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 City of AlamedaSales Tax Update

First Quarter Receipts for Fourth Quarter Sales (October - December 2015)

## Alameda

## In Brief

Alameda's receipts from October through December were 4.3\% above the fourth sales period in 2014.

Returns from recently added outlets boosted the general consumer goods, food and drugs, and restaurants groups and were a major factor in the overall gain in receipts. Solid gains from existing family apparel stores and quick service, casual dining, and fine dining restaurants also contributed to the increase.
Multiple onetime payments from contractors lifted building and construction, while the city's allocation from the countywide use tax pool increased $8.5 \%$ during the quarter.
A large onetime payment that inflated the prior year's returns, depressed business and industry results on a comparative basis. Absent this aberration, the group posted a solid overall sales quarter.
Lower yacht sales caused the drop in the automotive and transportation sector. Continued lower retail gasoline prices were largely offset by the addition of a new service station.
Net of aberrations, taxable sales for all of Alameda County grew $5.6 \%$ over the comparable time period; the Bay Area was up 3.6\%.

Sales Tax by Major Business Group


Top 25 Producers
In Alphabetical Order

| ABB Concise | Old Navy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Alameda Electrical | Penumbra |
| $\quad$ Distributors | Rock Wall Wine |
| Alameda Sushi | Ross |
| $\quad$ House | Safeway |
| Bed Bath \& Beyond | Safeway Fuel |
| Chevron | Standard Process |
| Chevron | Northern |
| CVS | California |
| Data 911 | TJ Maxx |
| Delphi Productions | Trader Joes |
| In N Out | Walgreens |
| Kohls | Webster 76 |
| Nob Hill Fuel |  |
| North Face |  |

Revenue Comparison
Two Quarters - Fiscal Year To Date

|  | 2014-15 | 2015-16 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Point-of-Sale | $\$ 4,043,806$ | $\$ 4,633,171$ |
| County Pool | 635,013 | 729,183 |
| State Pool | 3,723 | 5,445 |
| Gross Receipts | $\$ 4,682,542$ | $\$ 5,367,798$ |
| Cty/Cnty Share | $(234,127)$ | $(268,390)$ |
| Net Receipts | $\$ 4,448,415$ | $\$ 5,099,408$ |
| Less Triple Flip* | $\$(1,112,104)$ | $\$(1,274,852)$ |
|  |  |  |
| *Reimbursed from county compensation fund |  |  |

## California Overall

Excluding accounting aberrations, local sales and use tax receipts from the fourth quarter of 2015 ended 2.6\% above 2014's holiday quarter.
Solid returns for autos, RV s, building materials and most categories of restaurants were the primary contributors to the statewide increase. The growth in online shopping for merchandise shipped from out-of-state continued to raise countywide use tax allocation pool revenues.

The gains were largely offset by a $13.2 \%$ drop in tax receipts from service stations and other fuel-related expenditures. Except for value price clothing and shoes, most categories of general consumer goods were flat or down, reflecting heavy price discounting to reduce excess holiday inventories and the impact of the strong dollar on international tourist spending.
With some exceptions, particularly in the areas of computers and agricultural chemicals, overall receipts from business and industrial expenditures were also down primarily due to cutbacks in capital spending by energy producers and manufacturers of exported goods, equipment and raw materials.

Intense competition and price pressures resulted in only modest gains in receipts from grocers and pharmacists with the largest increase in this group coming from liquor stores and marijuana dispensaries.

HdL's most recent economic consensus forecast anticipates similar modest gains through 2016 with an eventual peak in auto sales replaced by strong sales of building and construction materials for home improvement and new housing. A recovery in tax receipts from fuel is not expected until the end of the year.

## The Triple Flip Is Over!

Beginning with taxes collected in January and forward, local governments will again receive their full share of Bradley-Burns sales and use tax reve-
nues thus ending an eleven-year program known as the Triple Flip.

The program began in 2004 when voters approved a $\$ 15$ billion bond issue to cover operating deficits resulting from a combination of that year's economic downturn plus failure to offset the loss of revenue from the Governor's popular reduction in the 65 -year-old, $2 \%$ Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Tax.

The State retained $25 \%$ of local sales tax to guarantee the bonds, reimbursed local governments from monies meant for schools and replaced the money taken from schools with state general funds thus creating what became known as the Triple Flip. The financing scheme resulted in interest payments totaling $\$ 4.8$ billion, plus another $\$ 200$ million in administrative fees while creating new budget challenges for local governments. It also resulted in voter passage of constitutional amendment Proposition 1A that bars state tampering with local sales and use tax revenues in the future.

SALES PER CAPITA


Revenue by Business Group Alameda This Quarter


## ALAMEDA TOP 15 BUSINESS TYPES

| *In thousands of dollars | Alameda |  | County | HdL State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business Type | Q4 '15* | Change | Change | Change |
| Boats/Motorcycles | 36.8 | -26.8\% | -8.0\% | 8.3\% |
| Casual Dining | 188.0 | 7.4\% | 8.7\% | 5.8\% |
| Department Stores | - CONF | ENTIAL - | -1.3\% | -0.5\% |
| Discount Dept Stores | - CONF | ENTIAL - | 0.9\% | 3.0\% |
| Drug Stores | - CONF | ENTIAL - | 0.4\% | 0.8\% |
| Family Apparel | 97.5 | 7.6\% | 9.7\% | 4.1\% |
| Fine Dining | 36.4 | 15.6\% | 15.7\% | 8.1\% |
| Fulfilment Centers | - CONF | ENTIAL - | 26.6\% | -5.0\% |
| Grocery Stores Liquor | - CONF | ENTIAL - | 0.5\% | 0.6\% |
| Light Industrial/Printers | 35.0 | 33.8\% | 14.6\% | 5.4\% |
| Medical/Biotech | - CONF | ENTIAL - | 11.5\% | -4.4\% |
| Plumbing/Electrical Supplies | - CONF | ENTIAL - | 9.7\% | 9.6\% |
| Quick-Service Restaurants | 143.9 | 26.7\% | 10.2\% | 8.0\% |
| Service Stations | 191.0 | -3.0\% | -11.1\% | -10.5\% |
| Specialty Stores | 69.4 | 0.1\% | 8.3\% | 4.4\% |
| Total All Accounts | 2,144.7 | 3.5\% | 5.3\% | 2.4\% |
| County \& State Pool Allocation | 358.0 | 9.2\% | 11.1\% | 10.8\% |
| Gross Receipts | 2,502.6 | 4.3\% | 6.1\% | 3.5\% |
| City/County Share | (125.1) | -4.3\% |  |  |
| Net Receipts | 2,377.5 | 4.3\% |  |  |


| Major Industry Group | Count | 4Q15 | 4Q14 | \$ Change | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business and Industry | 689 | 677,153 | 703,571 | $(26,418)$ | -3.8\% |
| General Consumer Goods | 1,882 | 463,659 | 429,777 | 33,882 | 7.9\% |
| Restaurants and Hotels | 325 | 414,151 | 357,534 | 56,617 | 15.8\% |
| Food and Drugs | 91 | 215,544 | 205,061 | 10,483 | 5.1\% |
| Fuel and Service Stations | 20 | 191,130 | 197,609 | $(6,479)$ | -3.3\% |
| Autos and Transportation | 126 | 102,173 | 109,880 | $(7,707)$ | -7.0\% |
| Building and Construction | 75 | 80,851 | 68,160 | 12,691 | 18.6\% |
| Transfers \& Unidentified | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -N/A- |
| Total | 3,209 | 2,144,664 | 2,071,592 | 73,072 | 3.5\% |

4Q14 Compared To 4Q15


4Q15 Percent of Total


Sales Tax by Major Industry Group


Agency Trend

 ADJUSTED FOR CITY OF ALAMEDA
PER CAPITA SALES TAX SURPLUS/GAP COMPARISON - 4 QUARTERS ENDING 4Q 2015


The above graph compares per capita sales tax generated from targeted retail categories against countywide averages. A retail surplus suggests the community is capturing its local market for that category of goods plus attracting shoppers from outside the jurisdiction. A retail gap suggests the possibility that residents may have a greater demand for products in the specific category than is being satisfied by local businesses. The information is provided only as a starting point in identifying potential sources of sales tax loss and should not automatically be interpreted as an expansion or leveraging opportunity without more detailed analysis and assessment.

SALES TAX TRENDS FOR ALL AGENCIES - 4Q 2015 SALES
Agency allocations reflect "point of sale" receipts

| Agency Name | Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current Year } \\ \text { 4Q } 2015 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Prior Year } \\ 4 Q 2014 \end{gathered}$ | Share of County Pool | Actual Receipts \% Change | Adjusted* <br> \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fremont | 5,609 | 10,405,250 | 9,692,795 | 15.0\% | + 7.4\% | + 11.5\% |
| Livermore | 2,850 | 6,674,470 | 6,031,622 | 9.6\% | + 10.7\% | + 11.3\% |
| Newark | 1,392 | 2,640,686 | 2,409,210 | 3.8\% | + 9.6\% | + 7.2\% |
| Albany | 579 | 570,657 | 551,606 | 0.8\% | + 3.5\% | + 7.1\% |
| San Leandro | 2,684 | 6,588,073 | 6,163,146 | 9.5\% | + 6.9\% | + 6.6\% |
| Emeryville | 917 | 2,105,784 | 1,992,368 | 3.0\% | + 5.7\% | + 6.6\% |
| Alameda | 3,209 | 2,144,664 | 2,071,592 | 3.1\% | + 3.5\% | + 5.7\% |
| Berkeley | 4,923 | 4,409,237 | 4,189,245 | 6.4\% | + 5.3\% | + 5.0\% |
| Oakland | 13,321 | 11,693,488 | 11,283,522 | 16.9\% | + 3.6\% | + 4.6\% |
| Pleasanton | 3,732 | 5,642,633 | 5,472,286 | 8.2\% | + 3.1\% | + 4.0\% |
| Dublin | 1,418 | 4,548,372 | 4,328,255 | 6.6\% | + 5.1\% | + 4.0\% |
| Alameda Co. Uninc | 2,569 | 2,092,090 | 2,002,015 | 3.0\% | + 4.5\% | + 2.7\% |
| Hayward | 4,418 | 7,476,930 | 7,298,449 | 10.8\% | + 2.4\% | + 0.4\% |
| Union City | 1,315 | 2,152,968 | 2,192,063 | 3.1\% | - 1.8\% | - 0.5\% |
| Piedmont | 223 | 48,801 | 55,693 | 0.1\% | - 12.4\% | - 15.3\% |
| Totals | 49,159 | 69,194,103 | 65,733,866 | 100.0\% | + 5.3\% | + 5.8\% |
| Alameda Pool | 15,217 | 11,389,447 | 10,324,311 |  | + 10.3\% | + 4.5\% |

COMPANIES ADJUSTED FOR ADJUSTED FOR
ECONOMIC DATA

Per Capita Sales

| Alameda |
| :--- |
| Count: 3,209 |
| Oakland |
| Count: 13,321 |
| San Leandro |
| Count: 2,684 |
| El Cerrito |
| Count: 677 |
| Berkeley |
| Count: 4,923 |
| Pleasanton |
| Count: 3,732 |
| Walnut Creek |
| Count: 2,881 |

## Per Capita Sales



[^0]
## City of Alameda



HdL Client Database Statewide Totals



[^0]:    Periods shown reflect the period in which the sales occurred - Point of Sale

