













Bond Survey (San Francisco / 2008)

1. Would you support a general obligation bond for recreation and park (capital) improvements of \$150 million?			Response Percent	Response Count
Yes			50.4%	63
No			13.6%	17
Maybe			36.0%	45
			answered question	125
			skipped question	2



2. How would you prioritize a proposed general obligation bond? In other words, what are your personal preferences in terms of what is targeted and spent? Please rate the following priorities for bond spending on a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being the highest priority. If you think a priority isn't on the list, please add it in the window provided.											
	0 (lowest)	1	2	3	4	5 (neutral)	6	7	8	9	10 (highest)
Renovate neighborhood park landscapes, paths and trails	2.2% (2)	3.4% (3)	3.4% (3)	1.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	10.1% (9)	16.9% (15)	15.7% (14)	9.0% (8)	14.6% (13)	
Renovate/replace recreation centers	1.1% (1)	5.7% (5)	2.3% (2)	8.0% (7)	3.4% (3)	19.3% (17)	13.6% (12)	9.1% (8)	11.4% (10)	12.5% (11)	
Repair seismic (earthquake) conditions	1.2% (1)	1.2% (1)	5.8% (5)	5.8% (5)	5.8% (5)	22.1% (19)	10.5% (9)	9.3% (8)	8.1% (7)	12.8% (11)	
Replace old and toxic playgrounds	1.1% (1)	2.3% (2)	3.4% (3)	2.3% (2)	2.3% (2)	11.5% (10)	9.2% (8)	8.0% (7)	6.9% (6)	8.0% (7)	
Add new playfields and repair existing fields	10.5% (9)	2.3% (2)	3.5% (3)	2.3% (2)	5.8% (5)	14.0% (12)	12.8% (11)	10.5% (9)	8.1% (7)	9.3% (8)	
Add new restrooms and renovate existing restrooms	2.4% (2)	1.2% (1)	2.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.7% (4)	11.8% (10)	16.5% (14)	15.3% (13)	9.4% (8)	12.9% (11)	
Replace pools	11.4% (10)	6.8% (6)	6.8% (6)	9.1% (8)	4.5% (4)	20.5% (18)	10.2% (9)	10.2% (9)	8.0% (7)	4.5% (4)	
Repair critical park infrastructure (irrigation, roads, stairways, lighting)	3.4% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.1% (1)	2.3% (2)	5.7% (5)	13.8% (12)	11.5% (10)	17.2% (15)	18.4% (16)	
Plant trees in neighborhood parks, and prune-for-safety and longevity	4.6% (4)	1.1% (1)	9.2% (8)	1.1% (1)	2.3% (2)	6.9% (6)	14.9% (13)	6.9% (6)	16.1% (14)	20.7% (18)	
Other (please describe in box below)	4.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.0% (1)	12.0% (6)	8.0% (4)	

3. Once a focus for a bond is selected (i.e. parks, restrooms, playfields, etc.), how do you think funds should be allocated among the City's Supervisor Districts, given that they are not equal in size, number of recreational facilities, and parks?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Equal funds per district, regardless		2.2%	2
By policy driven criteria city-wide (such as seismic and safety, physical condition, versatility of park, high needs)		28.3%	26
By need, picking one or two projects per district, depending upon budget		12.0%	11
By number of people to be served, aiming for projects that serve the most people		13.0%	12
By the amount of bond and other capital funds previously received in each District (those Districts that received the fewest funds in the past would now receive the most)		3.3%	3
Some funding for each District and a pool of matching funding to provide incentive to communities to match city funds and even generate in-kind contributions of labor as well as funding to leverage limited city dollars		25.0%	23
Other:		16.3%	15
	(please describe here)		21
	answered question		92
	skipped question		35



4. I would support converting the Open Space Fund (which is a set aside of 2.5 cents for every \$100 of property tax from the General Fund--see <http://www.sfnpc.org/bondsurvey#setaside> for more details) into a capital fund only, providing about \$30 million a year for capital improvements.



		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		52.4%	55
No		47.6%	50
<i>answered question</i>			105
<i>skipped question</i>			22

5. I would support creating citywide landscape assessment districts (LADs) that would levy an assessment on property owners at an amount agreed to by the property owners in a special election. (LADs allow property owners to elect a board to set the budget of each district.)



		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		52.4%	54
No		47.6%	49
<i>answered question</i>			103
<i>skipped question</i>			24

6. I would support expanding the property Transfer Tax by a few cents to provide funds for park improvements.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		65.4%	68
No		34.6%	36
<i>answered question</i>			104
<i>skipped question</i>			23

7. I would support a transfer tax increase on properties that sell for more than \$2.5 million.				
			Response Percent	Response Count
Yes			75.2%	79
No			24.8%	26
			<i>answered question</i>	105
			<i>skipped question</i>	22

8. I would support a transfer tax if it were designated for a specific improvement such as playgrounds or trees.				
			Response Percent	Response Count
Yes			55.9%	57
No			44.1%	45
			<i>answered question</i>	102
			<i>skipped question</i>	25

9. I would support earmarking a portion of the Hotel Tax to civic squares, plazas and public parks that are tourist destinations (i.e Pioneer Park at Coit Tower, Alamo Square, etc.)				
			Response Percent	Response Count
Yes			76.2%	80
No			23.8%	25
			<i>answered question</i>	105
			<i>skipped question</i>	22

10. What is your age group?			Response Percent	Response Count
18-30 years			4.6%	5
30-45 years			31.5%	34
45-60 years			42.6%	46
60 +			21.3%	23
		answered question		108
		skipped question		19

11. If you have any additional comments, please add them here:			Response Count
			52
		answered question	52
		skipped question	75