



**GODBE RESEARCH**  
Gain Insight

**CITY OF SUNNYVALE**

2019 District Elections Survey

Topline Report

n=528

12 minutes

Likely March 2020 Voters

May 29, 2019

**[www.godberesearch.com](http://www.godberesearch.com)**

Northern California and Corporate Offices  
1575 Bayshore Highway, Suite 102  
Burlingame, CA 94010

Nevada  
59 Damonte Ranch Parkway, Suite B309  
Reno, NV 89521

Pacific Northwest  
601 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Suite 1900  
Bellevue, WA 98004

## METHODOLOGY

**Sample Universe:**

- 37,726 Likely March 2020 Voters

**Sample Size:**

n=528 Likely March 2020 Voters

**Data Collection Methodology:**

n=72 Landline

n=28 Cell

n=146 Online from email invitation

n=282 Online from text invitation

**Margin of Error:**

- Likely March 2020 Voters  $\pm$  4.24%

**Interview Dates:** May 15 to May 18, 2019

## SUNNYVALE CLIMATE

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
1. In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in Sunnyvale?	Very satisfied	38.0%	201	
	Somewhat satisfied	43.6%	230	
	Somewhat dissatisfied	13.9%	73	
	Very dissatisfied	3.7%	20	
	DK/NA	0.9%	5	
	Total Satisfied	81.6%		
	Total Dissatisfied	17.6%		
	Ratio Sat to Dissat	4.6		
2. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the job Sunnyvale is doing to provide city services?	Very satisfied	35.7%	188	
	Somewhat satisfied	45.9%	242	
	Somewhat dissatisfied	10.3%	54	
	Very dissatisfied	3.8%	20	
	DK/NA	4.4%	23	
	Total Satisfied	81.6%		
	Total Dissatisfied	14.1%		
	Ratio Sat to Dissat	5.8		

## INITIAL BALLOT TESTS

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
3. Shall the City Charter be amended to change the system for electing city council members from the current system of 7 numbered seats elected at large to 7 single-member council districts elected by the voters of each district, maintaining existing provisions for 2, 4-year terms and appointment of the mayor by the Council from one of its members?	Definitely Yes	17.0%	46	
	Probably Yes	31.1%	83	
	Probably No	15.1%	41	
	Definitely No	13.7%	37	
	DK/NA	23.1%	62	
	Total Yes	48.1%		
	Total No	28.8%		
4. Shall the City Charter be amended to change the system for electing city council members from the current system of 7 numbered seats elected at large to 6 single-member council districts elected by the voters of each district and a mayor elected by all voters of the City, maintaining existing provisions for 2, 4-year terms for all elected council members and the mayor?	Definitely Yes	20.5%	53	
	Probably Yes	32.1%	83	
	Probably No	16.3%	42	
	Definitely No	7.7%	20	
	DK/NA	23.3%	61	
	Total Yes	52.6%		
	Total No	24.1%		
5. Before taking this survey, what had you seen, heard or read about the district election issue in Sunnyvale?	Heard about it/Know about it/Nothing specific	6.8%	36	
	Change to district map/Number of representatives	4.7%	25	
	Equal representation/Help minorities	4.3%	23	
	Opened to litigation/lawsuits	3.5%	18	
	Read about/Mercury news	3.5%	18	
	Other city's and done the same	2.1%	11	
	Read online/Nextdoor/City website	1.4%	7	
	Mail/Newsletters	0.7%	4	
	Negative - General mention	0.5%	2	
	Gone to meetings/City council	0.4%	2	
	Voted before/Past year	0.4%	2	
	Should not have districts	0.3%	2	
	Don't understand it	0.1%	1	
	Positive - General mention	0.0%	0	
	Other mention	0.7%	3	
Not seen, heard or read about the district election issue	63.3%	334		
DK/NA	12.8%	68		

## FEATURES OF THE MEASURE

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
Q6A. The measure would ensure specific neighborhoods can elect a council member	Much More Likely	27.1%	143	57.6%
	Swt. More Likely	30.5%	161	
	No Effect	17.1%	90	
	Swt. Less Likely	6.4%	34	
	Much Less Likely	9.0%	48	
	DK/NA	9.9%	52	
Q6B. The measure could result in more diversity among council members	Much More Likely	32.6%	172	63.2%
	Swt. More Likely	30.6%	162	
	No Effect	21.4%	113	
	Swt. Less Likely	4.1%	21	
	Much Less Likely	4.3%	22	
	DK/NA	7.1%	37	
Q6C. The measure would protect the City from an impending lawsuit under the California Voting Rights Act	Much More Likely	26.7%	141	58.0%
	Swt. More Likely	31.3%	165	
	No Effect	18.1%	95	
	Swt. Less Likely	2.8%	15	
	Much Less Likely	4.4%	23	
	DK/NA	16.7%	88	
Q6D. Instead of picking representatives from the entire city, known as at-large elections, the measure would switch to district elections that portion the City into geographic areas.	Much More Likely	26.8%	142	57.6%
	Swt. More Likely	30.8%	162	
	No Effect	16.6%	87	
	Swt. Less Likely	7.4%	39	
	Much Less Likely	9.5%	50	
	DK/NA	9.0%	47	

## FEATURES OF THE MEASURE -- RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Total		
	Column N %	Count	Mean
Q6B. The measure could result in more diversity among council members			0.90
Q6C. The measure would protect the City from an impending lawsuit under the California Voting Rights Act			0.88
Q6A. The measure would ensure specific neighborhoods can elect a council member			0.67
Q6D. Instead of picking representatives from the entire city, known as at-large elections, the measure would switch to district elections that portion the City into geographic areas.			0.64

## INFORMATIONAL STATEMENTS

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
Q7A. The California Voting Rights Act of 2001 requires that cities ensure that the votes of racial minorities are not diluted in at-large election systems. Moving to district elections will protect the City from a lawsuit	Much more likely to vote YES	26.9%	142	58.4%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	31.4%	166	
	No effect	29.3%	154	
	DK/NA	12.4%	65	
Q7B. Many other cities and school districts have faced costly lawsuits to force them to change to district elections in order to conform with State law	Much more likely to vote YES	24.8%	131	58.5%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	33.7%	178	
	No effect	27.8%	147	
	DK/NA	13.7%	72	
Q7C. The measure would help the City avoid a costly law suit that could cost the City millions of dollars and force a change to district election	Much more likely to vote YES	34.4%	182	67.8%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	33.4%	176	
	No effect	21.6%	114	
	DK/NA	10.6%	56	
Q7D. Smaller council districts may make it easier for neighborhood leaders to run for council and avoid having to run costly campaigns	Much more likely to vote YES	31.7%	167	66.2%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	34.5%	182	
	No effect	25.8%	136	
	DK/NA	8.0%	42	
Q7E. Last November, 57 cities across California changed how they elected city councils, switching for the first time to elect council members by distinct geographic districts	Much more likely to vote YES	21.4%	113	48.4%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	26.9%	142	
	No effect	40.6%	214	
	DK/NA	11.0%	58	
Q7F. The measure would continue the current process of the City Council appointing one of its members mayor every two years	Much more likely to vote YES	20.9%	56	45.9%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	25.0%	67	
	No effect	41.2%	111	
	DK/NA	12.9%	35	
Q7G. The measure allows the voters to decide who will be mayor	Much more likely to vote YES	34.8%	90	66.0%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	31.2%	81	
	No effect	26.3%	68	
	DK/NA	7.7%	20	
Q7H. The measure would require the Mayor to be elected by all voters and be the only person elected by the entire City	Much more likely to vote YES	33.3%	86	65.2%
	Swt. more likely to vote YES	31.9%	83	
	No effect	26.8%	70	
	DK/NA	8.0%	21	

## INFORMATIONAL STATEMENTS – RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Total		
	Column N %	Count	Mean
Q7C. The measure would help the City avoid a costly law suit that could cost the City millions of dollars and force a change to district election			1.14
Q7G. The measure allows the voters to decide who will be mayor			1.09
Q7H. The measure would require the Mayor to be elected by all voters and be the only person elected by the entire City			1.07
Q7D. Smaller council districts may make it easier for neighborhood leaders to run for council and avoid having to run costly campaigns			1.06
Q7A. The California Voting Rights Act of 2001 requires that cities ensure that the votes of racial minorities are not diluted in at-large election systems. Moving to district elections will protect the City from a lawsuit			0.97
Q7B. Many other cities and school districts have faced costly lawsuits to force them to change to district elections in order to conform with State law			0.96
Q7E. Last November, 57 cities across California changed how they elected city councils, switching for the first time to elect council members by distinct geographic districts			0.78
Q7F. The measure would continue the current process of the City Council appointing one of its members mayor every two years			0.77

## CRITICAL STATEMENTS

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
Q8A. The measure could pit neighborhood against neighborhood and they may no longer be focused on the good of the entire city, but more narrow constituencies	Much More Likely to vote NO	23.5%	124	53.8%
	Swt. More Likely to vote NO	30.3%	160	
	No Effect	29.1%	154	
	DK/NA	17.1%	90	
Q8B. Under the new system voters would be voting for one council member only once every 4 years, instead of voting every two years for several council members	Much More Likely to vote NO	21.5%	113	47.9%
	Swt. More Likely to vote NO	26.4%	139	
	No Effect	38.3%	202	
	DK/NA	13.8%	73	
Q8C. Under the new system voters would not be able to vote for the entire council as they do now	Much More Likely to vote NO	20.6%	109	44.3%
	Swt. More Likely to vote NO	23.7%	125	
	No Effect	41.9%	221	
	DK/NA	13.8%	73	
Q8D. Without a directly elected mayor no city council member would represent the entire city	Much More Likely to vote NO	21.2%	57	43.1%
	Swt. More Likely to vote NO	21.8%	59	
	No Effect	35.1%	94	
	DK/NA	21.8%	59	
Q8E. The measure would make the Mayoral election very expensive and the successful candidate may be beholden to wealthy special interests	Much More Likely to vote NO	28.0%	73	54.4%
	Swt. More Likely to vote NO	26.4%	68	
	No Effect	28.6%	74	
	DK/NA	17.0%	44	
Q8F. Sunnyvale voters have rejected a directly elected mayor twice in the past	Much More Likely to vote NO	11.9%	31	27.9%
	Swt. More Likely to vote NO	16.0%	42	
	No Effect	56.7%	147	
	DK/NA	15.4%	40	

## CRITICAL STATEMENTS -- RANKED BY MEAN SCORE

	Total		
	Column N %	Count	Mean
Q8E. The measure would make the Mayoral election very expensive and the successful candidate may be beholden to wealthy special interests			0.99
Q8A. The measure could pit neighborhood against neighborhood and they may no longer be focused on the good of the entire city, but more narrow constituencies			0.93
Q8D. Without a directly elected mayor no city council member would represent the entire city			0.82
Q8B. Under the new system voters would be voting for one council member only once every 4 years, instead of voting every two years for several council members			0.80
Q8C. Under the new system voters would not be able to vote for the entire council as they do now			0.75
Q8F. Sunnyvale voters have rejected a directly elected mayor twice in the past			0.47

## FINAL BALLOT TESTS

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
9. Shall the City Charter be amended to change the system for electing city council members from the current system of 7 numbered seats elected at large to 7 single-member council districts elected by the voters of each district, maintaining existing provisions for 2, 4-year terms and appointment of the mayor by the Council from one of its members?	Definitely Yes	20.5%	55	
	Probably Yes	38.0%	102	
	Probably No	15.6%	42	
	Definitely No	11.4%	31	
	DK/NA	14.6%	39	
	Total Yes	58.5%		
	Total No	26.9%		
10. Shall the City Charter be amended to change the system for electing city council members from the current system of 7 numbered seats elected at large to 6 single-member council districts elected by the voters of each district and a mayor elected by all voters of the City, maintaining existing provisions for 2, 4-year terms for all elected council members and the mayor?	Definitely Yes	19.4%	50	
	Probably Yes	35.5%	92	
	Probably No	15.4%	40	
	Definitely No	10.3%	27	
	DK/NA	19.5%	51	
	Total Yes	54.9%		
	Total No	25.6%		



## DEMOGRAPHICS

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
A. Gender	Male	47.7%	252	
	Female	50.9%	269	
	Unknown	1.4%	7	
B. Age	18-29	9.5%	50	
	30-39	12.7%	67	
	40-49	15.6%	83	
	50-69	39.9%	211	
	70+	22.2%	117	
	Not coded	0.0%	0	
C. Broad Ethnic Groupings	East and South Asian	24.8%	131	
	European	47.8%	252	
	Hispanic and Portuguese	12.9%	68	
	Likely African-American	0.4%	2	
	Other	5.4%	28	
	Unknown	8.8%	46	
D. Years of Education	8 or less	Pending		
	9 to 11			
	12			
	13 to 14			
	15 to 16			
	16 or more			
	Unknown			
E. Marital Status	Single or Unknown	51.2%	270	
	Married	29.4%	155	
	Non-Traditional	19.4%	102	
F. Veteran	Yes	4.8%	25	
	Unknown	95.2%	503	
G. Homeownership	Owner	Pending		
	Renter			
H. Zip Code	94085	11.3%	60	
	94086	27.9%	147	
	94087	45.9%	242	
	94089	14.9%	79	
I. Estimated Income Range		Pending		
J. Estimated Home Value Range		Pending		

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
K. Individual Party	American Independent	1.7%	9	
	Democratic	49.8%	263	
	Green	0.3%	1	
	Libertarian	0.4%	2	
	Natural Law	0.0%	0	
	Non-Partisan	29.5%	156	
	Other	0.4%	2	
	Peace and Freedom	0.0%	0	
	Reform	0.0%	0	
	Republican	18.0%	95	
	Unknown	0.0%	0	
	No data	0.0%	0	
	L. Household Party Type	Dem	35.7%	188
Dem&Ind		18.9%	100	
Dem&Rep		6.4%	34	
Dem&Rep&Ind		2.4%	13	
Ind		20.1%	106	
Rep		10.6%	56	
Rep&Ind		5.9%	31	
No data		0.0%	0	
M. Household Gender Composition	Mixed Gender Household	60.3%	318	
	Female Only Household	19.8%	104	
	Male Only Household	17.8%	94	
	Cannot Determine	2.2%	11	
	No data	0.0%	0	
N. Registration Date	2017 to present	31.3%	165	
	2013-2016	16.5%	87	
	2009-2012	7.8%	41	
	2005-2008	10.7%	57	
	2001-2004	6.9%	37	
	1997-2000	3.8%	20	
	1993-1996	3.5%	18	
	1981-1992	11.7%	62	
	1980 or before	7.8%	41	
	Not coded	0.0%	0	
O. Voting Frequency	0	0.3%	1	
	1	0.8%	4	
	2	5.3%	28	
	3	9.2%	48	
	4	13.1%	69	
	5	10.7%	57	
	6	13.9%	73	
	7	15.9%	84	
	8	30.9%	163	
P. Voting History	see detailed crosstabs			

		Total		
		Column N %	Count	Mean
<b>Q. Household Voter Count</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>29.8%</b>	<b>157</b>	
	<b>2</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>255</b>	
	<b>3</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>85</b>	
	<b>4</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>30</b>	
	<b>No data</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>R. Permanent Absentee Voter</b>	<b>Military</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	
	<b>Permanent US</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>433</b>	
	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>95</b>	