



## PROCLAMATION CALLING A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL

In accordance with the authority in me vested, I do hereby call the Berkeley City Council in special session as follows:

**Tuesday, March 17, 2026  
6:00 PM**

SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD ROOM - 1231 ADDISON STREET, BERKELEY, CA 94702

TELECONFERENCE LOCATION - 2928 LINDEN AVENUE, BERKELEY, CA 94705

ADENA ISHII, MAYOR

Councilmembers:

DISTRICT 1 – RASHI KESARWANI

DISTRICT 2 – TERRY TAPLIN

DISTRICT 3 – BEN BARTLETT

DISTRICT 4 – IGOR TREGUB

DISTRICT 5 – SHOSHANA O'KEEFE

DISTRICT 6 – BRENT BLACKABY

DISTRICT 7 – CECILIA LUNAPARRA

DISTRICT 8 – MARK HUMBERT

*This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person and virtual attendance. Attend this meeting remotely using [Zoom](#). To request to speak, use the "raise hand" function in Zoom. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252** or **1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and enter **Meeting ID: 160 015 7557**. To provide public comment, Press \*9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair. To submit a written communication for the public record, email [council@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:council@berkeleyca.gov).*

*Live captioned broadcasts of Council meetings are available on B-TV (Channel 33) and via [internet video stream](#). All Council meetings are recorded.*

*This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting, however, if you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person. The City Council may take action related to any subject listed on the Agenda.*

*Pursuant to the City Council Rules of Procedure and State Law, the presiding officer may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. Prior to removing an individual, the presiding officer shall warn the individual that their behavior is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. The presiding officer may then remove the individual if they do not promptly cease their disruptive behavior. "Disrupting" means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body, or engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force.*

**Government Code Section 84308 (Levine Act)** - Parties to a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use are required to disclose if they made contributions over \$500 within the prior 12 months to any City employee or officer. Parties and participants with a financial interest are prohibited from making more than \$500 in contributions to a decisionmaker for the 12 months after the final decision is rendered on the proceeding. The above contribution disclosures and restrictions do not apply when the proceeding is competitively bid, or involves a personnel or labor contract. For more information, see Government Code Section 84308.

## Preliminary Matters

### Roll Call:

## Action Calendar

*The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action. For items moved to the Action Calendar from the Consent Calendar or Information Calendar, persons who spoke on the item during the Consent Calendar public comment period may speak again during the Action Calendar public comment period on the item*

*The Presiding Officer will request that persons wishing to speak line up at the podium, or use the "raise hand" function in Zoom, to determine the number of persons interested in speaking at that time. If ten or fewer persons are interested in speaking on an individual agenda item, each speaker may speak for two minutes. If there are more than ten persons interested in speaking, the Presiding Officer may limit the public comment for all speakers to one minute per speaker. Speakers are permitted to yield their time to one other speaker, however no one speaker shall have more than four minutes. The Presiding Officer may, with the consent of persons representing both sides of an issue, allocate a block of time to each side to present their issue.*

*Action items may be reordered at the discretion of the Chair with the consent of Council.*

*The Presiding Officer may open and close an additional comment period for Action items on this agenda (excluding any public hearings, appeals, and/or quasi-judicial matters), at the start of the Action Calendar. Those who speak on an item during this comment period may not speak a second time when the item is taken up by Council.*

## Action Calendar – New Business

### 1. **Presentation and Discussion of Community Survey Results and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election** **From: City Manager**

**Recommendation:** Review the results of the community survey and provide direction to the City Manager and City Attorney regarding potential ballot measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election, including whether to:

1. Direct the City Manager and City Attorney to prepare draft ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure for the November 3, 2026, ballot to fund priority infrastructure investments, consistent with the results of the community survey and input received from the City Council at the March 17, 2026, work session;
2. Direct the City Manager and City Attorney to prepare draft ballot language for a potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax for the November 3, 2026, ballot to address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit and support essential City services; and
3. Authorize the City Manager to conduct a second community survey of likely Berkeley voters to test refined ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond and a 0.5 percent increase in the sales and use tax in the context of the anticipated November 2026 ballot environment.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: David White, City Manager's Office, (510) 981-7000

## Adjournment

I hereby request that the City Clerk of the City of Berkeley cause personal notice to be given to each member of the Berkeley City Council on the time and place of said meeting, forthwith.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the City of Berkeley to be affixed on this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

/s/ Adena Ishii, Mayor

Public Notice – this Proclamation serves as the official agenda for this meeting.

ATTEST:



Mark Numainville, City Clerk

**NOTICE CONCERNING YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS:** *If you object to a decision by the City Council to approve or deny a use permit or variance for a project the following requirements and restrictions apply: 1) No lawsuit challenging a City decision to deny (Code Civ. Proc. §1094.6(b)) or approve (Gov. Code 65009(c)(5)) a use permit or variance may be filed more than 90 days after the date the Notice of Decision of the action of the City Council is mailed. Any lawsuit not filed within that 90-day period will be barred. 2) In any lawsuit that may be filed against a City Council decision to approve or deny a use permit or variance, the issues and evidence will be limited to those raised by you or someone else, orally or in writing, at a public hearing or prior to the close of the last public hearing on the project.*

Archived indexed video streams are available at: [berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas](https://berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas).  
Channel 33 rebroadcasts the following Wednesday at 9:00 a.m. and Sunday at 9:00 a.m.

Communications to the City Council are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the City Council, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service to the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk Department for further information.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the public counter at the City Clerk Department located on the first floor of City Hall located at 2180 Milvia Street, and through the City's online records portal: <https://records.cityofberkeley.info/>.

Agendas, agenda reports, and revised/supplemental material may be accessed via the online agenda for this meeting at: [berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas](https://berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas) and may be accessed at reference desks at the following locations:

City Clerk Department - 2180 Milvia Street, First Floor  
Tel: 510-981-6900, TDD: 510-981-6903, Fax: 510-981-6901  
Email: [clerk@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:clerk@berkeleyca.gov)

Libraries: Main – 2090 Kittredge Street,  
Claremont Branch – 2940 Benvenue, West Branch – 1125 University,  
North Branch – 1170 The Alameda, Tarea Hall Pittman South Branch – 1901 Russell

**COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:**

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location.

To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at [ada@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:ada@berkeleyca.gov) or (510) 981-6418 (V) at least three business days before the meeting date.

Attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various scents, whether natural or manufactured, in products and materials. Please help the City respect these needs.

Captioning services are provided at the meeting, on B-TV, and on the Internet. In addition, assisted listening devices for the hearing impaired are available from the City Clerk prior to the meeting, and are to be returned before the end of the meeting.

If you have obtained interpretation services for your use during a City Council meeting and would like to request assistance, please contact the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6900, [clerk@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:clerk@berkeleyca.gov), or in-person during the meeting.

Questions regarding public participation may be addressed to the City Clerk Department (510) 981-6900 or by email at [clerk@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:clerk@berkeleyca.gov).



Office of the City Manager

ACTION CALENDAR

March 17, 2026

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager

Submitted by: Dave White, Deputy City Manager, City Manager's Office

Subject: Presentation and Discussion of Community Survey Results and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election

RECOMMENDATION

Review the results of the community survey and provide direction to the City Manager and City Attorney regarding potential ballot measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election, including whether to:

1. Direct the City Manager and City Attorney to prepare draft ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure for the November 3, 2026, ballot to fund priority infrastructure investments, consistent with the results of the community survey and input received from the City Council at the March 17, 2026, work session;
2. Direct the City Manager and City Attorney to prepare draft ballot language for a potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax for the November 3, 2026, ballot to address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit and support essential City services; and
3. Authorize the City Manager to conduct a second community survey of likely Berkeley voters to test refined ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond and a 0.5 percent increase in the sales and use tax in the context of the anticipated November 2026 ballot environment.

SUMMARY

This item presents the results of the City's first community survey related to potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election and requests City Council direction on next steps for ballot measure development.

The survey was administered by Lake Research Partners from February 19–23, 2026 and tested voter priorities and support for a potential General Obligation (GO) bond at varying funding levels, as well as voter sentiment regarding a potential increase to the

sales and use tax to address the City's projected General Fund budget deficit that is currently estimated at approximately \$27million<sup>1</sup>.

This survey effort builds on City Council policy guidance provided at the December 2, 2025, worksession regarding priority infrastructure categories and funding concepts. In parallel with the statistically valid voter survey, City staff are soliciting feedback on potential City Council supported projects from focus groups, commissions, and joint community meetings across Council districts.

City Council direction provided at this meeting will guide staff's next steps, including refinement of project categories, preparation of potential ballot language, and the design of a second, more targeted survey to test refined ballot language with likely voters.

**Key findings from the survey include:**

- Improved voter sentiment about Berkeley's direction. In February 2026, 56% of likely voters said Berkeley is headed in the *right direction* (up from 47% in May 2024), representing the highest "right direction" result since 2016.
- Initial support, exceeding the required 2/3rds threshold, for infrastructure investment through a bond measure. A potential \$300 million bond measure received 71% support, while a potential \$200 million bond received 70% support, indicating little difference in voter support between the two funding levels.
- Support remained even after exposure to opposing arguments. When voters were presented with both supportive and opposing statements, support for the \$300M bond remained at approximately 72%, suggesting durable voter support.
- There was majority support for a sales and use tax increase to address the City's budget deficit. Approximately 60% of voters initially supported the proposed 0.5% sales and use tax increase, declining slightly to 58% after exposure to pro and con arguments, remaining above the simple majority threshold required for approval.
- Top voter priorities include infrastructure resilience, safety, and accessibility. The most frequently identified priorities included climate resilience infrastructure (35%), sidewalk and accessibility improvements (31%), and stormwater upgrades (24%).

---

<sup>1</sup> Represents the City's current projected deficit after an update to the City's projected revenues that were presented to the Budget and Finance Policy Committee on February 26, 2026. The estimated deficit will be further refined to reflect resource needs of other funds that are experiencing deficits and resource constraints (i.e., Off Street Parking Fund, Internal Service fund for 1947 Center Street) and the results of ongoing labor negotiations.

- Individually ranked projects that are important include:
  - Renovating the 911 dispatch center to handle higher call volumes and modernize critical infrastructure;
  - Improving safety and accessibility by repairing cracked and uneven sidewalks and upgrading curb ramps citywide; and
  - Making fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by replacing fire stations that are no longer able to meet demands with new stations that run on green energy.

These findings provide an initial indication that Berkeley voters are receptive to infrastructure investment and generating resources to address the City's deficit, while also highlighting the importance of project prioritization and clear ballot language.

#### FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The community survey process, including up to two rounds of survey testing, is funded through an existing contract with Lake Research Partners with a not-to-exceed amount of \$100,000. No additional appropriation is required for the survey work. Any future fiscal impacts associated with potential ballot measures will be presented to City Council as part of ballot language development and implementation planning.

#### CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

This project is a Strategic Plan Priority Project, advancing the City's goals to provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities and to create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.

Berkeley faces significant unfunded capital infrastructure needs and a growing deferred maintenance backlog across public safety facilities, community-serving facilities, and critical infrastructure such as sidewalks, ADA accessibility improvements, seismic upgrades, and climate-resilient assets. Many City facilities and right-of-way assets were constructed decades ago and no longer meet current standards for accessibility, seismic safety, climate resilience, or modern service delivery. Annual capital allocations and existing funding sources are insufficient to address these needs at the scale and pace required, resulting in increased risk of facility failure, escalating repair costs, service disruptions, and inequitable conditions across neighborhoods. Current estimates indicate that Berkeley's long-term infrastructure needs exceed \$1.5 billion. While a bond measure of approximately \$300 million would not fully address these needs, it would represent a significant step toward stabilizing and modernizing critical civic infrastructure.

At the December 2, 2025, worksession<sup>2</sup>, City Council provided direction to staff to explore potential ballot measure concepts for the November 2026 election, including:

- Public safety facilities (e.g., fire stations, emergency response and dispatch facilities);
- Community facilities and quality-of-life investments (e.g., parks, recreation centers, pools, and community centers); and
- Critical infrastructure and accessibility improvements (e.g., sidewalks, ADA compliance, seismic upgrades, and climate resilience).

That feedback informed the structure, categories, and framing of the community survey instrument developed by Lake Research Partners in coordination with City staff.

On January 27, 2026, City Council approved a referral to the City Manager to include, as part of the upcoming community survey for the November 2026 election, a question assessing the perspectives of likely Berkeley voters on a potential increase to the City's sales and use tax rate<sup>3</sup>. More specifically, the referral requested that the survey test voter interest in increasing Berkeley's sales and use tax rate from 10.25 percent to 10.75 percent, consistent with rates adopted by several neighboring Alameda County jurisdictions. The item was framed in the context of generating resources to address the City's projected General Fund budget shortfall and ongoing fiscal challenges. The referral further emphasized that adding such a question to the survey would provide City Council with data to better understand resident perspectives on revenue options in parallel with feedback on infrastructure priorities, and to inform future policy discussions related to fiscal sustainability and potential ballot measure development.

### **Summary of Community Survey Results (February 2026)**

To ensure the City's ballot measure development process is grounded in statistically valid voter data, the City conducted an RFP which resulted in a contract with Lake Research Partners to design and administer up to two community surveys of Berkeley voters (Contract No: 32600095)<sup>4</sup>. The survey tested voter priorities related to infrastructure investment and funding mechanisms, including General Obligation Bonds at multiple funding levels and an exploratory question regarding a potential sales and use tax increase to reduce the City's projected deficit in the General Fund. The findings below summarize key topline results from the February 19–23, 2026 survey and provide context for City Council discussion and direction on potential next steps.

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-12-02%20Special%20Item%2002%20Discussion%20Regarding%20Potential%20Ballot.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-01/2026-01-27%20Item%2017%20Refer%20to%20the%20City%20Manager%20to%20include.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-01/2026-01-20%20Item%2002%20Ratification%20of%20City%20Manager%20Action.pdf>

Comprehensive question-by-question results, including demographic and subgroup breakouts, are provided in Attachment 1.

**Survey Fielding Window:**

The community survey was conducted February 19–23, 2026, using live telephone interviews and text-to-online methodologies to reach a representative sample of likely November 2026 voters.

**Survey Methodology:**

- Field dates: February 19–23, 2026
- Sample size: 500 likely November 2026 voters
- Mode: Live telephone interviews and text-to-online
- Margin of error: ± 4.4% at the 95% confidence level
- Split samples: A/B testing of funding levels and message framing to evaluate voter support under different scenarios.

The sample was stratified by age, gender, race, and region of the city to reflect the expected composition of likely voters.

**Voter Attitudes about Berkeley:**

Respondents were asked whether they believe the City of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or on the wrong track.

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Q3. Would you say that the city of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?</b> |                |
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Percent</b> |
| Right Direction   | 56%            |
| Wrong Direction   | 22%            |
| (Don't know)  | 23%            |

A majority of likely voters believe Berkeley is heading in the right direction.

**Job Performance of the City:**

Respondents were also asked to rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing providing services to residents.

| <b>Q4. How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?</b> |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Response</b>  | <b>Percent</b> |
| Excellent  | 11%            |
| Good   | 45%            |
| Just Fair  | 32%            |
| Poor   | 7%             |
| (Don't know)   | 5%             |

| <b>Combined Rating</b> |                |
|------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Response</b>        | <b>Percent</b> |
| Excellent/Good         | 56%            |
| Just Fair/Poor         | 39%            |

Overall perceptions of City service delivery are positive, with a majority (56%) rating services as excellent or good.

**Top Issues and Highest Priorities for Voters**

| <b>Q5. Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?</b> |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Response</b>  | <b>Percent</b> |
| Safeguarding critical infrastructure from the threats of climate change, including flooding and wildfires  | 35%            |
| Increasing Berkeley's safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways  | 31%            |
| Reducing pollution flowing to the Bay and flood risk by upgrading storm drains and installing green infrastructure   | 24%            |
| Improving parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, dog parks, and community centers  | 23%            |
| Replacing public safety facilities such as fire stations and emergency response buildings that are at the end of their useful life   | 22%            |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline by protecting waterfront parks and repairing docks                            | 15% |
| Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision by restoring and modernizing historic buildings for community, arts, and civic use | 11% |
| None  | 5%  |
| Don't know  | 4%  |
| Refused   | 1%  |

**Survey Results for Potential Ballot Measures**

**Q6.** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at an average rate of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

| <b>Response</b>       | <b>Percent</b> |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes - strongly        | 42%            |
| Yes - not so strongly | 31%            |
| Lean yes              | 14%            |
| Undecided/DK          | 16%            |
| Lean no               | 3%             |
| No - not so strongly  | 6%             |
| No - strongly         | 11%            |
| (Refused)             | 1%             |
| Total Yes             | 71%            |
| Total No              | 12%            |

**Q7.** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at an average rate of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

| <b>Response</b>       | <b>Percent</b> |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes - strongly        | 36%            |
| Yes - not so strongly | 17%            |
| Lean yes              | 18%            |
| Undecided/DK          | 15%            |
| Lean no               | 2%             |
| No - not so strongly  | 3%             |
| No - strongly         | 9%             |
| (Refused)             | 0%             |
| Total Yes             | 70%            |
| Total No              | 14%            |

| <b>6/7.Combined Initial GO Bond</b> |                |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Response</b>                     | <b>Percent</b> |
| Yes - strongly                      | 39%            |
| Yes - not so strongly               | 16%            |
| Lean yes                            | 16%            |
| Undecided/DK                        | 16%            |
| Lean no                             | 2%             |
| No - not so strongly                | 3%             |
| No - strongly                       | 8%             |
| (Refused)                           | 1%             |
| Total Yes                           | 70%            |
| Total No                            | 13%            |

**Q8.** This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City's projected budget deficit of \$32 million. Shall the City of Berkeley measure to increase funding for essential city services, such as 9-1-1 emergency response; neighborhood police services; fire prevention/protection; youth and senior services; community cultural programs; attracting/ retaining small businesses; and funding for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, by adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

| <b>Response</b>       | <b>Percent</b> |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes - strongly        | 37%            |
| Yes - not so strongly | 15%            |
| Lean yes              | 8%             |
| Undecided/DK          | 11%            |
| Lean no               | 5%             |
| No - not so strongly  | 5%             |
| No - strongly         | 10%            |
| (Refused)             | 0%             |
| Total Yes             | 60%            |
| Total No              | 29%            |

**Q12.** Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in. Is that extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

| <b>Sorted by "Extremely important"</b>         | <b>Percent</b> |
|--|----------------|
| 12u.Renovate 911 dispatch                      | 29%            |
| D12t.Replace fire stations                     | 27%            |
| 12p.Repair sidewalks                           | 27%            |
| D12f.Upgrade park restrooms                    | 24%            |
| C12s.Repair fire stations                      | 22%            |
| C12b.Earthquake protections for buildings      | 18%            |
| 12l.Protect Waterfront paths                   | 18%            |
| D12r.Repair public buildings - w/ Civic Center | 18%            |
| 12o.Mental health building                     | 17%            |
| C12q.Repair public buildings                   | 17%            |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 12a.Repair/rebuild community centers             | 15% |
| 12d.Safe/accessible playgrounds                  | 15% |
| D12c.Earthquake protections - specific buildings | 14% |
| C12e.Add park restrooms                          | 13% |
| 12h.Repair park paths/parking lots               | 12% |
| 12n.South Berkeley green space                   | 12% |
| 12j.Repair recreational facilities               | 11% |
| 12m.Repair seawall                               | 11% |
| 12i.Sports fields irrigation                     | 9%  |
| 12k.Repair Marina's docks                        | 8%  |
| 12g.New dog parks                                | 4%  |

**Key Community Survey Findings:**

- Voters report generally positive attitudes about the City's direction and services (56% right direction; 56% excellent/good job performance).
- Top infrastructure priorities are climate resilience (35%), sidewalk/accessibility (31%), and stormwater/green infrastructure (24%).
- Initial GO bond support at both tested levels: \$300M (71% yes) and \$200M (70% yes).
- After hearing pro/con arguments, GO bond support remains above two-thirds when combined (67% yes).
- Sales tax support is majority: 60% initially, 58% after pro/con arguments.
- Project importance ratings place the highest “extremely important” emphasis on 911 dispatch modernization (29%), fire station replacement (27%), and sidewalk repair (27%).

**Next Steps**

The following provides a high level overview of next steps and key milestones:

- In the event City Council is supportive of advancing the proposed GO bond and increase in the sales and use tax, then city staff would work to refine ballot language based on input received from City Council and the results of the first community survey.
- If City Council is supportive of advancing a second community survey, city staff would work with Lake Research Partners to implement the second community

survey in April 2026 with results presented to City Council in late April / early May 2026.

- Based on the results of the first and second (if administered) community survey(s) and the input received from the broad community engagement campaign that is underway, a refined project list for the proposed GO bond would be presented to the City Council. The refined project list will also reflect additional cost estimating and resources needed to implement the GO bond.
- Based on City Council direction, final ballot language would be presented to the City Council in July 2026 to meet statutory deadlines that require any measure to be placed on the ballot be submitted to Alameda County by August 7, 2026.

### BACKGROUND

The City's exploration of potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election is grounded in a series of City Council actions, long-range planning frameworks, and sustained cross-departmental analysis intended to address Berkeley's long-standing and growing capital infrastructure needs.

On June 17, 2025, City Council referred to the City Manager an item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support capital improvements to Fire Department facilities. On September 30, 2025, City Council subsequently referred an additional item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support improvements to recreation and community facilities. These referrals reflected Council's recognition that critical public safety and community-serving facilities face aging infrastructure, increasing maintenance backlogs, and operational constraints that cannot be fully addressed through existing funding sources.

This work builds on the City's long-range infrastructure planning framework established through Vision 2050, which emerged from Measure R (2018). Measure R directed the Mayor to convene a panel of subject matter experts to guide the City toward a climate-smart, technologically advanced, integrated, and efficient infrastructure future. The City Council accepted the Vision 2050 Framework in 2020, and in 2025, the Mayor convened a Task Force to review and update the recommendations contained in the original Vision 2050 report. Vision 2050 provides the overarching policy lens through which potential 2026 ballot measure projects are being evaluated, emphasizing equity, public health and safety, climate resilience, sustainability, and integrated systems planning.

At the December 2, 2025, City Council worksession, Council reviewed staff's preliminary assessment of the City's significant unfunded infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs and provided initial policy guidance to explore a potential General Obligation (GO) bond for the November 2026 ballot, with a funding capacity of up to approximately \$300 million. Staff noted that while a bond of this scale would not fully address the City's estimated infrastructure needs—currently exceeding \$1.5 billion—it

would represent a meaningful step toward stabilizing and modernizing critical assets that directly support public safety, community well-being, accessibility, and climate resilience.

Consistent with Council direction, staff developed a preliminary framework organizing potential bond projects into three high-level categories:

- (1) Community Facilities and Quality of Life;
- (2) Public Safety; and
- (3) Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility.

Projects within these categories were identified through a collaborative, cross-departmental process and evaluated using core City criteria as well as Vision 2050-aligned principles, including equity, public health and safety, climate resilience, sustainability, and opportunities to leverage external funding. Projects were also screened for readiness, feasibility, and deliverability to ensure that any potential ballot measure reflects projects that can be implemented within realistic timeframes and staffing capacity.

In parallel with the policy development and project framework, City Council directed staff to commence a robust community engagement and survey process to inform ballot measure development. To implement this direction, the City contracted with Lake Research Partners to design and administer a statistically valid community survey of Berkeley voters (Contract No:32600095). The survey was fielded from February 19–23, 2026 using live phone and text-to-online methodologies and tested voter priorities and support for potential General Obligation Bond concepts across multiple funding levels, as well as an exploratory question regarding a potential sales tax increase to address the City's projected budget deficit.

To complement the survey and ensure broader community input beyond likely voters, City staff implemented an expanded engagement strategy from January through March 2026 that included briefings and feedback sessions with the following:

- Six (6) City commissions (Environment and Climate Commission; Landmarks Commission; Commission on Disability; Disaster and Fire Safety Commission; Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission; and Transportation and Infrastructure Commission);
- Four (4) focus groups (Civic Recreation Users; residents interested in Capital Improvement Program priorities; Community Emergency Response Team groups; and Aquatic Parks stakeholders), and

- Joint community meetings organized by paired Council districts (Districts 5/6; 1/2; 3/8; and 4/7).

These engagements provided qualitative insight into community priorities, equity considerations, geographic differences in infrastructure conditions, concerns regarding affordability and cumulative tax burden, and expectations for oversight and transparency should a bond measure advance.

A website<sup>5</sup> has also been developed to provide information on the potential general obligation bond, the list of projects that could be funded by the proposed bond, information about community meetings, and a mechanism for community members to provide their input on the proposed list of projects.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

Many of the infrastructure investments under consideration for a potential November 2026 ballot measure directly advance the City's environmental sustainability, climate resilience, and environmental justice goals. Modernizing aging public facilities provides opportunities to incorporate energy-efficient building systems, high-performance materials, and low-carbon construction practices consistent with [Berkeley's Climate Action Plan](#) policies.

Several of the proposed project categories and example projects also directly support climate adaptation and resilience objectives, including improvements to stormwater infrastructure, shoreline and waterfront protection, seismic upgrades to critical facilities, and retrofits that enhance emergency response capacity during climate-related emergencies such as extreme heat, wildfire smoke events, flooding, and power outages. Investments in public safety facilities and emergency communications infrastructure further strengthen the City's ability to respond to increasingly frequent and severe climate-driven hazards.

In addition, proposed investments in sidewalks, ADA accessibility, and pedestrian infrastructure advance sustainable transportation and public health outcomes by improving walkability and accessibility, reducing reliance on vehicle travel, and supporting safer, more connected neighborhoods. Enhancements to parks, recreation facilities, and community centers also contribute to urban greening, heat mitigation, and community resilience by providing cooling spaces and accessible public gathering areas during extreme weather events.

Project prioritization and implementation will continue to be guided by the Vision 2050 framework, which elevates climate resilience, sustainability, equity, and integrated infrastructure planning as core principles. As specific projects are refined, staff will incorporate climate risk screening and lifecycle sustainability considerations to ensure

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/bond-revenue-measures/infrastructure-projects-potential-bond-measure>.

that public investments are durable, resilient to future climate conditions, and aligned with the City's long-term environmental and climate goals.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

City Council direction at this stage is necessary to ensure that any potential November 2026 ballot measure is aligned with Council policy priorities, informed by community input, and structured in a manner that is both feasible to implement and positioned for voter approval.

Providing direction now allows staff to refine project categories, develop ballot language, and conduct additional survey testing if authorized. Delaying direction could limit the City's ability to complete these steps in time to meet statutory deadlines for the November 2026 election.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

City Council could choose to take no action at this time. However, this approach would significantly constrain the City's ability to conduct additional survey testing, refine project priorities, and develop ballot language in a manner that meets the statutory deadlines for the November 2026 election. Delaying direction may also reduce the City's flexibility to respond to community feedback, incorporate equity and geographic considerations into project selection, and ensure that any potential ballot measure is fully vetted prior to Council consideration later in 2026.

Alternatively, City Council could direct staff to discontinue ballot measure development for the November 2026 election cycle. While this would avoid near-term ballot-related costs and workload, it would leave the City without a viable funding strategy to address its most urgent infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs, as well as the structural deficit in the General Fund.

#### CONTACT PERSON

Carianna Arredondo, Assistant to the City Manager, City Manager's Office, 510-981-6903

#### Attachments:

- 1: Results of 2026 Community Survey | Lake Research Partners
- 2: Proposed Infrastructure Project List Presentation

# CITY OF BERKELEY

## Findings from a community survey of 500 likely 2026 voters


February 19-23, 2026

David Mermin  
Emma Scotty

- Lake Research Partners designed and administered this survey, which was conducted by live telephone interview and text-to-online.
- The survey reached a total of 500 likely November 2026 election voters in Berkeley, California, sampled from the state voter file.
- The survey was conducted February 19-23, 2026.
- Data were weighted slightly by gender, region, age, race, party registration, homeownership, and education to reflect the expected demographic composition of likely November general election voters in Berkeley.
- The margin of error for the full sample is +/-4.4%.

# Demographics of Likely Voters in Berkeley

## GENDER



**55%**      **45%**

## AGE

|          |     |            |
|----------|-----|------------|
| Under 30 | --- | <b>19%</b> |
| 30-39    | --- | <b>15%</b> |
| 40-49    | --- | <b>15%</b> |
| 50-64    | --- | <b>21%</b> |
| 65+      | --- | <b>31%</b> |

## EDUCATION

|                          |     |            |   |
|--------------------------|-----|------------|---|
| High School or Less      | --- | <b>3%</b>  |   |
| Post-H.S. / Some College | --- | <b>21%</b> |   |
| College Graduate         | --- | <b>37%</b> | <b>76%</b><br>College Grad or Post Grad |
| Post-Graduate            | --- | <b>39%</b> |   |

## PARTY REGISTRATION

|  |            |            |
|--|------------|------------|
|  | Democrat   | <b>79%</b> |
|  | Republican | <b>3%</b>  |
|  | NPP/Other  | <b>19%</b> |

## RACE

|        |     |            |
|--------|-----|------------|
| White  | --- | <b>67%</b> |
| Black  | --- | <b>9%</b>  |
| Latino | --- | <b>9%</b>  |
| AAPI   | --- | <b>11%</b> |
| MENA   | --- | <b>2%</b>  |
| Other  | --- | <b>2%</b>  |
| DK/Ref | --- | <b>1%</b>  |

## REGION

|                         |     |            |
|-------------------------|-----|------------|
| Hills (Districts 5,6,8) | --- | <b>45%</b> |
| Central/South (3,4,7)   | --- | <b>27%</b> |
| West (1,2)              | --- | <b>28%</b> |

## HOMEOWNER

|      |     |            |
|------|-----|------------|
| Own  | --- | <b>54%</b> |
| Rent | --- | <b>43%</b> |
| Oth  | --- | <b>3%</b>  |

## YEARS IN BERKELEY

|             |     |            |             |     |            |
|-------------|-----|------------|-------------|-----|------------|
| Less than 2 | --- | <b>5%</b>  | 10 to 20    | --- | <b>23%</b> |
| 2 to 5      | --- | <b>13%</b> | 20 or more  | --- | <b>36%</b> |
| 5 to 10     | --- | <b>12%</b> | Entire life | --- | <b>10%</b> |

## IDEOLOGY

|              |     |            |
|--------------|-----|------------|
| Progressive  | --- | <b>41%</b> |
| Liberal      | --- | <b>36%</b> |
| Moderate     | --- | <b>17%</b> |
| Conservative | --- | <b>4%</b>  |

## Key Findings – Overview

- **Both the GO bond and sales tax ballot measures are in a good position to pass in Berkeley this November.** Support for both measures currently surpasses the needed thresholds, though communication about the measures would be helpful to ensure passage.
  - **The GO bond has 70% support on the initial ballot,** above the two-thirds needed to pass. Having a higher \$300m amount on the ballot does not negatively impact support.
  - **The sales tax has slightly lower support at 60%,** but since it only needs 50% support, passage looks likely.
- **Berkeley voters are generally satisfied with the City** and majorities say the City is going in the right direction and is doing a good or excellent job providing services.
- **Voters are focused on priorities related to safety** – like protecting infrastructure from climate change, 911 dispatch and fire stations, improving earthquake protections, and repairing sidewalks.



## Key Findings – GO Bond

---

- **Seven in ten voters (70%) would vote Yes** to enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds. Only 13% would vote No and 16% are undecided.
  - **Voters across demographics vote Yes at fairly similar margins**, though the highest support comes from voters who identify as progressive, those in the Central/South area, and people who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years.
- We tested two different versions of the bond measure – one at \$300m and one at \$200m. **Support is statistically the same between the two versions, indicating that there is no reason to not put the higher \$300m amount on the ballot.** In fact, support is slightly stronger in intensity and holds up to opposition more for the \$300m bond.
- **After hearing one statement in support and one in opposition to the bond measure, support remains right at the two-thirds mark**, with 67% Yes, 18% No, and 14% undecided.
  - After the statements, the \$300m version has higher support (72% Yes, 15% No, 13% undecided) than the \$200m (63% Yes, 22% No, 15% undecided). **The higher \$300m bond does not hurt support and in fact may help the bond hold up under pressure.**

## Key Findings – Sales Tax

---

- **A ½ percent sales tax to address the City’s budget deficit is slightly less popular than the bond measure, but in an even better position to pass since it only needs 50% support.** Six in ten Berkeley voters (60%) would vote Yes on the sales tax, 29% would vote No, and 11% are undecided.
  - Similar to the GO bond, support for the sales tax is highest in the Central/South region, and it also has higher support among younger women, liberals, and voters who have lived in Berkeley for over 20 years. **Majorities across all major demographics would vote Yes on the sales tax.**
- **Support for the sales tax remains largely steady after statements in favor and against the measure (58% Yes, 29% No, 13% undecided).**

## Key Findings – Context

---

- **A majority of Berkeley voters (56%) say the City is going in the right direction, while only 22% say wrong direction.** This is an improvement since the last survey in 2024, when 49% said right direction and 29% wrong direction.
- **The same number (56%) say the City is doing a good or excellent job at providing services to residents,** although intensity is low, with 11% who say excellent and 45% who say good. The City’s job rating has improved slightly but remains largely consistent with past surveys.
- While Berkeley voters have a mix of issues that they prioritize, **the top issues are *safeguarding critical infrastructure from the threats of climate change, including flooding and wildfires (35%) and increasing Berkeley’s safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways (31%)***. Issues related to pollution and flood risk (24%), parks and recreation facilities (23%), and public safety facilities (22%) are also strong priorities. Advancing the Civic Center Vision is the lowest on the list at 11%.

## Key Findings – Project Priorities

---


- **The top tier of projects that voters prioritize tend to focus on safety.** These include **renovating the 911 dispatch center** (29% extremely important, 66% extremely/very important), **repairing sidewalks** (27% extremely important, 65% extremely/very important), **replacing fire stations** (27% extremely important, 56% extremely/very important), **upgrading park restrooms** (24% extremely important, 62% extremely/very important), and **repairing fire stations** (22% extremely important, 57% extremely/very important).
- While not the highest priority, voters do place importance on improving earthquake protections and repairing public buildings. Including the Civic Center buildings in a list of other public buildings does not hurt the importance of repairs; voters do not want this to be the focus of funding, but including Civic Center in a list of other buildings for repairs does not have a negative impact. However, specifying Old City Hall and the Veterans Building is less effective than more generally talking about earthquake protections.
- The lowest priorities tested are new dog parks, Marina docks, and sports field irrigation. Projects for public safety, especially emergency and fire services, cracked sidewalks, and earthquake protections, are higher priorities for Berkeley voters.



# CONTEXT

# City Direction

A majority of Berkeley voters think the City is headed in the right direction, while under a quarter say it's going in the wrong direction. Younger women, progressives and liberals, and those who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years are the most optimistic.




|                  | Right Direction | Wrong Direction | DK        | Net        |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>56</b>       | <b>22</b>       | <b>23</b> | <b>+34</b> |
| Men              | 55              | 21              | 24        | +33        |
| Women            | 57              | 22              | 22        | +35        |
| < 50             | 57              | 17              | 26        | +40        |
| 50+              | 55              | 26              | 20        | +29        |
| Men < 50         | 51              | 20              | 29        | +31        |
| Women < 50       | <b>61</b>       | 15              | 24        | +46        |
| Men 50+          | 58              | 22              | 20        | +36        |
| Women 50+        | 52              | 28              | 20        | +24        |
| White            | 58              | 24              | 18        | +34        |
| POC              | 51              | 16              | 32        | +35        |
| Non-College      | 51              | 18              | 31        | +33        |
| College          | 57              | 23              | 20        | +34        |
| Progressive      | <b>60</b>       | 13              | 26        | +47        |
| Liberal          | <b>61</b>       | 22              | 16        | +39        |
| Mod/Cons         | 39              | 35              | 26        | +4         |
| Hills            | 57              | 24              | 18        | +33        |
| Central /South   | 59              | 22              | 19        | +37        |
| West             | 50              | 17              | 33        | +33        |
| Own              | 56              | 24              | 21        | +32        |
| Rent             | 55              | 20              | 25        | +35        |
| Under 10 years   | 56              | 15              | 29        | +41        |
| 10-20 years      | <b>62</b>       | 15              | 23        | +47        |
| 20 or more years | 53              | 29              | 18        | +24        |

Q3: Would you say that the city of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?

# City Direction – Timeseries


**Voters' rating of the City's direction has improved since 2024 and has reached the highest level since 2016.**



[T] Do you feel that the City of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or do you feel things are headed in the wrong direction?

# City Services Approval

A majority of voters also positively rate the City of Berkeley’s job providing services to residents, though only 11% say it is doing an excellent job. Liberals and 10-20 year residents are most likely to give the City a positive job rating.




|                  | Excellent/<br>Good | Just<br>Fair/Poor | DK | Net |
|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----|-----|
| Total            | 56                 | 39                | 5  | +17 |
| Men              | 56                 | 40                | 4  | +15 |
| Women            | 56                 | 38                | 6  | +18 |
| < 50             | 56                 | 38                | 6  | +18 |
| 50+              | 56                 | 40                | 4  | +15 |
| Men < 50         | 51                 | 43                | 6  | +8  |
| Women < 50       | 59                 | 34                | 6  | +25 |
| Men 50+          | 59                 | 38                | 3  | +21 |
| Women 50+        | 53                 | 42                | 5  | +10 |
| White            | 58                 | 38                | 4  | +20 |
| POC              | 51                 | 42                | 7  | +9  |
| Non-College      | 49                 | 47                | 4  | +3  |
| College          | 58                 | 37                | 5  | +21 |
| Progressive      | 55                 | 40                | 5  | +15 |
| Liberal          | 63                 | 34                | 4  | +29 |
| Mod/Cons         | 48                 | 46                | 6  | +3  |
| Hills            | 57                 | 39                | 4  | +18 |
| Central /South   | 56                 | 38                | 6  | +18 |
| West             | 54                 | 41                | 5  | +13 |
| Own              | 58                 | 38                | 4  | +19 |
| Rent             | 53                 | 40                | 6  | +13 |
| Under 10 years   | 54                 | 40                | 6  | +13 |
| 10-20 years      | 61                 | 34                | 4  | +27 |
| 20 or more years | 55                 | 41                | 4  | +14 |

Q4: How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?

# City Services Approval – Timeseries

Ratings have improved slightly since 2024, but the City’s job rating is generally consistent with recent years.




[T] How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?

# Issues

The top issues that voters choose as their highest priorities are related to safety – protecting infrastructure from the threats of climate change and increasing safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks.

A second tier of priorities includes reducing pollution and flood risk by upgrading storm drains, improving parks and recreation, and replacing public safety facilities.



Q5: Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?

## Issues by Demographics (1)

Safeguarding critical infrastructure from climate change is especially important to women and younger voters, particularly younger women, and this is also the top priority across regions. Men, especially younger men, are most concerned with fixing sidewalks, curb ramps, and paths.

|   | Total | Gender    |           | Age       |     | Gender/Age |           |       |       | Region |                |      | Race  |     |
|---|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----|------------|-----------|-------|-------|--------|----------------|------|-------|-----|
|   |       | M         | W         | < 50      | 50+ | M < 50     | W < 50    | M 50+ | W 50+ | Hills  | Central /South | West | White | POC |
| Safeguarding critical infrastructure            | 35    | 29        | <b>40</b> | <b>40</b> | 30  | 35         | <b>45</b> | 24    | 35    | 35     | 38             | 31   | 35    | 33  |
| Improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways   | 31    | <b>35</b> | 28        | 34        | 28  | <b>40</b>  | 30        | 31    | 26    | 31     | 32             | 30   | 30    | 33  |
| Reducing pollution/ upgrading storm drains      | 24    | 22        | 25        | 21        | 26  | 19         | 23        | 25    | 27    | 28     | 18             | 23   | 23    | 24  |
| Improving parks and recreation                  | 23    | 24        | 23        | 27        | 20  | 25         | 29        | 22    | 17    | 20     | 25             | 28   | 25    | 21  |
| Replacing public safety facilities              | 22    | 23        | 21        | 20        | 23  | 23         | 18        | 23    | 23    | 25     | 16             | 21   | 23    | 20  |
| Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline | 15    | 18        | 13        | 13        | 17  | 13         | 13        | 23    | 12    | 10     | 14             | 25   | 17    | 12  |
| Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision      | 11    | 13        | 9         | 11        | 11  | 12         | 10        | 14    | 8     | 9      | 15             | 9    | 11    | 9   |
| None  | 5     | 5         | 6         | 5         | 6   | 5          | 5         | 4     | 7     | 7      | 4              | 5    | 4     | 8   |

Q5: Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?

ALL RESPONDENTS

## Issues by Demographics (2)

Voters who are undecided about the GO bond measure are particularly concerned with upgrading storm drains to reduce pollution, while those undecided on the sales tax most prioritize safeguarding critical infrastructure. This is also the top priority for Yes voters, while No voters are more concerned with sidewalks.

|   | Total | Education |       | Home ownership |           | Years in Berkeley |       |     | Combined bond ballot |    |           | Sales tax ballot |    |           |
|---|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-----|----------------------|----|-----------|------------------|----|-----------|
|   |       | Non-Coll  | Coll+ | Own            | Rent      | <10               | 10-20 | 20+ | Yes                  | No | Und       | Yes              | No | Und       |
| Safeguarding critical infrastructure            | 35    | 29        | 37    | 36             | 34        | 39                | 38    | 30  | <b>40</b>            | 21 | 24        | <b>39</b>        | 25 | <b>41</b> |
| Improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways   | 31    | 33        | 30    | 26             | <b>37</b> | 27                | 34    | 32  | 32                   | 35 | 23        | 30               | 34 | 27        |
| Reducing pollution/ upgrading storm drains      | 24    | 19        | 25    | 26             | 21        | 21                | 26    | 24  | 24                   | 13 | <b>32</b> | 26               | 22 | 17        |
| Improving parks and recreation                  | 23    | 22        | 24    | 24             | 22        | 28                | 23    | 21  | 23                   | 18 | 27        | 24               | 23 | 20        |
| Replacing public safety facilities              | 22    | 19        | 23    | 25             | 19        | 17                | 19    | 26  | 22                   | 15 | 25        | 21               | 21 | 28        |
| Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline | 15    | 22        | 13    | 13             | 17        | 11                | 17    | 17  | 15                   | 18 | 12        | 15               | 16 | 12        |
| Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision      | 11    | 16        | 9     | 9              | 13        | 13                | 14    | 8   | 11                   | 9  | 9         | 11               | 12 | 3         |
| None  | 5     | 3         | 6     | 8              | 3         | 7                 | 3     | 5   | 2                    | 27 | 3         | 2                | 12 | 9         |

Q5: Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?

ALL RESPONDENTS

# GO BOND



## Text of GO Bond Ballot Measure

---


**[GO BOND \$300m]** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at an average rate of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

**[GO BOND \$200m]** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at an average rate of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

# Initial Ballot GO Bond Measure COMBINED

By nearly seven to one, Berkeley voters would vote Yes on a measure providing funding through a general obligation bond to invest in fire stations and emergency response facilities, parks and recreation facilities, climate change resiliency, and public buildings and infrastructure, just above the two-thirds threshold needed for the measure to pass.

Regionally, the highest support is in the Central/South region of the city. Progressives and voters who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years are also particularly supportive.




|                  | Yes       | No        | U/D/R     | Net        |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>70</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>+57</b> |
| Men              | 70        | 15        | 15        | +55        |
| Women            | 71        | 12        | 17        | +59        |
| < 50             | 72        | 12        | 16        | +61        |
| 50+              | 69        | 14        | 17        | +54        |
| Men < 50         | 72        | 14        | 14        | +57        |
| Women < 50       | 73        | 10        | 17        | +63        |
| Men 50+          | 69        | 15        | 17        | +54        |
| Women 50+        | 69        | 14        | 18        | +55        |
| White            | 74        | 12        | 14        | +62        |
| POC              | 64        | 15        | 21        | +49        |
| Non-College      | 73        | 5         | 22        | +68        |
| College          | 70        | 16        | 15        | +54        |
| Progressive      | <b>78</b> | 6         | 16        | +73        |
| Liberal          | 73        | 10        | 16        | +63        |
| Mod/Cons         | 52        | 30        | 18        | +22        |
| Hills            | 71        | 13        | 15        | +58        |
| Central /South   | <b>75</b> | 10        | 14        | +65        |
| West             | 65        | 15        | 20        | +50        |
| Own              | 67        | 19        | 14        | +48        |
| Rent             | 74        | 6         | 19        | +68        |
| Under 10 years   | 67        | 12        | 20        | +55        |
| 10-20 years      | <b>76</b> | 11        | 13        | +65        |
| 20 or more years | 70        | 15        | 15        | +56        |
| Right direction  | 79        | 7         | 14        | +72        |
| Wrong track      | 60        | 30        | 10        | +30        |

Q6/Q7. This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

# Initial Ballot GO Bond Measure - \$300m vs \$200m

We tested two separate versions of the bond measure with different amounts and found that having the larger \$300 million amount on the ballot does not impact support. In fact, the strong Yes vote is slightly higher for \$300m than \$200m.

Older women and liberal voters are more likely to vote Yes on \$300m, while younger voters, progressives, and those who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years are more likely to vote Yes on the lower \$200m version.



|                  | \$300 million |    | \$200 million |    |
|------------------|---------------|----|---------------|----|
|                  | Yes           | No | Yes           | No |
| Total            | 71            | 12 | 70            | 14 |
| Men              | 70            | 16 | 70            | 14 |
| Women            | 71            | 9  | 71            | 15 |
| < 50             | 69            | 15 | 76            | 9  |
| 50+              | 72            | 10 | 65            | 19 |
| Men < 50         | 72            | 21 | 72            | 8  |
| Women < 50       | 67            | 10 | 79            | 10 |
| Men 50+          | 68            | 11 | 69            | 19 |
| Women 50+        | 75            | 9  | 62            | 19 |
| White            | 76            | 11 | 72            | 13 |
| POC              | 61            | 15 | 67            | 16 |
| Progressive      | 75            | 5  | 82            | 7  |
| Liberal          | 76            | 13 | 71            | 8  |
| Mod/Cons         | 56            | 22 | 48            | 38 |
| Hills            | 71            | 13 | 71            | 14 |
| Central /South   | 74            | 11 | 77            | 10 |
| West             | 67            | 12 | 63            | 18 |
| Own              | 69            | 16 | 65            | 21 |
| Rent             | 72            | 7  | 76            | 5  |
| Under 10 years   | 70            | 13 | 65            | 12 |
| 10-20 years      | 71            | 12 | 81            | 10 |
| 20 or more years | 71            | 11 | 69            | 18 |

Q6/Q7. This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

## Text of Support/Oppose Statements – GO Bond Ballot Measure

---


*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer.

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently.

# Informed Ballot GO Bond Measure COMBINED

After balanced statements in support and in opposition to the bond measure, support decreases slightly but remains right at the passage threshold.

Moderate and conservative voters are the most likely to vote No, while three quarters of progressives still vote Yes. Regionally, support remains lowest in the West.




|                   | Yes       | No        | U/D/R     | Net        |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>67</b> | <b>18</b> | <b>14</b> | <b>+49</b> |
| Men               | 68        | 19        | 13        | +49        |
| Women             | 67        | 18        | 15        | +49        |
| < 50              | 71        | 15        | 14        | +56        |
| 50+               | 64        | 22        | 15        | +42        |
| Men < 50          | 71        | 17        | 12        | +54        |
| Women < 50        | 71        | 13        | 15        | +58        |
| Men 50+           | 65        | 21        | 14        | +45        |
| Women 50+         | 62        | 22        | 16        | +40        |
| White             | 71        | 17        | 12        | +54        |
| POC               | 60        | 20        | 19        | +40        |
| Non-College       | 66        | 9         | 25        | +56        |
| College           | 68        | 21        | 11        | +47        |
| Progressive       | <b>74</b> | 11        | 15        | +63        |
| Liberal           | 69        | 16        | 15        | +54        |
| Mod/Cons          | 52        | <b>36</b> | 12        | +17        |
| Hills             | 68        | 19        | 13        | +48        |
| Central /South    | 73        | 12        | 15        | +61        |
| West              | 62        | 23        | 16        | +39        |
| Own               | 66        | 24        | 10        | +42        |
| Rent              | 69        | 12        | 19        | +57        |
| Under 10 years    | 62        | 15        | 23        | +47        |
| 10-20 years       | <b>74</b> | 17        | 9         | +56        |
| 20 or more years  | 68        | 21        | 11        | +47        |
| Initial Undecided | 29        | 18        | 52        | +11        |

Q9/Q10. Q10: Next you will hear two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at rates of [] per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

# Informed Ballot GO Bond Measure - \$300m vs \$200m

The \$300m bond holds up better to stress testing, with the Yes vote 9 points higher than Yes on \$200m. Younger women and voters in the Central/South region who heard the \$300m amount are particularly supportive.

Among moderate/conservative voters and in the West, opposition is higher among those who heard the \$200m version.



|                  | \$300 million |    | \$200 million |    |
|------------------|---------------|----|---------------|----|
|                  | Yes           | No | Yes           | No |
| Total            | 72            | 15 | 63            | 22 |
| Men              | 72            | 16 | 64            | 21 |
| Women            | 72            | 14 | 62            | 22 |
| < 50             | 75            | 12 | 67            | 17 |
| 50+              | 69            | 17 | 58            | 26 |
| Men < 50         | 73            | 18 | 69            | 16 |
| Women < 50       | 77            | 8  | 66            | 19 |
| Men 50+          | 71            | 15 | 60            | 26 |
| Women 50+        | 67            | 20 | 57            | 25 |
| White            | 72            | 15 | 69            | 19 |
| POC              | 70            | 14 | 51            | 27 |
| Progressive      | 76            | 7  | 73            | 16 |
| Liberal          | 76            | 15 | 63            | 16 |
| Mod/Cons         | 59            | 30 | 46            | 42 |
| Hills            | 70            | 19 | 65            | 20 |
| Central /South   | 80            | 10 | 65            | 14 |
| West             | 67            | 13 | 56            | 32 |
| Own              | 69            | 19 | 63            | 29 |
| Rent             | 74            | 11 | 63            | 13 |
| Under 10 years   | 69            | 13 | 55            | 17 |
| 10-20 years      | 73            | 13 | 74            | 22 |
| 20 or more years | 72            | 17 | 63            | 25 |

Q9/Q10. Q10: Next you will hear two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at rates of [] per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

## GO Bond Target Profiles

Voters who are undecided on the bond measure are slightly more likely to be NPP voters, renters, and live in West Berkeley than the overall electorate. They are also more likely to have some college education, lived in Berkeley for under 10 years, and be people of color, especially men. Persuadable voters are similarly likely to be renters, lived in Berkeley for less than 10 years, have some college education, and also include moderates, younger women, college-educated women, and Black voters.

| Profile of GO Bond Undecided Voters – 16% of Electorate |                |                 |
|---|----------------|-----------------|
| Demographic   | % of Undecided | % of Electorate |
| NPP/Other   | 24             | 19              |
| 65-69   | 17             | 8               |
| Some college  | 27             | 16              |
| Non-college men   | 20             | 12              |
| Under 10 years in Berkeley                              | 37             | 30              |
| People of color   | 41             | 32              |
| Men of color  | 19             | 13              |
| Rent  | 51             | 43              |
| Rent West   | 20             | 13              |
| West  | 36             | 28              |

| Profile of GO Bond Persuadable Voters – 16% of Electorate |                  |                 |
|---|------------------|-----------------|
| Demographic   | % of Persuadable | % of Electorate |
| Moderate  | 23               | 17              |
| Women < 50  | 34               | 27              |
| Some college  | 29               | 16              |
| Non-college men   | 23               | 12              |
| College+ women  | 49               | 43              |
| Under 10 years in Berkeley                                | 40               | 30              |
| Black   | 15               | 9               |
| Black men   | 11               | 4               |
| People of color < 50                                      | 28               | 19              |
| Rent  | 51               | 43              |




# SALES TAX

**[SALES TAX]** Shall the City of Berkeley measure to increase funding for essential city services, such as 9-1-1 emergency response; neighborhood police services; fire prevention/protection; youth and senior services; community cultural programs; attracting/ retaining small businesses; and funding for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, by adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

# Initial Ballot Sales Tax Measure

Passage of the ½ percent sales tax to address the City’s budget deficit also looks promising. While it has lower initial support than the bond measure, support is well above the 50% threshold for passage. Demographics with the highest support for the sales tax include women under 50, liberal voters, Central/South voters, and 20+ year residents of Berkeley. Even half of voters who say the city is going in the wrong direction would vote Yes.



|                  | Yes       | No        | U/D/R     | Net        |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>60</b> | <b>29</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>+31</b> |
| Men              | 55        | 33        | 12        | +22        |
| Women            | 64        | 25        | 12        | +39        |
| < 50             | 63        | 25        | 12        | +38        |
| 50+              | 57        | 32        | 11        | +24        |
| Men < 50         | 55        | 31        | 14        | +24        |
| Women < 50       | <b>69</b> | 20        | 11        | +49        |
| Men 50+          | 54        | 35        | 10        | +19        |
| Women 50+        | 58        | 30        | 12        | +29        |
| White            | 62        | 27        | 11        | +35        |
| POC              | 55        | 32        | 13        | +24        |
| Non-College      | 63        | 21        | 15        | +42        |
| College          | 59        | 31        | 11        | +28        |
| Progressive      | 58        | 30        | 12        | +28        |
| Liberal          | <b>66</b> | 21        | 13        | +46        |
| Mod/Cons         | 52        | 39        | 9         | +13        |
| Hills            | 56        | 30        | 14        | +27        |
| Central /South   | <b>65</b> | 28        | 6         | +37        |
| West             | 60        | 27        | 13        | +33        |
| Own              | 61        | 29        | 10        | +32        |
| Rent             | 58        | 27        | 15        | +31        |
| Under 10 years   | 54        | 29        | 17        | +25        |
| 10-20 years      | 58        | 32        | 10        | +26        |
| 20 or more years | <b>65</b> | 26        | 9         | +38        |
| Right direction  | <b>67</b> | 22        | 11        | +45        |
| Wrong track      | 51        | 41        | 9         | +10        |

Q8: This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City’s projected budget deficit of \$32 million. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

## Text of Support/Oppose Statements – Sales Tax Ballot Measure


---

*Supporters* say the City must address its projected budget deficit to prevent layoffs of police officers and firefighters, the closure of a fire station, and the loss of vital youth and homeless services. This is a modest change to the sales tax, and it only brings Berkeley to the same tax rates as nearby cities like Oakland and Albany. It will fund essential services to make sure police and firefighters can continue to keep us safe and maintain the city's quality of life without putting a major burden on taxpayers.

*Opponents* say this tax hike is yet another burden on taxpayers without any new or improved services to show for it. Berkeley taxpayers simply can't afford all these tax increases, and we shouldn't be asked to pay more when nothing will change. Increasing the sales tax will increase the burden on low- and middle-class residents and local small businesses. The City should use its existing budget and avoid deficits instead of asking us for more money.

# Informed Ballot Sales Tax Measure

**After pro and con messaging, a solid majority continues to vote Yes on the sales tax measure, and opposition remains unchanged. Younger women, liberals, and 20+ year residents remain the strongest supporters.**



|                   | Yes       | No        | U/D/R     | Net        |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>58</b> | <b>29</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>+29</b> |
| Men               | 56        | 31        | 13        | +25        |
| Women             | 60        | 27        | 13        | +33        |
| < 50              | 62        | 26        | 12        | +36        |
| 50+               | 55        | 32        | 14        | +23        |
| Men < 50          | 58        | 27        | 15        | +31        |
| Women < 50        | <b>65</b> | 25        | 10        | +40        |
| Men 50+           | 54        | 35        | 11        | +19        |
| Women 50+         | 55        | 29        | 16        | +26        |
| White             | 62        | 25        | 13        | +37        |
| POC               | 50        | 36        | 14        | +14        |
| Non-College       | 57        | 24        | 19        | +33        |
| College           | 58        | 30        | 11        | +28        |
| Progressive       | 57        | 31        | 13        | +26        |
| Liberal           | <b>64</b> | 20        | 16        | +43        |
| Mod/Cons          | 53        | 39        | 8         | +14        |
| Hills             | 56        | 28        | 16        | +27        |
| Central /South    | 60        | 28        | 11        | +32        |
| West              | 60        | 30        | 10        | +30        |
| Own               | 60        | 28        | 12        | +32        |
| Rent              | 55        | 29        | 16        | +26        |
| Under 10 years    | 55        | 27        | 17        | +28        |
| 10-20 years       | 54        | 35        | 11        | +18        |
| 20 or more years  | <b>63</b> | 26        | 11        | +37        |
| Initial undecided | 23        | 12        | 65        | +11        |

Q11: Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the sales tax measure described earlier. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. Shall the measure adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

## Sales Tax Target Profiles

Undecided voters on the sales tax are heavily progressive/liberal men, non-college men, and men of color while persuadables are more likely to be Democratic and progressive/liberal men, younger men, non-college men, and renter men. Similar to the bond targets, both undecideds and persuadables have disproportionately lived in Berkeley for under 10 years. Both are also concentrated in the Berkeley Hills, particularly renters in the Hills.

| Profile of Sales Tax Undecided Voters – 11% of Electorate |                |                 |
|---|----------------|-----------------|
| Demographic   | % of Undecided | % of Electorate |
| Democrat < 50   | 42             | 36              |
| Progressive/liberal men                                   | 43             | 34              |
| Some college  | 27             | 16              |
| Non-college men   | 20             | 12              |
| Under 10 years in Berkeley                                | 43             | 30              |
| Men of color  | 19             | 13              |
| Rent  | 52             | 43              |
| Rent Hills  | 28             | 15              |
| Hills   | 54             | 45              |
| Hills women   | 30             | 24              |

| Profile of Sales Tax Persuadable Voters – 15% of Electorate |                  |                 |
|---|------------------|-----------------|
| Demographic   | % of Persuadable | % of Electorate |
| Democratic men  | 41               | 33              |
| Democrat < 50   | 42               | 36              |
| Progressive/liberal men                                     | 42               | 34              |
| Men < 50  | 29               | 21              |
| Some college  | 26               | 16              |
| Grad school   | 46               | 39              |
| Non-college men   | 23               | 12              |
| Under 10 years in Berkeley                                  | 40               | 30              |
| Rent men  | 32               | 20              |
| Rent Hills  | 28               | 15              |
| Hills   | 55               | 45              |

# PRIORITIES



## Text of Priority Items – Top Tier

**[Renovate 911 dispatch]** Renovate the 911 dispatch center to handle higher call volumes and modernize critical infrastructure

**[Replace fire stations\*]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by replacing fire stations that are no longer able to meet demands with new stations run on green energy

**[Repair sidewalks]** Improve safety and accessibility by repairing cracked and uneven sidewalks and upgrading curb ramps citywide

**[Upgrade park restrooms\*]** Upgrade deteriorating public restrooms at Berkeley parks

**[Repair fire stations\*]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by conducting essential repairs and adding green energy capacity

**[Earthquake protections for buildings\*]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings

**[Protect Waterfront paths]** Protect paths and roads on Berkeley's Waterfront from flooding due to sea level rise

**[Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center\*]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, South Berkeley Senior Center, and Civic Center Buildings to improve their energy efficiency and safety

**[Mental health building]** Expand mental health service capacity by replacing crumbling offices with a new energy efficient mental health services building

**[Repair public buildings\*]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, and South Berkeley Senior Center to improve their energy efficiency and safety

## Text of Priority Items – Lower Tier

---

**[Repair /rebuild community centers]** Repair and rebuild community centers that are out of date, energy inefficient, too small, or vulnerable to earthquakes

**[Safe/accessible playgrounds]** Make playgrounds safer and more accessible

**[Earthquake protections – specific buildings\*]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings such as Old City Hall and the Veterans Building

**[Add park restrooms\*]** Add public restrooms to Berkeley parks

**[Repair park paths /parking lots]** Improve safety and accessibility in the City's parks by repairing park pathways and parking lots

**[South Berkeley green space]** Expanding accessible green open space in South Berkeley

**[Repair recreational facilities]** Repair and modernize aged public recreational facilities like pools, soccer fields, and basketball courts

**[Repair seawall]** Rebuild the failing seawall that threatens public access to South Cove


**[Sports fields irrigation]** Fix failing irrigation and drainage at the City's most used sports fields

**[Repair Marina's docks]** Repair Marina's docks to extend their lifespan 50-plus years

**[New dog parks]** Build additional dog parks across the City to meet growing demand

# Priority Items

Of potential projects that the measures could fund, the top priorities for voters are renovating the 911 dispatch center, replacing outdated fire stations, and repairing sidewalks. The lowest priorities are new dog parks, repairing Marina docks, and sports fields irrigation.



Extremely important      Very important


Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items – Park and Fire Language Tests

Upgrading deteriorating park restrooms is a higher priority than adding new park restrooms.

Fire stations are a top priority, and voters do not shy away from replacing rather than repairing fire stations – replacing fire stations has slightly higher intensity as a priority than repairing.




Extremely important Very important

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items – Building Repair Language Tests

While including the examples of Old City Hall and the Veterans Building brings down the salience of improving earthquake protections and building safety, adding Civic Center Buildings to a list of other public buildings for repair does not have an impact. Neither example should be a focal point – talking about buildings in the broader context and emphasizing safety is most effective.



■ Extremely important   
 ■ Very important

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items by Demographics (1) – Top Tier

The public safety projects (911 dispatch center and fire stations) are top priorities across demographics. Replacing fire stations is especially important to younger women and voters in Central/South.

| Extremely important                        | Total | Gender |    | Age  |     | Gender/Age |           |       |       | Region |           |      | Race  |     |
|--|-------|--------|----|------|-----|------------|-----------|-------|-------|--------|-----------|------|-------|-----|
|  |       | M      | W  | < 50 | 50+ | M < 50     | W < 50    | M 50+ | W 50+ | Hills  | C/S       | West | White | POC |
| Renovate 911 dispatch                      | 29    | 26     | 31 | 26   | 32  | 21         | 29        | 30    | 33    | 31     | 33        | 22   | 29    | 28  |
| Replace fire stations*                     | 27    | 25     | 28 | 32   | 22  | 28         | <b>34</b> | 22    | 22    | 26     | <b>34</b> | 22   | 26    | 29  |
| Repair sidewalks                           | 27    | 24     | 28 | 24   | 29  | 20         | 28        | 28    | 29    | 26     | 26        | 28   | 26    | 29  |
| Upgrade park restrooms*                    | 24    | 23     | 25 | 22   | 26  | 21         | 23        | 26    | 26    | 24     | 25        | 23   | 23    | 26  |
| Repair fire stations*                      | 22    | 22     | 21 | 18   | 25  | 19         | 17        | 24    | 26    | 27     | 20        | 14   | 22    | 21  |
| Earthquake protections for buildings*      | 18    | 17     | 19 | 18   | 18  | 18         | 17        | 16    | 21    | 17     | 19        | 19   | 16    | 21  |
| Protect Waterfront paths                   | 18    | 14     | 22 | 16   | 19  | 14         | 18        | 14    | 25    | 19     | 16        | 19   | 17    | 19  |
| Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center* | 18    | 12     | 23 | 17   | 18  | 16         | 18        | 8     | 27    | 19     | 17        | 17   | 17    | 20  |
| Mental health building                     | 17    | 16     | 18 | 17   | 17  | 14         | 19        | 18    | 17    | 17     | 17        | 18   | 15    | 21  |
| Repair public buildings*                   | 17    | 14     | 19 | 15   | 18  | 12         | 18        | 16    | 21    | 21     | 10        | 16   | 16    | 16  |

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

## Priority Items by Demographics (2) – Top Tier

**Yes voters are particularly energized by the 911 dispatch, fire stations, and sidewalks. Upgrading park restrooms is the top priority for renters and voters who have mixed responses across the ballots.**

| Extremely important                        | Total | Education |       | Home ownership |           | Years in Berkeley |       |     | Combined bond ballot |    | Sales tax ballot |    | Ballot target |           |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-----|----------------------|----|------------------|----|---------------|-----------|
|  |       | Non-Coll  | Coll+ | Own            | Rent      | <10               | 10-20 | 20+ | Yes                  | No | Yes              | No | Yes all       | Mixed     |
| Renovate 911 dispatch                      | 29    | 29        | 29    | 28             | 30        | 28                | 24    | 32  | 34                   | 12 | 35               | 18 | 39            | 23        |
| Replace fire stations*                     | 27    | 29        | 26    | 27             | 26        | 21                | 30    | 29  | 29                   | 12 | 32               | 15 | 33            | 25        |
| Repair sidewalks                           | 27    | 28        | 26    | 26             | 29        | 20                | 26    | 32  | 29                   | 18 | 34               | 14 | 33            | 23        |
| Upgrade park restrooms*                    | 24    | 31        | 22    | 18             | <b>32</b> | 27                | 21    | 24  | 27                   | 21 | 26               | 22 | 20            | <b>30</b> |
| Repair fire stations*                      | 22    | 20        | 22    | 26             | 15        | 12                | 19    | 29  | 27                   | 0  | 28               | 8  | 35            | 13        |
| Earthquake protections for buildings*      | 18    | 16        | 19    | 18             | 19        | 14                | 17    | 21  | 23                   | 2  | 25               | 6  | 26            | 13        |
| Protect Waterfront paths                   | 18    | 22        | 17    | 19             | 17        | 11                | 23    | 20  | 22                   | 9  | 23               | 10 | 22            | 16        |
| Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center* | 18    | 21        | 17    | 14             | 22        | 17                | 22    | 16  | 18                   | 5  | 22               | 10 | 19            | 19        |
| Mental health building                     | 17    | 17        | 17    | 14             | 21        | 20                | 14    | 17  | 20                   | 3  | 23               | 8  | 24            | 13        |
| Repair public buildings*                   | 17    | 16        | 17    | 18             | 16        | 15                | 15    | 19  | 21                   | 3  | 25               | 1  | 27            | 10        |

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items by Demographics (1) – Lower Tier

The lower tier priorities are generally lower to voters across demographics.

| Extremely important                          | Total | Gender |    | Age  |     | Gender/Age |        |       |       | Region |     |      | Race  |     |
|--|-------|--------|----|------|-----|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-----|------|-------|-----|
|  |       | M      | W  | < 50 | 50+ | M < 50     | W < 50 | M 50+ | W 50+ | Hills  | C/S | West | White | POC |
| Repair/rebuild community centers             | 15    | 13     | 18 | 17   | 14  | 13         | 21     | 13    | 15    | 14     | 22  | 11   | 14    | 18  |
| Safe/accessible playgrounds                  | 15    | 13     | 16 | 13   | 17  | 13         | 13     | 13    | 20    | 16     | 12  | 16   | 14    | 17  |
| Earthquake protections – specific buildings* | 14    | 13     | 16 | 12   | 16  | 13         | 12     | 13    | 19    | 15     | 17  | 12   | 14    | 16  |
| Repair park paths/parking lots               | 12    | 8      | 16 | 12   | 13  | 7          | 15     | 9     | 16    | 9      | 17  | 13   | 11    | 14  |
| South Berkeley green space                   | 12    | 10     | 14 | 10   | 14  | 9          | 11     | 11    | 17    | 12     | 15  | 9    | 12    | 13  |
| Repair recreational facilities               | 11    | 10     | 12 | 8    | 15  | 6          | 10     | 14    | 15    | 10     | 14  | 12   | 11    | 12  |
| Repair seawall                               | 11    | 9      | 13 | 9    | 13  | 10         | 9      | 8     | 17    | 10     | 13  | 12   | 10    | 14  |
| Sports fields irrigation                     | 9     | 9      | 9  | 7    | 11  | 8          | 7      | 10    | 12    | 8      | 6   | 14   | 9     | 9   |
| Repair Marina’s docks                        | 8     | 6      | 9  | 6    | 9   | 6          | 7      | 7     | 11    | 6      | 7   | 11   | 8     | 8   |
| New dog parks                                | 4     | 5      | 3  | 4    | 4   | 4          | 4      | 7     | 3     | 4      | 7   | 3    | 4     | 5   |

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

## Priority Items by Demographics (2) – Lower Tier

**Building new dog parks and repairing Marina’s docks are relatively low priorities even for voters who vote Yes on both the bond and sales tax.**

| Extremely important                          | Total | Education |       | Home ownership |      | Years in Berkeley |       |     | Combined bond ballot |    | Sales tax ballot |    | Ballot target |       |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|------|-------------------|-------|-----|----------------------|----|------------------|----|---------------|-------|
|  |       | Non-Coll  | Coll+ | Own            | Rent | <10               | 10-20 | 20+ | Yes                  | No | Yes              | No | Yes all       | Mixed |
| Repair/rebuild community centers             | 15    | 15        | 16    | 14             | 17   | 14                | 17    | 15  | 18                   | 7  | 19               | 4  | 19            | 14    |
| Safe/accessible playgrounds                  | 15    | 15        | 15    | 13             | 16   | 13                | 14    | 16  | 18                   | 4  | 19               | 5  | 19            | 12    |
| Earthquake protections – specific buildings* | 14    | 15        | 14    | 13             | 17   | 13                | 13    | 16  | 18                   | 6  | 18               | 8  | 21            | 11    |
| Add park restrooms*                          | 13    | 16        | 12    | 9              | 18   | 15                | 14    | 10  | 14                   | 5  | 14               | 10 | 11            | 15    |
| Repair park paths/parking lots               | 12    | 16        | 11    | 13             | 11   | 8                 | 11    | 16  | 16                   | 4  | 17               | 5  | 17            | 9     |
| South Berkeley green space                   | 12    | 11        | 13    | 13             | 11   | 9                 | 10    | 15  | 14                   | 4  | 15               | 8  | 16            | 10    |
| Repair recreational facilities               | 11    | 11        | 11    | 9              | 15   | 12                | 7     | 13  | 13                   | 4  | 14               | 7  | 14            | 11    |
| Repair seawall                               | 11    | 10        | 12    | 11             | 11   | 12                | 8     | 12  | 13                   | 8  | 13               | 9  | 15            | 8     |
| Sports fields irrigation                     | 9     | 10        | 9     | 8              | 12   | 8                 | 10    | 10  | 11                   | 4  | 11               | 6  | 10            | 9     |
| Repair Marina’s docks                        | 8     | 8         | 8     | 6              | 10   | 6                 | 9     | 8   | 8                    | 8  | 9                | 6  | 8             | 8     |
| New dog parks                                | 4     | 4         | 4     | 4              | 5    | 5                 | 7     | 2   | 4                    | 1  | 6                | 2  | 6             | 3     |

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.



Washington, DC | Berkeley, CA | New York, NY

[LakeResearch.com](http://LakeResearch.com)

202.776.9066

David Mermin

[dmermin@lakeresearch.com](mailto:dmermin@lakeresearch.com)

Emma Scotty

[escotty@lakeresearch.com](mailto:escotty@lakeresearch.com)

City of Berkeley Voter Survey  
Live Phone and Text to Online  
February 19-23 2026

N=500 Likely November 2026 General Election Voters

Splits: A/B, C/D

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

Region

|                              |    |     |     |     |
|------------------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|
| Council District 5,6,8 ..... | 45 | 100 | 0   | 0   |
| Council District 3,4,7 ..... | 27 | 0   | 100 | 0   |
| Council District 1,2 .....   | 28 | 0   | 0   | 100 |

Party registration

|                  |    |    |    |    |
|------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Democrat .....   | 79 | 83 | 70 | 80 |
| Republican ..... | 3  | 3  | 1  | 4  |
| NPP /Other ..... | 19 | 15 | 28 | 16 |
| NPP .....        | 15 | 14 | 22 | 10 |
| Other.....       | 4  | 1  | 6  | 6  |

**Q1.** Before we begin, I need to know if I have reached you on a cell phone, and if so, are you in a place where you can talk safely?

|   |    |    |    |    |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| Yes, cell and can talk safely .....                     | 50 | 46 | 48 | 58 |
| Yes, cell and cannot talk safely ... <b>[CALL BACK]</b> |    |    |    |    |
| No, not on cell, but own one.....                       | 2  | 4  | 1  | 1  |
| No, not on cell, and do not own one.....                | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| (Don't know/refused)..... <b>[TERMINATE]</b>            |    |    |    |    |
| Text to online .....                                    | 48 | 50 | 51 | 41 |

**Q2.** Although it is some time from now, what are the chances of you voting in the November 2026 general election for Governor, Congress, and other offices? Are you almost certain to vote, will you probably vote, are the chances about 50-50, are you probably not going to vote, or are you definitely not going to vote?

|                             |                    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----|----|----|
| Almost certain to vote..... | 97                 | 96 | 97 | 97 |
| Probably will vote .....    | 3                  | 4  | 3  | 3  |
| 50-50 .....                 | <b>[TERMINATE]</b> |    |    |    |
| Probably not.....           | <b>[TERMINATE]</b> |    |    |    |
| Definitely not .....        | <b>[TERMINATE]</b> |    |    |    |
| Don't know .....            | <b>[TERMINATE]</b> |    |    |    |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Q3. [T]** Would you say that the city of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?

|                       |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Right Direction ..... | 56 | 57 | 59 | 50 |
| Wrong Direction ..... | 22 | 24 | 22 | 17 |
| (Don't know).....     | 23 | 18 | 19 | 33 |

**Q4. [T]** How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?

|                      |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Excellent .....      | 11 | 11 | 13 | 8  |
| Good.....            | 45 | 46 | 42 | 45 |
| Fair .....           | 32 | 32 | 31 | 33 |
| Poor.....            | 7  | 7  | 7  | 8  |
| (Don't know).....    | 5  | 4  | 6  | 5  |
| Excellent /Good..... | 56 | 57 | 56 | 54 |
| Fair /Poor .....     | 39 | 39 | 38 | 41 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Q5. [T\*]** Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley? **[RANDOMIZE]**  
**[ACCEPT UP TO TWO RESPONSES]**

|   |    |    |    |    |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| Safeguarding critical infrastructure from the threats of climate change, including flooding and wildfires.....                          | 35 | 35 | 38 | 31 |
| Increasing Berkeley's safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways .....                                   | 31 | 31 | 32 | 30 |
| Reducing pollution flowing to the Bay and flood risk by upgrading storm drains and installing green infrastructure.....                 | 24 | 28 | 18 | 23 |
| Improving parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, dog parks, and community centers .....   | 23 | 20 | 25 | 28 |
| Replacing public safety facilities such as fire stations and emergency response buildings that are at the end of their useful life..... | 22 | 25 | 16 | 21 |
| Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline by protecting waterfront parks and repairing docks.....                                 | 15 | 10 | 14 | 25 |
| Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision by restoring and modernizing historic buildings for community, arts, and civic use .....     | 11 | 9  | 15 | 9  |
| None .....  | 5  | 7  | 4  | 5  |
| Don't know .....  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  |
| Refused .....   | 1  | 1  | 0  | 1  |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

***The City of Berkeley is considering asking voters to approve a measure on the November 2026 ballot that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure.***

***Next you will [hear/see] a few different versions of ballot measures that may appear on the ballot in Berkeley this November. Here is the first measure.***

**Q6. SSA: [GO BOND – \$300m]** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at an average rate of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 42 | 47 | 38 | 36 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 15 | 10 | 25 | 14 |
| Lean yes .....              | 14 | 14 | 11 | 17 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 16 | 14 | 15 | 21 |
| Lean no.....                | 3  | 3  | 5  | 1  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 3  | 4  | 3  | 2  |
| No - strongly .....         | 6  | 6  | 3  | 9  |
| (Refused).....              | 1  | 2  | 0  | 0  |
| Yes .....                   | 71 | 71 | 74 | 67 |
| No .....                    | 12 | 13 | 11 | 12 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Q7. SSB: [GO BOND – \$200m]** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at an average rate of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 36 | 39 | 36 | 32 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 17 | 21 | 11 | 15 |
| Lean yes .....              | 18 | 12 | 30 | 16 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 15 | 15 | 13 | 19 |
| Lean no.....                | 2  | 3  | 3  | 0  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 3  | 2  | 3  | 5  |
| No - strongly .....         | 9  | 10 | 4  | 13 |
| (Refused).....              | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  |
| Yes .....                   | 70 | 71 | 77 | 63 |
| No .....                    | 14 | 14 | 10 | 18 |

6/7. Combined initial Go Bond

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 39 | 43 | 37 | 34 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 16 | 16 | 18 | 15 |
| Lean yes .....              | 16 | 13 | 20 | 16 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 16 | 14 | 14 | 20 |
| Lean no.....                | 2  | 3  | 4  | 0  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  |
| No - strongly .....         | 8  | 8  | 3  | 11 |
| (Refused).....              | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0  |
| Yes .....                   | 70 | 71 | 75 | 65 |
| No .....                    | 13 | 13 | 10 | 15 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

***Now here is a different measure that could be on the ballot this year.***

**Q8. [SALES TAX]** This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City’s projected budget deficit of \$32 million.

Shall the City of Berkeley measure to increase funding for essential city services, such as 9-1-1 emergency response; neighborhood police services; fire prevention/protection; youth and senior services; community cultural programs; attracting/ retaining small businesses; and funding for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, by adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 37 | 33 | 42 | 37 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 15 | 14 | 16 | 15 |
| Lean yes .....              | 8  | 8  | 7  | 8  |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 11 | 14 | 6  | 13 |
| Lean no.....                | 5  | 4  | 6  | 5  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 5  | 6  | 7  | 2  |
| No - strongly .....         | 18 | 19 | 15 | 19 |
| (Refused).....              | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  |
| Yes .....                   | 60 | 56 | 65 | 60 |
| No .....                    | 29 | 30 | 28 | 27 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Q9. SSA: [GO BOND – 300m]** Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier: **[ROTATE STATEMENTS]**

*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer. **[87 words]**

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently. **[79 words]**

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at rates of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 43 | 45 | 44 | 38 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 20 | 18 | 31 | 15 |
| Lean yes .....              | 9  | 7  | 5  | 14 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 13 | 11 | 10 | 20 |
| Lean no.....                | 3  | 5  | 2  | 1  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 3  | 5  | 2  | 2  |
| No - strongly .....         | 9  | 10 | 5  | 10 |
| (Refused).....              | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Yes .....                   | 72 | 70 | 80 | 67 |
| No .....                    | 15 | 19 | 10 | 13 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

**Q10. SSB: [GO BOND – 200m]** Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier: **[ROTATE STATEMENTS]**

*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer. **[87 words]**

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently. **[79 words]**

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at rates of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 32 | 31 | 36 | 28 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 17 | 20 | 12 | 16 |
| Lean yes .....              | 15 | 15 | 18 | 12 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 15 | 15 | 20 | 11 |
| Lean no.....                | 4  | 2  | 4  | 8  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 4  | 5  | 3  | 4  |
| No - strongly .....         | 13 | 12 | 7  | 21 |
| (Refused).....              | 1  | 0  | 1  | 1  |
| Yes .....                   | 63 | 65 | 65 | 56 |
| No .....                    | 22 | 20 | 14 | 32 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

9/10.Combined Go Bond engaged debate

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 37 | 38 | 40 | 33 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 18 | 19 | 21 | 15 |
| Lean yes .....              | 12 | 11 | 11 | 13 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 14 | 13 | 15 | 15 |
| Lean no.....                | 4  | 3  | 3  | 4  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 4  | 5  | 3  | 3  |
| No - strongly .....         | 11 | 11 | 6  | 16 |
| (Refused).....              | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  |
| Yes .....                   | 67 | 68 | 73 | 62 |
| No .....                    | 18 | 19 | 12 | 23 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Q11. [SALES TAX]** Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the sales tax measure described earlier: **[ROTATE STATEMENTS]**

*Supporters* say the City must address its projected budget deficit to prevent layoffs of police officers and firefighters, the closure of a fire station, and the loss of vital youth and homeless services. This is a modest change to the sales tax, and it only brings Berkeley to the same tax rates as nearby cities like Oakland and Albany. It will fund essential services to make sure police and firefighters can continue to keep us safe and maintain the city’s quality of life without putting a major burden on taxpayers. **[90 words]**

*Opponents* say this tax hike is yet another burden on taxpayers without any new or improved services to show for it. Berkeley taxpayers simply can’t afford all these tax increases, and we shouldn’t be asked to pay more when nothing will change. Increasing the sales tax will increase the burden on low- and middle-class residents and local small businesses. The City should use its existing budget and avoid deficits instead of asking us for more money. **[76 words]**

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

Shall the measure adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

|                             |    |    |    |    |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Yes - strongly .....        | 36 | 34 | 39 | 35 |
| Yes - not so strongly ..... | 15 | 14 | 16 | 14 |
| Lean yes .....              | 8  | 7  | 6  | 11 |
| Undecided/DK.....           | 13 | 16 | 11 | 10 |
| Lean no.....                | 4  | 2  | 7  | 3  |
| No - not so strongly.....   | 6  | 6  | 6  | 8  |
| No - strongly .....         | 19 | 20 | 15 | 20 |
| (Refused).....              | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  |
| Yes .....                   | 58 | 56 | 60 | 60 |
| No .....                    | 29 | 28 | 28 | 30 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

**Q12.** Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in. Is that extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all? **{ROTATE LIST}**

**Sorted by “Extremely important”**

|   |    |    |    |    |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 12u.Renovate 911 dispatch.....                            | 29 | 31 | 33 | 22 |
| D12t.Replace fire stations .....                          | 27 | 26 | 34 | 22 |
| 12p.Repair sidewalks.....                                 | 27 | 26 | 26 | 28 |
| D12f.Upgrade park restrooms .....                         | 24 | 24 | 25 | 23 |
| C12s.Repair fire stations.....                            | 22 | 27 | 20 | 14 |
| C12b.Earthquake protections for<br>buildings.....         | 18 | 17 | 19 | 19 |
| 12l.Protect Waterfront paths.....                         | 18 | 19 | 16 | 19 |
| D12r.Repair public buildings - w/<br>Civic Center .....   | 18 | 19 | 17 | 17 |
| 12o.Mental health building .....                          | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 |
| C12q.Repair public buildings.....                         | 17 | 21 | 10 | 16 |
| 12a.Repair/rebuild community<br>centers .....             | 15 | 14 | 22 | 11 |
| 12d.Safe/accessible playgrounds.....                      | 15 | 16 | 12 | 16 |
| D12c.Earthquake protections -<br>specific buildings ..... | 14 | 15 | 17 | 12 |
| C12e.Add park restrooms .....                             | 13 | 11 | 9  | 19 |
| 12h.Repair park paths/parking lots.....                   | 12 | 9  | 17 | 13 |
| 12n.South Berkeley green space .....                      | 12 | 12 | 15 | 9  |
| 12j.Repair recreational facilities .....                  | 11 | 10 | 14 | 12 |
| 12m.Repair seawall .....                                  | 11 | 10 | 13 | 12 |
| 12i.Sports fields irrigation.....                         | 9  | 8  | 6  | 14 |
| 12k.Repair Marina's docks .....                           | 8  | 6  | 7  | 11 |
| 12g.New dog parks .....                                   | 4  | 4  | 7  | 3  |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

a. **[Repair /rebuild community centers]** Repair and rebuild community centers that are out of date, energy inefficient, too small, or vulnerable to earthquakes

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 15 | 14 | 22 | 11 |
| Very important.....        | 39 | 41 | 41 | 33 |
| Moderately important ..... | 29 | 26 | 27 | 36 |
| Slightly important .....   | 10 | 9  | 6  | 14 |
| Not important at all.....  | 6  | 8  | 4  | 5  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 1  | 0  | 1  |
| Important.....             | 54 | 55 | 63 | 44 |
| Not important .....        | 45 | 44 | 36 | 55 |

b. **SSC: [Earthquake protections for buildings]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 18 | 17 | 19 | 19 |
| Very important.....        | 35 | 37 | 36 | 31 |
| Moderately important ..... | 28 | 26 | 27 | 31 |
| Slightly important .....   | 11 | 11 | 12 | 9  |
| Not important at all.....  | 8  | 9  | 5  | 8  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 0  | 1  | 3  |
| Important.....             | 53 | 54 | 55 | 50 |
| Not important .....        | 46 | 46 | 44 | 48 |

c. **SSD: [Earthquake protections – specific buildings]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings such as Old City Hall and the Veterans Building

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 14 | 15 | 17 | 12 |
| Very important.....        | 27 | 27 | 29 | 25 |
| Moderately important ..... | 32 | 35 | 27 | 33 |
| Slightly important .....   | 17 | 16 | 20 | 15 |
| Not important at all.....  | 9  | 7  | 7  | 14 |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1  |
| Important.....             | 41 | 41 | 46 | 37 |
| Not important .....        | 58 | 58 | 54 | 62 |

d. **[Safe/accessible playgrounds]** Make playgrounds safer and more accessible

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 15 | 16 | 12 | 16 |
| Very important.....        | 35 | 40 | 31 | 29 |
| Moderately important ..... | 31 | 29 | 36 | 28 |
| Slightly important .....   | 12 | 9  | 12 | 17 |
| Not important at all.....  | 7  | 6  | 6  | 8  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| Important.....             | 50 | 56 | 43 | 45 |
| Not important .....        | 49 | 43 | 55 | 53 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

e. **SSC: [Add park restrooms]** Add public restrooms to Berkeley parks

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 13 | 11 | 9  | 19 |
| Very important.....        | 41 | 39 | 47 | 39 |
| Moderately important ..... | 29 | 29 | 28 | 29 |
| Slightly important .....   | 10 | 11 | 10 | 7  |
| Not important at all.....  | 7  | 10 | 4  | 6  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 1  | 1  | 0  |
| Important.....             | 53 | 49 | 56 | 58 |
| Not important .....        | 46 | 50 | 43 | 42 |

f. **SSD: [Upgrade park restrooms]** Upgrade deteriorating public restrooms at Berkeley parks

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 24 | 24 | 25 | 23 |
| Very important.....        | 38 | 35 | 43 | 40 |
| Moderately important ..... | 26 | 29 | 19 | 29 |
| Slightly important .....   | 8  | 8  | 12 | 5  |
| Not important at all.....  | 3  | 4  | 2  | 3  |
| (Don't know).....          | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Important.....             | 62 | 59 | 68 | 63 |
| Not important .....        | 38 | 41 | 32 | 37 |

g. **[New dog parks]** Build additional dog parks across the City to meet growing demand

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 4  | 4  | 7  | 3  |
| Very important.....        | 16 | 15 | 18 | 18 |
| Moderately important ..... | 27 | 26 | 27 | 29 |
| Slightly important .....   | 22 | 21 | 27 | 20 |
| Not important at all.....  | 29 | 34 | 21 | 28 |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  |
| Important.....             | 21 | 18 | 24 | 21 |
| Not important .....        | 78 | 80 | 75 | 77 |

h. **[Repair park paths /parking lots]** Improve safety and accessibility in the City's parks by repairing park pathways and parking lots

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 12 | 9  | 17 | 13 |
| Very important.....        | 33 | 32 | 31 | 36 |
| Moderately important ..... | 32 | 36 | 32 | 26 |
| Slightly important .....   | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 |
| Not important at all.....  | 8  | 8  | 6  | 9  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 1  | 0  | 1  |
| Important.....             | 45 | 41 | 48 | 49 |
| Not important .....        | 54 | 58 | 51 | 50 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

i. **[Sports fields irrigation]** Fix failing irrigation and drainage at the City’s most used sports fields

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 9  | 8  | 6  | 14 |
| Very important.....        | 24 | 24 | 27 | 22 |
| Moderately important ..... | 40 | 43 | 42 | 32 |
| Slightly important .....   | 20 | 18 | 16 | 28 |
| Not important at all.....  | 5  | 5  | 7  | 2  |
| (Don't know).....          | 2  | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| Important.....             | 33 | 32 | 33 | 36 |
| Not important .....        | 65 | 66 | 65 | 63 |

j. **[Repair recreational facilities]** Repair and modernize aged public recreational facilities like pools, soccer fields, and basketball courts

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 11 | 10 | 14 | 12 |
| Very important.....        | 32 | 30 | 35 | 32 |
| Moderately important ..... | 35 | 38 | 32 | 34 |
| Slightly important .....   | 16 | 18 | 12 | 18 |
| Not important at all.....  | 4  | 4  | 6  | 2  |
| (Don't know).....          | 2  | 1  | 2  | 3  |
| Important.....             | 43 | 40 | 49 | 43 |
| Not important .....        | 55 | 59 | 49 | 54 |

k. **[Repair Marina’s docks]** Repair Marina’s docks to extend their lifespan 50-plus years

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 8  | 6  | 7  | 11 |
| Very important.....        | 24 | 26 | 24 | 20 |
| Moderately important ..... | 38 | 39 | 38 | 36 |
| Slightly important .....   | 20 | 17 | 24 | 21 |
| Not important at all.....  | 8  | 8  | 7  | 10 |
| (Don't know).....          | 3  | 4  | 1  | 2  |
| Important.....             | 32 | 32 | 31 | 32 |
| Not important .....        | 66 | 64 | 68 | 66 |

l. **[Protect Waterfront paths]** Protect paths and roads on Berkeley’s Waterfront from flooding due to sea level rise

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 18 | 19 | 16 | 19 |
| Very important.....        | 34 | 33 | 34 | 36 |
| Moderately important ..... | 28 | 29 | 28 | 25 |
| Slightly important .....   | 11 | 11 | 15 | 8  |
| Not important at all.....  | 7  | 8  | 5  | 7  |
| (Don't know).....          | 2  | 1  | 2  | 5  |
| Important.....             | 52 | 51 | 49 | 56 |
| Not important .....        | 46 | 48 | 49 | 40 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

m. **[Repair seawall]** Rebuild the failing seawall that threatens public access to South Cove

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 11 | 10 | 13 | 12 |
| Very important.....        | 31 | 32 | 34 | 27 |
| Moderately important ..... | 29 | 29 | 28 | 29 |
| Slightly important .....   | 16 | 15 | 15 | 17 |
| Not important at all.....  | 6  | 7  | 2  | 7  |
| (Don't know).....          | 8  | 7  | 9  | 7  |
| Important.....             | 42 | 42 | 46 | 39 |
| Not important .....        | 50 | 51 | 45 | 53 |

n. **[South Berkeley green space]** Expanding accessible green open space in South Berkeley

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 12 | 12 | 15 | 9  |
| Very important.....        | 36 | 37 | 34 | 35 |
| Moderately important ..... | 29 | 29 | 29 | 28 |
| Slightly important .....   | 12 | 10 | 14 | 15 |
| Not important at all.....  | 9  | 11 | 5  | 10 |
| (Don't know).....          | 2  | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| Important.....             | 48 | 49 | 50 | 44 |
| Not important .....        | 50 | 50 | 48 | 53 |

o. **[Mental health building]** Expand mental health service capacity by replacing crumbling offices with a new energy efficient mental health services building

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 |
| Very important.....        | 40 | 38 | 41 | 44 |
| Moderately important ..... | 24 | 25 | 26 | 22 |
| Slightly important .....   | 8  | 10 | 8  | 6  |
| Not important at all.....  | 8  | 8  | 6  | 8  |
| (Don't know).....          | 3  | 3  | 2  | 3  |
| Important.....             | 58 | 54 | 58 | 62 |
| Not important .....        | 40 | 43 | 40 | 35 |

p. **[Repair sidewalks]** Improve safety and accessibility by repairing cracked and uneven sidewalks and upgrading curb ramps citywide

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 27 | 26 | 26 | 28 |
| Very important.....        | 38 | 38 | 42 | 34 |
| Moderately important ..... | 26 | 28 | 24 | 26 |
| Slightly important .....   | 5  | 4  | 5  | 8  |
| Not important at all.....  | 4  | 5  | 2  | 3  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 0  | 0  | 2  |
| Important.....             | 65 | 64 | 68 | 62 |
| Not important .....        | 35 | 36 | 31 | 37 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

q. **SSC: [Repair public buildings]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, and South Berkeley Senior Center to improve their energy efficiency and safety

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 17 | 21 | 10 | 16 |
| Very important.....        | 31 | 29 | 40 | 27 |
| Moderately important ..... | 33 | 31 | 30 | 40 |
| Slightly important .....   | 10 | 9  | 14 | 10 |
| Not important at all.....  | 7  | 10 | 4  | 6  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 0  | 3  | 1  |
| Important.....             | 48 | 50 | 49 | 43 |
| Not important .....        | 51 | 50 | 47 | 56 |

r. **SSD: [Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, South Berkeley Senior Center, and Civic Center Buildings to improve their energy efficiency and safety

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 18 | 19 | 17 | 17 |
| Very important.....        | 30 | 29 | 29 | 30 |
| Moderately important ..... | 35 | 31 | 45 | 32 |
| Slightly important .....   | 10 | 14 | 4  | 10 |
| Not important at all.....  | 5  | 5  | 4  | 8  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 2  | 0  | 1  |
| Important.....             | 47 | 48 | 47 | 47 |
| Not important .....        | 51 | 50 | 53 | 51 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL /SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135            | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144            | 136  |

s. **SSC: [Repair fire stations]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by conducting essential repairs and adding green energy capacity

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 22 | 27 | 20 | 14 |
| Very important.....        | 36 | 39 | 36 | 30 |
| Moderately important ..... | 27 | 23 | 28 | 33 |
| Slightly important .....   | 6  | 4  | 8  | 8  |
| Not important at all.....  | 10 | 7  | 7  | 15 |
| (Don't know).....          | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  |
| Important.....             | 57 | 66 | 56 | 44 |
| Not important .....        | 43 | 34 | 43 | 56 |

t. **SSD: [Replace fire stations]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by replacing fire stations that are no longer able to meet demands with new stations run on green energy

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 27 | 26 | 34 | 22 |
| Very important.....        | 29 | 28 | 30 | 30 |
| Moderately important ..... | 27 | 29 | 22 | 29 |
| Slightly important .....   | 12 | 10 | 13 | 13 |
| Not important at all.....  | 4  | 6  | 1  | 3  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 1  | 0  | 3  |
| Important.....             | 56 | 54 | 64 | 52 |
| Not important .....        | 42 | 45 | 36 | 45 |

u. **[Renovate 911 dispatch]** Renovate the 911 dispatch center to handle higher call volumes and modernize critical infrastructure

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Extremely important .....  | 29 | 31 | 33 | 22 |
| Very important.....        | 37 | 35 | 38 | 40 |
| Moderately important ..... | 23 | 25 | 17 | 27 |
| Slightly important .....   | 5  | 3  | 9  | 3  |
| Not important at all.....  | 5  | 5  | 2  | 7  |
| (Don't know).....          | 1  | 2  | 1  | 0  |
| Important.....             | 66 | 66 | 71 | 62 |
| Not important .....        | 33 | 32 | 28 | 38 |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Finally, I would like to ask you a few questions for statistical purposes only.**

**Q13. [T] How long have you lived in Berkeley? [DO NOT READ, RECORD WITHIN RANGE]**

|                                    |    |    |    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Less than two years .....          | 5  | 3  | 8  | 5  |
| Two to less than five years.....   | 13 | 12 | 18 | 10 |
| Five to less than ten years .....  | 12 | 11 | 15 | 11 |
| Ten to less than twenty years..... | 23 | 26 | 18 | 23 |
| Twenty years or more .....         | 36 | 35 | 32 | 43 |
| All your life .....                | 10 | 13 | 8  | 9  |
| (Don't know/refused).....          | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  |

**Q14. [T] What best describes your gender? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]**

|                                     |    |    |    |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Man.....                            | 45 | 47 | 46 | 40 |
| Woman .....                         | 55 | 53 | 54 | 60 |
| Nonbinary .....                     | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Prefer to self-describe/other ..... | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| (Refused).....                      | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |

**Q15. [T] Just to make sure we have a representative sample, could you please tell me whether or not you are from a Latino, Hispanic, or Spanish-speaking background?**

**Q16. [T] [ASK ALL] And please tell me which one, or more than one, of these racial or ethnic groups you identify with?**

**[TEXT] Which one, or more than one, of these racial or ethnic groups do you identify with?**

**[RANDOMIZE/READ CHOICES/ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES]**

**[IF "OTHER" OR "BIRACIAL" OR "MULTI-RACIAL" PROMPT:] Which two or three of these do you identify with the most?**

|   |    |    |    |    |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| White or Caucasian.....                 | 67 | 71 | 59 | 69 |
| Black or African American .....         | 9  | 11 | 6  | 9  |
| Latino/Latina or Hispanic.....          | 9  | 5  | 14 | 10 |
| Asian American or Pacific Islander..... | 11 | 9  | 17 | 8  |
| Native or Indigenous American .....     | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Middle Eastern or North African .....   | 2  | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| (Other) .....                           | 2  | 1  | 2  | 3  |
| (Don't know/refused).....               | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

**Q17. [T]** In terms of local politics, do you consider yourself progressive, liberal, moderate, or conservative?

|                   |    |    |    |    |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Progressive.....  | 41 | 36 | 44 | 47 |
| Liberal.....      | 36 | 38 | 33 | 36 |
| Moderate.....     | 17 | 20 | 20 | 11 |
| Conservative..... | 4  | 4  | 2  | 5  |
| (Don't know)..... | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| (Refused).....    | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |

**Q18. [T]** What is the last year of schooling that you have completed?

|  |    |    |    |    |
|--|----|----|----|----|
| 1 - 11th Grade.....                                  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| High School Graduate.....                            | 3  | 2  | 6  | 3  |
| Vocational or technical school.....                  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Some college but no degree .....                     | 16 | 12 | 16 | 22 |
| Associate degree .....                               | 5  | 3  | 4  | 7  |
| 4-year college graduate or<br>bachelor's degree..... | 37 | 42 | 46 | 22 |
| Graduate School or advanced<br>degree.....           | 39 | 41 | 28 | 46 |
| (Refused).....                                       | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Non-college.....                                     | 24 | 17 | 26 | 33 |
| College graduate.....                                | 76 | 83 | 74 | 67 |

**Q19. [T]** Do you own your own home or do you rent?

|   |    |    |    |    |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| Own .....   | 54 | 64 | 41 | 50 |
| Rent.....   | 43 | 33 | 56 | 48 |
| (Other - unsheltered, live in dorm, with<br>parents, etc) ..... | 3  | 3  | 3  | 2  |
| (Don't know/refused).....                                       | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |

|               | TOTAL | HILLS | CENTRAL<br>/SOUTH | WEST |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|
| Weighted N=   | 500   | 225   | 135               | 140  |
| Unweighted N= | 500   | 220   | 144               | 136  |

Age

|                            |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| 18-24 years.....           | 12 | 12 | 16 | 7  |
| 25-29 years.....           | 7  | 5  | 13 | 4  |
| 30-34 years.....           | 6  | 4  | 11 | 6  |
| 35-39 years.....           | 9  | 4  | 7  | 17 |
| 40-44 years.....           | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  |
| 45-49 years.....           | 9  | 5  | 8  | 16 |
| 50-54 years.....           | 7  | 8  | 4  | 7  |
| 55-59 years.....           | 6  | 9  | 4  | 3  |
| 60-64 years.....           | 8  | 9  | 3  | 10 |
| 65-69 years.....           | 8  | 10 | 7  | 6  |
| 70-74 years.....           | 6  | 8  | 5  | 5  |
| Over 74 years.....         | 17 | 19 | 16 | 13 |
| (Don't know /Refused)..... | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Under 30.....              | 19 | 17 | 29 | 10 |
| 30 - 39.....               | 15 | 8  | 18 | 23 |
| 40 - 49.....               | 15 | 11 | 14 | 22 |
| 50 - 64.....               | 21 | 27 | 11 | 21 |
| 65 & over.....             | 31 | 37 | 27 | 24 |



## Berkeley's Infrastructure: Needs and Community Priorities

The goal is to **receive feedback on the City's proposed infrastructure project list** for a potential \$300M GO Bond.

- **Berkeley's Infrastructure Needs**
- **Past Investments & Current Conditions**
- **Draft Project Portfolio**
- **Community Input & Discussion**

### Agenda



Above Image: Berkeley & East Bay Cityscape.




*When infrastructure fails, the impacts don't stay in one place.*

**Berkeley relies on interconnected systems:**

- Pathways and sidewalks connect daily life
- Community spaces support health and belonging
- Public safety facilities protect lives
- Waterfront and climate infrastructure protects neighborhoods

**A citywide approach helps prevent closures, service loss, and higher costs.**

3



**What We Maintain** (abridged version):


- 42,000 trees;
- 300+ miles of sidewalks;
- 215 miles of streets;
- 53 miles of bicycle infrastructure;
- 54 parks;
- 95 buildings;
- 63 play areas;
- 38 public restrooms;
- 5 community centers;
- 3 resident camps; and
- 2 pools...**and more!**

*Much of this infrastructure is **75+ years old**.*

**Current estimates:**

- **\$1.65–\$2B** in unfunded infrastructure and deferred maintenance citywide.

4




# How Does the City Fund Infrastructure?

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Permanent / Ongoing</b>  | <b>One-Time / Volatile</b>  | <b>Restricted by Use</b>  | <b>Voter-Approved</b>   | <b>External</b>  |
| <b>General Fund</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~\$2.4M per year</li> <li>• ~\$9.9M for Streets</li> </ul> | <b>One-Time Revenues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property Transfer Tax (&gt;\$16M)</li> <li>• Interest Income (<math>\frac{1}{3}</math> above \$6M)</li> </ul> | <b>Restricted Revenues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streets</li> <li>• Sewer</li> <li>• Stormwater</li> <li>• Streetlights</li> <li>• Marina</li> </ul> | <b>Local Measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parcel Taxes (Parks, Measure FF – 2020 &amp; 2024)</li> <li>• Bonds (Measures M &amp; TI)</li> </ul> | <b>Grants</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal</li> <li>• State</li> <li>• Private</li> </ul> <p style="color: red; font-weight: bold;">TI \$100M bond + leveraged \$83M grants = \$183M total</p> |

Annual funding is **not enough** to address infrastructure and deferred maintenance. Reliance on **one-time, restricted, and voter-approved sources** makes long-term planning difficult.

5

Current funding covers just **~2%** of need, leaving a **98%** structural shortfall.



\* \$38.9M reflects General Fund, one-time, and restricted revenues, Measure FF & TI Spend down Projections not included in this amount.

| *NOTE AMOUNTS ARE ESTIMATES | FY 2027            | FY 2028            | FY 2029            |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Available Funding           | \$40,998,776.00    | \$37,727,476.00    | \$36,664,976.00    |
| Anticipated FF Funds        | \$15,000,000.00    | \$15,000,000.00    | \$15,000,000.00    |
| Projected TI Spend down     | \$12,001,652.00    | \$7,649,576.00     | \$0.00             |
| Capital & Maint. Need       | \$1,831,954,652.58 | \$1,868,593,745.63 | \$1,905,965,620.54 |

6

## Infrastructure Funding Gaps



Above Image: City of Berkeley Capital Projects Team

# When Infrastructure Investment Is Delayed

## Asset Impacts

-  Infrastructure wears down faster
-  Safety and access risks increase
-  Service disruptions are more common

## Cost Impacts

-  Construction costs continue to rise
-  Funding supports fewer projects
-  Delays lead to higher long-term costs

Delaying investment leads to **greater risks** and **higher long-term costs**

7

# Past Investments (Measure TI Highlights)



Berkeley Rose Garden



Willard Clubhouse



Telegraph Public Restroom



Sidewalk Improvements



North Berkeley Senior Center



Marina Roadway



Adult Mental Health Center



Park Improvements  
e.g. San Pablo Park

8

# Potential *Future* Project Investments



Crosswalk Improvements to Major Intersections



Repair and Improvements to Veterans Building



Repair and Improvements to Marina Docks Timber



Improvements to Playgrounds e.g. Glendale La Loma Park



More ADA Parking Spaces e.g. Strawberry Creek Park



Repair and Improvements to Maudelle Shirek (Old City Hall)



Repair and Improvements to Berkeley Waterfront Bay Trail



Repair and Improvements to Public Safety Facilities

9

Past Investments & Current Conditions



**Capital investments support *people, programs, and services* — not just buildings.**

## **Expanded & Reliable Services**

- New and improved programs
- Spaces that support reliable services

## **Improved Safety**

- Seismic and facility improvements
- Safer buildings and emergency readiness


## **Improved Access & Capacity**

- ADA upgrades and modernized spaces
- Facilities serve more people

## **Environmental Sustainability & Resilience**

- Green and stormwater improvements
- Energy-efficient systems and lower long-term costs

# Infrastructure ROI



**Above Images:** Maudelle Shirek Building current state (top) & Interior Rendering with repair and expansion (bottom)

10

## How projects\* were evaluated and prioritized:

### Community use and equity

- *Is there equitable community benefit?*

### Geographic balance

- *Are projects fairly distributed across districts?*

### Public health and safety

- *Does the project improve safety or well-being?*

### Infrastructure resilience

- *Will the investment deliver long-term value?*

### Deliverability and readiness

- *Is the project ready to move forward?*

### External funding potential

- *Can the project leverage grants or other funding?*

\*Applied within a **\$100M per-category cap** (\$300M total).

11

## Community Facilities & Quality of Life

Parks, playgrounds, restrooms, aquatics, dog parks, cultural centers and waterfront improvements.

## Public Safety

Fire station modernization and critical upgrades to essential emergency-response facilities.

## Critical Infrastructure & Accessibility

Core systems and facilities that require seismic upgrades or repairs – Civic Center (i.e., Maudelle Shirek Building) improvements, ADA, 50/50 program sidewalk projects.

12

# Project Portfolio



Above Images: Veterans Building Current State (top) & Interior Rendering with repair and programming possibilities (bottom)

# Project Themes



Draft Project Portfolio



## Lead Projects

### ➤ Modernization of high-use community hubs

- Frances Albrier Community Center
- King Pool & Locker Room
- Harrison Field
- Live Oak Courts & Lighting
- San Pablo Sports Field
- Citywide Dog Parks – 4-6 Sites
- Park Upgrades:  
 Codornices Park • Glendale La Loma Park • Harrison Park •  
 Cedar Rose Park • Cesar Chavez Park

## Community Facilities



**Above Images:** Glendale La Loma Park older play equipment and sand surfacing (bottom) alongside San Pablo Park with recent playground and safety improvements (top).

Draft Project Portfolio



13

## Proposed Project List | Community Facilities Highlight



**Before:** Aging Facility, Current State of Frances Albrier Community Center (FACC)



**After:** Modern Community & Resilience Center, Concept Design of FACC (Siegel & Strain Architects)

### Frances Albrier Community Center

#### Category

- Community Facilities • Climate Resiliency • ADA

#### Bond Allocation

- \$30M (100% of project)

#### Why This Project

- Only major community center not rebuilt or seismically upgraded.
- High-use facility at San Pablo Park needs modernization.
- New center will support daily programs and serve as a community resilience hub in emergencies.

#### Readiness

- Concept design complete; construction ~36 months after funding

14



# Proposed Project List | Community Facilities Highlight



**Before:** Example of open cinderblock restroom at Codornices Park (left) and temporary restrooms at Cesar Chavez Park (right)



**After:** Example of permanent restroom (concept rendering from Exeloo Corporation)

## Park Restrooms

*Cedar Rose, Codornices, Harrison, and Cesar Chavez Parks*

### Category

- Quality of Life Improvements • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$500k - \$750k each (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

### Why This Project

- Replaces aging restrooms with smart restroom facilities.
- Improves safety, accessibility, and growing demand.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~12 months after funding



## Lead Projects

### ➤ Neighborhood parks, open space, waterfront access, and climate resilience

- Adeline Corridor Open Space
- Aquatic Park – Dreamland Area Improvements
- Cesar Chavez Park – Pathway
- Marina Docks – Timber Pile Replacement
- Sea Level Rise – Bay Trail/Marina Blvd
- Sea Level Rise – University Ave Bike Park
- South Cove Seawall Replacement
- University Ave / Seawall Dr / Bay Trail / Plaza

## Quality of Life



**Above Images:** Bay Trail showing pavement damage (bottom left) alongside sections that have received recent improvements (top right).



# Proposed Project List | Quality of Life Highlight



**Before:** Aging Playground



**After:** Improved Waterfront Play Area, Concept Design of Dreamland (RRM Design Group)

## *Aquatic Park – Dreamland Area*

**Category**

- Community & Park Amenities • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.1M (25% match; leverages grants & Parks Tax)

**Why This Project**

- Implements a community-approved plan to improve a heavily used waterfront play area.
- Upgrades playgrounds, drainage, picnic areas, restrooms, and parking.

**Readiness**

- Concept design complete; construction ~18 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Quality of Life Highlight



**Before:** Decayed timber piles



**After:** New long-life concrete piles

## *Marina Docks Timber Replacement*

**Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Revenue-Generating Asset

**Bond Allocation**

- \$6M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Replaces failed timber piles that damage docks and private boats, taking marina slips out of service.
- Builds on Phase I to replace remaining at-risk piles with durable concrete piles designed to last 50+ years and withstand sea level rise.

**Readiness**

- Near shovel-ready; construction could begin ~12–15 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Quality of Life Highlight



**Before:** Corroded, deteriorating seawall



**After:** New, resilient seawall with sheet pile wall and enforcement structures

## South Cove Sailing Basin Seawall Replacement

### Category

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$5M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- Prevents failure of a corroded seawall that supports boat hoists and the Bay Trail at South Cove.
- Protects public access and marina operations from closure due to structural failure.

### Readiness

- Preliminary studies underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding



## Lead Projects

- **911 Dispatch Center:** 2100 MLK Jr. Way
  - Expansion and modernization
- **Fire Station 4:** 1900 Marin Ave
  - Full replacement, expansion
- **Fire Station 6:** 999 Cedar Street
  - Remodel, potential move to new Fire HQ
- **Fire Training Center:** 997 Cedar Street
  - Relocate and modernize training center


## Public Safety



**Above Images:** Water damage from roof leaks at PSB (top left) and failing HVAC at Fire Station 5 (bottom right).



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



**Before:** Constrained, outdated dispatch workspace



**After:** Modernized, efficient 911 operations center (concept rendering)

## Dispatch Center Improvements

**Category**

- Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$4M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Modernizes the 911 Dispatch Center to handle rising call volumes and aging infrastructure.
- Expands the operations floor and upgrades technology, HVAC, training, and wellness spaces to support readiness and staff retention.

**Readiness**

- Needs assessment complete; ready for design



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



**Before:** Constrained, outdated training site, including water damage (right image)



**After:** Concept Drawing of a purpose-built modern fire training center

## Fire Training Center Replacement

**Category**

- Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$28M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

**Why This Project**

- The current fire training facility is undersized, outdated, and located in a residential area.
- A new, purpose-built training center is needed to support modern training, scheduling, and parking needs for the Fire Department.

**Readiness**

- Early planning complete; construction timeline dependent on full funding



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



Training center in a residential neighborhood, undersized and does not support the modern mission

Exercise equipment is typically set up adjacent to apparatus and personal protective equipment (or PPE) that off-gas diesel fumes and known carcinogens



Apparatus are parked inches away from roll up doors, creating narrow spaces for personnel to circulate



Towers, once necessary for drying cotton hoses, are now obsolete



## Lead Projects

- **Upgrades of two buildings to advance the Civic Center Vision and Implementation Plan**
  - Maudelle Shirek Building (2134 MLK Jr.)
  - Veterans Memorial Building (1931 Center)
- **Modernization of high use civic facilities**
  - MLK Jr. Civic Center Building (2180 Milvia)
  - Public Safety Center (2100 MLK Jr.)
  - Berkeley Animal Shelter (1 Bolivar Dr.)
  - MLK Jr. Civic Center Annex (1947 Center)

## Critical Infrastructure



Above Images: Exterior facades of deferred maintenance at Maudelle Shirek (Old City Hall) Building.



# Proposed Project List | Critical Infrastructure Highlight



**Before:** Seismically vulnerable historic Old City Hall



**After:** Civic building for public use, with ADA upgrades; Concept rendering

## *Maudelle Shirek Building (Old City Hall)*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$6.7M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project


- Seismically upgrades Berkeley's first landmark that predates modern codes and is currently closed to the public due to safety risks.
- Restores the building for civic use with accessible hearing rooms, meeting spaces, and community uses.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending



# Proposed Project List | Critical Infrastructure Highlight



**Before:** Seismically unsafe, underutilized historic building



**After:** Stabilized facility ready for arts and community use

## *Veterans Memorial Building*

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Quality of Life • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$13.9M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Strengthens a historic building currently closed for assemblies due to seismic safety concerns.
- Future use as a community arts and cultural center with performance, rehearsal, gallery and gathering spaces for Berkeley's cultural and artistic groups.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending



## Lead Projects

- **Citywide ADA accessibility improvements**
  - Remove sidewalk trip hazards
  - Fix crosswalk mobility barriers
  - Upgrade non-compliant curb ramps
  
- **Fund 50/50 Program Sidewalk Projects**
  - Repair lifted and damaged sidewalks
  - Prevent future hazards

# Accessibility



**Above Images:** Examples of changes in level (elevations) on sidewalks that require improvements

Draft Project Portfolio



27

## Proposed Project List | Accessibility Highlight

### ADA Barrier Removal Projects

**Category**

- Pedestrian / Accessibility • Facilities

**Bond Allocation**

- \$4.3M (100% of project; no alternative funding sources)

**Why This Project**

- Addresses a Citywide backlog of ADA accessibility barriers identified in the ADA Transition Plan.
- Funds upgrades to paths of travel, restrooms, signage, and building access to improve compliance and access for people with disabilities.

**Readiness**

- Projects identified; implementation can begin as funding becomes available



**Before:** On-street accessible parking with blocked sidewalk access, creating barriers for wheelchair users and pedestrians.



**After:** Accessible parking with clear sidewalk access (PROWAG-compliant).

28



# Proposed Project List | Accessibility Highlight



**Before:** Damaged sidewalks and long repair waitlist



**After:** Safer, accessible sidewalks delivered faster citywide

## 50/50 Sidewalk Program

**Category**

- Pedestrian Safety • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$14M (50% of Bond Funding Requested for Sidewalk Repair Backlog)

**Why This Project**


- Advances public safety and ADA compliance by reducing the City's sidewalk repair backlog.
- Scales up the existing cost-share program to accelerate repairs citywide.

**Readiness**


- Ongoing program; shovel-ready and ready to scale immediately



# Illustrative Timeline



## We're asking for input on:



31

# Input & Discussion



**Scan the QR Code to visit our website and stay connected!**

Community Input & Discussion

## Funding Measure: General Obligation (GO) Bond

| What a GO Bond Is   | What it Funds  | Examples  |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Requires two-thirds voter approval</b></li> <li>• Long-term financing for capital projects</li> <li>• Repaid through property taxes</li> <li>• Typically repaid over ~30 years</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Capital only (no operating costs)</b></li> <li>• Facility modernization and replacement</li> <li>• Safety and climate-resilience projects</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings &amp; facilities</li> <li>• Streets &amp; transportation safety</li> <li>• Parks, pools, and recreation</li> <li>• Stormwater and waterfront projects</li> </ul> |

32

# Appendix A: Proposed Project List (Comprehensive)



## Proposed Project List | Highlights



Before: Current station



After: Modern station (concept design)

### *Fire Station No. 4 Replacement*

**Category**

- Fire Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$48M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Replaces an undersized 1960-era station no longer able to support current staffing or operational needs.
- Supports expanded staffing and future ambulance service recommended by the CityGate Standards of Coverage Study.

**Readiness**


- Conceptual layout complete; recommended option is full replacement on expanded site



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current station



**After:** Modern station (concept design)

## *Fire Station No. 6 Improvements*

**Category**

- Fire Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$22M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**


- Upgrades a 1960s-era station that no longer meets current staffing and operational needs.
- Supports an additional firefighter per shift with updated sleeping, turnout storage, office, and fitness space.

**Readiness**

- Conceptual layout complete; renovation & expansion recommended



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Constrained, outdated dispatch workspace



**After:** Modernized, efficient 911 operations center (concept rendering)

## *Dispatch Center Improvements*

**Category**

- Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$4M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Modernizes the 911 Dispatch Center to handle rising call volumes and aging infrastructure.
- Expands the operations floor and upgrades technology, HVAC, training, and wellness spaces to support readiness and staff retention.

**Readiness**

- Needs assessment complete; ready for design



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



**Before:** Constrained, outdated training site, including water damage (right image)



**After:** Concept Drawing of a purpose-built modern fire training center

## Fire Training Center Replacement

### Category

- Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

### Bond Allocation

- \$28M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- The current fire training facility is undersized, outdated, and located in a residential area.
- A new, purpose-built training center is needed to support modern training, scheduling, and parking needs for the Fire Department.

### Readiness

- Early planning complete; construction timeline dependent on full funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aging Facility, Current State of Frances Albrier Community Center (FACC)



**After:** Modern Community & Resilience Center, Concept Design (Siegel & Strain Architects)

## Frances Albrier Community Center

### Category

- Community Facilities • Climate Resiliency • ADA

### Bond Allocation

- \$30M (100% of project)

### Why This Project

- Only major community center not rebuilt or seismically upgraded.
- High-use facility at San Pablo Park needs modernization.
- New center will support daily programs and serve as a community resilience hub in emergencies.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; construction ~36 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aging pool and locker rooms



**After:** Modern 25m pool and updated facilities

## King Pool (& Locker Room) Improvements

### Category

- Community Facilities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$25M (100% of project)

### Why This Project

- Replaces aging pools and locker rooms with a modern, competition-capable 25-meter facility.
- Improves safety, accessibility, and long-term usability for community and youth programs.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



## Adeline Corridor Open Space

### Category

- Quality of Life Improvements • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$6M (100% of project)

### Why This Project

- Funds design and construction of 4 new or expanded Open Space areas within the Adeline Corridor Plan south of Ashby Avenue to expand park access in an equity priority area.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Example of open cinderblock restroom at Codornices Park (left) and temporary restrooms at Cesar Chavez Park (right)



**After:** Example of permanent restroom (concept rendering from Exeloo Corporation)

## Park Restrooms

*Cedar Rose, Codornices, Harrison, and Cesar Chavez Parks*

**Category**

- Quality of Life Improvements • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$500k - \$750k each (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

**Why This Project**

- Replaces aging restrooms with smart restroom facilities.
- Improves safety, accessibility, and growing demand.

**Readiness**

- Construction could begin ~12 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aging Playground



**After:** Improved Waterfront Play Area, Concept Design of Dreamland (RRM Design Group)

## Aquatic Park – Dreamland Area

**Category**

- Community & Park Amenities • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.1M (20% match; leverages grants & Parks Tax)

**Why This Project**

- Implements a community-approved plan to improve a heavily used waterfront play area.
- Upgrades playgrounds, drainage, picnic areas, restrooms, and parking.

**Readiness**

- Concept design complete; construction ~18 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Existing Condition of Park and Play Structure



**After:** Modern, Updated Play Area, Concept Design (Base Landscape Architecture)

## *Cedar Rose Park – 2–5 Play Structure*

**Category**

- Park Amenities • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.5M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

**Why This Project**

- Modernizes the heavily used 2–5 play area to meet current safety and ADA accessibility standards.
- Improves play structure, paths, site furnishings, fencing, and overall access.

**Readiness**

- Concept design complete; construction ~12 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Existing park conditions



**After:** Concept design of upgraded park (RRM Design Group)

## *Glendale LaLoma Park Improvements*

**Category**

- Park Amenities • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$3.5M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax)

**Why This Project**

- Modernizes play areas, parking, and pathways to improve safety and ADA access.
- Reimagines the 2–5 and 5–12 play areas, site furnishings, and circulation.

**Readiness**

- Concept design in progress; construction ~18 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Limited, off-leash, dog areas – César Chávez Park pictured (Photo Credit: Beth LaBerge/KQED)



**After:** New, accessible dog parks across Berkeley (example pictured Ohlone Dog Park)

## Dog Parks – City Wide

### Category

- Park Amenities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$2.5M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

### Why This Project

- Adds 4–6 new dog parks citywide to meet strong community demand.
- Includes fencing, seating, utilities, signage, and ADA improvements.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~12 months after funding

45



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Existing field conditions



**After:** Example of Synthetic Turf System with Cork Infill

## Harrison Field: Conversion to Artificial Turf

### Category

- Sports Facilities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$6M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax)

### Why This Project

- Replaces failing natural turf to double field capacity and reduce maintenance closures.
- Supports more reliable, year-round field use.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding

46



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aerial view of Live Oak – Uneven courts and limited lighting



**After:** Example of improved courts, turf field, and upgraded lighting, (concept rendering)

## Live Oak Park Improvements

### Category

- Sports Facilities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3M (66% of project; potential Parks Tax)

### Why This Project


- Levels basketball courts, converts the soccer practice field to turf, and upgrades lighting.
- Improves safety, field quality, and evening access for community use.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current conditions of pathway perimeters for Cesar Chavez Park

## Cesar Chavez Park Improvements

### Category

- Recreation Amenities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3M (60% of project; potential Parks Tax and/or State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) grant)

### Why This Project

- Repairs the 1.5-mile perimeter path to address deteriorated pavement and drainage issues.

### Readiness

- Near shovel-ready; construction ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Flood-prone trails and eroding pathways

## *Marina Blvd Shoreline Resiliency & Public Access*

### **Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Accessibility • Recreation Amenities

### **Bond Allocation**

- \$1.9M (50% of project; climate scope grant-eligible)

### **Why This Project**

- Rebuilds failing, narrow trail segments to safely serve high volumes of walkers and cyclists.
- Addresses shoreline erosion and frequent flooding at Virginia Street Extension that cuts off access to Cesar Chavez Park during king tides.

### **Readiness**

- Preliminary design and environmental review funded; construction ~24–30 months after funding

50

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Decayed timber piles



**After:** New long-life concrete piles

## *Marina Docks Timber Replacement*

### **Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Revenue-Generating Asset

### **Bond Allocation**

- \$6M (100% of project)

### **Why This Project**

- Replaces failed timber piles that damage docks and private boats, taking marina slips out of service.
- Builds on Phase I to replace remaining at-risk piles with durable concrete piles designed to last 50+ years and withstand sea level rise.

### **Readiness**

- Near shovel-ready; construction could begin ~12–15 months after funding

51

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Corroded, deteriorating seawall



**After:** Example of Bay Trail Improvements at Berkeley Marina

## Seawall Drive Bay Trail Improvements

### Category

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$5M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project


- Prevents failure of a corroded seawall that supports boat hoists and the Bay Trail at South Cove.
- Protects public access and marina operations from closure due to structural failure.

### Readiness

- Preliminary studies underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Corroded, deteriorating seawall



**After:** New, resilient seawall with sheet pile wall and enforcement structures

## South Cove Sailing Basin Seawall Replacement

### Category

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$5M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- Prevents failure of a corroded seawall that supports boat hoists and the Bay Trail at South Cove.
- Protects public access and marina operations from closure due to structural failure.

### Readiness


- Preliminary studies underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Flood-prone trail



**After:** Resilient shoreline protection and bike park (concept design)

## University Avenue

### Sea Level Rise Protection & Bike Park

**Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.75M (50% of project; climate scope grant-eligible)

**Why This Project**

- Protects University Avenue from flooding and storm surge that threaten critical roadway access, utilities, and nearby wetlands.
- Activates newly converted open space with a community-designed bike park.

**Readiness**


- Construction could begin ~36 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Damaged sidewalks and long repair waitlist



**After:** Safer, accessible sidewalks delivered faster citywide

## 50/50 Sidewalk Program

**Category**

- Pedestrian Safety • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$14M (50% of Bond Funding Requested for Sidewalk Repair Backlog)

**Why This Project**

- Advances public safety and ADA compliance by reducing the City's sidewalk repair backlog.
- Scales up the existing cost-share program to accelerate repairs citywide.

**Readiness**

- Ongoing program; shovel-ready and ready to scale immediately



# Proposed Project List | Highlights

## ADA Barrier Removal Projects



**Before:** On-street accessible parking with blocked sidewalk access, creating barriers for wheelchair users and pedestrians.



**After:** Accessible parking with clear sidewalk access (PROWAG-compliant).

### Category

- Pedestrian / Accessibility • Facilities

### Bond Allocation

- \$4.3M (100% of project; no alternative funding sources)

### Why This Project

- Addresses a Citywide backlog of ADA accessibility barriers identified in the ADA Transition Plan.
- Funds upgrades to paths of travel, restrooms, signage, and building access to improve compliance and access for people with disabilities.

### Readiness

- Projects identified; implementation can begin as funding becomes available

56



# Proposed Project List | Highlights

## Berkeley Mental Health – Facility Improvements



**Before:** Aging, inaccessible facility with limited capacity



**After:** Safer, new clinic with expanded treatment and group space (concept rendering)

### Category

- Health Facilities/ Critical Infrastructure • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3.25M (City share; ~40% of \$8M total, pending State grant)

### Why This Project

- Replaces an aging, inaccessible building with a certifiable mental health facility to expand outpatient services.
- Adds treatment rooms and group space to nearly double capacity for Medi-Cal beneficiaries and vulnerable residents.


### Readiness

- Schematic design complete; State grant decision expected Summer 2026

57



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of Berkeley Animal Shelter

## *Animal Services Facility Modernization*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$2M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Replaces roof, HVAC, drainage, electrical, and plumbing systems and includes programmatic updates to improve operational efficiency and animal care conditions at the Dona Springs Animal Shelter.

### Readiness

- HVAC and roofing assessment reports completed; construction could begin ~24 months after funding is secured

58

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Existing boiler and water heating system (electric heat pump replacement underway in 2026). South Berkeley Senior Center exterior.

## *South Berkeley Senior Center Improvements*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$3.9M (100% of total project cost; combined with \$5.5M Measure T1 Phase 2 seismic retrofit project)

### Why This Project

- Replaces end-of-life HVAC systems to ensure reliable cooling, improve energy efficiency, and support continued operations at the South Berkeley Senior Center.

### Readiness

- Permitting underway for the T1 seismic project; Construction could begin ~18 months after funding.

59

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior of West Berkeley Family Wellness Center

## West Berkeley Family Wellness Center Modernization

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$6.5M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Repairs aging building systems and upgrades HVAC, electrical, seismic, and ADA features to modernize the West Berkeley Family Wellness Center and improve safety, accessibility, and service delivery.

### Readiness

- Preliminary facility assessment completed. Construction could begin ~42 months after funding.



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of 1947 Center Street

## City Offices & Permit Center (1947 Center) Improvements

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Services

### Bond Allocation

- \$18.3M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Modernizes aging building systems, including seismic, HVAC, electrical, elevator, and ADA upgrades, to improve safety, accessibility, and reliability for a major City services hub.

### Readiness

- Building system assessments completed; Construction could begin ~36 months after funding.



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of 2180 Milvia, subject to leaks

## *City Hall (2180 Milvia) Improvements*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$11.7M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Replaces end-of-life mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and addresses hazardous materials, waterproofing, and ADA upgrades at Berkeley City Hall.

### Readiness

- Building system assessments completed; construction could begin ~36 months after funding.

62

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of Public Safety Building (2100 MLK)

## *Public Safety Building (2100 MLK) Improvements*

### Category

- Facilities • Public Safety • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Essential Services

### Bond Allocation

- \$8.4M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Modernizes building systems and internal spaces at the Public Safety Building to support reliable 24-hour emergency services, including HVAC, electrical, roofing, security, and ADA upgrades.

### Readiness

- Building system assessments underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding.

63

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Seismically vulnerable historic Old City Hall



**After:** Civic building for public use, with ADA upgrades; Concept rendering

## *Maudelle Shirek Building (Old City Hall)*

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$6.7M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Seismically upgrades Berkeley's first landmark that predates modern codes and is currently closed to the public due to safety risks.
- Restores the building for civic use with accessible hearing rooms, meeting spaces, and community uses.

### Readiness


- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending

64

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Seismically unsafe, underutilized historic building



**After:** Stabilized facility ready for arts and community use

## *Veterans Memorial Building*

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Quality of Life • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$13.9M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Strengthens a historic building currently closed for assemblies due to seismic safety concerns.
- Future use as a community arts and cultural center with performance, rehearsal, gallery and gathering spaces for Berkeley's cultural and artistic groups.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending

65

Proposed Project List | Highlights



