



Governing Board

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, July 25, 2012
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Location:
MetroCenter
101 8th Street, Conference Room 171
Oakland, California 94607

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**
Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer, California State Coastal Conservancy
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Public Comment**
- 4. Announcements**
- 5. Approval of Summary Minutes for April 25, 2012**
Action
Attachment: Summary Minutes for April 25, 2012

6. Chair's Report

Information/Discussion

Sam Schuchat

A. Report on Legislation (AB 1656)

B. Coastal Cleanup Day Outreach

C. Analysis of June 2012 Election Outcomes

Schuchat memo dated July 10, 2012 with attached spreadsheet

D. Roadmap for Next Year

7. Progress Report on Outreach Activities and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Information/Discussion

Sam Schuchat and Davis Lewis, Save The Bay

8. Advisory Committee Membership

Discussion

Sam Schuchat and Amy Hutzal, State Coastal Conservancy

Attachment: Hutzal memo dated July 17, 2012

9. Move October 24 Governing Board Meeting to November 14th

Action

Sam Schuchat

10. Adjournment

Agenda submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:

Agenda posted:

July 20, 2012



Governing Board

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

Wednesday, April 25, 2012
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Locations:

MetroCenter
101 8th Street, Conference Room 171
Oakland, California 94607

City Hall, Room 190
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

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

Sam Schuchat, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 12:07 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

Present were Sam Schuchat, Dave Cortese, Rosanne Foust, John Gioia, John Sutter, Phil Ting. Absent was Keith Caldwell.

Staff members present were Patricia Jones, Kenneth Moy, Herbert Pike (ABAG); Judy Kelly, Karen McDowell (San Francisco Estuary Partnership); Amy Hutzler, Melanie Denninger (California State Coastal Conservancy).

3. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

4. Announcements

Kelly reminded members of the upcoming San Francisco Estuary Partnership/Association of Bay Area Governments' Morning on the San Francisco Bay on the Marine Science Institute's Robert Brownlee on June 25, 2012, 10 AM to 12 PM.

There were no other announcements.

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of January 25, 2012

A motion to approve the summary minutes of the Governing Board meeting on January 25, 2012, was made by Gioia and seconded by Sutter. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Chair's Report

A. Report on Legislation (AB 1656)

Hutzel reported on the status of AB 1656 (Fong) which reverses the exclusion of northeastern Contra Costa County shoreline from eligibility for ABAG appointment to the Governing Board, addresses the exclusion of the eastern Solano and Contra Costa shorelines from the definition of San Francisco Bay, and extends the sunset date for the Authority to January 1, 2036. The legislation passed out of the Assembly Natural Resources Committee and the Assembly Local Government Committee, and will be considered by the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Members discussed the Delta Primary Zone.

Staff will continue to work with Assemblymember Fong's staff and to speak with other Assemblymembers about the legislation.

B. Report on EPA Grant Application

Schuchat reported that the grant application to the Environmental Protection Agency was not approved. Staff will request feedback from the EPA on the denial.

C. Update on Ballot Cost

Schuchat reported that, after discussions with ABAG it was determined that obtaining ABAG's endorsement will not reduce the cost of the ballot and therefore pursuing an endorsement has been put on hold. Staff will continue to work on finding solutions regarding ballot costs.

D. ABAG Endorsement

See Item 6.C. above.

E. Silicon Valley Leadership Group Meeting

Schuchat reported on the Silicon Valley Leadership Group event on April 12 at which the BART extension to the Silicon Valley was announced. Schuchat, Cortese and Foust attended the event.

At the event, the SVLG announced the formation of a steering committee for the restoration and flood control in the South Bay. The purpose of the steering committee is figure out how to generate funds and support for restoration and flood control in the South Bay. Cortese and Schuchat are members of the steering committee.

7. Appointment of Steve Goldbeck to the Advisory Committee

A motion to appoint Steve Goldbeck, Acting Executive Director, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, to the Advisory Committee was made by Gioia and seconded by Sutter. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Report on Outreach

Hutzel reported on ballot measure outreach to describe and get feedback on potential regional revenue measure, including staff meetings with elected officials, special districts, environmental organizations, foundations, business and labor representatives, and others; meetings of Save The Bay staff with the Bay Area's state legislators and Congressional representatives and local elected officials; and distribution of San Francisco Bay wetlands and Restoration Authority brochures at East Bay Coastal Cleanup Day events in Richmond.

Staff will develop outreach materials to be used at future meetings and events.

9. Report on Governing Board Work Plan and Term of Office

Schuchat noted the term of office of Governing Board members, as described in the staff memo, including the four year term on the initial appointments set by ABAG and the expiration of the initial terms in April 2013.

Schuchat reported on the development of an outline of the proposed revenue measure preparation activities leading to the November 2014 election, including ballot preparation tasks, roles and responsibilities for the Spring/Summer 2012. He noted that the Advisory Committee will have a briefing on April 30.

Members discussed inviting the Advisory Committee to participate in the next Governing Board meeting on July 25 to discuss the proposed regional revenue measure and activities;

and identifying individuals and groups which should be contacted about the Restoration Authority and the proposed regional revenue measure.

Patrick Band, Save The Bay, reported on Save The Bay's scope of work on a Restoration Funding Campaign to include outreach, capacity building, and public advocacy, in support of the work of the Restoration Authority. He reviewed charts showing projected campaign budget and projected campaign constituency building.

Members discussed identifying supporters, budget and fundraising, partnerships with the public, developing message, online and traditional media, and ethnic media.

10. Report on Upcoming Advisory Committee Meeting

Schuchat reported that the Advisory Committee will meet on April 30 to discuss the proposed regional revenue measure and activities.

11. Adjournment

The Governing Board meeting adjourned at about 1:10 p.m.

The next Governing Board meeting is on July 25, 2012.

Submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
June 12, 2012

Approved by the Governing Board:
TBD



MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 10, 2012

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

FROM: Sam Schuchat, Chair
Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

SUBJECT: Performance of funding measures in the June 2012 election
Attachment: Revenue measure spreadsheet

As you may recall, immediately after the June primary election I sent out a quick and dirty analysis of the funding measures in the Bay Area. Since then Save The Bay's Policy Associate Patrick Band has performed a more nuanced analysis of the June 2012 election results for Bay Area revenue measures. Here are some of the facts and figures, as well as lessons and trends apparent from the election:

- 76% of the 34 revenue measures were successful. About 25% of the winning measures had a margin of victory of less than 3%.
- 71% of the 14 parcel tax measures passed.
- Most of the revenue measures were to support schools. Only two of the measures—Crockett's Community Services District Parcel Tax and the City of Sonoma's sales tax—were to raise funds for activities somewhat related to the Restoration Authority's purposes, including flood management and recreation facilities. These measures passed by margins of 1.66% and 27.10%, respectively.
- The parcel tax measures that failed were plagued either by a very high tax rate, strong editorial opposition, questions about the benefitting agency's financial management, poor turnout among supporters, or inadequate campaigns.
- Most of the winning measures benefitted from strong endorsements from labor, partisan organizations, and editorial boards.

Attached is a spreadsheet prepared by Patrick that provides interesting details about each of the June revenue measures, such as registration in each race, turnout, and the specific ballot question.

| County | Jurisdiction | Measure | Bond/Tax Amount | Measure Sunset | Total Number of Registered Voters | Democrats | Republicans | Decline to State | Number of Ballots Cast | Threshold | Vote | Turnout | Ballot Question |
|--------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------|---------|--|
| Contra Costa | Antioch Unified School District | School Bond | \$59.5 Million | - | 45,625 | 24,881 | 9,793 | 8,908 | 8,659 | 55% | 54.53% | 19% | For critical renovation, modernization and safety needs at Antioch High School by building new, permanent classrooms including science and computer labs and a library, upgrading electrical systems, improving student access to computers and technology, shall the School Facilities Improvement District No. 1 of the Antioch Unified School District issue \$59,500,000 in bonds at legal interest rates with funds monitored by an Independent Citizens' Oversight Committee and no funds spent on administrators? |
| Contra Costa | West Contra Costa Unified School District | School Parcel Tax | Renewal - Amount Unknown | 5 year | 100,339 | 64,311 | 11,155 | 20,656 | 36,522 | 66% | 65.52% | 36% | To provide local funding the State cannot take away, preserve quality education including: reading, writing, math, science; maintaining reduced class sizes for the youngest children; retaining quality teachers; supporting libraries, improving campus safety; preparing students for college/workforce; shall West Contra Costa Unified School District renew its existing parcel tax for five years, increasing it by three cents/square foot of building area or three dollars/vacant parcel, with no funds for administrator salaries, exempting seniors and requiring citizen oversight? |
| Contra Costa | City of Pittsburg | Pittsburg Sales Tax | 0.5% - 0.25% | 5 year | 24,928 | 14,845 | 3,815 | 5,264 | 6,913 | 50% | 73.69% | 28% | To provide funding that stays in Pittsburg and cannot be seized by the State, to be used for Public Safety, gang prevention, job creation programs for local residents, to keep the Senior Center open, to maintain other City services, shall the City of Pittsburg enact a temporary, half-cent sales tax for five years, reduced to one-quarter cent for five years, then the increase be terminated, altogether, with citizens' oversight, mandatory audits and consistent community reporting? |
| Contra Costa | City of San Pablo | San Pablo Sales Tax | 0.5% - 0.25% | 5 year | 7,875 | 5,169 | 696 | 1,702 | 2,167 | 50% | 73.56% | 28% | To provide funding that cannot be seized by the State, but will stay in San Pablo for such things as Public Safety, gang prevention, youth services, job creation and job training programs for local residents (including the disenfranchised) and all other general city services, shall San Pablo enact a temporary half-cent sales tax for 5 years, reduced to one-quarter cent for 5 years, then terminated altogether, with citizens' oversight, mandatory audits, and consistent community reporting? |
| Contra Costa | Crockett Community Services District | Crockett CSD Parcel Tax | Renew \$50, Increase to \$110 | Permanent | 2,016 | 1,159 | 316 | 410 | 909 | 66% | 67.66% | 45% | Shall a resolution be adopted which will authorize the Board of Directors to increase the existing \$50 recreation special tax on residential parcels within the Crockett and Port Costa areas for maintenance and operation of the District's park and recreation facilities and services within the District and not to exceed a total of \$110 per parcel per year? |
| Contra Costa | East Contra Costa Fire Protection District | E. County Fire Parcel Tax | \$197 plus COLA | 10 Year | 52,669 | 24,006 | 16,748 | 9,630 | 17,427 | 66% | 43.80% | 33% | To preserve existing emergency services, add paramedic services and prevent further layoffs of up to one half of existing firefighters and the closure of up to 3 additional fire stations, shall an ordinance be adopted to enact a parcel tax of \$197 per year on each parcel of real property within the District, with an annual cost of living adjustment not to exceed 3% and terminating on June 30, 2023? |
| Marin | Ross Valley School District | Ross School Parcel Tax | Renewal & Increase by \$149 | 8 Year | 15,867 | 9,712 | 1,921 | 3,318 | 8,421 | 66% | 73.92% | 53% | To provide local funding the State cannot take away, preserve high quality education in reading, writing, math and science, educationally sound class sizes, school libraries, and art and music instruction, and to help attract and retain highly-qualified teachers, shall the Ross Valley School District renew its existing parcel tax for another eight years, increasing it by \$149 per year, with no funds used for administrators' salaries and an exemption for seniors, and requiring annual audits? |
| Marin | Town of Ross | Ross Public Safety Tax | Up to \$1000 per unit/parcel | 4 Year | 1,587 | 689 | 493 | 354 | 852 | 66% | 60.92% | 54% | Shall the voters of the Town of Ross adopt an ordinance authorizing from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2016, the levy of a special tax for public safety services in an amount not to exceed \$1000 per dwelling unit for single family residential uses and not to exceed \$1000 per parcel for multi-family, commercial or other non-residential uses, and increasing the Town's appropriations limit by the amount of the special tax proceeds? |
| Marin | Muir Beach Community Services District | Muir Beach CSD Tax | \$200 | 4 Year | 276 | 178 | 14 | 61 | 146 | 66% | 86.99% | 53% | Shall Muir Beach CSD Ordinance No. 2012-1, which imposes an annual special tax of two-hundred (\$200.00) dollars for a period of four (4) years, FY 2012-2013, FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015, and 2015-2016, on each parcel within the Muir Beach CSD for fire protection, including fuel abatement and emergency preparedness, be approved and shall the Muir Beach CSD appropriations limit be increased by the amount of this voter-approved tax? |
| San Mateo | Cabrillo Unified School District | S. Cabrillo School Bond | \$81 Million | - | 14,249 | 6,974 | 2,951 | 3,469 | 6,730 | 55% | 56.51% | 47% | To improve the quality of education in local schools by replacing leaky roofs; performing essential safety repairs on classrooms and facilities; updating science labs; equipping classrooms with 21st century technology; maximizing energy efficiency and water conservation to save money; and renovating, constructing, and equipping classrooms and facilities; shall Cabrillo Unified School District issue \$81 million in bonds at legal rates with citizen oversight, annual audits, no funds for administrators' salaries, and all funds staying in local schools? |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|-----|--------|-----|---|
| San Mateo | County of San Mateo | Rental Vehicle Tax | 2.50% | - | 335,378 | 171,404 | 68,336 | 83,133 | 114,266 | 50% | 50.08% | 34% | Shall Chapter 5.150 be added to the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, imposing a business license tax of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of gross receipts on operators of vehicle rental businesses located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County? |
| San Mateo | County of San Mateo | TOT | 2% Increase, from 10 to 12% | - | 335,378 | 171,404 | 68,336 | 83,133 | 114,142 | 50% | 46.81% | 34% | Shall Chapter 5.136 of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code be amended to increase the rate of tax imposed on occupants of lodging within the unincorporated County who reside in such lodging for thirty consecutive calendar days or less, from ten to twelve percent of the rent charged by operators of such lodging? |
| San Mateo | Wayside Road Maintenance District | Portola Valley Special Tax | \$625 - \$950 | Permanent | 53 | 31 | 8 | 9 | 30 | 66% | 86.67% | 57% | Shall the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley sitting as the governing body of the Wayside II Road Maintenance District adopt an ordinance increasing the annual special tax per parcel from \$625 to \$950 to provide revenue to maintain and repair the roads in the District? |
| San Mateo | Redwood City School District | W. Redwood City School | \$67 | 5 Year | 40,820 | 20,725 | 9,270 | 9,161 | 16,156 | 66% | 69.21% | 40% | To improve local elementary and middle school education for all students with funds that cannot be taken by the State; enhance reading, writing, math, and science skills; attract and retain qualified teachers; and support school libraries; shall the Redwood City Elementary School District levy an educational parcel tax of \$67 annually for five years only, exempting seniors, with independent citizen oversight, annual reports to the community, no money for administrators' salaries, and all money benefitting local schools? |
| San Mateo | County of San Mateo | Parking Business Lic. Tax | 8.00% | - | 335,378 | 171,404 | 68,336 | 83,133 | 114,295 | 50% | 46.91% | 34% | Shall Chapter 5.152 be added to the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, imposing a business license tax of eight percent of gross receipts on operators of commercial parking facilities located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County? |
| San Mateo | Jefferson Union High School District | Jefferson HS Parcel Tax | \$48 | 4 Year | 56,712 | 31,286 | 8,128 | 15,117 | 18,629 | 66% | 67.34% | 33% | To protect quality education for all students, with funds that cannot be taken by the State, by: enhancing math, science, reading, and writing skills; providing career training, college preparation, and 21st century computer instruction; attracting and retaining qualified teachers; shall Jefferson Union High School District levy \$48 annually per parcel for four years, exempting senior citizens, with independent citizen oversight, no money for administrators' salaries, and all funds benefitting Jefferson, Oceana, Terra Nova, Westmoor, and Thornton high schools? |
| San Mateo | County Service Area P-1 | Svc Area 1 Police/ Fire Tax | \$65 | 4 Year | 2,037 | 1,176 | 317 | 412 | 1,085 | 66% | 70.23% | 53% | Shall Resolution 71851 of the County of San Mateo continuing the levy of a special tax for four years at a maximum rate of \$65 per parcel per year for extended police and structural fire protection services be approved? |
| Alameda | Peralta Community College District | Peralta CCD Parcel Tax | \$48 | 8 Year | 331,572 | 213,883 | 26,135 | 65,684 | 104,368 | 66% | 72.86% | 31% | To provide College of Alameda, Laney College, Merritt College and Berkeley City College secure funds that cannot be taken by the state, and support affordable college education including: providing core academic programs including math, science and English; training students for successful careers; and educating students to transfer to university; shall Peralta Community College District levy \$48 per parcel annually for 8 years with Citizens' Oversight, no funds for administrators' salaries, and all funds spent in our college district? |
| Alameda | City of Alameda | Alameda 911 | 0.50% | Permanent | 41,860 | 22,935 | 6,454 | 9,479 | 17,042 | 66% | 50.56% | 41% | To maintain neighborhood crime patrols, fire protection and 911 emergency response; improve earthquake preparedness; replace an unsafe fire station; establish a citywide Emergency Operations Center, a joint police/ fire training facility, library, cultural and recreational facilities; replace outdated police/ fire vehicles and equipment; and for other capital equipment and facilities, shall the City of Alameda enact a one-half cent sales tax, with all revenue staying in the City, mandatory annual audits and public expenditure reports? |
| Alameda | Dublin Unified School District | Dublin School Bond | \$99 Million | - | 20,845 | 8,912 | 5,460 | 4,938 | 6,780 | 55% | 62.02% | 33% | To protect quality education with funding that cannot be taken by the State, shall Dublin Unified School District update/replace aging classrooms/science labs; provide 21st century computers/technology/classrooms; ensure classrooms meet safety codes; prevent student overcrowding; and improve energy/operational efficiency and utilize savings for teachers/instruction, by issuing \$99 million in bonds at legal rates, with independent oversight, no money for administrators, and all funds staying in Dublin? |
| Alameda | Hayward Unified School District | Hayward School Parcel Tax | \$58 | Five Year | 67,486 | 40,056 | 9,601 | 13,473 | 17,981 | 66% | 70.83% | 27% | To protect critical education programs, with funds that cannot be taken by the State, including: math, reading, writing, and hands-on science classes/labs; enhancing library services, technology and college preparation programs; providing programs for all students to meet State academic standards; and attracting and retaining qualified teachers; shall Hayward Unified School District be authorized to levy \$58 per parcel annually, for five years, with an exemption for senior citizens, mandatory citizens' oversight and all money used for classrooms? |
| Alameda | New Haven Unified School District | New Haven School Parcel Tax | \$180 | Four Year | 33,297 | 18,297 | 4,663 | 8,323 | 10,079 | 66% | 62.94% | 30% | To support high-quality local elementary, middle and high school education to prepare students for college and careers with outstanding core academic programs in reading, writing, math and science and highly qualified teachers and classified staff, shall New Haven Unified School District authorize a school parcel tax of \$180 per year, for four years, with citizen oversight, no funds for administrators' salaries, an exemption available for seniors and the disabled, and all funds staying in our local schools. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--|
| Sonoma | Cotati/ Rohnert Park Unified School District | Cotati School Parcel Tax | \$89 | Five Year | 24,840 | 12,368 | 5,244 | 5,571 | 10,359 | 66% | 66.90% | 42% | To protect quality education with local funding that cannot be taken by the State, shall Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District preserve reading/writing/math/science programs; keep school libraries open/available for students; protect art/music/vocational instruction; and attract/retain qualified teachers, by levying \$89 per parcel annually for five years, with exemptions for senior citizens, independent citizen oversight, no money for administrators' salaries, and all funds staying local? |
| Sonoma | Healdsburg Unified School District | Healdsburg School Bond | \$35 Million | - | 9,362 | 4,710 | 2,301 | 1,871 | 4,546 | 55% | 61.40% | 49% | Without increasing current tax rates, to improve the quality of education at Healdsburg High and Healdsburg Junior High, repair leaky roofs, improve student access to computers/modern technology, add science labs, lower energy costs by upgrading electrical/plumbing systems and installing solar panels, shall Healdsburg Unified School District acquire,construct,repair schools/sites/facilities/equipment by issuing \$35,000,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, with independent citizens' oversight, no money for administrators nor be taken by the State? |
| Sonoma | Guerneville School District | Guerneville School Bond | \$6 Million | - | 3,122 | 1,866 | 308 | 685 | 1,533 | 55% | 64.80% | 49% | To improve the quality of education, improve student access to computers and modern technology, make health and safety improvements, modernize outdated classrooms and restrooms, improve energy efficiency by installing solar panels, modernize playgrounds and playfields, and replace outdated heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems, shall the Guerneville School District issue \$6,000,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, have an independent citizens' oversight committee and have no money used for administrative salaries or be taken by the State? |
| Sonoma | Old Adobe Union School District | Old Adobe School Bond | \$26 Million | - | 13,832 | 6,854 | 3,301 | 3,009 | 5,969 | 55% | 56.80% | 43% | To improve the quality of education, repair or replace leaky roofs; improve student access to computers and modern technology; modernize outdated classrooms, restrooms and school facilities; replace old heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems; replace deteriorating plumbing systems; and make health and safety improvements; shall the Old Adobe Union School District issue \$26,000,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, have an independent citizens' oversight committee and have no money used for administrative salaries or be taken by the State? |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|---|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--|
| Sonoma | Sebastopol Union School District | Sebastopol School Bond | \$9 Million | - | 7,811 | 4,607 | 1,150 | 1,490 | 4,094 | 55% | 70.10% | 52% | To improve the quality of education; repair leaky roofs; improve energy efficiency by installing solar panels; repair deteriorating plumbing systems; improve student access to computers and modern technology; replace outdated HVAC systems; and renovate, repair, construct and/or upgrade classrooms, restrooms and school facilities; shall the Sebastopol Union School District issue \$9,000,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, have an independent citizens' oversight committee and have no money used for administrative salaries or be taken by the State? |
| Sonoma | Wright School District | Wright School Bond | \$14 Million | - | 8,074 | 4,199 | 1,608 | 1,860 | 3,078 | 55% | 62.20% | 38% | To improve the quality of education; repair or replace leaky roofs; improve student access to computers and modern technology; construct additional classrooms, restrooms and school facilities; improve energy efficiency; upgrade inadequate electrical systems; make health and safety improvements; and replace old plumbing systems; shall the Wright Elementary School District issue \$14,000,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, have an independent citizens' oversight committee and have no money used for administrative salaries or be taken by the State? |
| Sonoma | City of Sonoma | Sonoma Sales Tax | 0.50% | - | 6,425 | 3,315 | 1,525 | 1,277 | 3,291 | 50% | 67.10% | 51% | To preserve the safety, public services and quality of life of Sonoma, and provide funding for essential services such as police, fire and emergency medical services, street and road maintenance and repairs, flood prevention, park and open space maintenance, graffiti abatement and other general community services, shall an ordinance be adopted temporarily increasing the City sales tax by one-half of one percent for a term of 5 years, with all funds to be spent locally? |
| Santa Clara | West Valley- Mission Community College District | W. Valley CCD Bond | \$350 Million | - | 188,977 | 83,319 | 48,668 | 49,692 | 69,595 | 55% | 59.89% | 37% | To provide affordable education at West Valley and Mission Colleges by updating academic facilities and technology to prepare students for 21st century jobs/transfer to universities, upgrading healthcare, public safety and job-training facilities, and aging buildings for earthquake safety, and acquiring, constructing, repairing and equipping sites, buildings, classrooms and facilities, shall West Valley-Mission Community College District issue \$350,000,000 of bonds, at legal rates with citizens' oversight, no money for Sacramento, administrators' salaries or employee pensions? |
| Santa Clara | Milpitas Unified School District | Milpitas School Bond | \$95 Million | - | 25,022 | 10,500 | 5,149 | 8,560 | 8,449 | 55% | 64.05% | 34% | To continue providing high quality education for local students by repairing and upgrading classrooms and science labs, updating learning technology, replacing leaky roofs, providing classrooms for growing student enrollment, upgrading fire/earthquake safety, maximizing energy efficiency, improving disabled access, and repairing, constructing, acquiring or equipping classrooms, sites and facilities, shall Milpitas Unified School District issue \$95,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, with citizen oversight, annual audits, no funds for administrator salaries and all funds staying in local schools? |
| Santa Clara | Mountain View Whisman School District | Mountain View School Bond | \$198 Million | - | 27,143 | 13,437 | 4,677 | 8,009 | 10,863 | 55% | 67.58% | 40% | To protect quality education in Mountain View, provide safe and modern classrooms, and make schools operate more efficiently, shall the Mountain View Whisman School District remove hazardous lead/asbestos materials, improve earthquake safety, upgrade fire alarms/security, replace outdated and inefficient plumbing/electrical/heating/ventilation, update computers/technology, and upgrade, acquire, construct schools, sites, facilities and equipment by issuing \$198 million in bonds at legal rates, with independent oversight and all funds spent on local elementary and middle schools? |
| Santa Clara | Cupertino Union School District | Cupertino School Bond | \$220 Million | - | 62,511 | 23,841 | 13,959 | 23,019 | 26,432 | 55% | 66.25% | 42% | To continue providing high quality education for local students by fixing leaky school roofs, upgrading earthquake/fire safety, removing potentially hazardous materials from old structures, keeping schools clean and well-maintained, updating science labs/educational technology, providing classrooms for student enrollment growth, and renovating, acquiring, constructing, equipping classrooms/sites/facilities, shall Cupertino Union School District issue \$220,000,000 in bonds at legal rates with citizen oversight, annual audits, no funds for administrators' salaries, all funds staying in local schools? |
| Solano | Solano County | County Library Tax | 0.125% | - | 200,782 | 97,532 | 51,539 | 43,097 | 66,984 | 66% | 80.10% | 33% | Shall Ordinance No. 2011-1724 to extend the 1998 countywide library retail transactions and use tax at the rate of one-eighth of one percent (0.125%) for a maximum of 16 years, which provides local library funding; prevents library closures; maintains collections of books, databases, and other materials; preserves library hours and children, teen, adult, senior programs, including computer training, homework help, family literacy and children's storytimes, with all revenues staying in Solano County, be adopted? |



MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 17, 2012

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

FROM: Amy Hutzell
Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program and
Staff to the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

SUBJECT: Additional appointments to the Advisory Committee
Attachments: Enabling legislation provisions for Advisory Committee
Advisory Committee Roster

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Governing Board consider making additional appointments to its Advisory Committee in order to broaden the representation of community and agency interests, replace members who have left the Bay Area, and increase its constituency-building capacity. Staff further recommends that the Governing Board ask its Subcommittee on the Advisory Committee to provide a list of proposed new Advisory Committee members for appointment at the Governing Board's next meeting.

In staff's analysis, appointments from the following sectors and organizations would help round out the range of constituencies represented:

- Commercial or sportfishing interests
- Ports
- Silicon Valley Leadership Group
- Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
- Ducks Unlimited
- League of Conservation Voters
- California Audubon
- The Bay Institute
- Department of Fish and Game
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Selected shoreline cities
- Agricultural interests
- Additional labor interests

In addition, appointments should be made to replace former Advisory Committee members Patrick Congdon (Santa Clara County Open Space Authority) and Mendel Stewart (San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge) who have left the area.

Below for reference are Section 66703.7 of the Restoration Authority's enabling legislation (Government Code 66700 *et seq.*), which makes provisions for appointment of an Advisory Committee, and a roster of Advisory Committee members appointed to-date and the status of each.

**Excerpt from Restoration Authority Enabling Legislation (Government Code 66700 *et seq.*)
re: Advisory Committee**

66703.7. (a) Not later than six months after the date of the board's first meeting described in subdivision (a) of Section 66703.6, the board shall convene a Bay Restoration Advisory Committee to assist and advise the board in carrying out the functions of the board. The advisory committee shall meet on a regular basis.

(b) The membership of the advisory committee shall be determined by the authority based upon criteria that provide a broad representation of community and agency interests within the authority's jurisdiction over the restoration of wetland areas in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline. The membership of the advisory committee may include, but is not limited to, representatives from the following:

(1) The Department of Fish and Game.

(2) The State Coastal Conservancy.

(3) The San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex operated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(4) Open space and park districts that own or operate shoreline parcels in the San Francisco Bay Area.

(5) The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

(6) The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

(7) The San Francisco Bay Joint Venture Management Board.

(8) The San Francisco Bay Trail Project.

(9) The San Francisco Estuary Project.

(10) Nongovernmental organizations working to restore, protect, and enhance San Francisco Bay wetlands and wildlife habitat.

(11) Members of the public from bayside cities and counties in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Roster of Advisory Committee Appointees and the Status of Each

| <u>Appointee</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Notes</u> |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| Steve Abbors | Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District | Active | |
| Josh Arce | Brightline Defense Project | Active | |
| Dion Aroner | AJE Partners | Active | |
| Cindy Chavez | South Bay Labor Council | Active | |
| John Coleman | Bay Planning Coalition | Active | Replaced Ellen Johnck |
| Patrick Congdon | Santa Clara County Open Space Authority | Retired | Replacement needed |
| Grant Davis | Sonoma County Water Agency | Active | |
| Steve Goldbeck | SF Bay Conservation & Development Com. | Active | Replaced Will Travis |
| Beth Huning | SF Bay Joint Venture | Active | |
| Ellen Johnck | Bay Planning Coalition (Ret.) | Resigned | Replaced by John Coleman |
| Jerry Kent | EBRPD (Retired) | Active | |
| David Lewis | Save The Bay | Active | |
| Sally Lieber | Consultant; Candidate for Assembly | Active | |
| Cynthia Murray | North Bay Leadership Council | Active | |
| Steve Ngo | SF City College Trustee | Resigned | |
| Rahul Prakash | Entrepreneur | Active | |
| Bruce Raful | Raful & Associates | Active | |
| Curt Riffle | The David and Lucille Packard Foundation | Active | |
| John Rizzo | SF City College Trustee | Active | |
| Bob Spencer | Economic consultant | Active | |
| Mendel Stewart | SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge | Relocated to East Coast | Replacement needed. Mendel's successor at the Refuge will be selected Fall 2012 |
| Laura Thompson | SF Bay Trail Project/ABAG | Active | |
| Will Travis | SF Bay Conservation & Development Commission (Retired) | Resigned | Replaced by Steve Goldbeck |
| Kate White | San Francisco Foundation | Active | Formerly SF ULI |