods when it is storming.

With the work we started with the 2012 tax measure and the ‘14 and ‘16 bond measures, we would be foolish to backslide on maintaining the roads that have been repaved with those funds. Plus we still have a lot of work to do on drains and similar infrastructure.

Q3a. In a few words of your own, why would you vote YES on this ballot measure?
Opponents of a measure largely object to taxes in general.

In a few words of your own, why would you vote **NO** on this ballot measure? (Open-ended; Asked of No Voters Only; N=137)

- Taxes already high/been paying too much taxes/against additional taxes: 54%
- City needs to spend money wisely/mismanagement of funds: 23%
- City has not figured out how to make private streets public: 13%
- No changes/improvement made within the city/nothing happens: 12%
- Should have more transparency on where the money goes: 6%
- Need to know more/need more info: 6%
- City has enough money: 4%
- Do not trust the Government/not doing their job: 2%
- Do not agree with the measure/unnecessary: 2%
- It will hurt local businesses/people will shop elsewhere: 1%
- Other: 6%

Opponents of a measure largely object to taxes in general.
We have way too many taxes. We need to remove some of them and not add anything.

We pay more than enough taxes. Taxes are too high right now.

There have been too many tax increases. They must stop.

Unless the money could ONLY be used for the purposes indicated and all prior ballot measures for the schools and roads be directed only towards those expenses. Why do we vote bond measure after bond measure and the roads and schools never get fixed????

My property tax bill has gone from $32K to $40k over the last couple years. Assessed value has been rising.

I live on a private road which is funded by myself and my neighbors. I therefore wouldn't receive as much benefit from this tax as someone who lives on a public road and doesn't need to fund the maintenance themselves.

I have not been convinced of the need for an increase rather than sustaining the tax.

I would vote yes on renewing the ½-cent tax but decline to increase it.

Q3b. In a few words of your own, why would you vote NO on this ballot measure?

I.1.c Packet Pg. 86
A half-cent sales tax has stronger and broader support compared with a full cent.

Q2 Total. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?

Q4. The structure of this measure has not been finalized. Instead of establishing a one-cent sales tax, it could continue the existing half-cent sales tax with no increase in taxes. If that were the case, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Investment Priorities
### Q10.
I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. Split Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring speedy emergency response</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire prevention</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing collapsing storm drains</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving public streets that are in poor condition</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully investing in the maintenance of public roads to minimize future costly repairs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving major City streets</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for natural disasters</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- Speedy emergency response and wildfire prevention are “extremely important” priorities for majorities of Orinda voters.

---

- **Q10.** I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. Split Sample

---

- Speedy emergency response and wildfire prevention are “extremely important” priorities for majorities of Orinda voters.
Q10. I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. Split Sample

- Replacing failing storm drains to prevent road flooding
  - Ext. Impt.: 29%
  - Very Impt.: 47%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 22%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 76%

- Maintaining vital City services
  - Ext. Impt.: 29%
  - Very Impt.: 46%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 19%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 76%

- Repairing public storm drains at the same time the roads are repaired
  - Ext. Impt.: 32%
  - Very Impt.: 42%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 22%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 75%

- Repaving public residential streets and roads
  - Ext. Impt.: 25%
  - Very Impt.: 49%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 21%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 74%

- Repairing streets to improve driver, pedestrian, and bicyclist safety
  - Ext. Impt.: 30%
  - Very Impt.: 36%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 25%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 67%

- Providing safe routes to schools
  - Ext. Impt.: 32%
  - Very Impt.: 35%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 25%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 66%

- Improving traffic safety on local streets
  - Ext. Impt.: 21%
  - Very Impt.: 38%
  - Smwt. Impt.: 30%
  - Ext./Very Impt.: 58%

Repairing storm drains, repaving roads, and improving safety are also key priorities.
### Parks and private storm drains are much lower priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining local parks</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting vital City services</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving public arterial and collector streets</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional police patrol coverage</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoring wildlife habitat along San Pablo Creek</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^Accepting ownership of private storm drains on private property, and making them part of the City's publicly-maintained storm drain system</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Community Park Master Plan</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing recreational opportunities such as a walking trail along San Pablo Creek</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. ^Not Part of Split Sample
Messaging and Movement
Support for a measure shifts very little as voters learn more from supporters and opponents.

*Simple Majority Vote Threshold*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Yes</th>
<th>Total No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Vote</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Support Statements</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Support and Critical Statements</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 Total, Q12 & Q14. If the election were held today, do you think you would vote “Yes” in favor of this measure, or “No” to oppose it?
Segmenting the Electorate by Intensity of Support

Consistent Definitely Yes
- Voters who consistently indicated they would definitely vote “yes” on the measure: disproportionately higher-income households, mothers, and older and female Democrats.

Ever No
- Voters who at any point in the survey indicated that they would vote “no” on the measure: disproportionately Republicans, those on private roads, and lower-income voters.

Swing
- Voters who do not fall into any of the other categories – remaining consistently undecided or switching positions: disproportionately voters under 30, and those without a college degree.
Statements Supporting a Measure  
*(Ranked in Order of Effectiveness)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements Supporting a Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(FUTURE COSTS)</strong> Delaying maintenance and repairs to Orinda's public roads and drains only increase costs in the long run. This measure will help repair roads and drains while construction costs are still relatively affordable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(SAFETY)</strong> This measure will improve the safety of Orinda's main public roads. By fixing deteriorating roads and preventing potholes, it will reduce damage to vehicles and help to prevent accidents that threaten the safety of drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(EXPIRING)</strong> This measure extends an existing tax the City has been using to pay for vital services. Without this measure, the City will have to find a way to raise more than $1 million a year just to prevent cuts to essential services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(TRACK RECORD)</strong> Since local voters first authorized this local sales tax to fund road improvements, it has finished all scheduled repairs on budget and ahead of schedule. This track record of success has been documented by the citizens' committee overseeing spending from the measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(CHILDREN)</strong> Safer roads mean safer conditions for everyone in our neighborhoods. In particular, this measure will invest in ensuring that children can walk and bike to school safely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(KEEP IMPROVING)</strong> Orinda's overall pavement condition has improved greatly over the last few years as the City has invested in road maintenance and improvements. Without this tax our roads will deteriorate again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(PROPERTY VALUE)</strong> By maintaining and improving public street and road conditions, this measure will help to protect property values for Orinda homeowners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(NO OTHER SOURCES)</strong> Unlike many cities in the Bay Area, Orinda does not have a utility users tax or business license tax, and has not increased its real property transfer tax on homeowners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. I am going to read some statements from people who support the measure. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to support it on a future ballot.
Highlighting the future cost of delaying action on repairs is persuasive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Convincing</th>
<th>Somewhat Convincing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Costs</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiring</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Record</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Improving</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Other Sources</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. I am going to read some statements from people who support the measure. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to support it on a future ballot.
Swing voters rank future costs, safety, and replacement of the expiring tax as the most-compelling rationales for support.  

*(Very Convincing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>All Voters</th>
<th>Alternate Targets</th>
<th>Type of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent Def. Yes</td>
<td>Swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Costs</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiring</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Record</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Improving</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Other Sources</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. I am going to read some statements from people who support the measure. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to support it on a future ballot.
Statements Opposing a Measure  
(Ranked in Order of Effectiveness)

*(FOREVER)* This measure will create a "forever tax." Local residents will be paying a one-cent sales tax from now on, whether or not the money is being used effectively or as promised.

*(HIDING)* We have already been asked three times in the last decade to fund street improvements, and they are likely to ask again in a few years. This piecemeal approach is designed to hide the true costs from voters.

*(TAXES)* The cost of living in the Bay Area is too high already, and there may be numerous other tax increases on next year's ballot, including other measures to fund transportation. We have hit our limit on taxes, and should vote no.

*(TRUST)* The City should find money in its existing budget, rather than raising taxes. And we simply can't trust City government to spend this money effectively and efficiently.
Highlighting that the tax does not have a sunset provision is somewhat compelling for opponents, as is asserting a piecemeal approach to funding is hiding the true cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Convincing</th>
<th>Somewhat Convincing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Forever</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiding</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. I am going to read some statements from people who oppose the measure. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to oppose it on a future ballot. *Split Sample
Q13. I am going to read some statements from people who oppose the measure. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to oppose it on a future ballot. *Split Sample

These messages hold the most sway with those already consistently opposed.

(Very Convincing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>All Voters</th>
<th>Alternate Targets</th>
<th>Type of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Def. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Forever</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiding</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views of Private Roads and Storm Drains
Voters are divided on the concept of a measure to repair and accept ownership of private roads.

As you may know, about 30 miles of Orinda roads are privately-owned. These roads are not maintained by the City. Most of these roads do not have gates that physically restrict access to the general public. All local residents, including those living on these privately-owned roads, pay existing City taxes that fund repairs to public roads. The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The concept is divisive across party lines, with slightly more opposition among Republicans.

Support for a Measure to Repair Private Roads by Party

- **Democrats**: 47% Support, 50% Oppose, 3% Don't Know (52% of Sample)
- **Independents**: 46% Support, 50% Oppose, 5% Don't Know (26% of Sample)
- **Republicans**: 42% Support, 53% Oppose, 5% Don't Know (22% of Sample)

Q15. The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City's publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?
Seven in ten privately-owned road residents support the measure to repair those roads.

Support for a Measure to Repair Private Roads by Type of Road

- **City-Maintained Privately-Owned**
  - Total Support: 38% (72% of Sample)
  - Total Oppose: 59%
  - Don't Know: 3%

- **Privately-Owned**
  - Total Support: 71%
  - Total Oppose: 25%
  - Don't Know: 4%

Q15. The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City's road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?
Voters next heard a brief exchange of pros and cons on the concept.

Here are statements from supporters and opponents of a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system.

**Supporters** say that people living on privately-owned roads pay the same taxes as their neighbors who live on City-maintained roads, but they do not get the same benefits. Their roads are open to public use. Supporters would like the benefit of regular maintenance and major repairs to their roads, especially in the event of a major disaster.

**Opponents** say that people who choose to live in homes on private roads knew what they were agreeing to when they bought their homes. They should continue to pay their own maintenance costs instead of the City having to take over responsibility and liability for their private roads.
Q15. The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?

Q16. Having heard this, would you support or oppose this ballot measure?
Voters then received additional context about the potential cost of this concept.

At this time, the potential cost of such a ballot measure is not known, because the City does not know the condition of the 30 miles of privately-owned roads. However, current estimates range from $5 million to $25 million. These costs would be funded through additional taxes to local residents.

Having heard this, let me ask you again: would you support or oppose a ballot measure to generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system? Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?
Q15, Q16 & Q17. The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?

These details increased opposition to nearly three in five.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Opinion</th>
<th>After Pro/Con</th>
<th>With Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Support
- Initial Opinion: 46%
- After Pro/Con: 45%
- With Cost Estimate: 36%

Total Oppose
- Initial Opinion: 50%
- After Pro/Con: 50%
- With Cost Estimate: 58%
On a different, but related subject: typically, storm water runoff from residences is directed to ditches or catch basins within public road rights of way that are maintained by the City. The collected street runoff is then usually sent through a storm drainpipe on private property into the nearest creek or water channel. It is the responsibility of the private property owner to maintain the storm drainpipe across their property, unless the City has accepted a drainage easement to maintain that specific storm drainpipe.

The City is considering a bond measure to take over ownership and maintenance of private storm drain pipes. Such a bond measure would likely cost at least $30 million, which equates to approximately $260 annually for the next 20 years for a property assessed at $1 million. Does this bond measure sound like something you would support or oppose?

- Strongly support: 14%
- Somewhat support: 27%
- Somewhat oppose: 23%
- Strongly oppose: 26%
- Don't know: 9%

Total Support: 41%
Total Oppose: 50%
Q18. The City is considering a bond measure to take over ownership and maintenance of private storm drains. Such a bond measure would likely cost at least $30 million, which equates to approximately $260 annually for the next 20 years for a property assessed at $1 million. Does this bond measure sound like something you would support or oppose?

Majorities of Democrats and Republicans oppose this concept; independents are split.

Support for a Measure to Repair Private Storm Drains by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(% of Sample)
A slim majority of those who live on private roads support the private storm drain measure concept.

Support for a Measure to Repair Private Storm Drains by Type of Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Road</th>
<th>Total Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City-Maintained</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately-Owned</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. The City is considering a bond measure to take over ownership and maintenance of private storm drains. Such a bond measure would likely cost at least $30 million, which equates to approximately $260 annually for the next 20 years for a property assessed at $1 million. Does this bond measure sound like something you would support or oppose?
Communications
Voters most frequently look to local newspapers and newsletters for Orinda news

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lamorinda Weekly</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda News</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City's quarterly Orinda Way printed newsletter</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information you receive in the mail</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City email alerts</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nextdoor.com website</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixle alerts</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weekly Orinda Outlook e-mail newsletter from the City</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The East Bay Times</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of Orinda's website</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19. I’m going to read you a list of sources from which people get information about local City of Orinda news. I’d like you to tell me how often you use it to get information about local City of Orinda news: frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never. Split Sample
Nixle, Nextdoor, and City email alerts are increasingly important information sources.

*(Frequently/Occasionally)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nixle alerts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>+38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City email alerts</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>+23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nextdoor.com website</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lamorinda Weekly</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City's quarterly Orinda Way printed newsletter</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of Orinda's website</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weekly Orinda Outlook e-mail newsletter from the City</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information you receive in the mail</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orinda News</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19. I’m going to read you a list of sources from which people get information about local City of Orinda news. I’d like you to tell me how often you use it to get information about local City of Orinda news: frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never. Split Sample
Conclusions
Conclusions

✓ A one-cent general-purpose sales tax measure for the City of Orinda appears viable, with broad majority support throughout an exchange of messaging.

✓ Orinda continues to be widely regarded as an excellent place to live, and voters express satisfaction with the delivery of City services.

✓ Satisfaction with the City’s streets and roads has grown substantially since 2016, though mostly in the “somewhat satisfied” category. Investments in local streets and roads are visible, but voters feel there’s more to be done.

✓ Wildfire prevention and emergency response times are a high-ranking priority for investment, followed by the condition of streets and roads.

✓ The public/private roads issue is divisive, with 50% opposing a measure to repair and accept ownership of private roads. Given a pro/con, these attitudes don’t shift; assigning an estimated price tag yields opposition from nearly three in five.

✓ The dynamic is similar for private storm drains.
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Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) recently completed a survey of Orinda voters likely to participate in the November 2020 election. The study found that a one-cent, general-purpose sales tax for the City of Orinda appears viable for this November’s election, with broad majority support; wildfire prevention, emergency response and road repairs are high priorities for investment from such a measure. Orinda continues to be widely regarded as an excellent place to live, and voters express satisfaction with the delivery of City services. Investments in local streets and roads have been visible, but voters feel there is more work to be done. The public/private roads issue is divisive.

Key specific findings of the survey include:

- **Perceptions of Orinda's quality of life are very positive, though intensity has eroded over time.** Orinda voters offer nearly universally positive ratings, with 96% calling life there "excellent" or "good." However, the share who give the highest rating of "excellent" has declined in the last few years to below a majority.

  ![Figure 1: Quality of Life Rating](image_url)

  **Figure 1: Quality of Life Rating**

  *Would you say that the overall quality of life in Orinda is excellent, good, only fair, or poor?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Only Fair/Poor/Don’t Know</th>
<th>Excellent/Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Voters continue to express satisfaction with the City’s delivery of services. More than two in five (44%) give the city "excellent" or "above average" ratings for service delivery, and fully 85% say those services are at least "average." This is fairly consistent with ratings over the last several years.

Figure 2: Orinda Voter Perceptions of City Service Delivery

Overall, how would you rate the job being done by the City of Orinda in providing basic services and taking care of the needs of Orinda residents? Would you say the City of Orinda is doing an excellent job, above average job, average job, below average job, or poor job?

- Strong majorities of voters support a general-purpose sales tax measure, with slightly more intensity behind one that sunsets after 10 years. As shown in Figure 3, nearly three in five (59%) support an ongoing one-cent general purpose sales tax; nearly two-thirds (64%) support the measure that sunsets after 10 years. In either case, more voters say they would "definitely" vote yes than even softly oppose a measure, and fewer than one in ten are undecided.

Figure 3: Support for a One-Cent Sales Tax Measure

Orinda Essential City Services Measure. To help maintain essential City services, including: ongoing repairs/ maintenance to public roads and storm drains; restoring wildlife habitat and recreation along San Pablo Creek; emergency/ natural disaster preparedness, including wildfire prevention/ evacuation planning; shall the City of Orinda renew the existing half-cent sales tax and increase it by half-cent, providing $2.4 million annually (HALF SAMPLE: until ended by voters) (HALF SAMPLE: for 10 years), with financial audits and a citizens oversight committee?
Most voters rate speedy emergency response and wildfire prevention as “extremely important” priorities for investment of funds from such a measure. As shown in Figure 4 below, very broad majorities also call basic infrastructure repairs "extremely" or "very important."

**Figure 4: Top Investment Priorities**

I am going to read you a list of specific City projects and services that could be funded by the measure. Recognizing that there will not be enough funding to complete all of these projects, please tell me how important each one is to you: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>% Extremely Important</th>
<th>% Extremely/Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring speedy emergency response</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire prevention</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing collapsing storm drains</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving public streets that are in poor condition</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully investing in the maintenance of public roads to minimize future costly repairs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving major City streets</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for natural disasters</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing failing storm drains to prevent road flooding</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining vital City services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing public storm drains at the same time the roads are repaired</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, three in five believe streets and roads have gotten better over the last few years. Fully 62% of Orinda voters believe the overall quality of public streets and roads in the City has gotten better, and 30% say it is "much better" (as shown in Figure 5 on the next page). Paired with the high priority voters continue to assign to repaving local streets and roads, these findings indicate that voters clearly see progress, but also more work to be done in this area.
Figure 5: Perception of Changes in Road Quality

In the last few years would you say that the overall quality of public streets and roads in the City of Orinda has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same?

- Much better: 30%
- Somewhat better: 32%
- About the same: 21%
- Somewhat worse: 9%
- Much worse: 5%
- Don't know: 3%

Total Better: 62%
Total Worse: 14%

Figure 6: Support for a Measure to Repair and Accept Ownership of Private Roads

As you may know, about 30 miles of Orinda roads are privately-owned. These roads are not maintained by the City. Most of these roads do not have gates that physically restrict access to the general public. All local residents, including those living on these privately-owned roads, pay existing City taxes that fund repairs to public roads. The City is considering a ballot measure that would generate funding to repair and accept ownership of private roads into the City’s publicly-maintained road system. Does this sound like something you would support or oppose?

- Strongly support: 20%
- Somewhat support: 25%
- Somewhat oppose: 24%
- Strongly oppose: 27%
- Don't know: 4%

Total Support: 46%
Total Oppose: 50%

Voters next heard a brief, balanced exchange of pros and cons on the idea, which did little to shift overall patterns of support. Forty-five percent support the proposal and 50% oppose it. Providing the context of an estimated cost ("current estimates range from $5 million to $25 million") increased opposition to 58%.

- Voters are divided on the concept of a measure to repair and accept ownership of private roads. Given a brief description of the concept of a ballot measure to generate funding to repair roads that are currently privately owned, Orinda voters oppose it by a narrow margin (just four points). Notably, opponents of the idea are more likely to feel strongly (27% "strongly oppose") than are supporters (20% "strongly support.")
In sum, Orinda voters are largely pleased with their quality of live and the City's delivery of services. They see improvements in road repairs, but nonetheless back increased investment in improvements (as well as in natural disaster preparedness and public safety) through an increase in the City's sales tax. There does not appear to be a broad appetite to accept ownership of the City's private roads into the publicly-maintained road system.

1 Methodology: From Jan. 31-Feb. 6, 2020, FM3 conducted 436 telephone (cell and landline) and online interviews with registered voters in Orinda likely to participate in the November 2020 election. The margin of sampling error is +/- 4.9% at the 95% confidence interval. Due to rounding, some percentages do not add up to 100.
April 24, 2020

The Honorable Steve Glazer
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5108
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Senate Bill 1349 (Glazer)
Support from the City of Orinda

Dear Senator Glazer:

On behalf of the City of Orinda, we would like to thank you for authoring SB 1349 and express our strong support. We appreciate the time and effort you have afforded us, including Concord and Contra Costa County, to discuss this important issue that impacts almost all of the local jurisdictions in your district.

Senate Bill 1349 makes important changes to existing law regarding a city or county's ability to levy a transaction and use tax for general or specific purposes, subject to certain limitations and express voter approval requirements.

This bill does not in any way alter the existing requirement that any new or additional transactions and use tax be submitted to the voters for approval, nor does the bill raise the existing 2% cap. Rather the bill simply clarifies existing law for purposes of the current 2% cap on the combined rate of all taxes. This bill would mirror similar laws already passed related to Alameda County when their public agencies faced similar issues with the 2% cap.

Because this bill will provide Contra Costa County with the tools needed to generate funding for critical services, provides the option as to when any additional transactions and use tax can be submitted to the voters, and in light of the massive economic impacts placed on local government due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we strongly support your legislation and commend your leadership during such trying times.

The City of Orinda Council is still considering placing a future transaction and use tax this November or in two years. Your legislation will help our City maintain its ability to let our voters decide for taxes to benefit Orinda regardless of other past (CCTA, BART) or future (County) regional tax measures.

Sincerely,

Darlene K. Gee
City of Orinda
An act to amend Section 4213 of the Public Resources Code, relating to fire prevention. An act to amend Sections 29140 and 180201 of the Public Utilities Code, and to amend Section 7291 of, and to add Chapter 3.94 (commencing with Section 7299.2) to Part 1.7 of Division 2 of, the Revenue and Taxation Code, relating to taxation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 1349, as amended, Glazer. State responsibility area fire prevention fees. Transactions and use taxes: County of Contra Costa.

Existing law authorizes various specified cities and counties, subject to certain limitations and approval requirements, to levy a transactions and use tax for general or specific purposes, in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in the Transactions and Use Tax Law. A provision of the Transactions and Use Tax Law prohibits the combined rate of all taxes that may be imposed in accordance with that law in a county from exceeding 2%.

Existing law, the Local Transportation Authority and Improvement Act, generally authorizes a county board of supervisors to create or otherwise designate a transportation authority in the county that may impose a transactions and use tax at a rate not to exceed 1% for specified county streets and highway projects or public transit projects, in conformity with the Transaction and Use Tax Law, if the tax ordinance is adopted by a 2/3 vote of the authority and if the ordinance is subsequently approved by a majority of the voters. Existing law, before January 1, 2021, also authorizes the Contra Costa Transportation Authority to impose a transactions and use tax at a rate not to exceed 1% for specified county streets and highway projects or public transit projects in Contra Costa County. This act authorizes the County of Contra Costa, by adopts a tax ordinance at a rate not to exceed 1% for specified county streets and highway projects or public transit projects, which is subsequently approved by a majority of the voters.

February 21, 2020
Authority to impose a transactions and use tax for the support of countywide transportation programs at a rate of no more than 0.5% that, in combination with other transactions and use taxes, exceeds the above-described combined rate limit of 2%, if certain requirements are met, including a requirement that the ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax be submitted to, and approved by, the voters.

Existing law, the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Act, creates the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, which comprises a territory that includes the County of Contra Costa, and, among other things, authorizes the board of directors of the district to impose transactions and use taxes in conformity with the Transactions and Use Tax Law for specified purposes, subject to periodic legislative review and amendment, as provided.

This bill would provide that, notwithstanding the combined rate limit under the Transactions and Use Tax Law, neither a transaction and use tax rate imposed in the County of Contra Costa by the transportation authority for those county streets and highway projects, public transit projects, or countywide transportation programs nor a transactions and use tax rate imposed by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, as specified, will be considered for purposes of that combined rate limit within the County of Contra Costa. The bill would declare that the changes made with regard to taxes imposed by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority for countywide transportation programs are declaratory of existing law.

This bill would also authorize the County of Contra Costa to impose a transactions and use tax in conformity with the Transactions and Use Tax Law for general or specific purposes to support countywide programs at a rate of no more than 0.50% that, in combination with other transactions and use taxes, would exceed the above-described combined rate limit of 2% if certain requirements are met, including a requirement that the ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax be submitted to, and approved by, the voters. The bill would provide that, notwithstanding the combined rate limit under the Transactions and Use Tax Law, a transaction and use tax rate imposed in the County of Contra Costa imposed pursuant to the authority provided by this bill will not be considered for purposes of that combined rate limit within the County of Contra Costa.

This bill would make legislative findings and declarations as to the necessity of a special statute for the County of Contra Costa.
Existing law provides that the state has the primary financial responsibility for preventing and suppressing fires in areas that the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection has determined are state responsibility areas, as defined. Existing law, until July 1, 2017, required that a fire prevention fee be charged on each habitable structure on a parcel that is within a state responsibility area, to be used for specified fire prevention activities, and prescribed procedures for the collection and processing of the fees by the State Board of Equalization. Existing law requires the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to provide to the State Board of Equalization certain information, including a contact number for the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to be printed on a bill for the fee to respond to questions about the fee. Existing law repeals those provisions requiring the payment of the fee on January 1, 2031.

In 2017, the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration and the Office of Tax Appeals were established, and existing law transferred many of the tax and fee administration and appeals of taxes and fees from the State Board of Equalization to the department and the office, respectively.

This bill would change the reference in the fire prevention fee provisions from the “State Board of Equalization” to the “California Department of Tax and Fee Administration” or the “Office of Tax Appeals,” as appropriate. The bill would require the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to provide the above information to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration. The bill would additionally require the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to provide the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection’s internet website information regarding the fee to be printed on the bill.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 29140 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:

29140. (a) The board shall, by ordinance, impose transactions and use taxes in conformity with Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the purposes specified in Sections 29142 and 29142.2, subject to periodic legislative review and amendment.
(b) (1) Notwithstanding Section 7251.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, a transactions and use tax rate imposed pursuant to subdivision (a) on or before the effective date of the act adding this subdivision January 1, 2020, that applies within the County of Alameda shall not be considered for purposes of the combined rate limit within the County of Alameda established by that section.

(2) Notwithstanding Section 7251.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, a transactions and use tax rate imposed pursuant to subdivision (a) on or before the effective date of the act adding this subdivision that applies within the County of Contra Costa shall not be considered for purposes of the combined rate limit within the County of Contra Costa established by that section.

SEC. 2. Section 180201 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:

180201. (a) (1) A retail transactions and use tax ordinance applicable in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of a county may be imposed by the authority in accordance with this chapter and Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, if the tax ordinance is adopted by a two-thirds vote of the authority and imposition of the tax is subsequently approved by a majority of the electors voting on the measure, or by any otherwise applicable voter approval requirement, at a special election called for that purpose by the board of supervisors, at the request of the authority, and a county transportation expenditure plan is adopted pursuant to Section 180206.

(2) A transactions and use tax approved by the electors pursuant to this subdivision shall remain in effect for the period of time specified in the tax ordinance. The tax may be continued in effect, or reimposed, by a tax ordinance adopted by a two-thirds vote of the authority and the reimposition of the tax is approved by any applicable majority of the electors.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 7251.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, a transactions and use tax rate imposed pursuant to subdivision (a) in the County of Contra Costa shall not be considered for purposes of the combined rate limit within the County of Contra Costa established by that section.

SEC. 3. Section 7291 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is amended to read:
7291. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority may impose a transactions and use tax for the support of countywide transportation programs at a rate of no more than 0.5 percent that would, in combination with all taxes imposed pursuant to Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251), exceed the limit established in Section 7251.1, if all of the following requirements are met:

1. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority adopts an ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax by any applicable voting approval requirement.
2. The ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax is submitted to the electorate and is approved by the voters voting on the ordinance pursuant to Article XIII C of the California Constitution.
3. The transactions and use tax conforms to the Transactions and Use Tax Law, Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251), other than Section 7251.1.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding Section 7251.1, a transactions and use tax rate imposed pursuant to subdivision (a) shall not be considered for purposes of the combined rate limit established by Section 7251.1.

(2) This subdivision does not constitute a change in, but is declaratory of, existing law.

SEC. 4. Chapter 3.94 (commencing with Section 7299.2) is added to Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read:

CHAPTER 3.94. LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE IN THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

7299.2. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, the County of Contra Costa may impose a transactions and use tax for general or specific purposes to support countywide programs at a rate of no more than 0.5 percent that would, in combination with all taxes imposed in accordance with the Transactions and Use Tax Law (Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251)), exceed the limit
established in Section 7251.1, if all of the following requirements are met:

(1) The county adopts an ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax by any applicable voting approval requirement.

(2) The ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax is submitted to the electorate and is approved by the voters voting on the ordinance pursuant to Article XIII C of the California Constitution.

(3) The transactions and use tax conforms to the Transactions and Use Tax Law (Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251)), other than Section 7251.1.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 7251.1, a transactions and use tax rate imposed pursuant to subdivision (a) shall not be considered for purposes of the combined rate limit established by Section 7251.1.

SEC. 5. The Legislature finds and declares that a special statute is necessary and that a general statute cannot be made applicable within the meaning of Section 16 of Article IV of the California Constitution because of the unique fiscal pressures being experienced in the County of Contra Costa.

SECTION 1. Section 4213 of the Public Resources Code is amended to read:

4213. (a) (1) Commencing with the 2011–12 fiscal year, the fire prevention fee imposed pursuant to Section 4212 shall be collected annually by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration in accordance with the Fee Collection Procedures Law (Part 30 (commencing with Section 55001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code).

(2) Notwithstanding the appeal provisions in the Fee Collection Procedures Law, a determination by the department that a person is required to pay a fire prevention fee, or a determination by the department regarding the amount of that fee, is subject to review under Article 2 (commencing with Section 4220) and is not subject to a petition for redetermination by the Office of Tax Appeals.

(3) (A) Notwithstanding the refund provisions in the Fee Collection Procedures Law, the Office of Tax Appeals shall not accept any claim for refund that is based on the assertion that a determination by the department improperly or erroneously calculated the amount of the fire prevention fee, or incorrectly determined that the person is subject to that fee, unless that
determination has been set aside by the department or a court reviewing the determination of the department.

(B) If it is determined by the department or a reviewing court that a person is entitled to a refund of all or part of the fire prevention fee, the person shall make a claim to the Office of Tax Appeals pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 55221) of Part 30 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(b) The annual fire prevention fee shall be due and payable 30 days from the date of assessment by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration.

(c) On or before each January 1, the department shall annually transmit to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration the appropriate name and address of each person who is liable for the fire prevention fee and the amount of the fee to be assessed, as authorized by this article, and at the same time the department shall provide to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration the board’s internet website information and a contact telephone number for the board to be printed on the bill to respond to questions about the fee.

(d) Commencing with the 2012–13 fiscal year, if in any given fiscal year there are sufficient amounts of money in the State Responsibility Area Fire Prevention Fund created pursuant to Section 4214 to finance the costs of the programs under subdivision (d) of Section 4214 for that fiscal year, the fee may not be collected that fiscal year.
AGENDA TITLE: Discussion of the Draft Capital Improvement Plan Fiscal Years 2020-2024

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the City Council conduct its first review and discussion of the to the City's rolling five year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2020-2024. Staff will seek comments on the preliminary annual update as part of the development of the CIP. **No action is being taken to approve projects or appropriate funds.** The information obtained from this meeting will be used to develop the next Draft of the CIP. The City Council will have additional opportunities to review and provide input in the next two months along with the mid-year budget adjustments before the CIP is approved. Staff recommends an additional $110,000 from one-time Miner Road Sinkhole reimbursement funds that were originally intended for new capital improvement projects be transferred to the City's General Fund Emergency Reserve Fund.

CIP PLANNING PROCESS IN UNCERTAIN TIMES

Staff believe it is important to acknowledge that the impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic are going to have an impact on City resources. As the CIP is developed Staff will be updating the information to reflect these impacts.

The CIP is a financial planning document which relies on estimates of available resources. The plan then presents a road map balancing the various funding needs over numerous proposed projects, to ensure sufficient funding exists to accomplish its goals. For Capital Projects it is important to look beyond one year. In some cases the City may have accumulated funds over multiple years or it may still be in a saving mode to address critical deficiencies.

As with any “plan” it is not uncommon to make adjustments based on current conditions. This initial discussion of the CIP and the schedule for its projects is assuming the health order restrictions from COVID-19 will be concluding within 60 +/- days. This year the CIP process will be quite dynamic given the difficulty to forecast the effects and duration of the shelter-in-place orders which limit construction activity, combined with future revenue reductions from the downturn in the economy.

Even after the CIP is approved in June 2020, if further reductions in revenue or additional shelter-in-place orders occur again, the City Council will still have the opportunity to postpone or cancel projects on an individual case by case basis prior to authorizing a major expenditure (over $25,000). Staff will be monitoring the conditions and updating the City Council at key milestones such as: Prior to soliciting bids; and Prior to awarding contracts.
BACKGROUND:
The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) identifies projects and funding sources for long-term investments that are designed to protect, preserve, and enhance the City's infrastructure, extend the useful service life of public facilities and improve or enhance delivery of City services. The City Council annually discusses priorities, overall funding of future projects, and new projects to be added to the CIP.

The City Council last approved a CIP on June 18, 2019, for the five-year period FY 2019-2023. Generally in the spring, City Staff meets with the City Council to present proposed changes to the CIP which includes a summary of new projects, scheduling or fiscal changes to current projects, and removal of completed or discontinued projects. Based on input from the City Council and the public this will be used to prepare a proposed updated CIP that will be presented to the City Council in May 2020.

When the item is discussed next with the City Council, the draft document will include more detail about each project in terms of an updated cost estimate, proposed funding, and the preliminary timing expected each of the projects. The final document presented for adoption is typically considered by the City Council in June. Programming for multiple years enables the five-year CIP to be used as a planning tool to identify future projects, evaluate the costs and benefits of those proposed projects, and plan for funding of projects that extend beyond 1-2 years.

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of this item is to receive input from the City Council (concurrence and/or direction) on each of the lists A-F before staff proceeds with analyses of the CIP projects, which includes balancing the various fund sources to ensure minimum levels are maintained. To make these analyses more efficient, City Council’s preliminary input will be valuable as it will provide guidance to staff on which projects to prioritize. Staff have separated the potential projects into the categories as described below.

Two items that should be noted in reviewing the project lists are:

1. One-time funding utilization: this concerns the recent Miner Road sinkhole reimbursement from FEMA of $2,243,500. The recommendations have changed in the past month. As originally presented at the Mid-year budget review at the March 3, 2020 City Council meeting, the one-time reimbursement amount was allocated into three categories: 1) $480,000 allocated to Reserves and Internal Service Funds; 2) $1,350,000 allocated to current capital projects as noted below in Summary Table D and; 3) $413,500 was considered as available for other new capital projects.

Given the ensuing COVID-19 pandemic and its negative economic impact, Staff is recommending changes to allocations previously presented. Of the $413,500 available for new projects (#3 above), Staff proposes only utilizing $303,500 for capital projects as shown below with gray highlight, and leaving another $110,000 available for Reserves.
2. Drainage Impact Fees (Fund 210): In light of the significant needs identified in the City’s Storm Drain Repair Plan, Staff proposes utilizing this Fund to the maximum extent practicable, which would draw it down to a near zero balance. The detailed analyses in the next phase of the CIP process will quantify the impacts.

**Category Descriptions** (see Summary Tables below for recommendations, and see Attachments for complete project listings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>New Projects with funding identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>New Projects – recommended funding shown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>New Projects – no funding available at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Current CIP Projects – see recommended changes in Summary Table below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Unfunded CIP Projects list – this is updated each year. Some projects moved to other Categories, and new projects are added (from B (if no funding is approved) and C above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Potential Projects list - this is updated each year. Some projects are moved or deleted and some new ones are added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables show project summaries and recommendations in each category. For details on the projects, refer to the attachments which list the projects in each category.

Due to the uncertainty with future funding related to COVID-19, Staff has denoted below the projects with an * asterisk next to the Project No. that we recommend would be the first to be considered for postponement or cancellation due to lack of funding. (This first appears in List B). Projects using restricted funds such as gas tax or traffic impact fees, would still proceed provided there is an adequate balance, since those funds have a restricted and limited use.

### (A) Proposed New Projects with funding identified – Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Fund Source (Fund #)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation on El Toyonal, Oak Flat Rd. and La Espiral</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Add-on Sales Tax (105)</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>2023 Annual Pavement Project</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Various (*). Note this will be last year for Add-on Sales Tax</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>Moraga Way &amp; Coral Drive Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (2022)</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Drainage Impact Fees (210)</td>
<td>$970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>Ivy Dr. 48&quot; SD Pipe Lining</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Drainage Impact Fees (210)</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (A) Proposed New Projects with funding identified – Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Fund Source (Fund #)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>Flashing beacons - Glorieta Crosswalk at Virginia Dr.</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Traffic Impact Fees (205)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6</td>
<td>Moraga Way Pathway (El Camino Moraga to Altamount)</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>TDA Grant (263), Traffic Impact Fees (205)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7</td>
<td>Solar Panels and Battery Back-up for the Orinda Community Center</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>State OES Grant (260), $217,551 &amp; One-Time funding (700), $100,000</td>
<td>$317,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Add-on Sales Tax (105), Gas Tax (200), Garbage Co. Road Maint. Fees (335), CCTA Return To Source (330)

### (B) New Projects – recommended funding shown - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Possible Funding Source (Fund #)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Replace/Repair Sewer Line through Community Center Driveway</td>
<td>One-Time funding (700)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2*</td>
<td>Extend the Fence and Add Gate Around Wilder Field 4</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3*</td>
<td>Crosswalk on Orindawoods Dr. at Kite Hill Rd.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4*</td>
<td>Upgrade drainage ditch at 25 La Cuesta</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5*</td>
<td>Murals Along Camino Pablo Near State Route 24 (seed money-only spend if 100% match from other sources)</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal One-Time funding - (700) $213,500

### (C) New Projects – No Funding available at this time - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>Replace Roof Covering on Wilder Ranch House</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>Rheem Boulevard Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (2023)- Storm Drain Repair - Group 1</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>Various Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (2024) - Group 2</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>Various Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (Group 3)</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5</td>
<td>Various Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (Group 4)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.6</td>
<td>Various Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (Group 5)</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.7</td>
<td>Various Storm Drain Pipe Repairs (Group 6)</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (C) New Projects – No Funding available at this time - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.8</td>
<td>Sandblast &amp; Paint Pedestrian Overcrossing Hwy. 24 on-ramp (end of Orinda Way)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.9</td>
<td>Vashell Way Pedestrian Activation</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (D) Current CIP Projects - Recommended Changes - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4140*</td>
<td>Martha Rd./Catherine Place Ped. Path</td>
<td>Fully fund project using One-Time funding- Sinkhole reimbursement. The financial condition of the City can be considered before the project is bid for construction in FY 20/21</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108</td>
<td>City Hall Stabilization</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>City Hall Water Leak</td>
<td>Emergency work Nov. 2019</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal One-Time funding - (700), approved at Mid Year Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4154</td>
<td>Ichabod Ln. Drainage</td>
<td>Move project to unfunded category E as now estimated at $425,000 vs. funding of $50,000 Dr. Impact Fees (210)</td>
<td>$(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4135</td>
<td>Ivy Dr. &amp; Miner Rd./Honey Hill Rd. Bike Route</td>
<td>Move to Potential Project category F as grant was not received. Free up $5,000 TIF matching funds</td>
<td>$(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4159</td>
<td>San Pablo Creek Restoration</td>
<td>Move to Unfunded Project category E as grant was not received. Frees up General &amp; Long Term Planning funds (612)</td>
<td>$(25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4163</td>
<td>Downtown Precise Plan</td>
<td>Project 4158 Design Standards scope has now been incorporated into Downtown Precise Plan</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4149</td>
<td>Replace Natural Grass Turf at Wilder Field 3</td>
<td>Move to Unfunded Project category E as a low priority. Free up Wilder Endow. (340)</td>
<td>$(200,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Categories Summary for Recommended use of One-Time Reimbursement $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.7</td>
<td>Solar Panels ($ was allotted to Generator)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1-B.6</td>
<td>See projects listed above</td>
<td>$213,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See first three projects on List D; these are projects already included in CIP last year that needed additional funding $1,350,000

Reserve and Internal Service Fund per Mid-Year Budget discussion on 3/3/20 $480,000

Additional $ for Reserves (Not Used for New Project) $100,000

Total $2,243,500

(E) Unfunded CIP Projects – Recommended Changes - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7013</td>
<td>Oak Park – Donald Dr. Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>Move to Potential Project category F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art project on walkway over on/off ramp (Pedestrian Overcrossing at end of Orinda Way)</td>
<td>Move and expand into “Murals along Camino Pablo near State Route 24” project in category B above (B.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vashell Way Pedestrian Activation</td>
<td>Move and expand to category C above (C.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Terrace Area Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Project scope adjusted to reflect Connect Orinda Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F) Potential Projects – Recommended Changes - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ped. Walkway along Moraga Way</td>
<td>Move portion of this project to New Funded Project category A (A.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Oaks Circle/Orchard Rd. 60” Culvert (PL-513) Replacement</td>
<td>Move and merge into Various Storm Drain Pipe Repair Project (2024) in Category B (B.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley Guardrail/Embankment Stabilization</td>
<td>Move to Unfunded category E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEXT STEPS:
Staff will follow the direction given by the City Council and address/incorporate any comments into the draft of the FY 2020-2024 CIP to be reviewed by Council in May 2020. Staff will further analyze the selected projects, and determine impact to the funding sources and the fund balances and show this information in the draft CIP. This includes updating estimates of revenues with projections on the impacts from the Covid 19 pandemic.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Project budgets, cost estimates, project funding sources, and funding balances are preliminary and will be refined and presented as part of the draft CIP as noted above.
• No funding is being appropriated by the City Council this item is for preliminary review only.
• No new projects are approved to move forward.
• It is recommended that Staff be directed to transfer $110,000 from the one-time reimbursement for Miner Road currently in General Capital – Fund 700 to the General Fund reserves.

ATTACHMENTS:
A. New CIP Projects -funding identified (A)
B. New CIP Projects -funding TBD (B)
C. New CIP Projects-unfunded (C)
D. Current CIP Funded Projects
E. Master Unfunded CIP Project List (List E)
F. Potential Projects (List F)

Respectfully Submitted by:
Larry Theis
Assistant City Manager/PW Director

Prepared By: Sheri Smith, City Clerk

Approved by:

Steve Salomon, City Manager  4/10/2020
Projects to be considered to be added into CIP as Funded Project: The order of these projects does NOT represent priority.

Public Works Dept. /Transportation Projects

A1. **Pavement rehabilitation on El Toyonal, Oak Flat Rd. and La Espiral.**

Description/Notes: Due to utility company replacement work (EBMUD water mains on El Toyonal and La Espiral and CCCSD sewer main on Oak Flat Rd.), repaving work on these streets has been delayed. These streets were part of the 2019 annual paving project and now are included in a separate project to be performed when the utility company work is completed, estimated to be summer 2022. The design work has already been completed.

Cost: $900,000

Recommendation: Add to CIP as a funded project to be funded by Orinda Add-on Sales Tax (Fund 105).

A2. **2023 Annual Pavement Project**

Description/Notes: To maintain road pavement, the City utilizes a Pavement Management System which uses data based on actual pavement condition to schedule maintenance treatments on a road by road basis. Using these results, a list of Streets is determined in coordination with the CIOC. This annual pavement project will consist of various road treatments such as crack sealing, slurry seal, mill and overlay. Funding is by combination of the Orinda Add-on Sales Tax, Gas Tax, CCTA Return to Source, and Road Maintenance Fees (Solid Waste Provider).

Cost: $3,000,000

Recommendation: Add to CIP as a funded project to be funded by Orinda Add-on Sales Tax, Gas Tax, CCTA Return to Source, and Road Maintenance Fees (Solid Waste Provider). Orinda Add-on Sales Tax (Fund 105).

A3. **Moraga Way & Coral Drive Culvert Repairs (2022)**

Description/Notes: The storm drain culverts listed below are in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the City’s Storm Drain Plan. The culverts will require replacement or rehabilitation and obtaining regulatory permits (which may take one year).

- 95 Coral Drive (PL-927)
- 188 Moraga Way (PL-454)
- 3 Risa Court (PL-898)

Cost: $966,900

Recommendation: Add to CIP as funded project, to be funded by the Drainage Impact Fee Fund (Fund #210).
Attachment A

STAFF RECOMMENDED NEW CIP PROJECT LIST

A4. Ivy Dr. 48" Pipe Lining

Description/Notes: Repair a deteriorated storm drain pipe crossing Ivy Dr. near Descanso. This corrugated metal pipe has holes in the invert and debris buildup near the outlet. The repair will likely consist of cleaning out the debris, grading the creek bed at the outlet and lining the pipe. Regulatory permits will be required. The pipe extends under private property and Staff is in discussion with owner regarding their participation in the repairs of the private portion.

Cost: $170,000

Recommendation: Add to CIP as funded project, to be funded by the Drainage Impact Fee Fund (Fund #210).

Public Works Dept./Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects

A5. Install flashing beacons at existing crosswalk on Glorietta Blvd. at Virginia Dr.

Description/Notes: Install solar powered RRFB’s (rectangular rapid flashing beacons) at the existing crosswalk at this location. The system would be activated by push buttons on each side. Orinda has three other similar systems in use. This project was requested by the public through TSAC, who then recommended it be included in the CIP.

Cost: $50,000

Recommendation: Add to CIP as a funded project to be funded by TIF.

A6. Moraga Way Pathway (El Camino Moraga and Altamount Dr.)

Description/Notes: Provide separated pedestrian pathway on west side of Moraga Way from El Camino Moraga and Altamount Dr. utilizing a six-inch high asphalt berm (dike).

Cost: $250,000

Recommendation: Add to CIP as a funded project to be funded partially by TDA grant funds, which Staff has applied for. Grant review committee recommendation is to provide $130,00 in TDA funds, which will require local funding of $120,000 from Transportation Impact Fees (Fund #205).

Parks & Recreation Dept./Facilities

A7. Solar Panels and Battery Back-up for the Orinda Community Center

Description/Notes: Effectively outfit the Orinda Community Center with solar panels and battery back-up system in order to maintain certain facility operations during a power outage.

Cost: $317,000

Recommendation: Add to CIP as a funded project to be funded by $217,551 grant funds from the State OES 2019-20 Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) Resiliency Allocation to Cities and $100,000 from one time sinkhole reimbursement funds.
ATTACHMENT B

STAFF RECOMMENDED BUT INADEQUATE FUNDING NEW CIP PROJECT LIST

Projects to be considered to be added into CIP as Funded Project but has inadequate funding sources:
The order of these projects does NOT represent priority.

Parks & Recreation Dept./Facilities

B.1 Replace/Repair Sewer Line through Community Center Driveway

Description/Notes: Replace/repair an approximate 150 foot sewer line running from the northwest corner of the community center to Orinda Way. Video footage shows multiple breaks.
Cost: $50,000
Recommendation: Add to CIP as funded project. Fund using one-time sinkhole reimbursement.

B.2 Extend the Fence and Add Gate Around Wilder Field 4 and Art & Garden Center

Description/Notes: Extend the existing 4-ft. black coated chain link fence partially surrounding Wilder Field 4 by approximately 700 feet to extend up Big Leaf Road past the mail kiosk and add a 6 ft. double-gate across the existing EVA.
Cost: $37,000
Recommendation: Add to CIP as funded project. Fund using one-time sinkhole reimbursement.

Public Works Dept.

B3. Crosswalk on Orindawoods Dr. at Kite Hill Rd.

Description/Notes: Place a new crosswalk at this location: install solar powered RRFB’s (rectangular rapid flashing beacons), stripe a ladder-type crosswalk and construct a new curb ramp on the east side of Orindawoods Dr. The system would be activated by push buttons on each side. Orinda has three other similar systems in use. This project was requested by the public through TSAC, who then recommended it be included in the CIP.
Cost: $75,000
Recommendation: Add to CIP as funded project. Fund using one-time sinkhole reimbursement.

B4. Upgrade drainage ditch at 25 La Cuesta

Description/Notes: A failing, shallow, cobble rock lined ditch at this location needs upgrading (with a deeper ditch) so that overflow will not flood adjacent properties.
Cost: $31,500
Recommendation: Add to CIP as funded project. Fund using one-time sinkhole reimbursement.
Planning Dept.

**B.5 Murals Along Camino Pablo Near State Route 24**

**Description/Notes:** Create murals along Camino Pablo near State Route 24 and Vashell Way. This includes the pedestrian bridges between the two sides of Downtown and BART (as shown on pages 61-62 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). The Vashell Way mural would be located on the south-east wall of the Casa Orinda building (as shown on page 40 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). This project includes funding for the community process of selecting qualified artists as well as partial funding for the murals.

**Cost:** $10,000

**Recommendation:** Add to CIP as funded project using one-time sinkhole reimbursement. The intent is to use the city funding as seed money to be used as matching funds for community fundraising. Staff will outreach to the community groups for possible partnerships and potential philanthropic giving to fully fund the mural art desired by the community. City funds will only be used if such matching funds are obtained.
 attachment C

Staff recommended projects to be added to the unfunded project list “E”

Projects recommended to be added to the Unfunded CIP Projects List: The order of these projects does NOT represent priority.

Parks & Recreation Dept. /Facilities

C.1 Replace the Roof Covering on the Wilder Ranch House

Description/Notes: Replace the existing wood shake roof covering on the Wilder Ranch that has exceeded its useful life with a compliant alternative material.

Cost: $25,000

Public Works Dept. /Transportation Projects

(Note Storm Drain Repair Groups are organized by priority based on the City’s Storm Drain Repair Plan, 2019, with Group 1 being the highest priority in this unfunded list)

C2. Rheem Boulevard Culvert Repair (2023) - Storm Drain Repair - NGroup 1

Description/Notes: This culvert (PL-492), located near 15 Rheem Boulevard, is in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the City’s Storm Drain Plan. The culvert will require replacement, repairing the headwall, slope stabilization and obtaining regulatory permits (which may take one year to obtain).

Cost: $924,000

Recommendation: Consider adding CIP as funded project. Funding is needed from Drainage Impact Fee Fund (Fund #210) and Orinda Add-On Sales Tax (L) Fund (Fund #105).

C3. Various Storm Drain pipe Repair (2024) - Group 2

Description/Notes: The storm drain culverts listed below are in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the City’s Storm Drain Plan. The culverts will require replacement or rehabilitation and obtaining regulatory permits (which may take one year to obtain).

- 123 Orchard Road (PL-513)
- 4 Orchard Road (PL-409)
- 207 Moraga Way (PL-452)

Cost: $915,750

Recommendation: Consider adding to CIP as funded project, to be funded by the Drainage Impact Fee Fund (Fund #210).
attachment c

staff recommended projects to be added to the unfunded project list “e”

c4. various storm drain pipe repair – group 3

description/notes: the storm drain culverts listed below are in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the city’s storm drain plan. the culverts will require replacement or rehabilitation and obtaining regulatory permits.

- 2 dos encinas (pl-864)
- 232 ivy drive (pl-958)
- 232 ivy drive (pl-959)

cost: $1,030,000

c5. various storm drain pipe repair – group 4

description/notes: the storm drain culverts listed below are in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the city’s storm drain plan. the culverts will require replacement or rehabilitation and obtaining regulatory permits.

- 199 canon drive (pl-1765)
- 199 canon drive (pl-1766)
- 8 alta vista (pl-1775)

cost: $1,503,150

c6. various storm drain pipe repair – group 5

description/notes: the storm drain culverts listed below are in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the city’s storm drain plan. the culverts will require replacement or rehabilitation and obtaining regulatory permits.

- 10 ranch road (pl-1074)
- 511 bear creek road (pl-1089)
- 70 van tassel lane (pl-1809)

cost: $1,048,900

c7. various storm drain pipe repair – group 6

description/notes: the storm drain culverts listed below are in critical condition as identified in the highest priority pipes list, in the city’s storm drain plan. the culverts will require replacement or rehabilitation and obtaining regulatory permits.

- 38 lost valley drive (pl-751)
- 295 orchard road (pl-580)
- 58 brookside road (pl-437)
- el camino moraga (pl-867)

cost: $961,000
Attachment C

STAFF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS TO BE ADDED TO THE UNFUNDED PROJECT LIST “E”

Public Works Dept. /Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects

C.8 Sandblast & Paint Pedestrian Overcrossing Hwy. 24 on-ramp (end of Orinda Way)
Description/Notes: Sandblast and paint this Caltrans-owned bridge, which is maintained by the City under a Maintenance Agreement with Caltrans. Work will need to include containment facilities. Caltrans permits will be required.
Cost: $125,000

Planning Dept.

C.9 Vashell Way Pedestrian Activation

Description/Notes: Enhance Theatre District activity through transformation of Vashell Way into a part-time pedestrian alley. The project would include special paving, murals, lighting, and bollards (as detailed on pages 39-41 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). Potential funding could come from Measure RR and philanthropic community groups/community members.
Cost: $250,000
Recommendation: Funding source needs to be identified
## Fiscal Year 2019-2023 Adopted CIP Project List By Category

### CITY BUILDINGS & FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Center HVAC</td>
<td>4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Accessibility Improvements</td>
<td>4086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Slide Stabilization</td>
<td>4108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Garden Center Sound Absorption</td>
<td>4113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Roof Replacement</td>
<td>4141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Elevator</td>
<td>4145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Sprinkler Compliance and Repair</td>
<td>4156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install Mini Split HVAC System at Orinda Library</td>
<td>4160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Boiler Replacement</td>
<td>4161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Exterior Painting</td>
<td>TBD10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Library Air Handlers</td>
<td>TBD11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Window Replacement</td>
<td>TBD4002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Roof Replacement</td>
<td>TBD6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Interior Painting</td>
<td>TBD7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSPORTATION / DRAINAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miner Road Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project</td>
<td>0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Toyonal EVA Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>0067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Bridge Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>0087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner Rd Pavement Rehab &amp; Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>4071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Transition Plan Compliance Projects</td>
<td>4074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain Plan &amp; Inventory</td>
<td>4092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming Improvements Program</td>
<td>4107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Bicycle, Trails, and Walkways Program</td>
<td>4109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Drainage Facilities Improvement Program</td>
<td>4111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Measure J &amp; L Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>4118/4132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Annual and Measure J &amp; L Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>4119/4120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Pablo Bicycle Route Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>4128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorietta Elementary Safe Route to School</td>
<td>4131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Dr. &amp; Miner Rd./Honey Hill Rd. Bike Route</td>
<td>4135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga Way Crosswalk at Brookside Road</td>
<td>4137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orinda Way Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Rd-Catherine Ct Ped Path</td>
<td>4140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure Program for Pavement Projects</td>
<td>4146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavenida Culvert Repair</td>
<td>4148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Annual Pavement Project</td>
<td>4150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookwood Culvert Repair</td>
<td>4151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Sobrante at Golf Course Slide Stabilization</td>
<td>4152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Vista Pavement Repair</td>
<td>4153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichabod Lane Storm Drain Extension</td>
<td>4154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Annual Pavement Project</td>
<td>4155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Pablo Traffic Calming</td>
<td>TBD3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Annual Pavement Project</td>
<td>TBD3023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LONG TERM PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Orinda Streetscape Master Plan</td>
<td>4130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Development Standards Update</td>
<td>4158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Creek Restoration</td>
<td>4159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARK IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resurface Community Park Tennis Courts</td>
<td>4052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Park (Crossroads Park)</td>
<td>4103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park Renovation Plan &amp; Improvements</td>
<td>4112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park Pathway Improvement</td>
<td>4142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Natural Grass Turf at Wilder Field 3</td>
<td>4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephens Trail and Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>TBD3003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Fields 1&amp;2 Turf Replacement</td>
<td>TBD4010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacements</td>
<td>0020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List "D"
In lieu of individual project sheets for projects that do not have funding, this list represents projects that are of significant importance but do not have funding sources identified. These projects will not move forward unless funding sources can be identified. The order of the project listed below do not present priority.

Public Works Dept. / Transportation Projects

1. **Downtown Intersection Operational Improvements**
   - **Description/Notes:** Consider reconfiguration of the intersection of Camino Pablo/EB Hwy 24 Off-ramp/Brookwood Rd, including a traffic circle/roundabout or removal of some traffic movements. Due to the five legs to this intersection, signal operations are protracted and can be somewhat difficult to discern. Due to the high volumes of vehicles along Camino Pablo and the Hwy 24 off-ramp, multi-lanes within the circle must be considered to operate with reasonable level of service. Special consideration must be evaluated for pedestrian and bicycle traffic safety due to the lack of right of way control afforded by standard traffic signals.
   - **Cost:** TBD

2. **Camino Sobrante Slope Stabilization**
   - **Description/Notes:** This project contemplates a reconstruction and rehabilitation of Camino Sobrante from Orinda Way east to El Ribero. No funds have been secured for this major reconstruction project, which will include a geotechnical study for slope stabilization and repair.
   - **Cost:** TBD

3. **Moraga Way at Stein Way Improvements**
   - **Description/Notes:** The project is identified in the Lamorinda Fee and Financing Authority Expenditure Plan. It would address the increased traffic accessing Moraga Way at this intersection. The scope of the project is still to be determined.
   - **Cost:** $750,000

4. **Rheem Blvd. & Glorietta Blvd. Intersection Improvements (#3038)**
   - **Description/Notes:** The need for installation of a traffic signal at this intersection was identified in the Lamorinda Transportation Improvement Program (1994) based on the proposed Rancho Palos Colorados project in Moraga, which has not yet occurred. The need for improvements to this intersection continues to be monitored and will likely not be implemented until Moraga completes their Rancho Palos Colorados project.
   - **Cost:** TBD

5. **Sign Inventory and Replacement**
   - **Description/Notes:** Inventory of Existing Roadway Signage including condition and retroreflectivity; add to GIS database. Establish a protocol of sign replacement by type or age
   - **Cost:** TBD
6. **Full trash capture/Triton Drop Inlet to capture oil & grease runoff from Chevron**
   Description/Notes: Install full trash capture device at inlet near Chevron gas station. Chevron may have a future improvement project. Depending on the future improvement project, the City may place a requirement for Chevron to construct this project.
   Cost: $TBD

7. **Happy Valley Road Guardrail/Embankment Stabilization**
   Description/Notes: Repair the slide on the northerly side of Happy Valley Road south of Sundown Terrance (near the border of Lafayette), consider soldier pile retaining walls along the west side of Happy Valley Road just north of the Sundown Terrance, and provide additional pavement width to install metal beam guardrails. Ref. CCTA CTPL potential project list.
   Cost: $1,000,000+

8. **Camino Pablo Pathway Rehabilitation**
   Description/Notes: Pavement rehabilitation of Camino Pablo pathway from Wagner Ranch Elementary School to Orinda Way. (#1 on “Top 10” list compiled from BTW Plan)
   Cost: $TBD

9. **Miner Road Pedestrian Bridge at San Pablo Creek**
   Description/Notes: Construct a pedestrian bridge over San Pablo Creek. Ref. CCTA CTPL potential project list.
   Cost: $TBD

10. **Brookwood Road Walkway**
    Description/Notes: Provide a pedestrian walkway along Brookwood Road. (#7 on “Top 10” list compiled from BTW Plan)
    Cost: $TBD

11. **Park and Recreation Master Plan (#4059)**
    Description/Notes: Develop a Parks and recreation Master Plan with consideration of the recently adopted Bicycle, Trails, and Walkways Master Plan. The existing Master Plan was adopted in 1988.
    Cost: $100,000

12. **Parklands Acquisition (#4060)**
    Description/Notes: Provide funding for parkland acquisition opportunities as provided in the Orinda General Plan and Parks Master Plan.
    Cost: $TBD
13. Park Monument Signage (#4113)
   Description/Notes: Develop program to replace aging signs, and implement, subject to design and cost estimates.
   Cost: $ TBD

14. Replace Natural Grass Turf at Wilder Field 3 (CIP Project #4149)
   Description/Notes: Replace fescue turf with Bermuda grass, which is more durable and requires less irrigation.
   Cost: $200,000

Parks & Recreation Dept./Facilities

15. Art & Garden Center Parking Lot
   Description/Notes: Construct a parking lot uphill of the Art & Garden Center with ADA pathway. Funding has not been identified. Wilder residents have provided initial feedbacks. The scope of this parking lot needs to be further developed.
   Cost: $150,000

16. Community Center Exterior Painting (#4033)
   Description/Notes: Painting of the Community Center and Library Buildings. This project is considered a long term maintenance expenditure. (Library painting is now under separate funded project #TBD10)
   Cost: $140,000

17. Upgrades to City Hall Pedestrian Paths
   Description/Notes: Upgrade City Hall pedestrian paths, including adding lighting and railing.
   Cost: $50,000

18. Community Center Kitchen Renovations (#4022)
   Description/Notes: Upgrade kitchen to meet current health and safety codes.
   Cost: $75,000

19. Orinda Oaks Park Restroom Replacement (#TBD4012)
   Description/Notes: The project replaces the existing aged restroom with a new, efficient and accessible facility.
   Cost: $100,000
20. Near-Term Downtown Pedestrian Safety and Beautification Enhancements
   Description/Notes: The project area for this project is focused on the connections between the Theatre District and BART and the Village District and BART. This includes re-opening the second pedestrian entrance to BART, beautification of the pedestrian undercrossing, pedestrian safety and comfort improvements, and improving the landing of the walkway from the pedestrian bridge from BART to the Village District, including creating a gateway to the existing pedestrian bridge near the southern end of Orinda Way (as detailed on pages 22-27 and 36-38 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). Potential funding could come from Measure RR and CCTA Measure J. Ref. CCTA CTPL potential project #3043.
   Cost: $50,000 - 650,000

21. Construct Living Landscape Berm on Bryant Way
   Description/Notes: Enhance Bryant Way through visual screening and freeway noise attenuation by creating an earthen mound with vegetation on top of it along the freeway side of Bryant Way (as detailed on pages 42-44 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). (Note this project is an expansion of the “Visual Screening Enhancements” project which appeared in the 2019-2023 Potential Project List (F). The planting work in that project was completed)
   Cost: $200,000 - $400,000

22. San Pablo Creek Restoration (CIP Project #4159)
   Description/Notes: Perform creek hydrology study work, determine potential creek alignments, determine trail alignments for future pedestrian creek trail, provide a pedestrian connection to the de Laveaga (EBMUD) trail, and perform property acquisition due diligence. Plan for public creek access (as detailed on pages 28-32 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). Future creek restoration phases would include CEQA compliance and project implementation. Note: The State Water Board has allowed mitigation fees (from creek/culvert project regulatory permit conditions) to be paid into this project.
   Cost: $125,000

23. Library Terrace Area Pedestrian Improvements
   Description/Notes: This project will include replacing the existing surface material with decomposed granite, installing string lighting (if not already completed through remaining ConnectOrinda funds), permanent games (such as concrete foosball), and outdoor furnishings that transform the area into a well-used area for people of all ages that remains beautiful (as detailed on pages 33-35 of the ConnectOrinda Plan).
   Cost: $100,000
Attachment F

POTENTIAL PROJECT LIST

Due to the limited funding and resources, these projects will not be added to the CIP (funded or unfunded lists) unless Council direct otherwise. This list includes projects requested by the Public over prior years. Projects new to the list this year are shown in *italics*.

Public Works Dept. /Transportation Projects

1. **El Toyonal widening**
   - **Description/Notes:** Widen El Toyonal roadway to accommodate school bus.
   - **Cost:** $1,000,000+

2. **Loma Vista Drive Pavement Widening between El Toyonal to El Toyonal**
   - **Description:** Per request from a resident, widen Loma Vista Pavement.
   - **Cost:** $TBD

3. **Glorietta Pedestrian Pathway (Rheem to Moraga Way)**
   - **Description/Notes:** Extend pathway on west side of Glorietta Blvd. from Rheem, south to Moraga Way, converting road shoulder to pathway using an asphalt dike. Adjust pavement grades to obtain accessible pathway. Adjust/regrade driveways to conform at pathway.
   - **Cost:** $1,000,000+

4. **Ichabod Ln. Drainage (formerly CIP Project #4154)**
   - **Description:** Per request from a resident, reduce storm water flow in gutter.
   - **Cost:** $50,000 to $420,000, depending on extent of new stormdrain line

Public Works Dept. /Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects

5. **Brookwood Road Walkway**
   - **Description/Notes:** Provide a pedestrian walkway along Brookwood Road.
   - **Cost:** $TBD

6. **Pedestrian Walkway along Moraga Way (Downtown to Altamount)**
   - **Description/notes:** A study to determine the feasibility and cost of providing a pedestrian facility improvements (sidewalk or separated walkway) along Moraga Way from downtown to Altamount Dr.. BTW Plan Project #1.8 (Note the section between El Camino Moraga and Altamount Dr. is proposed as a funded CIP project in the 2020-2024 CIP).
   - **Cost:** $100,000 for study only (Capital project will be $1,000,000+)

7. **Southwood Sidewalks**
   - **Description:** Extend Southwood sidewalk. BTW Plan Project #19.
   - **Cost:** $TBD
8. **Adding stairs at the north corner of Northwood Drive and Moraga Way**  
   **Description:** A Resident requested stairs to the north corner of Northwood Drive and Moraga Way. A sidewalk exists however it is a steep slope, which matches the grade of the roadway. Evaluation will need to be determine to ensure the existing ADA sidewalk can be maintained.  
   **Cost:** TBD

9. **Ivy Dr. & Miner Rd./Honey Hill Rd. Bike Route (formerly CIP Project #4135)**  
   **Description:** Ivy Drive Bicycle Route (Bicycles, Trails, and Walkways Plan Project #41) combined with the Miner Road/ Honey Hill Road Bicycle Route (Bicycles, Trails, and Walkways Plan Project #3). Work will include evaluation by traffic engineer on design alternatives. Note: this project was submitted for a TDA grant, but was unsuccessful.  
   **Cost:** $50,000

---

**Parks & Recreation Dept./Parks**

10. **Designated Off-leash Dog Area**  
   **Description/Notes:** Design and construct a dedicated off-leash dog area/park in Orinda.  
   **Cost:** TBD

11. **Bocce Ball Courts**  
   **Description/Notes:** Design and construct 2-4 bocce courts in Orinda.  
   **Cost:** TBD

12. **Community Garden**  
   **Description/Notes:** Create a community garden offering rentable “plots” in Orinda.  
   **Cost:** TBD

13. **Oak Park – Donald Drive Pavement Rehabilitation (formerly CIP Project #7013)**  
   **Description/Notes:** Pavement rehabilitation of Donald Drive within Oak Park. This roadway is private, ½ owned by the City, along with the parcel of land which comprises Oak Park. The other (northern) ½ of the roadway is owned by the adjacent four properties. The roadway serves the Park and also acts as an access driveway for the four property owners that on the north side of the Park property. Project requires a financial contribution from the four property owners who utilize the road ($40,000 each).  
   **Cost:** $160,000
14. **Comprehensive Downtown Transportation Study** (formerly “Long-Term Direct Pedestrian Connection Between the Two Sides of Downtown”)  
*Description/Notes:* Before long-term projects that would modify the operation and capacity of existing transportation modes are pursued, a comprehensive transportation study is needed to understand how all modes of transportation move along and between the Camino Pablo Corridor and Highway 24, the Village, Theatre District and BART station (as detailed on pages 87-93 of the ConnectOrinda Plan).  
*Cost:* $200,000

15. **Stay-High Pathway between BART and the Village District**  
*Description/Notes:* Currently, people walking between the BART station and the Village must take a circuitous route that involves dropping down to street level from one pedestrian bridge, walking beside fast-moving vehicle traffic, then climbing back up to cross a second bridge. This project would join the two bridges with a structure that would be elevated above the existing at-grade sidewalk alongside Camino Pablo (as detailed on pages 96-97 of the ConnectOrinda Plan). In conjunction with the existing structures, this pathway could serve pedestrians and slow-moving bicyclists/people scootering who are not comfortable riding on Camino Pablo.  
*Cost:* $1.5-2.0 million