



Governing Board

MEETING AGENDA—REVISED

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Location:

Association of Bay Area Governments

101 8th Street, Training Center

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

John Gioia, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment

4. Announcements

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of July 24, 2013

Action

Attachment: Summary Minutes for July 24, 2013

6. Reports from the Vice Chair – John Gioia, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa

Information

A. Timeline for 2014 Ballot Measure

7. Outreach by Governing Board and Advisory Committee

Information/Discussion

Reports from Governing Board members and staff.

8. Report on Draft Expenditure Plan

Information/Discussion

Amy Hutzler, State Coastal Conservancy

Attachment: (To be sent under separate cover.)

9. Report on Ballot Access Costs

Information/Discussion

Dave Pine, Supervisor, County of San Mateo, will report on ballot access costs.

10. Advisory Committee: Appointment of New Members

Action

John Gioia will report on the appointment of a new member to the Advisory Committee.

Attachment: Denninger memo dated September 5, 2013

11. Adjournment

Agenda submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
September 11, 2013

Agenda posted:
September 18, 2013



Governing Board

SUMMARY MINUTES (DRAFT)

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

1:00 p.m. to 3:00 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

1. Call to Order

Sam Schuchat, Chair, called the meeting to order at about 1:08 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

Present were Sam Schuchat, Keith Caldwell, Dave Cortese, John Gioia, Dave Pine, John Sutter.

Absent was Rosanne Foust.

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

3. Public Comment

Daniel Franco, Fifth Avenue Waterfront Community Alliance, spoke on the Oak to Ninth project at Brooklyn Basin.

There were no other public comments.

4. Announcements

Sutter commented on an insert on Bay restoration in the recent issue of Bay Nature.

McDowell announced the State of the Estuary Conference will be held October 29 to 30, at the Oakland Marriott City Center.

There were no other announcements.

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of January 23, 2013

A motion to approve the summary minutes of the Governing Board meeting on April 24, 2013, was made by Sutter and seconded by Cortese. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Chair's Report

A. South Bay Wetlands Tour on May 30, 2013

Schuchat reported on the South Bay Wetlands Tour organized by the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture on May 30, 2013. Board members Schuchat, Pine and Sutter, and five Advisory Committee members participated. The next tour will be scheduled in the Fall.

B. SB 279

Schuchat reported on the status of SB 279 which passed out of the Senate and the first few Assembly committees.

7. Report on Outreach by Governing Board and Advisory Committee

Schuchat and Governing Board members reported on their outreach activities.

Amy Hutzler reported on a South Baylands Steering Committee meeting and a presentation by the Resources Legacy Fund.

Steven Knight, Save The Bay, announced a meeting of business groups on resiliency at Google.

Schuchat spoke at the Bay Nature publication party for the Bay Restoration issue; met with the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club and an Audubon group, and will meet with the Bay Planning Coalition and the Napa Farm Bureau with Caldwell. He reported that some of the Advisory Committee members have done some outreach, including Mackenzie, Santa Clara County Parks and Open Space, met with the San Jose Mayor and City Council;

Morkill, Don Edwards Refuge, met with Citizens to Save the Refuge and the Redwood City Rotary Club; Rafal made a presentation to the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

Caldwell has scheduled meetings with the Napa County Farm Bureau and the Napa Valley Vintners Association, the cities of Napa and American Canyon, Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District. He met with Assemblymember Yamada and a representative of Senator Wolk regarding Cargill Salt Ponds. He will schedule a presentation with the North Bay Water Reuse Authority.

Cortese reported on meetings with Carl Guardino, Silicon Valley Leadership Group; a representative of the Santa Clara Valley Tax Association; and Santa Clara County Farm Bureau.

Sutter reported on scheduling a presentation with the Oakland Chamber and contacting the Bay Area News Group.

Gioia reported on scheduling meetings with the Committee on Industrial Safety, Council of Industries of Western Contra Costa, and scheduling in the Fall a Saturday walk along the Richmond waterfront at restoration locations.

Pine reported on meetings with the San Mateo County Association of City and County Governments, along with David Lewis, Save The Bay; Mid-peninsula Parks Working Group; San Francisco International Airport. He plans on meeting with Bay Bio and labor groups. He attended a salt pond restoration event by Save The Bay at Ravenswood Open Space Preserve.

Barry Barnes, TBWB, commented on outreach conversations about ballot placement and costs; feedback from labor and heavy trade construction; and legislative activities regarding ballot designation.

8. Report on Ballot Access Costs

Pine and Gioia reported on ballot access costs, including discussions with Save The Bay, TBWB, and the Resource Legacy Fund, and the Contra Costa County Registrar; assessment of the problem, including costs of placing measure on county ballots; possible costs reductions; fundraising to cover costs; and seeking legislative solution regarding costs.

Gioia reported that Joe Canciamilla, Contra Costa County Registrar, will assist in preparing a work-up on ballot costs, and on his conversations with CSAC on legislation about ballot costs.

9. Report on Preparation for 2014 Ballot Measure

Barry Barnes and Sarah Stern-Benoit, TBWB, reported on continuing work in preparation for a 2014 ballot measure, including progress in support for a ballot measure, key messages, addressing ballot access costs, developing an expenditure plan, and building a coalition to support placing a measure on the ballot. They presented a timeline and reviewed next steps.

Members discussed testing different levels for support for a ballot measure, sea level rise, and the economy; expected revenues and expenditures; defining the ballot measure, developing an expenditure plan, and regional equity; and ballot measure costs and leveraging funds.

10. Appointment of New Member to the Advisory Committee

A motion to appoint Chris Elias of the Santa Clara Valley Water District to the Advisory Committee was made by Cortese and seconded by Caldwell. The motion passed unanimously.

Members suggested a representative from the Bay Area Flood Control Authority be considered for appointment to the Advisory Committee.

11. Adjournment

The Governing Board meeting adjourned at about 2:33 p.m.

The next Governing Board meeting is on September 25, 2013.

Submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
September 9, 2013

Approved by the Governing Board:
TBD



MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 20, 2013

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

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

SUBJECT: Report on Draft Expenditure Plan

ATTACHMENTS: Sept. 9, 2013 Draft Expenditure Plan
Draft Preliminary Sample Project List

At its meeting on July 24, the Governing Board discussed the two-fold need for an expenditure plan that outlines potential uses of parcel tax revenue: 1) to inform and get feedback from stakeholders and potential supporters and 2) to appear in voter pamphlets as part of the ballot measure.

A Draft Expenditure Plan (attached) has been crafted to address statutory requirements, resonate with voters and other stakeholders, and anticipate implementation needs. To date, participants in crafting and refining the Draft Expenditure Plan have included Save The Bay and its consultants and staff of the Coastal Conservancy and the Association of Bay Area Governments. Ruth Bernstein of EMC and Beth Huning and Marc Holmes, representatives of the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, were consulted during the initial drafting.

During the week of September 9, Governing Board Chair Sam Schuchat circulated the Draft Expenditure Plan to both the Governing Board and to its Advisory Committee for a first round of comments and feedback. The Governing Board meeting on September 25 will provide the first opportunity for discussion of the Draft Expenditure Plan among Governing Board members. To help focus your discussion, comments received to-date from Governing Board and Advisory Committee members and others are summarized below.

Governing Board member John Sutter provided a comment letter and Robert Doyle, General Manager of East Bay Regional Park District, provided a letter and a list of 21 projects along the Alameda and Contra Costa shoreline that potentially meet the objectives of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority.

Comments on the Draft Expenditure Plan were also provided in various formats by the following Advisory Committee members:

- Anne Morkill, Project Leader, San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex
- Laura Thompson, Manager, San Francisco Bay Trail Project
- Richard Mitchell, Director of Planning & Building Services, City of Richmond
- Adrian Covert, Policy Manager, Bay Area Council (representing Jim Wunderman)
- John Rizzo, Trustee, San Francisco City College
- Mike Mielke, Silicon Valley Leadership Group
- Sarah Rose, California League of Conservation Voters

In addition to comments from Governing Board and Advisory Committee members, a comment letter was received from Norman LaForce, Sustainability, Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife Legal Defense Fund (SPRAWLDEF).

Comments covered a variety of areas of the Draft Expenditure Plan, and generally fell in to one of five categories:

A. Project Eligibility

1. General

- i. “Overall it looks like a strong outline to guide expenditures for the highest and best benefit of the program goals outlined – improving health and safety, improved wildlife habitat, and increased public access to the Bay.” - Rose

2. Public Access

- i. “[Section B.3.a.] could be interpreted to mean that only deteriorating facilities, signs, and trails will be constructed, repaired, and replaced... I assume that construction of new facilities, new signs and new trails are an allowable expense under this plan.” - Thompson
- ii. “[Section B.3.a.] could be interpreted as only constructing trails and facilities to provide access for people with disabilities...when I believe the intent is to build facilities for everyone’s use.” – Thompson

3. Flood Protection

- i. Add flood protection to title, and throughout program descriptions. – Morkill
- ii. “Nowhere is flood protection mentioned in the expenditure plan. The Expenditure Plan should be consistent with the project types outlined in Article 2 of AB 2954, including flood protection – a critically important issue for the Bay Area Council.” - Covert
- iii. “SPRAWLDEF is very concerned that this money will be used for such ‘brick and mortar’ dike and levee proposals and not for habitat restoration... SPRAWLDEF does not view the use of restoration tax dollars for that purpose to be warranted.” Define what is meant by “building and restoring levees related to bay restoration”. – LaForce

4. Restoration

- i. Supplement reference to San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge with references to lands owned by other public agencies. – Morkill
- ii. “Many people would be willing to support: a) Removal of bay fill and restoration of original shore line in specific locations, b) restoration of historic

streams that originally emptied into the bay, c) Cleaning up pollution ‘hot spots’ at ex-industrial locations, and d) Reintroducing native fish and wildlife. People are willing to support restoration efforts that are specific and that can be accomplished within 24 to 36 months” – Mitchell

iii. Will “projects that do not directly involve the Bay but concern streams and waterways be eligible for funding?” – LaForce

5. Other

i. Clarify whether land acquisition is eligible. – Morkill

ii. “[T]he expenditure plan does not provide adequate information for how long term maintenance and funding will be provided for stewardship of restored wetlands.” Are monitoring, maintenance, and stewardship eligible categories? - LaForce

iii. “...it seems prudent to list all potential candidates [for funding]. Standard list from grants.gov is an example.” - Morkill

B. Process for Developing Criteria and Evaluating Projects

1. “Who will make the decision as to the criteria to be used” - LaForce

2. “I see this as a fundamental role for the advisory committee – to help develop an objective-based process for filtering and ...using a variety of criteria for the Governing Board to select those projects to receive grants.” - Morkill

3. “...clarify the roles of the Advisory Committee vs the Governing Board, especially as it relates to making recommendations regarding priority setting and oversight.” – Mielke

4. “Will the public actually be commenting on selection of project grants or on the criteria used to select project grants? I would recommend the latter.” - Morkill

C. Specificity of the Plan

1. Programmatic Approach vs. Project List

a. “While there are advantages to the programmatic approach, there are also, in my view, some serious disadvantages... The board should, I think also discuss a project list, which is the usual method for revenue measures.” - Sutter

b. “The proposed expenditure plan appears to be too vague to generate sustained taxpayer support.” – Mitchell

c. “The plan does not specify projects or the criteria for how the projects would be evaluated for funding.” – LaForce

d. “I do think that allowing the authority or other oversight entities the ability to continuously manage towards improving best practices is a good idea. IN California we have certainly had experiences with focused and dedicated funding for programs that have been eclipsed by real world needs.” - Rose

2. Geographic Scope

a. “The Draft Plan leaves open the possibility that...all of the funds could be spent in a few of the 9 counties.” – Rizzo

b. “How does the East Bay, especially the West Contra Costa County area fit into the Authority’s concept?” – LaForce

c. “I don’t see anywhere in the document a statement about the scope of activities. Is the scope the entire 9 counties, or does it cover only those lands in public ownership (focused primarily in the South Bay)?” - Mielke

d. “Would you consider preparing a map that identifies specific problems and restoration projects, including their locations around the bay?” – Mitchell

3. Division Between Program Areas

- a. “Could you please clarify the following statement: *‘The restoration work accomplished by this measure will achieve the goals laid out in one or more of the three program areas described below.’* With the amount of money that the parcel tax and matching funds would generate, wouldn’t we expect to address all the areas listed?” – Mielke
- b. “...\$15 million per year sounds like too much for some of the proposed programs (providing environmental education) and too little for others (limiting pollutants and engaging in restoration activities).” - Mitchell

D. Authority Administration

1. “How many FTEs and what level of budget do you expect will be required to adequately staff the Authority?” – Mielke
2. “The 5% limit on administrative expenses in your draft proposal is commendable.” – Sutter
3. “How many meetings do you expect the Advisory Committee to participate in every year?” - Mielke

E. General Comments

1. Summary should be revised to be the same language as SFBRA brochure and fact sheets, which make a more compelling argument to voters and stakeholders. – Morkill
2. Change “landfill” to “development” in first paragraph - Mielke
3. Introductory paragraphs for sections C2 and C3 are identical – Morkill
4. “[A]rticulate what the success of the program looks like... how can we evaluate success of various investments... it will be important to tell the public about the investments made... and the direct impacts/improvements.” - Rose

Additional follow-up conversations with the majority of respondents yielded further substance to feedback. Members are generally supportive and understanding of the challenges inherent in the process of drafting such a document, and look forward to seeing a revised Draft Expenditure Plan and accompanying materials over the coming weeks. One suggestion made was for an illustrative document outlining projects in each county which would be eligible for funding under the criteria set forth in authorizing legislation and the Draft Expenditure Plan. With that in mind, attached is a Draft Preliminary Sample Project List that could be revised and expanded, mapped, and used to accompany the more programmatic Draft Expenditure Plan.

Following your September 25 discussion of the DEP, it is recommended that staff of ABAG and the Coastal Conservancy, with assistance from Save The Bay and TBWB, further refine the Draft Expenditure Plan and Draft Preliminary Sample Project List to reflect Governing Board direction; consult with tax and election law attorneys and staff counsel; and seek additional external feedback. The refined Draft Expenditure Plan would be returned to the Governing Board for consideration and additional input at its November 20 meeting, though final approval would not be recommended until the entire ballot measure and the associated resolution or ordinance is enacted by the Governing Board in late spring 2014.

DRAFT -- DRAFT -- DRAFT

Note: This draft document reflects discussions to-date among stakeholders regarding potential expenditure priorities for a regional Restoration Authority revenue measure. It is intended to serve as a focus for continuing discussions leading up to formulation of a ballot measure and expenditure plan by the Restoration Authority. Nothing in this draft document should be construed to signify language that may or may not appear on a ballot measure or supporting campaign materials.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY SAFE, CLEAN WATER, POLLUTION PREVENTION, HABITAT RESTORATION AND SHORELINE ACCESS EXPENDITURE PLAN

A. Summary

Over the last century, we have had a massive impact on the Bay with landfill and toxic pollution. It is not too late to reverse what we've done and restore the Bay for future generations. The San Francisco Bay Safe, Clean Water, Pollution Prevention, Habitat Restoration and Shoreline Access parcel tax ("Measure") is estimated to generate approximately \$15,000,000 per year to support these goals.

The purpose of this measure is to give voters in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area the opportunity to reverse the damage that has been done to the Bay and to support the removal of pollution, restoration of wildlife habitat, preservation of clean water, protection of shoreline communities, and expansion of trails and public access to the San Francisco Bay.

Part B of this Expenditure Plan ("Plan") outlines three programs for cleaning up, enhancing and restoring the San Francisco Bay. Part C of the Plan contains provisions for community oversight, accountability and public involvement.

B. Program Descriptions

This Measure will fund Bay restoration across the nine county Bay Area. The restoration work accomplished by this Measure will achieve the goals laid out in one or more of the program areas described below.

1. Safe, Clean Water and Pollution Prevention Program

The purpose of this Program is to remove pollution, trash and harmful toxins from the Bay to provide clean water for fish, birds and other wildlife.

- a. Improve water quality through limiting pollutants and engaging in restoration activities, making fish and wildlife healthier.
- b. Reduce pollution levels through shoreline cleanup and trash removal from the San Francisco Bay.

- c. Restore wetlands that provide natural filters and remove pollution from the water.
- d. Protect the public from the risks of severe flooding and storms by providing natural flood protection and building and restoring levees related to bay restoration.

2. Vital Fish, Bird and Wildlife Habitat Program

The purpose of this Program is to significantly improve wildlife habitat that will support and increase vital populations of fish, birds, and other wildlife in and around San Francisco Bay.

- a. Enhance the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge and other public lands in and around the Bay, providing expanded habitat for fish, birds and mammals.
- b. Protect and restore wetlands and other San Francisco Bay and shoreline habitat to benefit wildlife, including shorebirds, waterfowl and fish.

3. Shoreline Public Access and Education Program

The purpose of this Program is to enhance the quality of life of Bay Area residents through safer public access and educational opportunities compatible with bay restoration.

- a. Construct, repair and/or replace deteriorating facilities, signs, trails, etc. around the shoreline to protect natural resources and provide access for people with disabilities.
- b. Provide environmental education to protect natural resources and encourage community engagement.

C. Administrative Provisions

1. Funds will be administered by the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

The revenue raised by the Measure for the purposes described in this Plan will be administered by the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (“Authority”). The Authority is a regional entity created by the California legislature in 2008 to “raise and allocate resources for the restoration, enhancement, protection, and enjoyment of wetlands and wildlife habitats in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline” (Government Code Sections 66700 *et seq.*). The Restoration Authority Board is made up of local elected officials from each region of the Bay Area.

2. Accountability and Public Oversight

Implementation of the Plan shall be guided by the following procedures to ensure that the revenue generated by the Measure is spent in the most efficient and effective manner possible, consistent with serving the public interest in the Bay Area, and the desires of the voters of the Bay Area:

- a. The Authority will commission an independent annual audit of its revenue and expenditures and will also prepare an annual report on past and upcoming activities and publish an annual financial statement.
- b. The Authority has appointed a community-based Advisory Committee to provide advice on all aspects of its activities, to ensure maximum benefit for safe, clean water, pollution reduction, habitat restoration and public access. Advisory Committee meetings will be announced in advance and will be open to the public. The responsibilities of this committee include
 - Making recommendations regarding expenditure priorities.
 - Reviewing Plan expenditures on an annual basis to ensure they conform with the Plan.
 - Reviewing the annual audit and report prepared by the Governing Board, describing how Measure funds were spent.
- c. All actions, including decisions about selecting projects for funding, will be made by the Authority in public meetings with proper advance notice and with meeting materials and minutes available in advance to the public.

3. Implementation Requirements

Implementation of the Plan shall be guided by the following procedures to ensure that the revenue generated by the Measure is spent in the most efficient and effective manner possible, consistent with serving the public interest in the Bay Area, and the desires of the voters of the Bay Area.

- a. The Restoration Authority Governing Board shall conduct one or more public meetings annually to gain public input on selection of project grants to expend revenues generated by the Measure.
- b. Actual revenues generated by the Measure may be higher or lower than estimates in this Plan due to variability in annual tax receipts. The Authority shall annually estimate revenue from the Measure.
- c. The Authority may accumulate revenue over multiple years so that

sufficient funding is available for larger and long-term projects. All interest income shall be used for the purposes identified in this Plan.

- d. To enhance local workforce development and employment opportunities, and involve youth and young adults in caring for our natural resources, the Authority will encourage grantees to engage local community based organizations and businesses in projects funded by this Measure.
- e. No more than 5% of the Measure's annual expenditures may be used for administrative expenses by the Authority.

DRAFT

SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY

DRAFT Preliminary List of Sample Projects

September 17, 2013

Project	County	Project Description	Lead Organizations
McLaughlin Eastshore State Park	Alameda, Contra Costa	Creation or restoration of beach, dune, wetland, coastal prairie, and creek habitats, and shoreline access projects.	East Bay Regional Park District
Coyote Hills	Alameda	Restore marsh, seasonal wetlands, and coastal prairie for endangered wildlife and improve shoreline access.	East Bay Regional Park District
South Bay Salt Ponds Restoration Project: Eden Landing, Alviso, and Ravenswood Ponds	Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Clara	Restoration and enhancement of former salt ponds, flood management levees and infrastructure, and public access, including Bay Trail segments.	Department of Fish and Wildlife, State Coastal Conservancy
Dutch Slough	Contra Costa	Tidal restoration in the southwestern Delta, using fill material to raise elevations and levees to provide flood protection, and construction of public access trails.	Department of Water Resources, State Coastal Conservancy, Department of Fish and Game
Breuner Marsh	Contra Costa	Restoration of tidal marsh, seasonal wetland and coastal prairie by removing and recontouring fill, construction of a 1.5 mile segment of Bay Trail and an Interpretive Center, and restoration at the mouth of Rheem Creek.	East Bay Regional Park District
Bel Marin Keys	Marin	Design and implementation of tidal restoration, using dredged sediment to raise elevations prior to breaching, a levee to protect neighboring communities, and completion of Bay Trail segments.	State Coastal Conservancy
Lower Napa River Wetlands	Napa	Enhancement of tidal marshes and managed wetlands along the lower Napa River, including public access, bird islands, water control structures, monitoring, and operation of facilities.	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Yosemite Slough	San Francisco	Completion of park improvements (entry, parking, signs, trails, visitor center, etc.), monitoring of restored wetlands, and operations and maintenance of wetlands and visitor amenities	California State Parks Foundation, State Parks
Crissy Field Educational Programs	San Francisco	Programs at Crissy Field to engage youth in the protection and restoration of San Francisco Bay.	Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
Cullinan Ranch	Solano	Monitoring and management of restored wetlands	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ducks Unlimited
Suisun Marsh	Solano	Enhancement of marshes within Suisun Marsh to benefit waterfowl and shorebirds.	Department of Fish and Wildlife, Suisun Resource Conservation District, Solano Land Trust
Sears Point	Sonoma	Completion of restoration, construction of public access improvements, and monitoring and management of restored wetlands.	Sonoma Land Trust, Ducks Unlimited
Petaluma River	Sonoma	Enhancement of wetlands along the Petaluma River to provide habitat for fish and wildlife and projects to complete trail segments and provide water access for nonmotorized boats.	Friends of the Petaluma River, City of Petaluma, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Living Shorelines: Oyster and Eelgrass Restoration	Marin, Alameda, Contra Costa	Restoration of eelgrass and oyster beds at a number of sites along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay, with the goal of providing shoreline protection from waves and erosion while providing habitats for wildlife and improving water quality.	State Coastal Conservancy, San Francisco State University, UC Davis, NOAA Fisheries
Coastal Clean-Up Activities	Baywide	Support for Coastal Clean-Up Day at sites around the Bay.	Coastal Commission, Save The Bay, cities and counties, others.

[Blank Page]



MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 5, 2013

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

FROM: Melanie Denninger
Project Specialist
State Coastal Conservancy

SUBJECT: Two Additional Appointments to the Advisory Committee

This memo is to present two more candidates recommended for appointment to the Restoration Authority's Advisory Committee. The candidates are Ben Field, Executive Director of the South Bay Labor Council and Mitch Avalon, Contra Costa County Deputy Public Works Director (retired, but still active with the County) and founder of the Bay Area Flood Protection Agencies Association. Mr. Field would step into the Advisory Committee role once filled by Cindy Chavez, who was formerly Executive Director of the South Bay Labor Council and was recently elected to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Avalon would expand the reach of the Advisory Committee to include flood management agencies. The Governing Board's Committee on the Advisory Committee, comprised of Councilmember Faust and Supervisor Gioia, has agreed that these two candidates be considered for appointment.

The following are brief biographies of the two candidates:

Ben Field

Ben Field was elected to the post of Executive Officer of the south Bay Labor Council in December 2012. He is responsible for running the largest, most sophisticated grassroots political campaign operation in the South Bay. He oversees political campaign work carried out by the Labor Council's Committee on Political Education (COPE) advocating for candidates and public policies that are good for working families.

During the 2012 election cycle, Ben was in charge of several successful campaigns. Among them were three critical local measures including the significant increase in San Jose's minimum wage, Santa Clara County's sales tax for healthcare and public safety, and continued funding for a safe, clean water supply, and the election of two candidates to replace under-performing board members of the El Camino Hospital District. He supervised hundreds of volunteers and hired staff to carry out the campaign work, which also included dozens of other successful candidate races. Before his election as Executive Officer, Ben served as Chief of Staff for the Labor Council from 2009-2012.

Prior to joining the Labor Council, Ben served as a Deputy District Attorney in Santa Clara County for 15 years, where he prosecuted a variety of cases including murders, sexual assaults, gang offenses, and white collar crimes. He is also an adjunct professor at San Jose State University, where he has taught courses on the U.S. presidency, constitutional law, judicial politics, law and society, and political history. Ben has served as the co-chair of the Friends of PAT, a faith-based group that supports community organizing and social justice activities, the Chair of the Cardozo Society, and is a member of the Jewish Community Relations Council. He is also a volunteer leader with Habitat for Humanity and a senior fellow of the American Leadership Forum.

After graduating with a degree in Political Science from Columbia University in 1986, Ben worked as a legislative aide to Congressman Don Edwards and later on the United States Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development. He earned a law degree and a PhD in American History from the University of California at Berkeley and served in the U.S. Naval Reserve from 1988-1998. He has authored several articles and a book on history and the law.

Ben is an avid runner, having competed in numerous 100-mile races and plays the harmonica in a garage band known as "The Retribution Blues Band."

Mitch Avalon

Mitch Avalon is a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley where he received his Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering. He joined Contra Costa County Public Works Department in 1979 after working with Bechtel for a year. Mr. Avalon has worked in many areas of Public Works, including transportation engineering, development engineering, design, and construction.

Mr. Avalon was appointed Deputy Public Works Director and Deputy Chief Engineer for the Flood Control and Water Conservation District in 1998, overseeing the development of regional management plans for flood protection and enhancement of the environmental resources in the District's 75 miles of creeks and 30 basins. He is also responsible for overseeing the County's Clean Water Program, Real Estate Division and Environmental Division. Mr. Avalon spent one year as Acting Deputy Director at the Community Development Department, managing their current planning program.

Mitch is currently retired but still working with the County Public Works Department.

Mitch has been chair of the Alhambra Watershed Council since its founding in 1997. The Council produced a Watershed Management Plan in 2004 through a community based planning process and is now working on implementation projects. Mitch is also on the Board of Directors of the Friends of the San Francisco Estuary, the San Francisco Estuary Institute and the California Central Valley Flood Control Association, past Chair of the Flood Control and Water Resources Policy Committee for the County Engineers Association of California, past Chair of the Contra Costa City-County Engineering Advisory Committee and founding Chair of the Bay Area Flood Protection Agencies Association.

On the human interest side, Mitch has climbed Mount Kilimanjaro in Africa and Mount Tyndal in the Whitney range, and bicycled across the United States.