



Governing Board

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, February 25, 2015
1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

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

Please join meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone:
<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/797659869>

Public Conference Call:
Call-in Number: (877) 336-1831
Participant Code: 226167

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

Chair Ted Lempert will call the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comments

Information

4. Announcements

Information

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of December 10, 2014

Action

Attachment: Summary Minutes for December 10, 2014

6. Chair's Report

Information

Lempert

7. Report on Past and Current Options for Revenue-Raising Mechanisms

Information

Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer, California State Coastal Conservancy

Attachment: Schuchat memo dated February 20, 2015

8. Legislation Update

Information

Lempert

Attachment: Lempert memo dated February 19, 2015

9. Report on Membership Option for Restoration Authority

Information

Cindy Chavez, Supervisor, Santa Clara County

10. Report on Preliminary Schedule of Critical Path Steps Leading to a 2016 Ballot Measure

Information

Schuchat

Attachment: Proposed Revised Schedule

11. Appointment of New Advisory Committee Member

Action

Schuchat

Attachment: Hutzel memo dated February 20, 2015

12. Proposed Time and Dates for the Mid-September Meeting

Action

Schuchat

Attachment: McDowell memo dated February 20, 2015

13. Adjournment

Next meeting is on Wednesday, April 22, 2015, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Agenda submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
February 20, 2015

Agenda posted:
February 20, 2015

Blank Page



Governing Board

SUMMARY MINUTES (DRAFT)

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

1:00 p.m. to 3:00 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

Ted Lempert, Chair, called the meeting to order at about 1:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Anna Schneider, Executive Assistant, California State Coastal Conservancy, reported that four (4) members were present. A quorum of the Governing Board was present.

Present were Keith Caldwell, Cindy Chavez, Ted Lempert, Dave Pine (arrived later), John Sutter.

Absent was Rosanne Foust, John Gioia.

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

3. Public Comments

There was no public comment.

4. Announcements

There were no announcements.

5. Approval of Summary Minutes of September 24, 2014

Lempert recognized a motion by Sutter and a second by Chavez to approve the summary minutes of the Governing Board meeting on September 24, 2014. There was no discussion. The motion passed with four (4) aye votes.

Ayes: Caldwell, Chavez, Lempert, Sutter.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: None.

Absent: Foust, Gioia, Pine.

6. Chair's Report

[Pine arrived.]

Lempert introduced Ruth Bernstein of EMC Research and Sarah Stern-Benoit of TBWB Strategies to report on their work on two recent ballot measures, the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District's Measure AA and the Santa Clara County Open Space District's Measure Q, and on the election outcomes.

7. Report on Past and Current Options for Revenue-Raising Mechanisms

Amy Hutzel, Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program, California State Coastal Conservancy, reported on past and current options for revenue raising mechanisms.

Members discussed the following: Continuing with pursue a parcel tax and options for placing the measure before voters. Members then noted the need to evaluate the effects on revenue and voting of placing a measure on ballots in less than the entirety of the nine Bay Area counties.

8. Report on Membership Option for Restoration Authority

Cindy Chavez, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara, reported on membership option for the Restoration Authority.

Members discussed the following: The need to raise funds prior to placing a measure on the ballot in order to enable obtaining technical and outside legal advice and the potential for local agencies to contribute funds via membership. Chavez volunteered to take the lead on pursuing the membership and funding concept. Pine volunteered to work with her.

9. Legislation Update

Hutzel and Patrick Band, Save The Bay, reported on legislation update and proposed legislation activity by Save The Bay.

Members discussed the following: Extending the sunset dates for the Restoration Authority and for provisions added to its enabling legislation in 2014, clarifying the eligibility criteria for the Chair, and clarifying eligible ballot access charges.

Lempert recognized a motion by Sutter and a second by Pine to approve Save The Bay working with legislators to introduce a bill for the above purposes, with refinement in early 2015. The motion passed with five (5) aye votes.

Ayes: Caldwell, Chavez, Lempert, Pine, Sutter.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: None.

Absent: Foust, Gioia.

10. Report on Preliminary Schedule of Critical Path Steps Leading to November 2016 Ballot Measure

Hutzel reported on the preliminary schedule of critical path steps leading to the November 2016 ballot measure.

Members discussed the following: The need to proceed promptly and to add detail to the schedule.

11. Planning for February 25, 2015 Meeting with Advisory Committee

Hutzel reported on planning for the Governing Board meeting with the Advisory Committee on February 25, 2015.

Members discussed the following: Attending the Advisory Committee meeting.

12. Proposed Revised 2015 Governing Board Meeting Schedule

Hutzel reported on the proposed revised Governing Board meeting schedule for 2015.

Members discussed the following: Moving the date of the September 2015 Governing Board meeting from September 23 to September 16, and planning to choose the best time for the meeting when the times and locations of the State of the Estuary Conference gala and BCDC's anniversary conference and celebration have been set.

Lempert recognized a motion by Chavez and a second by Sutter to approve the revised 2015 Governing Board meeting schedule. There was no discussion. The motion passed with five (5) aye votes.

Ayes: Caldwell, Chavez, Lempert, Pine, Sutter.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: None.

Absent: Foust, Gioia.

13. Adjournment

The Governing Board meeting adjourned at about 2:54 p.m.

Next meeting is on Wednesday, February 25, 2015, 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m., followed by
Advisory Committee meeting from 2:45 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:
February 20, 2015

Approved by the Governing Board:
TBD



Date: February 20, 2015

To: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

From: Sam Schuchat
Executive Officer
State Coastal Conservancy

Subject: **Analyses of Selected Revenue Measure Options**

Introduction

This memo reports on analyses of selected revenue measure options for the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, including those which staff was directed to report upon by the Governing Board at its December 10, 2014 meeting. The memo is provided for information and discussion. The Governing Board may wish to provide direction regarding further research and reporting.

Analyses of Selected Revenue Measure Options

1. Options for Accelerating Revenue-Generation and Increasing the Total Amount of Revenue Generated

Since the last Governing Board meeting, there has been further discussion among members of the Baylands Steering Committee (which includes Save The Bay, Resources Legacy Fund, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Moore Foundation, Bay Area Council, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, and a few others) about options for a regional measure for Bay restoration. They concluded that a revenue measure that would raise a larger amount earlier than the previously contemplated \$9 parcel tax could potentially generate additional support among key constituents.

One option that could serve this purpose is a general obligation (GO) bond, perhaps with a charge of a few dollars per \$100,000 of assessed value. In light of potential support for a GO bond, Save The Bay is analyzing a GO bond for feasibility in terms of revenue generation, level of support, and the Restoration Authority's current powers. Save The Bay's preliminary analysis of the feasibility of a bond measure and a recap of previous polling on parcel tax measure rates and duration are provided below.

Analyses of Selected Revenue Measure Options

February 20, 2015

2

a. Preliminary GO Bond Analysis from Save The Bay

A bond measure approach utilizes the existing bonding powers of the Restoration Authority (Government Code §66704(e)(2)) to generate significantly greater funding than a flat parcel tax. The table below shows that a bond measure would generate two to five times the revenue of a flat \$9 parcel tax over the same geography. Structuring a measure in this manner distributes the tax more equitably, with owners of more highly assessed parcels paying a greater amount.

Additionally, this approach allows for large projects to be funded in a much shorter timeframe, providing the Restoration Authority greater flexibility in granting funds for large-scale projects.

	\$9 Parcel Tax	\$300 million Bond	\$300 million Bond	\$750 million Bond
Term	10 year	20 year	30 year	30 year
Regional Revenue	\$150 MM	\$300 MM	\$300 MM	\$750 MM
Cost to Voters*	\$9 per parcel	\$2.84 per \$100k	\$1.93 per \$100k	\$4.38 per \$100k

*Note: Annual Cost is illustrative and subject to revision.

It is worth noting in the chart above that doubling the term of the parcel tax would increase the total revenue to \$400 million. Unlike bonding options, however, it would not all come in at once. An initial legal review by and on behalf of Save The Bay of the ability for the Restoration Authority to pursue a regional bond measure is encouraging. Save The Bay's work to date has focused on addressing the following areas of inquiry:

- Evaluation and recommendations for legislative changes in 2015 to allow the Restoration Authority to move forward with a regional bond measure in 2016. Current thinking is that limited changes to existing statute are required. These would be focused on extension of sunsets and elimination or relaxation of the current cap on bonding authority (which limits bonded indebtedness of the Restoration Authority at any point in time to 10% of the previous year's revenue)
- Analysis of the Authority's ability, under its existing grant program structure, to use bond revenue to fund projects on land not owned by the Restoration Authority. Additional work is needed in this area, but research by Save The Bay to date indicates that use of bond funds financed by an ad valorem tax for restoration improvements (consistent with Article 13A of the Constitution and the Restoration Authority's statute) is allowable both on property owned by other public agencies and on private property.
- Research addressing use of bond funds to meet staffing and overhead expenses associated with administering the Restoration Authority's grant program, estimated to be less than \$600,000 annually. Bond counsel is poised to begin working to answer this and related technical questions with support from Save The Bay and other staff.

Analyses of Selected Revenue Measure Options

February 20, 2015

3

b. Higher Parcel Tax and Longer Duration

Another option that could accelerate generation of revenue and increase total receipts for Bay restoration is a higher parcel tax, a longer duration, or both. Since 2010, two voter research firms, Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) and EMC Research, have included varying parcel tax amounts and durations in their voter surveys regarding a possible Restoration Authority parcel tax measure. The table below summarizing survey results shows the strongest support for a \$9 measure, ambiguous results when comparing a \$9 measure to a \$14 measure and, though the information is now four and one half years old, a significant reduction in support for a \$25 measure. The same research showed that duration seems to have negligible effect on voter support.

Survey Firm/Date	Parcel Tax Rate	Duration	Total Yes
FM3-February 2014	\$9/year	10 years	68%
FM3-February 2014	\$9/year	20 years	68%
FM3-February 2014	\$14/year	10 years	63%
FM3-February 2014	\$14/year	20 years	68%
FM3-June 2013	\$10/year	Not specified	66%
EMC-May 2013	\$9/year	Not specified	65%
EMC-July 2011	\$10/year	Not specified	59%
FM3-August 2010	\$25/year	10 years	58%
FM3-August 2010	\$25/year	20 years	56%

Source: Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates

An additional indicator of voter response to varying tax amounts is that many participants in focus groups convened by EMC in May 2011 voiced support for a measure at \$10/year and marked weakening of support at \$20/year.

2. Impacts of Placing a Measure on Ballots in Less than the Entirety of the Nine Counties

The Restoration Authority has considered three principal configurations for a voting/taxing area encompassing fewer than all nine counties or only portions of counties. In response to direction from the Governing Board, the impacts of each on the vote count and the amount of revenue to be generated are summarized below. A brief discussion of collateral impacts follows that summary.

a. Excluding Napa and Solano Counties

Napa and Solano are the lowest polling counties, but together they only comprise 7% of likely voters. According to an analysis drawn from past voter surveys, exclusion of Napa and Solano Counties would result in the following changes to cumulative voter support:

Parcel Tax Amount	Duration	Yes Vote in Nine Counties	Yes Vote in Seven Counties
\$9/year	10 years	68%	69%
\$9/year	20 years	68%	69%
\$14/year	10 years	63%	64%
\$14/year	20 years	68%	68%

Analyses of Selected Revenue Measure Options

February 20, 2015

4

These changes in voter support fall within the margins of error for the voter surveys.

The exclusion of Napa and Solano Counties would result in a reduction of approximately 158,000 taxable parcels, lowering annual receipts on a \$9 regional parcel tax from approximately \$15,000,000 to approximately \$13,578,000.

b. Excluding Eastern Contra Costa County

Depending upon the specific delineation of the taxable geographic area, exclusion of the portion of Contra Costa County east of the hills would result in a reduction of approximately 242,609 taxable parcels, lowering annual receipts on a \$9 regional parcel tax from approximately \$15,000,000 to approximately \$12,816,549. According to EMC's 2011 poll (see also 2.c. below), respondents both in the entire county and in the portion east of the hills showed 56% support for the measure tested.

c. Excluding Areas Beyond the Bay Perimeter

EMC's 2011 poll was designed to test support for a ballot measure in the entirety of the nine counties with support in areas closest to the Bay—roughly bordering the Highway 101 and Interstate 80 corridors and extending north and south include only the largest population centers in Sonoma, Napa, Solano, and Santa Clara counties—called “Area B.” The full nine counties polled at 60%, with Area B at 62%, a difference that fell within the +/- 2.5% margin of error for that poll. In EMC's January 2014 poll, those respondents in Area B continued to show only a slightly higher level of support than those in the entirety of the nine counties. After their 2010 poll, staff asked FM3 to “rerun” their results along similar lines; this yielded similar results, i.e. within the margin of error of the poll.

d. Possible Collateral Impacts

Concerns about collateral impacts of placing a measure on ballots in less than the entirety of the nine counties have also been noted by the Governing Board, consultants assisting with development of a ballot measure, and by Save The Bay. These collateral impacts on prospects for passage could include degrading the concept of a revenue measure being a regional solution to the regional need for Bay restoration; raising the issue of taxing low-income urban communities ringing the Bay (e.g., Richmond) while sparing wealthier outlying communities (e.g., Orinda and Walnut Creek); and significantly increasing the complexity and cost of delineating and monitoring voting and taxation areas. In the event that Napa County, Solano County, and/or eastern Contra Costa County were excluded, some important shoreline restoration projects (outside the Delta Primary Zone) would also likely need to be removed from the Restoration Authority's project list.

3. New Approach to Determining Passage and Allocating Funds

At the December 10, 2015 Governing Board meeting, a new alternative for determining measure passage and allocation of revenue was proposed by Director Sutter and discussed. Under this alternative, votes would be calculated by county, with only those counties passing the measure

Analyses of Selected Revenue Measure Options

February 20, 2015

5

being eligible for project funding from revenue-measure receipts, and at least six counties would need to pass the measure for it to become effective. The intent of this alternative is to neutralize the impact of less robust support in Napa and Solano Counties, while striving to retain the regional concept of the measure. Based upon early advice to the Restoration Authority from outside counsel, passage of a measure could be calculated either county-by-county or cumulatively. The polling discussed in 2.a. above suggests that using a county-by-county approach to determining passage of a measure would not provide a significant advantage over a cumulative approach. Disadvantages of this new alternative could include confusing voters due to the increased complexity of the measure, some degradation of the regional nature of the measure, and increased costs of communicating with voters due to variations in the assigned letter and title of the measure. Additional research would be needed to determine if the legislation enacted in 2014 to reduce ballot measure costs would apply if this new alternative were pursued.

4. Potential for the Restoration Authority to Participate in an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District

A state law which became effective January 1, 2015 (SB 628 Beall) provides a new public-infrastructure-financing tool known as “Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts” (EIFDs). Staff has explored the new law for possible relevance to the Restoration Authority.

Under the new legislation, cities and counties can form EIFDs and then finance a wide range of infrastructure projects, using revenue-raising measures including issuance of general obligation bonds. Issuance of bonds is subject to 55% approval of a bond measure. Prohibited uses of funds raised pursuant to an EIFD include operation and maintenance and services of any kind.

While EIFDs hold promise for cities and counties, a preliminary review of the new law finds that, absent amendment, the Restoration Authority may not be eligible to form or join an EIFD. Further investigation would be needed to determine whether it would be advantageous for the Restoration Authority to participate in a local agency EIFD in another manner, such as through a joint powers agreement, and whether interest would exist among local agencies for such an arrangement.

Blank Page



Date: February 19, 2015

To: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

From: Ted Lempert
Chair

Subject: **Legislative Activities in 2015 – Action Item**

Following the decision of the Governing Board not to move forward with a 2014 regional restoration funding measure, staff have begun early planning consistent with this Board's direction around a possible measure in 2016.

In that process, Save The Bay has identified several modifications to the Authority's existing enabling statute (Govt. Code §66700 et seq.) that would provide clarification or other necessary changes as the Board plans for a future regional measure.

Planned Changes to Statute

1. Extension of Sunset – Current statute establishes a repeal (sunset) date of January 2029 for the Authority. Absent an extension of the sunset date, the Authority would be unable to propose a revenue measure in 2016 with a term of more than 12 years. An extension of the sunset to 2049 would allow the Authority to propose a 30 year measure, and provide an additional 2 years of operations following expiration.
2. Governing Board – Government Code section 1090 prohibits an individual from simultaneously serving in two offices when there is a potential conflict of interest except when there is clear statutory authority allowing an individual to do so. The current statute explicitly allows six elected officials to serve both as a councilmember/supervisor/district board member and as a member of the Governing Board. The current statute does not explicitly allow an elected official to serve as the Chair of the Governing Board. The statute will be amended to explicitly allow an elected to serve as the chair and remove this disparity.
3. Ballot Access – Legislation in 2013 provided the Authority with one-time reduced cost access to the regional ballot. That provision expires in 2016 unless it is extended, regardless of whether the Authority moves forward with a measure.

Legislative Activities in 2015

February 19, 2015

2

4. Bonding Limit – Current statute limits the Authority’s total amount of bonded indebtedness at any one time to 10% of total revenues in the previous fiscal year. This functionally eliminates the Authority’s ability to use bonding authority to fund projects. Proposed amendments would eliminate the 10% cap, and rely on the existing statutory limit in place (Resources Code 5790) of 5% of regional assessed value.

Recommendation

No additional action by the Governing Board is needed at this time.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY
DRAFT SCHEDULE OF TASKS, GOVERNING BOARD DECISIONS & DEADLINES THROUGH CY 2015 (11-25-14)

NOTES: 1. EXCLUDES CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES 2. INCLUDES TASKS FOR GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS (GB), STAFF (S) AND SAVE THE BAY (STB) 3. ALL TASKS WILL BE UNDERTAKEN IN CLOSE CONSULTATION WITH INTERESTED PARTIES

TOPIC	QUARTER AND CALENDAR YEAR				
	Q4 2014 <i>(Governing Board Mtg.: Dec. 10)</i>	Q1 2015 <i>(Governing Board Mtg.: Feb. 25)</i>	Q2 2015 <i>(Governing Board Mtgs.: Apr. 22 & June 24)</i>	Q3 2015 <i>(Governing Board Mtg: Sept. 16)</i>	Q4 2015 <i>(Governing Board Mtg: Nov. 18)</i>
FUNDRAISING - Co. ballot costs - Polling - Ballot advisors - Filing fees	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Determine amounts of cash or commitments needed, set deadlines for ballot-cost- and filing-fee-funding, refine fundraising strategy, identify roles & expectations, prepare support materials. (GB, S, STB) Identify key potential funding sources. Deadlines Key potential funding sources should be identified prior to Jan. 14 Baylands Steering Cmte. meeting.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Identify additional key potential funding sources. (GB, S, STB) Implement fundraising strategy and report on progress. If needed, make changes in strategy.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Implement fundraising strategy and report on progress. If needed, make changes in strategy. If SFBRA is to conduct Aug. polling, then by June 1 , any funds needed for Aug. polling must be in SFBRA account or available from another source.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Implement fundraising strategy and report on progress. If needed, make changes in strategy.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Implement fundraising strategy and report on progress. If needed, make changes in strategy. Nov. 18: Determine whether results of fundraising for ballot costs enables continuing to work toward Nov. 2016 ballot measure. By Nov. 1 , commitments of funding to cover ballot costs must be in hand to help GB evaluate whether to continue work toward a November 2016 ballot measure.
POLLING - Benchmark - Tracking	Tasks (S) With assistance of outside counsel, evaluate feasibility of tiered parcel tax and prepare memo. (S) Prepare summary of ballot measure options considered to date, along with reasons that flat parcel tax rose to top Deadlines Analysis of legal and other feasibility factors associated with tiered parcel tax should be completed prior to Jan. 14 Baylands Steering Cmte. meeting.	Tasks (S) If needed, obtain consultant assistance for evaluating bond measure concept and refining legislation. Feb. 25: Confirm or revise major terms of ballot measure and ID any terms requiring further investigation.	Tasks (STB) Report on March poll. (GB, S, STB) Consider number, timeframe, scope and responsibility for future polling. If SFBRA is to conduct Aug. 2015 poll: April 22: Direct staff regarding scope of Aug. poll & authorize staff to seek polling consultants. June 24: Select polling consultant for Aug. poll, authorize expenditure of funds for poll, and identify GB contact(s) for finalizing poll.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Conduct poll, analyze results, and report to GB. Sept. 16: Determine whether results of Aug. poll support continuing to work toward 2016 ballot measure. The results and analysis of the Aug. poll are needed by Sept. 1 to enable the GB to consider them at its Sept. 16 meeting.	Tasks (S) With assistance of outside counsel, evaluate feasibility of tiered parcel tax and prepare memo. (S) Prepare summary of ballot measure options considered to date, along with reasons that flat parcel tax rose to top Deadlines Analysis of legal and other feasibility factors associated with tiered parcel tax should be completed prior to Jan. 14 Baylands Steering Cmte. meeting.
REVENUE MEASURE -Revenue-raising mechanism -Expenditure plan -Resolutions	Tasks (S) With assistance of outside counsel, evaluate feasibility of tiered parcel tax and prepare memo. (S) Prepare summary of ballot measure options considered to date, along with reasons that flat parcel tax rose to top Deadlines Analysis of legal and other feasibility factors associated with tiered parcel tax should be completed prior to Jan. 14 Baylands Steering Cmte. meeting.	Tasks (S) If needed, obtain consultant assistance for evaluating bond measure concept and refining legislation. Feb. 25: Confirm or revise major terms of ballot measure and ID any terms requiring further investigation.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Review bonding options & revenue projections. (GB, S, STB) Based upon feedback from fundraising and outreach, and to comport with a bond measure, consider whether revisions to the Draft Expenditure Plan or list of potentially eligible projects are needed. If needed, devise and implement a process for making such revisions. (GB, S, STB) Evaluate pros and cons of June Nov. 2016 ballot. April 22: Confirm or revise major terms of ballot measure and ID any terms requiring further investigation. April 22: If revisions are needed per above, direct staff regarding objectives and process for making them. Apr. 22: Give direction regarding any bonding-related leg. June 24: Make preliminary selection of June or Nov. 2016 ballot.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) If needed, implement a process for revising the Draft Expenditure Plan or list of potentially eligible projects. (STB) Pursue bonding-related legislation.	Tasks (S, STB) Pursue bill to extend SB279. (S, STB) Develop & provide the GB a schedule and strategy for sustaining prior agreements with Counties and adjusting to any pertinent new developments. Apr. 22: Direct staff to implement strategy for sustaining prior agreements with Counties and adjusting to any pertinent new developments.
BALLOT ACCESS -Coordination among counties -SFBRA relations with each county -County election charges	Tasks (STB) Seek legislation to extend SB279. Identify bill authors. Per tentative leg. calendar: Jan. 30 is last day to submit bill requests to the Leg. Counsel.	Tasks (STB) Ensure that bill to extend SB279 is introduced. Per tentative leg. calendar: Feb. 27 is last day for bills to be introduced.	Tasks (STB) Pursue bill to extend SB279. (S, STB) Develop & provide the GB a schedule and strategy for sustaining prior agreements with Counties and adjusting to any pertinent new developments. Apr. 22: Direct staff to implement strategy for sustaining prior agreements with Counties and adjusting to any pertinent new developments.	Tasks (S, STB) Implement strategy for sustaining prior agreements with Counties and adjusting to any pertinent new developments (e.g., change in parcel tax structure or in registrars). (STB) Pursue bill to extend SB279.	Tasks (S, STB) Implement strategy for sustaining prior agreements with Counties and adjusting to any pertinent new developments (e.g., change in parcel tax structure or in registrars). (STB) Pursue bill to extend SB279.
OUTREACH, EDUCATION & COMMUNICATION	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Identify key leaders & clarify who is responsible for contacting and reporting on responses. (GB,S) Update Advisory Cmte. (GB, S, STB) In consultation with Advisory Cmte., develop strategy for benefitting from Advisory Cmte. in 2015. Deadlines Key leaders should be identified prior to Jan. 14 Baylands Steering Cmte. meeting.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Identify Key leaders & clarify who is responsible for contacting and reporting on responses. (GB, S, STB) Contact key leaders and report on responses, (GB,S) Update Advisory Cmte. & have GB/Adv. Cmte. meetings back-to-back on Feb. 25. (GB, S, STB) Refine strategy for benefitting from Advisory Cmte. during CY 2015 and submit for GB consideration.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Contact key leaders and report on responses. (GB,S) Update Advisory Cmte. & deploy for outreach and feedback. Apr. 22: Direct staff to implement strategy for benefitting from Advisory Cmte. in CY 2015.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Contact key leaders and report on responses. (GB,S) Update Advisory Cmte. & deploy for outreach and feedback.	Tasks (GB, S, STB) Contact key leaders and report on responses; report on feedback from Advisory Cmte. outreach. (GB,S) Update Advisory Cmte. Nov. 18: Determine whether support by key leaders and others warrants continuing work toward a 2016 ballot measure.
ADMINISTRATION	Tasks (STB) Seek legislation to extend sunset date of SFBRA and modify eligibility criteria for Chair. Identify bill authors. Per tentative leg. calendar: Jan. 30 is last day to submit bill requests to the Leg. Counsel.	Tasks (STB) Ensure that legislation to extend sunset date of SFBRA and modify eligibility criteria for Chair is introduced. Per tentative leg. schedule: Feb. 27 is last day for bills to be introduced.	Tasks (GB, S) Revisit the viability of administering SFBRA via a JPA entered into just prior to 2016 election. If needed, craft and pursue an alternative to be put in place prior to adoption of ballot measure resolutions.	Tasks (STB) Pursue legislation to extend sunset date of SFBRA and modify eligibility criteria for Chair. (S) Prepare and post financial statement for FY14/15. (GB, S, STB) Review post-enactment administrative needs and confirm or modify strategy to meet those needs (e.g., JPA). Sept. 16: Approve financial statement for FY 14/15.	Tasks (STB) Pursue legislation to extend sunset date of SFBRA and modify eligibility criteria for Chair. (S) Prepare and post financial statement for FY14/15. (GB, S, STB) Review post-enactment administrative needs and confirm or modify strategy to meet those needs (e.g., JPA). Sept. 16: Approve financial statement for FY 14/15.

Blank Page



Date: February 20, 2015

To: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

From: Amy Hutzell
Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program
State Coastal Conservancy

Subject: **Appointment to the Advisory Committee**

After consulting with Vice-Mayor Foust and Supervisor Gioia, who have advised the Governing Board about past appointments to the Advisory Committee, staff is recommending that the Governing Board appoint a replacement for the departing representative of the Bay Area Flood Protection Agencies Association (BAFPAA). Mitch Avalon (Contra Costa County Public Works Department, retired) is leaving the Advisory Committee, as he has been replaced in his role with BAFPAA by Roger Leventhal (Marin County Public Works Department). BAFPAA represents an important group of stakeholders whose interests are integral with Bay wetlands and rising sea level.

The following is a brief biography for Mr. Leventhal:

Roger Leventhal, P.E. is a Senior Engineer with the Marin County Public Works Flood Control Division. He is currently working on planning and design studies for sea level rise along the Eastern Marin shoreline and at the Stinson Beach area; both locations being among the most vulnerable to sea level rise flooding around the bay. He has a MS from U.C. Berkeley in Hydraulics and Coastal Engineering and worked for over 20 years as a private engineering consultant specializing in hydrology/hydraulic analysis and creek/ tidal wetlands restoration prior to coming to Marin County in 2011. He has helped design and build innovative projects that use natural systems to provide flood protection with habitat; especially the beneficial reuse of dredged sediments in tidal wetlands and coarse-grained bay beach systems to combat wind-wave erosion.

He is working closely with County planning staff and others to develop sea level rise adaptation alternatives that use both these “soft” engineering approaches to flood protection, such as wetlands and beaches, with the need to protect the urban edge with more traditional “hard” engineering measures.

Appointment to the Advisory Committee

February 20, 2015

2

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the appointment of Roger Leventhal, Senior Engineer, Marin County Public Works Flood Control Division, to the Advisory Committee of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority.



Date: February 20, 2015

To: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

From: Karen McDowell
San Francisco Estuary Partnership

Subject: **Set Date and Time for September 2015 Governing Board Meeting**

A conflict has developed for several Governing Board members and staff for the September 16th meeting. Staff has proposed a new set of dates for the meeting.

Potential dates for September 2015 Governing Board Meeting:

- 1) Tuesday, September 8th, 10 AM- 12 PM
- 2) Wednesday, September 9th, 10 AM – 12 PM
- 3 & 4) Monday, September 21st, 10 AM – 12 PM or 1 PM – 3 PM
- 5 & 6) Tuesday, September 22nd, 10 AM – 12 PM or 1 PM – 3 PM
- 7 & 8) Thursday, September 24th, 10 AM – 12 PM or 1 PM – 3 PM
- 9 & 10) Friday, September 25th, 10 AM – 12 PM or 1 PM – 3 PM
- 11) Monday, September 28st, 10 AM – 12 PM

Recommendation

Select a date and time from the list above for the September 2015 Governing Board Meeting.

Blank Page