



Governing Board

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, February 26, 2014
1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Location:
California State Coastal Conservancy
1330 Broadway, 11th Floor Conference Room
Oakland, California 94612

For additional information, please contact:
Clerk of the Governing Board, (510) 464-7900

Agenda and attachments available at:
www.sfbayrestore.org

The Governing Board may take action on any item on this agenda.

1. Call to Order

Samuel Schuchat, Executive Officer, California State Coastal Conservancy, will call the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comments

4. Announcements

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of January 29, 2014

Action

Attachment: Summary Minutes for January 29, 2014

6. Chair's Report

Information/Discussion

Samuel Schuchat

A. Orientations for New Advisory Committee Appointees

B. Coordination with Potential Related Ballot Measures

C. New Information from County Election Officials

7. Report on Need for April Governing Board Meeting and Other Schedule Updates

Action

Samuel Schuchat

8. Report on January 2014 Polling by Private Parties

Information/Discussion

Patrick Band, Save The Bay

Attachments: Metz/Below memo dated February 12, 2014

9. Report on Fundraising for Ballot Access, Ballot Advisors, and Tracking Poll

Action

Dave Pine, Supervisor, County of San Mateo

Attachments: Hutzel memo dated February 18, 2014

10. Report on Outreach by Governing Board Members

Information/Discussion

Governing Board members

11. Report on External Communications

Information/Discussion

Samuel Schuchat

Attachments: Hutzel memo dated February 18, 2014; Media Talking Points; Media Inquiry Process

12. Adjournment

Next meeting is on March 19, 2014, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Agenda submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
February 19, 2014

Agenda posted:
February 20, 2014



Governing Board

SUMMARY MINUTES (DRAFT)

Wednesday, January 29, 2014

1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Location:

1330 Broadway, 11th Floor Conference Room
Oakland, California

For additional information, please contact:
Clerk of the Governing Board, (510) 464 7900

Agenda and attachments available at:
www.sfbayrestore.org

1. Call to Order

Samuel Schuchat, Chair, called the meeting to order at about 1:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Frederick Castro, Clerk, reported that five members were present. A quorum of the Governing Board was present.

Present were Samuel Schuchat, Keith Caldwell, Cindy Chavez, Rosanne Foust, and John Gioia.

Absent were John Sutter and Dave Pine.

Present were Ezra Rapport and Kenneth Moy (ABAG); Judy Kelly (San Francisco Estuary Partnership); Amy Roach, Amy Hutzler and Melanie Denninger (California State Coastal Conservancy).

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Announcements

There were no announcements.

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of November 30, 2013

Schuchat recognized a motion by Foust and a second by Chavez to approve the summary minutes of the Governing Board meeting on November 20, 2013. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Schuchat, Caldwell, Chavez, Foust, Gioia.

Absent: Pine, Sutter.

Sutter joined the meeting.

6. Chair's Report

A. Introduction of New Governing Board Member

Schuchat introduced Cindy Chavez, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara, who fills the Governing Board seat representing Bayside Cities/Counties.

Schuchat reported that he and Amy Hutzel attended a meeting with other entities to coordinate efforts to place ballot measures for the November election.

B. New Polling by RLG/STB Just Conducted

Schuchat reported that RLG and Save The Bay are now conducting polling. A report on polling results is forthcoming.

C. Status on the Development of the Project List and Map

Schuchat and Hutzel reported on the status of developing a project list of examples of projects which may be eligible for funding and an accompanying map. Land owners and land managers of wetlands and non-governmental organizations and others have been contacted to provide input. A revised list and map will be presented at the next meeting.

Members discussed the status of the draft expenditure plan, and that projects included in a project list are not being used for the ballot measure.

Pine joined the meeting.

7. Annual Financial Reports: Fiscal Years Ending 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013

Kenneth Moy, ABAG Legal Counsel, reported on the annual consolidated financial reports for Fiscal Years ending 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Schuchat recognized a motion by Foust and a second by Chavez to approve and post the consolidated annual financial reports for Fiscal Years ending 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Schuchat, Caldwell, Chavez, Foust, Gioia, Pine, Sutter.

8. Election Counsel and other Technical Advice to Support Drafting of Ballot Measure

Dave Pine, Supervisor, County of San Mateo, reported on the selection of Election Counsel to support drafting of a ballot measure.

Schuchat recognized a motion by Foust and a second by Caldwell to approve the selection of Remcho, Johnson and Purcell as Election Counsel to advise the Authority regarding the legal requirements for placement of a special tax as a regional measure in the nine counties of the Authority's jurisdiction, and to acknowledge that Kenneth Moy will represent both ABAG and the Authority as Legal Counsel.

Members discussed the selection of election counsel and determined that they had no conflicts resulting from past relationships between members and the recommended firm.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Schuchat, Caldwell, Chavez, Foust, Gioia, Pine, Sutter.

9. Funding needed for County Election Charges

Schuchat reported on the funding needed for county election costs, election counsel, polling, and expenses.

Patrick Band, Save The Bay, provided additional information on estimated county election costs and implementation of SB 279. County Registrars from Contra Costa, Napa, and Santa Clara Counties will provide a range of election costs for the nine Bay Area counties.

Members discussed the estimated election costs, county election costs, SB 279 implementation, and fundraising to cover election costs.

10. Outreach by Governing Board Members

Schuchat reported on the current list of supporters of the work of the Restoration Authority.

Members reported on outreach efforts.

Schuchat presented at a panel at a San Mateo County Climate Change summit and will present at a League of Women Voters of the Bay Area meeting.

Foust presented at the San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce and will send materials to Half Moon Bay, San Mateo Area, and San Francisco's Chamber of Commerce, and the matter will be presented at the San Mateo C/CAG and SAMCEDA.

Caldwell will continue to meet with elected officials and will contact Senator Thompson.

Pine presented at the ABAG Executive Board meeting on January 16 and will contact operating engineers representatives, BayBIO, C/CAG, and Senator Feinstein.

Gioia will contact Congressman Miller and the East Bay Leadership Forum.

Sutter will contact business group representatives and the matter will be presented at an East Bay Regional Park District meeting.

The Governing Board next took up Item 13.

11. External Communications

Patrick Band, Save The Bay, reported on external communications, including production of updated outreach materials, talking points and other documents.

12. Refined Timeline through November Election and Addition of June Meeting

Schuchat reported on the timeline through the November election and the need to add an early June meeting.

Members discussed the availability of county Registrar offices in June and July.

Schuchat recognized a motion by Foust and a second by Pine to adopt a Schedule of Tasks, Deadlines and Governing Board decisions from January 2014 through November 2014, and to add a June meeting to the Governing Board meeting schedule. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Schuchat, Caldwell, Foust, Pine, Sutter.

Absent: Chavez, Gioia.

13. Joint Powers Agreement Term Sheet

Schuchat recused himself from the discussion. Governing Board Vice Chair John Gioia, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa, chaired the meeting.

Hutzel reported on the joint powers agreement proposed terms among the Restoration Authority, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the State Coastal Conservancy. She reviewed a timeline for receiving authorization from ABAG and the Coastal Conservancy and the Restoration Authority's Governing Board. ABAG and the Coastal Conservancy would continue to provide staff support at no charge to the Restoration Authority when the JPA is executed and until a ballot measure passes, after which time costs incurred by ABAG and the Coastal Conservancy would be reimbursable by the Restoration Authority.

Amy Roach, Staff Counsel, State Coastal Conservancy, reported on the Conservancy Board's support of the proposed joint powers agreement and Conservancy's Board's preference regarding indemnification, namely Option 1.

Moy reported on ABAG and the Restoration Authority's position and advice regarding indemnification, namely Option 2.

Members discussed the proposed terms of the Joint Powers Agreement, including costs and staffing and organizational structure, indemnification options, and meeting with representatives of the State Coastal Conservancy Board and the Association of Bay Area Governments' Executive Board to discuss indemnification options under a Joint Powers Agreement.

Gioia recognized a motion by Foust and a second by Chavez to consent to the dual representation by Kenneth Moy, ABAG Legal Counsel, of the Restoration Authority and the Association of Bay Area Governments in negotiating and drafting a proposed joint powers

agreement among ABAG, the Conservancy and the Restoration Authority. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Caldwell, Chavez, Foust, Gioia, Pine, Sutter.

Absent: Schuchat

Gioia recognized a motion by Sutter and a second by Pine to select indemnification option two (2) under the proposed terms of a Joint Powers Agreement among the Restoration Authority, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the State Coastal Conservancy, and to meet with representatives of the Association of Bay Area Governments and State Coastal Conservancy to discuss indemnification options under a Joint Powers Agreement.. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Caldwell, Chavez, Foust, Gioia, Pine, Sutter.

Absent: Schuchat.

Gioia and Chavez left the meeting. Schuchat resumed chairing the meeting. The Governing Board next took up Item 11.

14. Appointment of Additional Advisory Committee Member

Amy Hutzell, California State Coastal Conservancy, reported on additional appointments to the Advisory Committee. Staff recommended the appointment of Jordan Wellwood, Center Director, Richardson Bay Audubon Center and Sanctuary; Josh Collin, Chief Scientist, San Francisco Estuary Institute; and Casey Fromson, Governmental Affairs Officer, Caltrain Modernization Program, San Mateo County Transportation District.

Schuchat recognized a motion by Foust and a second by Pine to appoint Jordan Wellwood, Center Director, Richardson Bay Audubon Center and Sanctuary; Josh Collin, Chief Scientist, San Francisco Estuary Institute; and Casey Fromson, Governmental Affairs Officer, Caltrain Modernization Program to the Advisory Committee. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes: Schuchat, Caldwell, Foust, Pine, Sutter.

Absent: Chavez, Gioia.

15. Adjournment

The Governing Board meeting adjourned at about 3.29 p.m.

Next meeting is on February 26, 2013, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
February 19, 2014

Approved by the Governing Board:
TBD

[Blank Page]



PUBLIC OPINION STRATEGIES

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates - FM3

Public Opinion Research & Strategy

SANTA MONICA • OAKLAND • MADISON • MEXICO CITY

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: David Metz and Curtis Below
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates

Lori Weigel
Public Opinion Strategies

RE: Key Findings from Recent Survey Regarding San Francisco Bay Restoration

DATE: February 12, 2014

The bipartisan research team of Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) and Public Opinion Strategies (POS) recently completed a survey of 1,800 voters in the nine-county Bay Area to assess opinions about the San Francisco Bay and reactions to a potential regional measure to fund Bay restoration.ⁱ The survey results show that the measure continues to appear viable for the November 2014 ballot, with a consistent two-thirds of local voters in support.

Among the key findings of the survey are the following:

- **The overall public mood is continuing to show signs of improvement.** From a low point in 2011, an increasing number of Bay Area voters say that the region is headed in a positive direction. Fifty-seven percent feel the Bay Area is headed in the “right direction,” with optimism greatest among upper-income and highly educated voters. Only conservative Republicans express any significant pessimism.
- **A consistent two-thirds of Bay Area voters indicate support for a regional measure to fund Bay restoration.** Given draft ballot language for a potential Bay restoration parcel tax, 67 percent of voters initially indicate they would support such a measure. Demographically, support is strongest among Democrats, independents, liberals, women, renters, and well-educated voters. Support is comparatively lower among Republicans, conservatives, men, homeowners, less well-educated voters, and African Americans. Age, income and union

affiliation did not appear to play a significant role in support. Support is lowest in Napa, Solano and Contra Costa counties, though majorities of voters in those counties still expressed support for a measure.

- **Support does not appear to be sensitive to the amount or duration tested.** Using split samples, the poll tested support for taxes in the amounts of nine or fourteen dollars, and durations of ten or twenty years. Levels of support generally held within the margin of error at both the nine and fourteen dollar price points, and for either 10-year or 20-year durations.
- **Support for a regional Bay Restoration parcel tax has steadily risen over time.** Surveys testing similar regional measure concepts were conducted in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013. Support in the 2010 and 2011 surveys generally fell in the mid-to-upper 50's, while support in this most recent survey was at 67 percent.
- **While opposition to a measure is largely driven by anti-tax sentiment, support is more diffuse and general in nature.** Measure supporters expressed a wide variety of reasons for voting “yes,” including its environmental benefits, a desire to preserve the Bay for future generations, support for improving water quality, and their perception that the measure’s costs were reasonable. Opponents generally did not question the merits of investing in Bay restoration, but were opposed to an increase in local taxes.
- **Support increases modestly with positive messaging and criticisms have only a marginal impact.** Survey respondents were presented first with a series of arguments in favor of the measure, and then arguments against the measure. Collectively, the impact of these pro and con messages was limited, though support did increase in the low 70's after only positives. However, the intensity of support – the proportion stating they would “definitely” vote “yes” – did increase ten points. These findings suggest that there exists a ceiling of support, likely not far above the two-thirds vote threshold.
- **Nearly two-thirds of voters say they would like to see money spent where it can be used most effectively.** Survey respondents were asked to choose which of two positions came closer to their own opinion: whether money raised in their county should be spent in the county, or whether it should be spent where it could most effectively help the Bay. Nearly two-thirds express a preference for spending it where it can be used most effectively (65%) – up from 58 percent in 2010.
- **The top tier of messages focus on future generations, fish contamination, and the diverse ways that people experience the Bay.** Over 80 percent found arguments in favor of the measure focusing on leaving a legacy for future generations, on the many ways residents connect with and appreciate the Bay, and on preventing contamination of fish to be “convincing” reasons to vote “yes.” Furthermore, these themes also generated the most intensely positive reactions, with more than two in five finding them to be “very” convincing reasons to vote for the measure.

- **The greatest vulnerabilities for the measure are assertions that money will be wasted; that the cost of living is too high to support an additional tax; and that it is unfair to require the same payment from voters living further from the Bay.** While these criticisms – even the most compelling ones – tested at levels far below the best positive messages, they were still seen as convincing reasons to vote “no” by more than two in five voters, a proportion that exceeds the one-third threshold necessary to defeat the measure.

Taken together, the results show that it is clearly possible for a Bay restoration measure to win approval from voters this November, but that it will require a substantial public education effort to demonstrate the benefits of the measure to local voters.

ⁱ **Methodology:** From January 22 – February 1, 2014, FM3 and POS completed 1,800 telephone interviews (on landlines and cell phones) with voters in the nine-county Bay Area likely to cast a ballot in the November 2014 statewide election. 900 interviews were conducted across the Bay Area in a natural geographic distribution, while another 900 interviews were distributed equally between the nine Bay Area counties (i.e., 100 in each county). The margin of sampling error for the results across the entire Bay Area is +/-2.7% at the 95% confidence level, while the margins of sampling error ranged from +/-5.5% to +/-9.2% in each county. Due to rounding, not all totals will sum to 100%.

[Blank Page]



MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 18, 2014

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

FROM: Amy Hutzler, Manager
San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program
State Coastal Conservancy

SUBJECT: Obtaining a Loan for Ballot Advisory Costs

The Governing Board needs the assistance of consultants for ballot advice and a tracking poll leading up to possible adoption of a ballot measure resolution in late May. The Governing Board has not yet assembled the funding for the ballot advisors and pollster. Temporary funding would enable timely completion on tasks.

The director of the ABAG Finance Authority, a Joint Powers Authority managed by ABAG, has agreed to request Finance Authority board approval of a no-interest loan to cover the costs incurred by the ballot advisors and pollster until the Restoration Authority obtains donations to reimburse the Finance Authority. Upon receiving a request and suitable assurances from the Restoration Authority, ABAG staff would submit a request for a loan of up to \$85,000 for the consideration of its Finance Authority board at a March meeting.

The assurances requested by Finance Authority staff are as follows: The Restoration Authority will repay the loan regardless of whether it decides to place a tax measure on the ballot or regardless of the success of the measure in the November election. The Restoration Authority will repay the loan as soon as it has funds (i.e. the first proceeds of any fundraising by the Restoration Authority will repay the loan). If the Restoration Authority is unable to raise the funds needed to repay the loan, the loan will become a grant.

Upon approval by the Governing Board of these and/or other assurances to the Finance Authority, staff recommends that the Chair forward a request for the loan and a record of the approved assurances to the Finance Authority. Staff further recommends that the Governing Board authorize the Chair to negotiate and execute an agreement between the Restoration Authority and the Finance Authority to obtain and repay the loan.

[Blank Page]



MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 18, 2014

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

FROM: Amy Hutzal, Manager
San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program
State Coastal Conservancy

SUBJECT: Coordination on External Communications

Attachments: 1. Media Inquiry Process
2. Media Talking Points

Save The Bay (STB), in consultation with Coastal Conservancy and ABAG staff, has developed the two attached documents for guidance on external communications leading up to the potential Governing Board adoption of an election resolution on May 28. STB's objective in providing these documents is to provide the best responses to media inquiries and to provide consistent information in all external communications. STB will present these guidance documents for discussion under Agenda Item 11: External Communications at the Governing Board's February 26, 2014 meeting.

[Blank Page]

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

Media Inquiry Process

February 18, 2014

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide clear and consistent guidelines for responding to media inquiries about the work of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority.

These guidelines will ensure that the messages that reach the public about the Restoration Authority are consistent and accurate; that the best spokesperson for each media opportunity is the one who gets quoted; and that reporters are responded to promptly and effectively. These guidelines will also help to build key relationships with individual reporters that can be leveraged proactively throughout the election cycle.

Lead Contacts

Coordination of media calls related to the Authority should be handled by the Governing Board Chair, Sam Schuchat, or his designee. Questions on any external activities related to a potential campaign should be referred to non-public contacts, and can not utilize public agency resources (staff time, email, phones, etc). Save The Bay has identified Vanessa Barrington as their lead contact for relevant questions.

Authority: Sam Schuchat, Chair, Governing Board
sschuchat@scc.ca.gov Office: 510-286-4185 Cell: 510-469-4430

Campaign: Vanessa Barrington, Editorial and Public Affairs Manager, Save The Bay
vbarrington@savesfbay.org; Office: 510-463-6822 Cell: 415-505-0116

Types of Inquiries:

The following calls should be directed to Governing Board Chair (or designee)

- Questions about the Restoration Authority, it's structure, membership, and history
- Questions about the Draft Expenditure Plan, Conceptual Project List, or other details related to measure preparation, including work with county registrars and local elected officials.
- Questions about the Restoration Authority and its structure and inner workings
- Calls about why the measure is needed and what it will do for the Bay Area
- Calls directly related to the Coastal Conservancy's work or interests

The following calls should be directed to the campaign:

- General calls about the campaign, including stakeholders/supporters
- Calls about who supports the measure

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

Media Inquiry Process

February 18, 2014

- Calls about why the measure is needed and what it will do for the Bay Area
- Calls directly related to Save The Bay's work or interests

In some cases, local reporters will reach out to Governing Board and Advisory Committee members or other stakeholders from their communities. We want to encourage that "local voice" to speak on the issues as appropriate, while understanding that each call must be evaluated on a case by case basis. In all cases, the appropriate lead should be notified of the media inquiry.

What to do when you receive a call from a reporter:

1. If a reporter calls, it is perfectly acceptable (and even encouraged) to take a few minutes and call them back. Feel free to say that you can't speak at the moment, but are more than happy to call them back shortly.

Always make sure you get their name, the outlet they write for, their contact information, and ask the following questions:

- What's your deadline?
 - Are you writing about a particular angle or do you have specific questions?
 - How long is the interview and what type of information are looking for from me?
 - Are you interviewing others on this topic?
2. If the inquiry comes via email, reply via email with an offer to help and the above questions.
 3. Based on the reporter's answers to the questions, determine if you are the best spokesperson for the opportunity. If you're not, pass on the reporter's contact information to either Sam or Vanessa.
 4. If you think you are the best contact for the reporter, do the following before calling the reporter back:
 - Perform an internet search for the reporter and outlet, if they are unfamiliar to you. Look at the types of stories the reporter writes, and what they've written lately to determine if there are any potential issues that may arise.
 - Think about the audience for the publication before determining your main talking points, particularly in context of how the Authority's work relates to the publication's readership.
 - From the key message document prepare yourself with 1 to 3 key messages you want to convey to this reporter, with supporting information, data, or opinions of others to bolster your points
 - Have these key messages in front of you and review how you would respond to questions in a way that highlights those messages.

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
Media Talking Points
February 18, 2014

Will there be a nine-county parcel tax placed on the ballot in 2014?

- The Restoration Authority is currently exploring a ballot measure for fall 2014. The Governing Board plans to decide by May or early June whether November 2014 is the right time to move forward.

What is the Bay Restoration Authority?

- The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority is a Bay Area regional entity charged with raising and allocating resources for the restoration of wetlands and wildlife habitat on the San Francisco Bay shoreline. Funds it raises would be granted to projects that restore, protect, and enhance these areas, along with flood protection and public access connected to such projects. You can learn more online at sfbayrestore.org

What is the process for getting the measure on the ballot?

- The Restoration Authority has been working for the past year to collect input from the public, municipalities and stakeholders throughout the Bay Area, and researching how new funding for restoration would be allocated. The Authority Governing Board will likely vote in summer 2014 on whether to place a measure on the November 4, 2014 ballot.

Why is this measure needed?

- The Bay is the cornerstone of our economy and quality of life. Scientists agree that our Bay needs 100,000 acres of tidal marsh habitat for the health of fish, birds, wildlife, and people. Unfortunately, over the last century most of this habitat was destroyed by unchecked filling of the Bay, leaving about 45,000 acres today. Fortunately, more than 31,000 acres of salt ponds and other shoreline sites have been acquired for marsh restoration. This measure will provide funding needed to accelerate marsh restoration on those sites and help reverse damage to the Bay.
- *Flood Protection* – Dozens of communities along the Bay shoreline, and billions of dollars in infrastructure are protected from flooding by outdated and seismically unsafe levees. Wetland restoration provides both an opportunity to update these critical flood protection systems, as well as a natural buffer to reduce the impact of storm surges and sea level rise.
- *Clean Water* – We've long known that fish caught in the Bay are often unsafe to eat. Wetlands provide a natural filter for the Bay, keeping both trash and noxious pollutants out of Bay waters.
- *Public Access* – As recently as the 1960's, less than 3 miles of Bay shoreline was open and accessible to the public. Today, the Bay Trail has been extended to more than 300 miles, but many communities remain disconnected from the fragmented system. Restoration provides an opportunity to connect existing trails to new shoreline, improve existing bicycle and walking paths, and keep these open spaces safe for all residents to enjoy.

What types of projects will this measure fund?

- This measure will fund projects that
 - Reduce trash and pollution in the Bay
 - Improve water quality
 - Restore habitat for fish, birds, and wildlife
 - Protect communities from floods
 - Increase shoreline public access

How will this measure benefit the entire region?

- A healthy San Francisco Bay is vital to our region's quality of life and economy. Well-planned funding to accelerate wetland restoration is one of the best ways to make the Bay healthier, expand public access and help protect shoreline communities.

**San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
Media Talking Points
February 18, 2014**

- Even if you don't live close to the Bay, the benefits of Bay restoration will have lasting impacts for our region. Restoration will improve water quality, reduce harmful toxins and trash, and expand habitat for wildlife, including threatened and endangered species. Public access improvements will mean more Bay Area residents can visit the shoreline. And flood control efforts will help protect billions of dollars worth of highways, small businesses, and residential communities.

Who is supporting/sponsoring the measure?

- Regional leaders from business, environment, and local communities are strongly supporting the Restoration Authority plan to help restore San Francisco Bay. Leaders from across the region agree that funding to restore habitat, reduce shoreline flooding and improve access to the Bay is a high priority. A list of those supporting the work of the Restoration Authority is online at sfbayrestore.org

How large will this measure be?

- The Restoration Authority is currently considering a modest annual assessment of \$9-14 per Bay Area parcel.

How much revenue will this generate?

- Details are still being ironed out by the Authority. A modest \$10 per parcel measure would generate roughly \$15 million annually, and leverage additional state and federal resources, significantly increasing the public funds available to accelerate Bay marsh restoration.

Who votes on this measure?

- The Restoration Authority covers each of the nine Bay Area counties, and all registered voters would have an opportunity to cast a vote on the proposal.

Does the measure have to reach 2/3 in each county?

- No. The combined votes from all participating counties would be tabulated, and the measure would pass if 2/3 of all voters casting ballots vote "yes."

Who will decide how the funds are spent?

- The Restoration Authority's Governing Board, comprised of local elected officials, would administer a grant program to qualifying projects. By law, funds raised by the measure can only be spent on wetland restoration and associated flood control and public access projects.

Who provides oversight to ensure funds are being spent as planned?

- The Restoration Authority has developed an Expenditure Plan that requires an independent annual audit of revenue and expenditures, an annual report on past and upcoming activities, and publishing of an annual financial statement. A community Advisory Committee has also been created to review and make recommendations on expenditures through an ongoing public, transparent process.

Who is part of the Advisory Committee? How are they chosen?

- Individuals from a broad cross-section of community interests have been appointed by the Governing Board. This Committee includes over 30 individuals from every one of the nine Bay Area counties. Individuals interested in serving can apply for appointment by contacting the Restoration Authority.

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
Media Talking Points
February 18, 2014

Is the Restoration Authority part of ABAG or state government?

- No. The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority is an independent regional entity, not part of any other government or agency.
- The Restoration Authority is planning to utilize existing staffing resources from the San Francisco Estuary Partnership and the California Coastal Conservancy through a joint powers agreement. This will allow the Restoration Authority to fulfill its mission at a bare minimum of cost to taxpayers.

How will the money be divided among counties?

- Geographic diversity is one of the factors the Authority will consider in allocating resources to projects.

Can existing agencies do this work?

- The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority was created with this mandate and because there was no agency empowered to propose to Bay voters new funding for Bay restoration, and to oversee that funding.

What is the role for local cities and counties?

- This is a regional effort, which will require support from communities throughout the Bay Area. More than 30,000 acres of shoreline marsh restoration opportunities are waiting – the missing ingredient is funding. This measure would significantly increase funds for that purpose and accelerate marsh restoration that benefits the Bay and local communities.

Does the Authority currently have any funding?

- The Authority does not have an existing revenue stream to complete its mission of restoring San Francisco Bay. That's why such a broad coalition of supporters is coming together to support this proposed ballot measure. With funding, we can help accelerate restoration that makes the Bay clean and healthy for the next generation.

Why has this taken so long?

- As a new regional special district, the Authority has been working methodically to research the best proposal and timing for voters to consider. After four years of planning and deliberate outreach to key stakeholders across the region, the Authority is preparing to propose a measure to Bay Area voters.

[Blank Page]