

November 2017 Bond Project

EXHIBIT D Additional Information on School Bond Elections and the Survey

[Information to address comments, discussions, or questions at the May 23 Board meeting.]

Results of Past Bond Elections (including the results of special and general elections)

Date	Bond Amount	Yes	No	Comments
November 2, 2004	\$235 million	64%	36%	general election
May 2, 1989	\$360 million	52%	48%	special election
May 2, 1989	\$38 million	51%	49%	special election
February 9, 1988	unknown	47%	53%	special election

There were two overrides in 2004 presented at the same time as the \$235 million bond; both failed, each with 57% voting “No”. There were also overrides in 1988 and 1989 that failed.

The following is from an interview of Paul Ulan, Principal, Primary Consultants:

Sample Survey Information

The Executive Summary, presented on May 23, says the survey sample is residents who voted in the November 2013 or 2015 elections or the May 2016 special election. On May 23, the presentation and the presenter were incorrect in stating that the sample is of those who voted in all three elections. By picking these elections the consultant was seeking a sample that represented those voters with a high propensity to vote in the November 2017 election. The sample does not overly select those who voted in May 2016, who may tend to favor education. The following is an excerpt from the methodology section of the draft report:

Four hundred seventy-nine high efficacy voters in the Tucson Unified School District were interviewed in a random stratified sample taken April 25th, 2017 through April 29th, 2017. The sample was balanced by age (under 30 – 9.8%, 30-39 -10.9%, 40-49 – 9.4% 50-64 – 29.0% and 65+ 40.1%) and gender (male – 45.3 and female – 54.7) to represent a likely voter turnout for a November 2017 special election.

Impact of an All-Mail Election

Although the vast majority of voters are on permanent early voter lists, 100% vote-by-mail elections are relatively new phenomena and there isn't a lot of experience to estimate the potential impact. According to Mr. Ulan, the results have been mixed. There may be more voters than in a typical off-year election, because it will be easier to vote. This could be favorable. On the other hand, because of the ease of filing a ballot, voters may be less informed, which could favor a "no" vote—a vote against government and taxes in general. Mainly, he says, the district needs to understand that the dynamics of the campaign will change. Voting may take place earlier and people who may want to vote won't because they lose or don't get a ballot or don't mail it in on time.

These impacts have been anticipated as outlined in the following from Ricky D. Hernández, Deputy County School Superintendent and Chief Financial Officer:

Our office wants to make you aware that 1) the City of Tucson will be conducting City Council elections in November 2017 through a vote-by-mail election and 2) the City will not be consolidating their Council elections with any County elections.

If your Governing Boards choose to move forward with a special election for your school district, we would want to encourage you to authorize the election be conducted through a vote-by-mail ballot. We would setup at least one early ballot drop off center within the boundaries of your district, but these would be separate from the centers opened by the City of Tucson. Also, it is the County's general practice to have an MOU between the City Clerk's Office and the County Recorder to ensure that any vote-by-mail ballots that are dropped off at each other's locations would be handed over to the correct jurisdiction for proper tabulation.

We have had this take place in the past and it has generally worked well. We certainly would do the best we can to provide additional information to educate voters about the fact that City of Tucson voters within your school district boundaries will be receiving two ballots for the same Election Day.

Isn't 60% Support Good Enough?

The survey indicates about 60% support for a \$240 million bond. Based on this, the Bond Advisory Committee recommended pursuing a \$240 million bond as the optimum approach—though they recognized that the district could pursue a \$180 million bond with a higher likelihood of success.

Mr. Ulan recommends that the district call the election for a \$180 million bond, which appears to have the support of 70% of the survey sample. His recommendation is based on his experience that support for bonds may drop by 10% to 15% between the time of the survey and the election. This could be due to respondents tending to answer in a way that they feel is expected by the surveyor or it may be due to other election items that push the voter away from supporting tax increases or government in general.

Regardless, some districts (recently, Sahuarita for instance) have been successful with bonds when the survey indicated just 60% support. These districts were able to move forward with a unified front of strong leadership support both internally and within the

community. They were relatively free of controversy. They had a large group of advocates who worked to garner favorable votes by forming speaker bureaus and they had many persons who submitted “pro” statements for the election ballots.

Does the Survey Support Calling for any Bond?

In spite of expressed concerns about management and trust in the district and in spite of the fact that the district is experiencing changes in leadership, Mr. Ulan recommends that the district call the election for the \$180 million bond. As presented on May 23, over 84% of survey respondents recognize the importance of quality schools for the community and the children. Structuring the election information and outreach to highlight the benefits of the bond to students and the community and showing that the district will establish citizen oversight to monitor the bond expenditures should help to secure a successful bond election.