## Survey on Services for Pacifica

SurveyMonkey

**1. Outsourcing the Police Department: The City of Pacifica could consider outsourcing the Police Department through a contract with the San Mateo County Sheriff's Department. The Sheriff's department would assume all Law Enforcement duties and the City of Pacifica Police Department would be eliminated. It is estimated that the savings to Pacifica would be $1.5 million annually. The City of San Carlos recently went through this process and is projected to save $2 million annually.The City of San Carlos selected the County Sheriff to provide police services starting Nov. 1, 2010. The City of Half Moon Bay has also entered into a contract with the Sheriff and the new service began July 1, 2011. Pro: May result in savings of up to $1.5 million per year. Con: Loss of local control of services and identity with the community. Potential loss of jobs for current employees of the department. The City loses the ability to directly control the service level and the cost of the service. The knowledge that officers have about Pacifica may be lost. Significant costs (approximately $2 million) to re-establish local department if a decision was ever made in the future to return to a local department.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider outsourcing the police department? | 25.6% (378) | 12.7% (187) | 4.3% (63) | 12.0% (177) | **45.4% (669)** | 3.39 | 1,474 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 151 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,474** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **43** |

**2. Eliminate Supervisory Positions when vacancies occur (Department of Public Works): Combine supervisory functions and eliminate two positions. These changes could be included in the 2012/2013 Budget. Pro: This change will result in savings of $126,249 in the General Fund and savings in other special funds. Con: May reduce opportunities for promotion for employees.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating supervisory positions when vacancies occur? | **59.6% (879)** | 21.7% (320) | 6.7% (99) | 5.3% (78) | 6.7% (99) | 1.78 | 1,475 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 90 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,475** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **42** |

**3. Changes in Service Levels in Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) •Eliminate Homework Center in Elementary Age Recreation Services ($9,900) Pro: Savings of $9,900 Con: Elimination of program – only true academic homework center (open to all children) in Pacifica; less part-time staff available for other department programs/events.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating the Homework Center program? | 19.8% (289) | 9.1% (133) | 7.9% (116) | 11.2% (164) | **52.0% (760)** | 3.67 | 1,462 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 113 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,462** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **55** |

**4. Changes in Service Levels in Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) •Eliminate Afterschool Program in Teen & J Teens Recreation Services ($2,300) Pro: Expenditure reduction of $2,300. Con: Loss of program to participants; less part-time staff available for other department programs/events.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating the Teen and J Teen Afterschool Program? | 16.0% (232) | 7.7% (112) | 9.0% (130) | 12.4% (180) | **54.8% (793)** | 3.82 | 1,447 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 104 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,447** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **70** |

**5. Changes in Service Levels in Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) •Eliminate all services in Teens/J-Teens by the reduction of one full-time position by 25% ($32,628). Pro: Possible savings of $32,628 – calculation dependent on other programs' status. Con: Only achievable through the elimination of ALL Teen/J-Teen programs; loss of teen services; loss of account revenue; staff responsible for this account are also responsible for other programs; cost for administrative support would not be saved. Reduction of full-time would be difficult and an elimination of all Teen/J-Teen programs would result in the elimination of programs and services in other accounts; loss of part-time staff resulting in less available for other events.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating all Teen/J Teen program? | 16.1% (234) | 8.2% (119) | 9.8% (143) | 14.6% (212) | **51.2% (744)** | 3.77 | 1,452 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 87 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,452** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **65** |

## 6. Changes in Service Levels in Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) •Reduce part-time staff hours in Recreation Swimming Services ($4,500). Pro: Savings of $4,500. Con: Less time/staff for maintenance; higher ratio of participants to staff.

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating part-time staff hours for recreational swimming programs? | 23.1% (333) | 16.2% (234) | 12.3% (178) | 11.9% (172) | **36.4% (525)** | 3.22 | 1,442 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other (please specify) | 98 |
| **answered question** | **1,442** |
| **skipped question** | **75** |

## 7. Changes in Service Levels in Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) •Reduce part-time staff hours for the Swim Team ($5,500). Pro: Savings of $5,500. Con: Less time/staff for maintenance; higher ratio of participants to staff.

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating part-time staff hours for swim team programs? | 28.4% (411) | 19.0% (275) | 12.0% (173) | 11.6% (167) | **29.0% (419)** | 2.94 | 1,445 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other (please specify) | 92 |
| **answered question** | **1,445** |
| **skipped question** | **72** |

**8. Changes in Service Levels in Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) •Eliminate all Special Events ($26,211). Pro: Expenditure reduction of $26,211. Con: Loss of 8 major special events and support for two more, lack of visibility to public; loss of special event revenue; full-time positions assigned to this account are also assigned to several other accounts making it difficult to achieve savings. Reduction of full-time hours would be difficult and an elimination of all special events could result in the elimination of programs and services in other accounts**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating 8 major recreation special events? | 20.0% (284) | 14.0% (199) | 14.1% (200) | 14.8% (210) | **37.0% (525)** | 3.35 | 1,418 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 143 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,418** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **99** |

**9. Changes in Services Levels in PB&R - Senior Services Programs • Eliminate Senior Services Programs ($261,033). Programs and services are provided at the Pacifica Community Center, which houses a multi-purpose senior center. The center provides a congregate and nutrition lunch program, transportation, information and referral services, multiple classes/clubs, entertainment and volunteer opportunities. Meals on Wheels are prepared and delivered from this facility. A gift shop with homemade items is located in the senior lounge area. Programs are partially funded by Older American Act grants, San Mateo County grants, charitable donations, client donations, General Fund support of the City of Pacifica, Pacificans Care, fundraising and in-kind volunteer hours. The Senior Services Division is divided into four areas: Programs, Congregate Nutrition, Meals on Wheels and Transportation. These programs are interconnected. Staff assigned to Senior Services work in all areas, and any elimination of one may result in elimination of all. Pro: Cutting Senior Services would result in savings of the total City support equaling $261,033. •Senior Programs Con: Local citizens would not receive vital health/social programs, programs that encourage physical fitness, social interaction and lifelong learning, information and referral service, County linkage in-home help support, appointment services for senior services (legal aid, HICAP, Tax assistance, podiatry, medical equipment loan closet, Health Education Resource Room). •Congregate Lunch Program Con: Loss of "anchor" program/service at the center; loss of affordable and nutritious lunch program, isolation of Seniors; loss of all Senior funding: federal OAA funds, County Program Support Funds, loss of major kitchen equipment belonging to County, and one time only federal funds. •Transportation Con: Isolation for seniors who do not have driving privileges, shortfall of participants in other Center programs and activities, loss of program funding and revenue; would have to pay back grant for new bus; loss of all transportation. •Meals on Wheels Con: Loss of program funding; elimination of services to homebound clients; contribute to isolation of clients though elimination of contact; potential increase in emergency calls to homebound seniors (impact on FD and PD), loss of major kitchen equipment in Center kitchen.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider reducing Senior programs? | 11.4% (166) | 9.1% (132) | 4.5% (66) | 13.5% (196) | **61.5% (895)** | 4.05 | 1,455 |
| Should the City consider reductions in the Senior congregate lunch program? | 10.4% (148) | 7.7% (110) | 6.0% (85) | 14.2% (202) | **61.8% (880)** | 4.09 | 1,425 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider reductions in Senior citzen transportation programs? | 9.0% (129) | 7.6% (108) | 5.5% (79) | 14.9% (212) | **63.0% (898)** | 4.15 | 1,426 |
| Should the City consider reductions in the Meals on Wheels program? | 7.2% (102) | 4.9% (70) | 4.6% (65) | 13.5% (192) | **69.8% (993)** | 4.34 | 1,422 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 139 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,459** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **58** |

## 10. Non-Departmental Expenditures (General) - Community Services •Eliminate funding for Resource Center ($83,000). Pro: Saves $83,000 Con: Eliminates funding support for important community services for those in need in Pacifica

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating funding for the Resource Center? | 17.6% (252) | 12.2% (175) | 9.8% (140) | 15.2% (217) | **45.3% (648)** | 3.58 | 1,432 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 134 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,432** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **85** |

## 11. Non-Departmental Expenditures (General) - Community Services •Eliminate funding for Visitor Center ($10,000). Pro: Saves $10,000 Con: Reduces resources available to support tourism in Pacifica and funding support for the Chamber of Commerce

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider this option? | 42.6% (618) | 17.3% (251) | 12.6% (183) | 9.1% (132) | 18.4% (267) | 2.43 | 1,451 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 122 |
| | | | | | answered question | | 1,451 |
| | | | | | skipped question | | 66 |

## 12. Non-Departmental Expenditures (General) - Community Services •Eliminate funding support for Pacifica Community Television (PCT) ($49,584). Pro: Saves $49,584 Con: Terminates PCT coverage of City Council, Planning Commission and School District Board meetings as well as some community programming. Provides less transparency for government functions in the community

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider eliminating funding support for City and School District meeting broadcasts on Pacifica Community Television? | 43.1% (632) | 15.5% (227) | 10.8% (159) | 10.3% (151) | 20.3% (297) | 2.49 | 1,466 |
| | | | | | answered question | | 1,466 |
| | | | | | skipped question | | 51 |

**13. Non-Departmental Expenditures (General) - Community Services •Reduce funding support for 14 extra library hours in the County Library in Pacifica. Extra hours are necessitated by having to split County allocation of hours between two facilities. ($75,000) Pro: Saves $75,000 Con: Reduces library services in Pacifica for residents and may erode support for libraries in Pacifica. Cuts in service at a time when library usage is increasing. Loss of match funds from the County ($37,500)**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither oppose or support | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City conisider eliminating funding for 14 additional hours per week of County library services? | 22.0% (323) | 11.5% (168) | 6.6% (97) | 13.1% (192) | **46.8% (685)** | 3.51 | 1,465 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 116 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,465** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **52** |

**14. Business License (General): Restructure/increase the % charged for each business type. A business license in Pacifica can range from the minimum of $40 per year to the maximum of $12,457. Businesses with gross sales under $25,000 pay the minimum, contractors are $50 and professionals (dentist, doctor, lawyer) are $100. The majority of Pacifica business licenses issued are less than $100 per year. 73 businesses pay $100 – an increase to $150 generates an additional $3,650 annually 430 businesses pay minimum $40 – an increase to $80 generates an additional $17,200 annually Pro: Would increase the amount of revenue received from Business Licenses and replace some of the revenue recently lost due to a court ruling. The ruling stated that businesses cannot be charged for initial application ($130) or an annual renewal fee ($35) which the City had charged until FY11/12 (lost annual revenue of $37,600) Con: Increases in tax rate must be approved by voters. In current economy, additional business tax might be difficult for struggling businesses.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider restructuring the business tax to increase revenues? | **40.1% (578)** | 18.6% (268) | 8.0% (116) | 8.5% (123) | 24.8% (358) | 2.59 | 1,443 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 127 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,443** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **74** |

**15. Transient Occupancy Tax (General) (TOT) (Hotel tax): The TOT can also be applied to Vacation Rentals By Owners (VRBO's). From a quick survey of online Pacifica VRBO (a total of 12), a potential $30,000 to $40,000 could be collected annually including $480 in business licenses. Pro: The County and most other cities charge TOT on VRBOs. The tracking, via internet, and the collection can be done by current staff. Potential revenue increase of $30,000 - $40,000 annually. Con: The task will involve adopting ordinance language regarding VRBOs, identifying VRBO homes in Pacifica, notifying the owner and getting compliance with the TOT. Not all VRBO rentals are year round making estimates difficult.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider collection of transient occupancy taxes from Vacation Rentals By Owners (VRBO)? | **51.8% (744)** | 18.2% (262) | 9.7% (140) | 5.0% (72) | 15.2% (219) | 2.14 | 1,437 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other (please specify) | 62 |
| **answered question** | **1,437** |
| **skipped question** | **80** |

**16. Sales Tax (General): The City receives one cent on every dollar spent in Pacifica. Fuel and service stations continue to be the largest source of sales tax for the City. A one cent increase in the sales tax is projected to generate $1.7 million per year and half cent $865,000 per year. Pro: Generates $1.7 million (one cent) or $865,000 (half cent) Con: Requires a vote and could possibly conflict with sales tax proposals by the State of California. Would raise the sales tax above neighboring jurisdictions.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider a one cent increase in sales tax? | 33.8% (455) | 13.6% (183) | 5.4% (73) | 8.3% (112) | **38.8% (522)** | 3.05 | 1,345 |
| Should the City consider a half cent increase in sales tax? | **43.0% (541)** | 17.1% (215) | 4.3% (54) | 5.3% (67) | 30.3% (382) | 2.63 | 1,259 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,443** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **74** |

**17. Utility Users Tax (UUT) (General): The City's current UUT is 6.5% on gas and electricity. This is collected through the utility companies and paid to the City. A proposal to restructure the tax would reduce the tax to 6% and apply it to telecommunications as well as gas and electricity. This would generate $800,000 per year in additional revenue. For businesses there is a maximum annual tax of $500. In many cases small/medium businesses pay $500 annually in UUT and very large businesses reach the maximum of $500 in just the first few months of each annual cycle. Eliminating the $500 cap on UUT could generate an additional $7,000 per large user or $175,000 annually. Raising the cap from $500 to $3,000 would generate around $60,000 annually. Pro: Change in general rate by lowering it for gas and electricity and the addition of telecommunications could generate up to $800,000 annually. Cap could be raised or eliminated for businesses. Con: Eliminating the cap could have a negative impact on some businesses.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider restructuring the UUT by lowering the percentage from 6.5% to 6% for gas and electricity and then add telecommunications to the 6%? | **34.2% (490)** | 15.6% (224) | 13.8% (197) | 6.1% (88) | 30.2% (433) | 2.83 | 1,432 |
| Should the City consider eliminating the $500 cap on the UUT? | **32.6% (446)** | 16.2% (222) | 14.3% (196) | 6.6% (91) | 30.3% (415) | 2.86 | 1,370 |
| Should the City consider raising the cap on the UUT to $3,000? | 28.4% (386) | 16.1% (219) | 15.1% (206) | 7.6% (103) | **32.8% (446)** | 3.00 | 1,360 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 108 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,437** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **80** |

**18. Parcel Tax: The City of Pacifica could propose to the voters a parcel tax similar to the one enacted in the Pacifica School District. At $118 per parcel per year the tax would generate $1.2 million annually. Pro: Generate $1.2 annually for the life of the parcel tax Con: Requires a vote of the electorate (2/3)**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider a parcel tax measure to generate new revenue? | 24.3% (349) | 13.0% (187) | 7.0% (100) | 7.5% (108) | **48.2% (691)** | 3.42 | 1,435 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 138 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,435** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **82** |

**19. Increase revenue from rental properties (City owned) - The City receives rent from a variety of non-profit entities for facilities like the Sanchez Art Center, the Pacifica Pier and cell towers. Rents vary from seven cents per square foot to a flat monthly rent of $1,107 depending on the facility, tenant improvements and utilities. Pro: Could generate some additional revenue. Con: Requires re-negotiation of existing long term leases. May be a burden on some non-profit organizations.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider renegotiating exsiting leases to generate new rental income? | **33.2% (472)** | 20.0% (285) | 15.6% (222) | 10.3% (146) | 20.9% (297) | 2.66 | 1,422 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 124 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,422** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **95** |

**20. Increase of Fireworks Tax/Surcharge – The City currently receives a surcharge of 8% on the sale of all fireworks in the permitted booths during the 4th of July. The surcharge generates $30,000 annually to cover the cost of public safety. An additional 6% would generate an additional $23,400 annually. Pro: Off sets the cost of administering fireworks sales and staffing for 4th. Additional revenue could offset City total expense of $52,000. Con: May reduce the revenue for non-profit groups (lower sales) and would need to work with fireworks company regarding surcharge. Other cities that discontinued sales were then approached by non-profit organizations for funding.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should City consider increasing the surcharge for the sale of annual fireworks? | **61.0% (880)** | 13.3% (192) | 6.4% (93) | 5.1% (74) | 14.1% (204) | 1.98 | 1,443 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 142 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,443** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **74** |

**21. Update Building Permit Fees (Planning Department). The majority of the City's building permit fees have not been modified, even to keep up with inflation, since the 1990's. If these fees were reset to be comparable to other cities of similar size, Pacifica could expect an average increase in building permit revenue in the 10% to 15% range or approximately $22,000 to $33,000 per year at a minimum. Resetting these fees can only be accomplished through a formal fee study to confirm that the city is achieving full cost recovery for permit and inspection services. The updated fees could also be tied to a construction index or other widely accepted inflation multiplier that would automatically reset the fees each year. Many local jurisdictions use this method to ensure that fees are updated on a regular basis. Pro: Generate $22,000 to $33,000 annually. Revised fees would reflect the actual cost to the City in provided permit and inspection services. Con: Increased fees would add costs for permit applicants.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should City consider updating and increasing the permit fees for planning and building? | **45.2% (650)** | 19.3% (278) | 9.7% (139) | 6.7% (96) | 19.2% (276) | 2.35 | 1,439 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 83 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,439** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **78** |

**22. Assess Fee for Winter Storm Water/Erosion Control Inspections (Planning Department). The City could add a fee for winterization inspections. Construction sites are required to put in place measures to prevent erosion over the winter months and the City inspects these sites to insure that they remain protected from erosion. These inspections usually involve multiple visits to a site to ensure that proper erosion control measures are kept in place. This added fee could generate $14,000 of new revenue annually. Pro: Generate $14,000 annually. Revised fee would reflect the actual cost to the City in providing required winterizing inspection services. Con: Increased fees would add costs for permit applicants**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider assessing a fee for Winter Storm Water/Erosion Control Inspections? | **42.3% (606)** | 16.5% (236) | 12.6% (180) | 7.0% (101) | 21.7% (311) | 2.49 | 1,434 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other (please specify) | 63 |
| **answered question** | **1,434** |
| **skipped question** | **83** |

**23. Towing/storage of vehicles (Police Department). Begin collecting a $50 per vehicle towing fee. Current law allows for the recovery of staff time costs directly related to the towing and storage of vehicles initiated by the police department. The Police Department Franchise Contract with tow companies mandates the tow company to pay $50 per vehicle that is towed per police authorization. Based on the towing of approximately 500 vehicles per year, the City would anticipate approximately $25,000 in annual revenues. As staffing costs increase in subsequent years, the tow recovery fee would be increased to incorporate those costs. This fee does not apply to motorists that request their own tow service for non-police related tows (i.e. flat tire, mechanical breakdown, etc.). Pro: Allows for the City to recover fees for staff time directly related to the towing/storage/removal of vehicles. Con: The tow companies are mandated to pay these fees to City and may not be able to realistically recover all of these fees through increases they pass on to the customer. It should be noted that currently there are only two tow companies on the City contract list with one other company showing an interest to seek approval. This limited competition allows these tow companies to maximize their own business revenues through police requested tows with the City of Pacifica.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider assessing a $50 per vehicle recovery fee from towing companies? | **53.4% (766)** | 16.4% (235) | 11.8% (169) | 3.8% (55) | 14.6% (209) | 2.10 | 1,434 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 59 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,434** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **83** |

**24. Community Center Rentals (PB&R) Home of Senior Services, recreation preschool classes, recreation instructional classes, city special events, location for community group and non-profit meetings as well as private party rentals. The Community Center is a hub for community gathering and socializing as well as both structured and self-directed recreational activities. Increase non-profit fundraising rental fees ($3,000). Pro: Increased revenue, improve cost recovery. Con: Fee increase to participants.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider increasing the community center rental fee for non-profits when the event is a fundraiser? | 26.5% (379) | 14.6% (209) | 11.1% (159) | 13.7% (195) | **34.0% (486)** | 3.14 | 1,428 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 67 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,428** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **89** |

**25. Teen Programs (PBR) - Cabrillo Afterschool Program, Youth Advisory Board, J-Teen Dances, Leaders in Training Education (LITE's). These programs provide safe environments for teens and J-teens to socialize and recreate; promote healthy choices; encourage connections to the community via experiences in leadership and volunteer opportunities. Increase fees in three programs ($5,500). 1. Increase LITE program fee from $25 to $50 ($2,000). Pro: Increase in revenue of $2,000. Con: Fee increase to participants; some families may have a hard time, program may lose participation; doubles current fee, which is scheduled to be implemented for 2012. 2. Add $1/ticket for J-Teen Dances an increase from $6 to $7( $2,500). Pro: Increase in revenue of $2,500. Con: Fee increase to participants, may reduce participation. 3. Increase Teen Center Fee from $125 to $150 ($1,000). Pro: Increase in revenue of $1,000. Con: Fee increase to participants, may reduce participation.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider increasing the fees in the three Teen programs? | 30.9% (440) | 15.2% (216) | 8.5% (121) | 9.4% (133) | **36.0% (512)** | 3.04 | 1,422 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 97 |
| | | | | | **answered question** | | **1,422** |
| | | | | | **skipped question** | | **95** |

**26. Recreation Swimming Services (PB&R) - Adult lap swim, recreation swimming, swim lessons, adaptive aquatics, swim meets, pool parties – programs for infants to seniors. Programs provide safe recreational experiences, healthy recreational choices for children & adults, activities that help fight obesity, teaching life-saving skills which helps to prevent drowning. Increase fees in three areas ($4,600 - $5,400). 1. Increase All Access monthly fee from $65 to $67 ($1,300). Pro: Increase in revenue of $1,300. Con: Fee increase to participants, may lose participants. 2. Increase Pool Party fee from $95 to $100/hour ($800) or increase fee from $95 to $105/hour ($1,600) Pro: Increase in revenue of $800 - $1,600 depending on amount of increase. Con: Increase in fee to customer. 3. Increase in Swim Meet fee from $100 to $110/hour ($2,500). Pro: Increase in revenue of $2,500. Con: Increase in fee to customer.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider increasing the fees in the recreational swim programs? | **50.4% (715)** | 16.3% (231) | 5.7% (81) | 5.3% (75) | 22.3% (317) | 2.33 | 1,419 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other (please specify) | 66 |
| **answered question** | **1,419** |
| **skipped question** | **98** |

**27. Swim Team (PB&R) Promoting physical fitness through swim instruction, providing competitive opportunities, teaching life-saving skills, hosting an annual weekend swim meet bringing in out-of-towners. Increase Swim Team Fee by $5/month ($7,200) or by $10/month ($14,400). Pro: Increase in revenue of $7,200 to $14,400 depending on amount of increase. Con: Could result in reduced enrollment if participants leave the program due to the increase.**

| | Support this option | Somewhat support this option | Neither support or oppose | Somewhat oppose this option | Oppose this option | Rating Average | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should the City consider increasing the fee in the swim team program? | 47.0% (659) | 18.5% (260) | 7.6% (107) | 7.2% (101) | 19.7% (276) | 2.34 | 1,403 |
| | | | | | Other (please specify) | | 54 |
| | | | | | answered question | | 1,403 |
| | | | | | skipped question | | 114 |

**28. Please rank your preferences of the options. Using number one as your first choice and or number ten as your last choice.**

| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | 9th | 10th |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contract out Law Enforcement | 28.0% (374) | 3.4% (46) | 2.8% (38) | 3.5% (47) | 3.9% (52) | 4.4% (59) | 4.8% (64) | 8.1% (108) | 10.5% (141) | **30.6% (409)** |
| Reduce Parks, Beaches and Recreation Programs including Senior Services | 3.0% (39) | 4.3% (56) | 4.5% (59) | 4.9% (63) | 6.1% (79) | 6.6% (85) | 11.4% (148) | 16.5% (214) | 20.1% (261) | **22.6% (293)** |
| Eliminate funding for Resource Center, Visitor Center, PCT and Library Hours | 4.3% (54) | 5.6% (71) | 5.4% (68) | 6.8% (86) | 7.6% (96) | 9.2% (116) | 10.6% (134) | 16.9% (213) | **17.7% (223)** | 15.8% (199) |
| Increase Business License Fees | 8.5% (106) | 13.9% (173) | 15.6% (193) | **17.9% (223)** | 12.5% (156) | 11.3% (141) | 9.1% (114) | 6.4% (80) | 3.6% (45) | 1.3% (16) |
| Increase Sales Tax | **20.2% (258)** | 12.2% (156) | 7.6% (97) | 7.0% (89) | 7.9% (101) | 7.3% (94) | 8.8% (113) | 9.6% (123) | 12.0% (154) | 7.3% (94) |
| Apply Utility Users Tax to Telecommunications | 10.0% (124) | 12.5% (154) | 12.9% (159) | 12.0% (148) | **13.4% (165)** | 11.0% (136) | 11.0% (136) | 9.3% (115) | 5.6% (69) | 2.3% (28) |
| Impose a Parcel Tax | 7.7% (97) | 9.4% (119) | 7.4% (93) | 5.2% (66) | 6.9% (87) | 8.9% (113) | 9.1% (115) | 8.6% (109) | 15.1% (191) | **21.6% (273)** |
| Increase Parks, Beaches and Recreation Fees | 5.2% (64) | 7.5% (92) | 9.7% (119) | 11.7% (144) | 13.0% (160) | 15.0% (184) | **16.5% (203)** | 12.6% (155) | 7.6% (94) | 1.1% (14) |
| Increase Building Permit Fees | 10.8% (135) | 14.6% (182) | **17.4% (217)** | 15.8% (197) | 13.9% (174) | 11.1% (139) | 7.6% (95) | 5.0% (62) | 2.2% (27) | 1.7% (21) |
| Increase rents for City owned properties | 10.3% (128) | **17.7% (220)** | 16.0% (198) | 14.5% (180) | 13.7% (170) | 11.8% (147) | 7.9% (98) | 4.4% (55) | 2.7% (33) | 1.0% (12) |

**answered question**

**skipped question**

**29. To include your comments and thoughts, please complete this survey by Janaury 20, 2012. Additional space for comments is provided below.**

| | Response Count |
|---|---|
| | 540 |
| answered question | 540 |
| skipped question | 977 |