

# AGENDA

## Legislative Committee

The next meeting of the Legislative Committee will be as follows.

***PLEASE NOTE THAT WE WILL BE MEETING AT 5:30 P.M.***

***in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium***

**Date:** Thursday, March 13, 2014 - 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.  
**Place:** San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>  
 1250 San Carlos Avenue  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium**  
 San Carlos, California

PLEASE CALL Jean Higaki (599-1462) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

1	Public comment on related items not on the agenda.	Presentations are limited to 3 Minutes	
2	Approval of Minutes from February 13, 2014	Action (Gordon)	Pages 1 - 3
3	Update from Advocation & Shaw/Yoder/Antwih	Oral Presentation (Advocation & Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)	Verbal
4	Update on Stormwater Funding Initiative Enabling Legislation (AB 418)	Information (Matt Fabry)	Verbal
5	Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified)	Action (Gordon)	Pages 4 - 14
6	Recommend that the C/CAG Board consider an action regarding the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority's (SFBRA) mission to restore, enhance, and protect the wetlands and wildlife habitat in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline; and request that SFBRA staff coordinates messaging and outreach efforts	Action (Gordon)	Page 15 - 21
7	Adjournment	Action (Gordon)	

**NOTE:** All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

<sup>1</sup>From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES  
February 13, 2014**

At 5:35 P.M. Member Gordon called the Legislative Committee meeting to order in the Second Floor Auditorium at the San Mateo Transit District Office.

**Committee Members Attending:**

Irene O'Connell (City of San Bruno)  
Deborah Gordon (Town of Woodside)  
Art Kiesel (City of Foster City)  
Mary Ann Nihart (City of Pacifica)  
Karen Ervin (City of Pacifica)

**Guests or Staff Attending:**

Andrew Antwih, Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc.  
Matt Robinson, Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc.  
Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Wally Abrazaldo, C/CAG Staff  
Jim Bigelow, Redwood City Chamber of Commerce

**1. Public comment on related items not on the agenda.**

None

**2. Approval of Minutes from December 12, 2013.**

Member O'Connell moved and member Kiesel seconded approval of the December 12, 2013 minutes. Motioned passed unanimously.

**3. Update from Advocation & Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih.**

Andrew Antwih and Matt Robinson from Shaw/Yoder/Antwih provided a verbal and written update of legislative issues from Sacramento. Some of the topics covered included the following:

A number of the 2013 bills on the C/CAG watch list were 2 year bills that fell to the wayside. If authors want to move forward with the bills they have to reintroduce the bills by 2/21/14. This is the deadline for new bill introductions. About a thousand bills are expected to be introduced next week. Andrew and Matt will have a better idea of the bills of interest to C/CAG in the next couple of weeks.

The Governor's budget proposal was on introduced on January 8 and was well received. If the

legislature approves the proposal there will be a ballot initiative to increase the rainy day fund. Surplus revenues are expected and estimates are conservative. The Budget expects to appropriate about \$850 mil in Cap and Trade dollars this year. Member Gordon asked about the methodology CARB uses in calculating the projections for Cap and Trade but it appears not easy to obtain from CARB. Cap and Trade main expenditure categories include:

- Strategic Growth Council for implementing SB375 and Sustainable Communities Strategies projects.
- Air Resources Board (ARB) for low carbon cargo, passenger, and freight projects.
- Rail modernization and High Speed Rail projects
- Natural Resource Protection projects
- Energy Efficiency projects

The Governor's budget proposal also includes a kind of replacement for redevelopment by revamping the Infrastructure Financing Districts (IFD) structure. There has been mixed support from the Cities and a lot of critique of the proposal. The proposal would lower the vote threshold to 55% and expand the type of projects that the IFD can fund but there are many strings attached. Member Gordon asked that this issue be presented in detail to the whole C/CAG Board. Several members would like to know the difference from what Cities can already do now with tax increment financing.

Other budget items include appropriation of the remaining \$160 mil Prop 1B funds for inner city rail, \$800 mil for State Transit Assistance (STA) transit projects, a \$351 mil loan repayment for local streets and roads, highway repair projects, ATP, and \$618 mil for water action planning and the Integrated Regional Water Management Program (IRWMP).

On February 5<sup>th</sup>, the State Transportation Agency Secretary's infrastructures priorities working group released a report titled, "California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities: Vision and Interim Recommendations." This report highlights priorities in the areas of rail modernization, fix it first, and active transportation programs (ATP). Longer term recommendations included seeking to lower thresholds for local taxes, using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fee in lieu of gas tax, and a re-examination of the state transportation improvement program (STIP).

The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), also released a report of an external review of Caltrans conducted by the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI). This report examined a restructuring of Caltrans and the STIP process. Both reports will be distributed to the legislative committee.

#### **4. Update on Stormwater Funding Initiative Enabling Legislation (AB 418) and other related potential funding initiatives.**

Matt Robinson reported that AB 418 has been heard at the Senate Governance and Finance Committee and passed with a vote of 5-1. The next stop is the Senate floor, which will require a 2/3 vote approval due to the urgency clause. He is confident that the vote can pass. From there it moves to the Assembly Policy Committee and then the Assembly floor. He estimates the best case is passage at the end of May or early June and worst case is passage by July or August.

AB 418 was amended to include the recommended “watershed” terminology as well as some clarification from Senate Governance and Finance Committee that this bill is specific to C/CAG only. Organizations in opposition include Howard Jarvis and CalTAX. Assembly member Mullin is also planning to introduce a bill that will give all Joint Powers Agencies (JPA) taxing authorities identical to the entities that make up the JPA e.g. Cities and County.

Member Ervin asked if there were concerns about the water bond that will be on the ballot. It is hoped that the AB 418 will be out ahead of the water bond on the ballot.

Water bond related AB 1331 SB 848 both contain a storm water component. Senator Steinberg is trying to amend SB 731 to include streamlining for drought projects. Matt Fabry is looking at some proposed water bond language to see if there is a way to make it more competitive for C/CAG.

Matt Fabry reported that he has not received support letters from all of the jurisdictions and he continues to ask that support letters be submitted. He is concerned that some jurisdictions may not submit a support letter and that there is a need to identify any issues that individual jurisdictions may have regarding moving forward with an actual funding initiative.

Matt Fabry also mentioned that the water bond issue may not be that much of a concern as local initiatives tend to fare better among voters than statewide initiatives. However, there is a concern regarding the SF Bay Restoration Authority who might submit a competing initiative with similar messaging as C/CAG’s message for safe clean water. Member Nihart is not sure if the SF Bay Restoration Authority is in a position politically and/ or financially to make a November ballot initiative.

**5. Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified).**

The Legislative Committee did not take an action at this time. It was decided to wait until after the 2/21/14 deadline for new bill introductions and upon further development of legislation.

**6. Review and recommend approval of the Draft C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2014**

Member O’Connell moved and member Kiesel seconded approval of the Draft C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2014. Motioned passed unanimously.

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting informally adjourned at approximately 6:15 P.M.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** March 13, 2014  
**To:** C/CAG Legislative Committee  
**From:** Sandy Wong, Executive Director  
**Subject:** Review and recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified)

(For further information or questions contact Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee recommend the C/CAG Board to take a position on any legislation or direct staff to monitor any legislation for future positions to be taken.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Unknown.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

NA.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from the C/CAG's State legislative advocates. Status of the active 2-year bills being tracked by the Legislative Committee is included in the attached report

February 21, 2014 was the deadline to introduce new bills to the State Legislature. Approximately 1,930 bills were introduced. The C/CAG Legislative advocates were tasked with identifying bills which may be of interest to C/CAG.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- March 13, 2014 State Legislative Update from Shaw Yoder Antwih
- C/CAG Bill Matrix (revised March 4, 2014)
- Full Legislative information is available for specific bill at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>



ADVOCATION



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, *inc.*  
LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

**March 13, 2014**

**TO:** Board Members, City/County Association of Governments, San Mateo County  
**FROM:** Matt Robinson and Andrew Antwih, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.  
Chuck Cole, Advocation, Inc.

**RE:** STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – March 2014

---

**Legislative Update**

February 21 marked the last day for members of the Legislature to introduce bills for consideration in 2014. Since the beginning of the year, 1,930 bills were submitted in total by both houses of the Legislature. Beginning in late March, policy committees will begin hearing both new bills and bills introduced in 2013 that moved out of the house of origin (two-year bills). We have provided C/CAG with a list of bills we are currently tracking reflecting. The Legislature will break for Spring Recess on April 10, reconvening on April 21.

As we reported to the Legislative Committee last month, the Governor is proposing \$850 million be appropriated from Cap and Trade auction revenues in 2014-15 for various programs, including \$100 million for sustainable communities strategies. On February 12, the Governor released proposed language for the budget trailer bill and it is in line with what we reported last month, specifically that money will be appropriated to the Strategic Growth Council to administer the Sustainable Communities Implementation Program, a competitive grant program in which local and regional entities would submit eligible projects to the Council for funding. Eligible projects include affordable housing, transit capital, active transportation, transit-oriented development, agricultural land preservation, and sustainable communities planning. The Bay Area Congestion Management Agency Association (of which C/CAG is a member) submitted a letter of support for the Governor's expenditure of Cap and Trade revenues, but called for a more regionalized approach to the distribution of funds, additional eligible uses, as well as additional funding for the program. We will continue to advocate on C/CAG's behalf regarding the use of Cap and Trade funds in coordination with other congestion management agencies.

As mentioned above, we are actively monitoring a number of bills for C/CAG. However, none more important than AB 418 (Mullin) which would clarify C/CAG's authority to submit a special tax or property-related fee to the voters for stormwater management programs. AB 418, which requires a two-thirds vote due to the bill's urgency clause.

We are happy to report that this bill passed off the Senate Floor by a vote of 27-8 on February 20! The bill now heads to the Assembly where it will be heard in the Assembly Local Government Committee in early April.

Also at last month's meeting, members of the Legislative Committee expressed interest in the Governor's Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) proposal. Details of the proposal are not in print yet, but will likely make their way into a budget trailer bill later this year. In the meantime, we have held the first of several meetings with administration staff to get a better understanding of the Governor's proposal which would lower the voter-threshold for the formation of an IFD from two-thirds to 55 percent, as well as expand the types of projects that can be financed through an IFD. The Governor's proposal would require a local government entity seeking to

utilize the lower voter-threshold and fund the newly eligible projects to have resolved all outstanding issues with the state surrounding the dissolution of a former redevelopment area.

AB 471 (Atkins) [Chapter 1, Statutes of 2014], signed by the Governor on February 18, allows an IFD to overlap with a former redevelopment area. The Governor proposed to allow the overlap as part of his IFD program when the budget was released in January. We will provide an overview of existing IFD law, as well as the Governor's proposal, at C/CAG's May Board meeting.

Finally, both water bonds continue to move through the Legislative process. SB 848 (Wolk) passed the Senate Governance and Finance Committee on February 26 and AB 1331 is scheduled to be heard in Senate Natural Resources and Water on March 25. We continue to work with staff to ensure that C/CAG is positioned to receive funding for stormwater management and permit compliance.

In addition to the two water bonds mentioned above, the Governor signed a package of bills to provide \$687 million for drought relief programs throughout the state, of which \$472.5 million is appropriated for integrated regional water management grants.

The legislation had broad, bipartisan support:

**SB 103** passed 34-2 in the Senate and 64-3 in the Assembly.

**SB 104** passed 33-3 in the Senate and 68-1 in the Assembly.

The two bills provide funding to support drought relief, including money for housing and food for workers directly impacted by the drought, bond funds for projects to help local communities more efficiently capture and manage water and funding for securing emergency drinking water supplies for drought-impacted communities.

In addition, the legislation increases funding for state and local conservation corps to assist communities with efficiency upgrades and reduce fire fuels in fire risk areas, and includes \$1 million for the Save Our Water public awareness campaign – which will enhance its mission to inform Californians how they can do their part to conserve water.

### **Bills of Interest**

#### **AB 418 (Mullin)**

**Summary:** This bill would enable San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) to put a special tax or property related fee before the voters for stormwater management activities consistent with C/CAG's joint powers agreement. Any action must be consistent with the California Constitution. **C/CAG is the sponsor of this bill.**

**Status:** This bill passed the Senate Floor on February 20 by a vote of 27-8. The bill is now in the Assembly Local Government Committee and will be heard in early April.

#### **AB 2170 (Mullin)**

**Summary:** This bill would clarify that parties to a Joint Powers Agreement may exercise any power common to the contracting parties, including, the authority to levy a fee or tax.

**Status:** This bill is eligible to be heard in committee on March 23.

**AB 2194 (Mullin)**

**Summary:** This bill would amend the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act to allow a community facilities district to finance stormwater management, including compliance with state and federal stormwater permit requirements.

**Status:** This bill is eligible to be heard in committee on March 23.

**AB 2403 (Rendon)**

**Summary:** This bill would change the definition of “water” under the Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act to include recycled water and stormwater intended for water service. The Act defines terms used in Articles XIIC and XIID of the Constitution.

**Status:** This bill is eligible to be heard in committee on March 25.

**SB 391 (DeSaulnier)**

**Summary:** This bill would impose a fee, beginning January 1, 2014, of \$75 on every real estate instrument, paper, or notice that is required or permitted by law, excluding real estate instruments, papers, or notices recorded in connection with a transfer subject to a documentary transfer tax. Revenue from this fee would be used to fund projects and programs that support the development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, emergency shelters and rapid rehousing services, among other identified, related projects.

**Status:** Assembly Appropriations Suspense File. This bill may still be moved.

**SB 556 (Corbett)**

**Summary:** This bill would prohibit a person, firm, corporation, or association that is a nongovernmental entity and contracts to perform labor or services relating to public health or safety for a public entity from displaying on a vehicle or uniform a logo that reasonably could be interpreted as implying that the labor or services are being provided by employees of the public agency, unless the vehicle or uniform conspicuously displays a disclosure.

**Background:** According to the author and proponents, public agencies are routinely hiring third party intermediaries, such as labor contractors or temporary staffing agencies. Arrangements that they argue, separate the company at the top from the workers at the bottom, thus shielding the public agency from liability. They argue that subcontracting has implications for consumers and the public because many times consumers don't even know what entity they are actually doing business with, or who is in charge if something goes wrong. In addition, they argue that when workers enter a home or have access to personal information; the consumer should have the right to know if the worker is a city employee, a known company employee, a temporary or contracted out employee, or an independent contractor.

Opponents argue that SB 556 undercuts the primary reason for entering into independent contracting relationships by shifting liability to a public agency. The League of Cities writes that “many public agencies that contract for services specify uniform requirements in their written contracts with a service provider. These uniform requirements are oftentimes done for the purpose of ensuring the public knows who the contractor is serving and for identifying regional operations during a major disaster or mutual aid request from the public agency.”

The bill was last amended on September 4<sup>th</sup> 2013 to further narrow the bill so that their proposed notice requirements would only apply to health and public safety services that are contracted out by a public agency. Despite the latest amendments, many public agencies around the state remained opposed to the bill.

**Status:** Assembly Floor Inactive File. This bill may still be moved.



**SB 731 (Steinberg)**

**Summary:** This bill would provide that aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project, on an infill site, within a transit priority area, shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment. The bill would require the Office of Planning and Research to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, and the secretary to certify and adopt, revisions to the guidelines for the implementation of CEQA establishing thresholds of significance for noise and transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas

**Status:** Assembly Local Government Committee

**SB 1156 (Steinberg)**

**Summary:** Under the Cap and Trade program, the manufacturers of transportation fuels are required to begin purchasing GHG emissions allowances on January 1, 2015. The revenues from the sale of these emissions would be available for the state for programs that reduce GHG emissions. This bill would remove transportation fuels from the Cap and Trade program, and instead impose a carbon tax on suppliers of fossil fuels to be deposited in the Carbon Tax Revenue Special Fund to be rebated to taxpayers. While there is no mention of mass transportation funding in the current version of the bill, Senator Steinberg has stated his intention to provide a third of the revenues collected to mass transportation.

**Status:** This bill is eligible to be heard in committee on March 23.

# C/CAG Priority Bill Matrix as of 3/4/2014

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#">AB 418</a> <a href="#">Mullin</a> D  Local government: special tax, assessment, or property-related fee.	ASSEMBLY L. GOV. 2/24/2014 - Re-referred to Com. on L. GOV. pursuant to Assembly Rule 77.2.	Existing law, until January 1, 2013, authorized the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County to impose a fee of up to \$4 on motor vehicles registered within San Mateo County for a program for the management of traffic congestion and stormwater pollution within that county.  This bill would authorize the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, in accordance with specified provisions of the California Constitution, to impose a parcel tax or a property-related fee for the purpose of implementing stormwater management programs, as prescribed. This bill contains other related provisions.  <b>Last Amended on 2/10/2014</b>	Sponsor
<a href="#">AB 471</a> <a href="#">Atkins</a> D  Local government: redevelopment: successor agencies to redevelopment agencies.	ASSEMBLY CHAPT ERD 2/18/2014 - Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 1, Statutes of 2014	Existing law authorizes the creation of infrastructure financing districts, as defined, for the sole purpose of financing public facilities, subject to adoption of a resolution by the legislative body and affected taxing entities proposed to be subject to the division of taxes and voter approval requirements. Existing law prohibits an infrastructure financing district from including any portion of a redevelopment project area.  This bill would delete that prohibition and would authorize a district to finance a project or portion of a project that is located in, or overlaps with, a redevelopment project area or former redevelopment project area, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.  <b>Last Amended on 1/29/2014</b>	
<a href="#">AB 1331</a> <a href="#">Rendon</a> D  Clean and Safe Drinking Water Act of 2014.	SENATE N.R. & W. 1/7/2014 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on N.R. & W.  3/25/2014 9:30 a.m. - Room 112 SENATE NATUR AL RESOURCES AND WATER, PAVLEY, Chair	Existing law, the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012, if approved by the voters, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$11,140,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance a safe drinking water and water supply reliability program. Existing law provides for the submission of the bond act to the voters at the November 4, 2014, statewide general election. This bill would repeal these provisions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. Last Amended on 1/7/2014	

# C/CAG Priority Bill Matrix as of 3/4/2014

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#">AB 1937</a> <a href="#">Gordon</a> D  Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 2011: emergency response standards.	ASSEMBLY U. & C. 3/3/2014 - Referred to Com. on U. & C.	Existing federal law requires the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) within the United States Department of Transportation, to adopt minimum safety standards for pipeline transportation and for pipeline facilities, including an interstate gas pipeline facility and intrastate gas pipeline facility, as defined. Existing law authorizes the United States Secretary of Transportation to prescribe or enforce safety standards and practices for an intrastate pipeline facility or intrastate pipeline transportation to the extent that the safety standards and practices are regulated by a state authority that submits to the secretary annually a certification for the facilities and transportation. Existing law authorizes a state authority that has submitted a current certification to adopt additional or more stringent safety standards for intrastate pipeline facilities and intrastate pipeline transportation only if those standards are compatible with the minimum standards prescribed by the PHMSA. This bill would delete the requirement that the commission report to the Legislature on the status of establishing the compatible emergency response standards on or before January 1, 2013. This bill contains other existing laws.	
<a href="#">AB 2090</a> <a href="#">Fong</a> D  High-occupancy toll lanes: Santa Clara County.	ASSEMBLY TRANS. 3/3/2014 - Referred to Com. on TRANS.	Existing law authorizes the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to conduct, administer, and operate high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, under which single-occupancy vehicles may use high-occupancy vehicle lanes by paying a toll, on 2 state highway corridors within the county. Existing law requires that implementation of the HOT lanes ensure that specified levels of service, described as Level of Service C or D, as specified, be maintained at all times in the high-occupancy lanes and that unrestricted access to the lanes by high-occupancy vehicles be available at all times. This bill would delete the reference to Level of Service C or D, and instead would require VTA to establish, with the assistance of the Department of Transportation, appropriate performance measures, such as speed or travel times, for the purpose of ensuring optimal use of the HOT lanes by high-occupancy vehicles without adversely affecting other traffic on the state highway system. The bill would provide for high-occupancy vehicles to have access to the lanes at all times rather than unrestricted access as under existing law.	
<a href="#">AB 2170</a> <a href="#">Mullin</a> D  Joint powers authorities: common powers.	ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/21/2014 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.	Existing law provides that 2 or more public agencies, by agreement, may form a joint powers authority to exercise any power common to the contracting parties, as specified. This bill would provide that the parties to the agreement may exercise any power common to the contracting parties, including, but not limited to, the authority to levy a fee or tax, as specified.	Watch
<a href="#">AB 2194</a> <a href="#">Mullin</a> D  Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982.	ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/21/2014 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.	The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 authorizes a community facilities district to finance various services, including, but not limited to, flood and storm protection services, as specified. This bill would additionally authorize the financing of storm water management.	Watch
<a href="#">AB 2250</a> <a href="#">Daly</a> D  Toll facilities: revenues.	ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/24/2014 - Read first time.	Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law authorizes tolls to be imposed on certain facilities that are part of the state highway system, including toll roads, toll bridges, and high-occupancy toll lanes. Existing law, in certain cases, provides for the toll facilities to be administered by local agencies. This bill would require the department, when adopting statewide policies for toll facilities on the state highway system, to ensure that a majority of the toll revenues generated from toll facilities on the state highway system that are administered by local agencies remain available for expenditure by those local agencies.	

# C/CAG Priority Bill Matrix as of 3/4/2014

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#">AB 2403</a> <a href="#">Rendon</a> D  Local government: assessments, fees, and charges.	ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/24/2014 - Read first time.	Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution generally require that assessments, fees, and charges be submitted to property owners for approval or rejection after the provision of written notice and the holding of a public hearing. Existing law, the Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act, prescribes specific procedures and parameters for local jurisdictions to comply with Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution and defines various terms for these purposes. This bill would modify the definition of water to specifically include recycled water and stormwater intended for water service. This bill would also make legislative findings and declarations in this regard.	Watch
<a href="#">SB 1</a> <a href="#">Steinberg</a> D  Sustainable Communities Investment Authority.	SENATE 2 YEAR 9/13/2013 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 9/12/2013)	The Community Redevelopment Law authorizes the establishment of redevelopment agencies in communities to address the effects of blight, as defined. Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies, as of February 1, 2012, and provides for the designation of successor agencies. This bill would authorize certain public entities of a Sustainable Communities Investment Area, as described, to form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority (authority) to carry out the Community Redevelopment Law in a specified manner. The bill would require the authority to adopt a Sustainable Communities Investment Plan for a Sustainable Communities Investment Area and authorize the authority to include in that plan a provision for the receipt of tax increment funds provided that certain economic development and planning requirements are met. The bill would authorize the legislative body of a city or county forming an authority to dedicate any portion of its net available revenue, as defined, to the authority through its Sustainable Communities Investment Plan. The bill would require the authority to contract for an independent financial and performance audit every 5 years. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.  <b>Last Amended on 9/3/2013</b>	
<a href="#">SB 391</a> <a href="#">DeSaulnier</a> D  California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013.	ASSEMBLY APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 8/30/2013 - Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file. Hearing postponed by committee.	Under existing law, there are programs providing assistance for, among other things, emergency housing, multifamily housing, farmworker housing, home ownership for very low and low-income households, and downpayment assistance for first-time homebuyers. Existing law also authorizes the issuance of bonds in specified amounts pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law. Existing law requires that proceeds from the sale of these bonds be used to finance various existing housing programs, capital outlay related to infill development, brownfield cleanup that promotes infill development, and housing-related parks. This bill would enact the California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013. The bill would make legislative findings and declarations relating to the need for establishing permanent, ongoing sources of funding dedicated to affordable housing development. The bill would impose a fee, except as provided, of \$75 to be paid at the time of the recording of every real estate instrument, paper, or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded. By imposing new duties on counties with respect to the imposition of the recording fee, the bill would create a state-mandated local program. The bill would require that revenues from this fee be sent quarterly to the Department of Housing and Community Development for deposit in the California Homes and Jobs Trust Fund, which the bill would create within the State Treasury. The bill would provide that moneys in the fund may be expended for supporting affordable housing, administering housing programs, and the cost of periodic audits, as specified. The bill would impose certain auditing and reporting requirements. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.  <b>Last Amended on 8/8/2013</b>	Watch

# C/CAG Priority Bill Matrix as of 3/4/2014

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#">SB 556</a> <a href="#">Corbett</a> D</p> <p>Agency: ostensible: nongovernmental entities.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY 2 YEAR 9/13/2013 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 9/11/2013)</p>	<p>Existing law specifies the authority of agents in dealing with 3rd persons. Existing law states when an agency is ostensible for purposes of determining the authority of an agent. Existing law prohibits unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices undertaken by a person in a transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods to any consumer. This bill would prohibit a person, firm, corporation, or association that is a nongovernmental entity and contracts to perform labor or services relating to public health or safety for a public entity from displaying on a vehicle or uniform a logo, as defined, that reasonably could be interpreted as implying that the labor or services are being provided by employees of the public agency, unless the vehicle or uniform conspicuously displays a disclosure, as specified. <b>Last Amended on 9/4/2013</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#">SB 731</a> <a href="#">Steinberg</a> D</p> <p>Environment: California Environmental Quality Act.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY 2 YEAR 9/13/2013 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was L. GOV. on 9/11/2013)</p>	<p>The California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report, or EIR, on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA requires the Office of Planning and Research to develop and prepare, and the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency to certify and adopt, guidelines for the implementation of CEQA by public agencies. CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency's action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA. CEQA establishes time periods within which a person is required to bring a judicial action or proceeding to challenge a public agency's action taken pursuant to CEQA. This bill would provide that aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project, as defined, on an infill site, as defined, within a transit priority area, as defined, shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment. The bill would require the office to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, and the secretary to certify and adopt, revisions to the guidelines for the implementation of CEQA establishing thresholds of significance for noise and transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas. The bill would require the office, on or before July 1, 2015, to prepare, develop, and transmit to the secretary recommended proposed changes or amendments to the guidelines establishing criteria for a lead agency to assess the need for translating specified notices into non-English languages and requirements for the posting of those notices in non-English languages. Because the bill would require the development of guidelines that would require a lead agency to translate notices into non-English languages and to post those translated notices, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The bill would require the office to produce a report on economic displacement and would require the office to publicly circulate a draft of the report. The bill would require the lead agency, in making specified findings, to make those findings available to the public at least 10 days prior to the adoption of the findings and to provide specified notice of the availability of the findings for public review. Because the bill would require the lead agency to make the draft finding available for public review and to provide specified notices to the public, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The bill would require the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant for specified projects, to, among other things, prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation of negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, EIRs, or other environmental documents for specified projects. Because the bill would require a lead agency to prepare the record of proceedings as provided, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The bill would authorize the tolling of the time period in which a person is required to bring a judicial action or proceeding challenging a public agency's action taken pursuant to CEQA through a tolling agreement that does not exceed 4 years. The bill would authorize the extension of the tolling agreement.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 9/9/2013</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>

# C/CAG Priority Bill Matrix as of 3/4/2014

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#">SB 848</a> <a href="#">Wolk</a> D  Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality, and Water Supply Act of 2014.	SENATE APPR. 2/26/2014 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2. Page 2831.) (February 26). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.	Existing law creates the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012, which, if approved by the voters, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$11,140,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance a safe drinking water and water supply reliability program. Existing law provides for the submission of the bond act to the voters at the November 4, 2014, statewide general election. This bill would repeal these provisions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 2/20/2014</b>	
<a href="#">SB 1062</a> <a href="#">Block</a> D  Elections: vote by mail ballots.	SENATE E. & C.A. 2/27/2014 - Referred to Com. on E. & C.A.	Existing law sets forth the procedures by which a voter may apply for and receive a vote by mail ballot. Existing law requires an elections official to deliver to each qualified applicant the vote by mail ballot for the precinct in which the applicant resides and all supplies necessary for the use and return of the ballot. This bill would require the elections official to also deliver to each qualified applicant a return envelope with postage prepaid in which a vote by mail voter may return his or her ballot. By imposing additional duties on local elections officials, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.	
<a href="#">SB 1077</a> <a href="#">DeSaulnier</a> D  Vehicles: vehicle-miles-traveled charges.	SENATE T. & H. 2/27/2014 - Referred to Com. on T. & H.	Existing law establishes the Department of Motor Vehicles and provides for its general powers and duties, including, among other things, the registration of vehicles, the licensing of drivers, and the regulation of vehicles generally. This bill would require the Department of Motor Vehicles to develop and implement, by July 1, 2015, a pilot program designed to assess specified issues related to implementing a vehicle-miles-traveled fee in California. The bill would also require the department to prepare and submit a specified report of its findings to the policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature no later than June 30, 2016. The bill would provide that these provisions would be repealed on January 1, 2018.	
<a href="#">SB 1156</a> <a href="#">Steinberg</a> D  California Carbon Tax Law of 2014.	SENATE PRINT 2/21/2014 - From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 23.	The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. This bill, effective January 1, 2015, would impose a carbon tax of an unspecified amount per ton of carbon-dioxide-equivalent emissions on suppliers of fossil fuels. The bill would require the State Board of Equalization to administer and implement the carbon tax, and would require revenues from the tax to be deposited in the Carbon Tax Revenue Special Fund in the State Treasury. The bill would exempt suppliers of fossil fuels subject to the tax from regulations imposed by the State Air Resources Board under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 relative to the compliance obligation in the second compliance period under which suppliers of specified fuels are required to obtain allowances for carbon-dioxide-equivalent emissions under the cap-and-trade program adopted by the State Air Resources Board. The bill would state the intent of the Legislature that revenues from the carbon tax be rebated to taxpayers, particularly low- and medium-income taxpayers, of other taxes, and for implementation of the carbon tax to be revenue neutral. This bill contains other related provisions.	Watch

# C/CAG Priority Bill Matrix as of 3/4/2014

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#">SCA 4</a> <a href="#">Liu</a> D</p> <p>Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.</p>	<p>SENATE APPR. 8/29/2013 - Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</p>	<p>The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax, except that certain school entities may levy an ad valorem property tax for specified purposes with the approval of 55% of the voters within the jurisdiction of these entities. This measure would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition, if the proposition proposing the tax includes certain requirements. This measure would prohibit a local government from expending any revenues derived from a special transportation tax approved by 55% of the voters at any time prior to the completion of a statutorily identified capital project funded by revenues derived from another special tax of the same local government that was approved by a 2/3 vote. The measure would also make conforming and technical, nonsubstantive changes. <b>Last Amended on 8/28/2013</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#">SCA 8</a> <a href="#">Corbett</a> D</p> <p>Transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.</p>	<p>SENATE APPR. 8/29/2013 - Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</p>	<p>The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax, except that certain school entities may levy an ad valorem property tax for specified purposes with the approval of 55% of the voters within the jurisdiction of these entities. This measure would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition, if the proposition proposing the tax includes certain requirements. The measure would also make conforming and technical, nonsubstantive changes. <b>Last Amended on 5/21/2013</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** March 13, 2014

**To:** C/CAG Legislative Committee

**From:** Sandy Wong, Executive Director

**Subject:** Recommend that the C/CAG Board consider an action regarding the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority's (SFBRA) mission to restore, enhance, and protect the wetlands and wildlife habitat in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline; and request that SFBRA staff coordinates messaging and outreach efforts.

(For further information or questions contact Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee recommend that the C/CAG Board consider an action regarding the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority's (SFBRA) mission to restore, enhance, and protect the wetlands and wildlife habitat in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline; and request that SFBRA staff coordinates messaging and outreach efforts.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Unknown.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

NA.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Save the Bay staff requested C/CAG's support for the SFBRA's mission in anticipation of a potential regional funding initiative in November 2014. C/CAG is not being asked to support a potential ballot measure at this time, given that it is still uncertain as to whether the SFBRA will proceed with an initiative this year. It is expected that, should the C/CAG Board decide to support this effort, C/CAG will be added to the attached list of supporters and may be asked to endorse a ballot measure if such a measure proceeds.

As discussed at last month's Legislative Committee meeting, an SFBRA ballot measure could impact public support for C/CAG's potential storm water funding initiative depending on timing and messaging of the two initiatives. Staff believes the two efforts have complementary programs and will benefit each other with regard to public outreach and education and



recommends supporting the current request. The extent of C/CAG's support would be limited to the SFBRA's mission to restore, enhance, and protect the wetlands and wildlife habitat in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Supporters List (1-6-14)
- San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Frequently Asked Questions (1-22-13)



## Supporters

*The following organizations and officials have expressed support for the work of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority to raise local funding for Bay restoration.*

### **United States Congress**

Congressmember Anna Eshoo  
Congressmember Mike Honda  
Congressmember Jared Huffman  
Congressmember Barbara Lee  
Congressmember Zoe Lofgren  
Congressmember Jackie Speier  
Congressmember Eric Swalwell  
Fmr. Congressmember Lynn Woolsey

### **Legislature & Statewide Officers**

Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson  
Senator Jim Beall  
Senator Ellen Corbett  
Senator Noreen Evans  
Senator Loni Hancock  
Senator Jerry Hill  
Senator Mark Leno  
Senator Lois Wolk  
Fmr. Senator Elaine Alquist  
Assemblymember Tom Ammiano  
Assemblymember Rob Bonta  
Assemblymember Wes Chesbro  
Assemblymember Paul Fong  
Assemblymember Richard Gordon  
Assemblymember Marc Levine  
Assemblymember Kevin Mullin  
Assemblymember Bill Quirk  
Assemblymember Nancy Skinner  
Assemblymember Phil Ting  
Assemblymember Bob Wieckowski  
Fmr. Assemblymember Michael Allen  
Fmr. Assemblymember Fiona Ma  
Fmr. Assemblymember Sandre Swanson

### **Environmental Organizations**

Audubon California  
The Bay Institute  
California League of Conservation Voters  
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance  
Clean Water Action  
Committee for Green Foothills  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Ducks Unlimited  
Friends of Five Creeks  
Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed  
Friends of Coyote Creek Watershed  
Friends of the San Leandro Creek  
Friends of Gallinas Creek  
Greenbelt Alliance  
Golden Gate Audubon Society  
Lake Merritt Institute  
Madrone Audubon Society  
Marin Audubon Society  
Marin Open Space Trust  
Napa Solano Audubon Society  
The Nature Conservancy  
San Francisco Bay Joint Venture  
San Francisco Baykeeper  
Santa Clara County Creeks Coalition  
Santa Clara League of Conservation Voters  
Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society  
Save The Bay  
Sonoma Land Trust  
The Trust for Public Land  
Urban Creeks Council

**Bay Area Business Groups**

Bay Area Council  
San Mateo County Economic Development  
Association  
Silicon Valley Leadership Group

**Bay Area County Supervisors**

Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson  
Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan  
Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty  
Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley  
Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle  
Contra Costa County Supervisor John Gioia  
Contra Costa County Supervisor Federal Glover  
Marin County Supervisor Kathrin Sears  
Marin County Supervisor Susan Adams  
Napa County Supervisor Keith Caldwell  
Napa County Supervisor Brad Wagenknecht  
San Francisco Supervisor John Avalos  
San Francisco Supervisor London Breed  
San Francisco Supervisor David Campos  
San Francisco Supervisor David Chiu  
San Francisco Supervisor Malia Cohen  
San Francisco Supervisor Jane Kim  
San Francisco Supervisor Eric Mar  
San Francisco Supervisor Scott Wiener  
San Francisco Supervisor Norman Yee  
San Mateo County Supervisor Carole Groom  
San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley  
San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine  
San Mateo County Supervisor Warren Slocum  
San Mateo County Supervisor Adrienne J.  
Tissier  
Santa Clara County Supervisor Ken Yeager  
Santa Clara County Supervisor S. Joseph  
Simitian  
Solano County Supervisor Erin Hannigan  
Solano County Supervisor Linda Seifert  
Sonoma County Supervisor Susan Gorin

**Local Bay Area Elected Officials**

Margaret Abe-Koga, Mountain View  
Councilmember  
Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley Councilmember  
Ruth Atkin, Emeryville Councilmember  
Vinnie Bacon, Fremont Councilmember  
Marc Berman, Palo Alto Councilmember  
Desley Brooks, Oakland Councilmember  
Ronit Bryant, Mountain View Councilmember  
Tom Butt, Richmond Councilmember  
David Canepa, Daly City Mayor  
Erin Carlstrom, Santa Rosa Vice Mayor  
Suzanne Chan, Fremont Councilmember  
Stewart Chen, Alameda Councilmember  
Kansen Chu, San Jose Councilmember  
Chris Clark, Mountain View Vice Mayor  
Julie Combs, Santa Rosa Councilmember  
W. Clarke Conway, Brisbane Mayor  
Pauline Cutter, San Leandro Councilmember  
Peter Drekmeier, Fmr. Palo Alto Mayor  
Ted Driscoll, Portola Valley Councilmember  
Emily Duncan, Union City Vice Mayor  
Carol Dutra-Vernaci, Union City Mayor  
Jose Esteves, Milpitas Mayor  
Thomas Ferrito, Fmr. Los Gatos Mayor  
Rosanne Foust, Redwood City Councilmember  
Maureen Freshchet, San Mateo Councilmember  
Rich Garberino, South San Francisco Vice  
Mayor  
Pat Gascoscas, Union City Councilmember  
David Glass, Petaluma Mayor  
Michael Gregory, San Leandro Councilmember  
Pradeep Gupta, South San Francisco  
Councilmember  
William J. Harrison, Fremont Mayor  
Rose Herrera, San Jose Councilmember  
Minane Jameson, Board Director, Hayward Area  
Recreation and Park District  
Dan Kalb, Oakland Councilmember  
Ash Kalra, San Jose Councilmember  
Mike Kasperzak, Mountain View Councilmember  
Gabe Kearney, Petaluma Councilmember

Kirsten Keith, Menlo Park Councilmember  
Larry Klein, Palo Alto Councilmember  
Liz Kniss, Palo Alto Councilmember  
Gustav Larsson, Sunnyvale Councilmember-  
elect  
Kenneth Leary, American Canyon  
Councilmember  
Benny Lee, San Leandro Councilmember  
Linda LeZotte, Santa Clara Valley Water District  
Board Member  
Sam Liccardo, City of San Jose Councilmember  
Jason Liles, Fmr. Healdsburg Mayor  
David Lim, San Mateo Mayor  
Eric Lucan, Novato Mayor Pro Tem  
Jesus Malgapo, Vallejo Councilmember  
Jamie Matthews, Santa Clara Mayor  
Linda Maio, Berkeley Vice Mayor  
Tara Martin-Milius, Sunnyvale Councilmember  
Jael Myrick, Richmond Councilmember  
Lynette Gibson McElhaney, Oakland  
Councilmember  
Robert H. McConnell, Vallejo Councilmember  
Maryann Moise, Portola Valley Councilmember  
Carmen Montano, Milpitas Councilmember  
Ray Mueller, Menlo Park Mayor  
Jim Navarro, Union City Councilmember  
Julie Pierce, Clayton Mayor and Vice President,  
ABAG  
Jim Prola, San Leandro Vice Mayor  
Diana Prola, San Leandro Unified School  
District, President  
Mark Salinas, Hayward Councilmember  
Pete Sanchez, Suisun City Mayor

Libby Schaaf, Oakland Councilmember  
Greg Scharff, Palo Alto Mayor  
Brian Schmidt, Santa Clara Valley Water District  
Board Member  
Nancy Shepherd, Palo Alto Vice Mayor  
Jac Siegel, Mountain View Councilmember  
Diana Souza, San Leandro Councilmember  
Hermie Sunga, Vallejo Councilmember  
John Sutter, East Bay Regional Park District  
Board President  
Michael Sweeney, Hayward Mayor  
Lena Tam, City of Alameda Councilmember  
Dave Warden, Belmont Councilmember  
José Francisco Zermeño Cárdenas, Hayward  
Councilmember

#### **Bay Area Community Organizations**

East Bay Bicycle Coalition  
Marin County Bicycle Coalition  
Napa County Bicycle Coalition  
Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition  
San Francisco Bay Trail Project  
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition  
SPUR  
Trails for Richmond Action Committee  
Woodside-Atherton Garden Club

#### **Bay Area Public Agencies**

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)  
Hayward Area Recreation and Park District  
San Francisco Estuary Partnership



## **San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Frequently Asked Questions**

(1-22-13)

### **Why is it important to protect and restore San Francisco Bay?**

San Francisco Bay is one of our nation's greatest natural treasures and the defining feature of where we call home. But it won't remain so without the necessary funding to protect and restore it for generations to come.

Restoring San Francisco Bay isn't just essential from an environmental or quality of life perspective. It's equally important to expand bicycle and walking trails on public land, and to continue to strengthen our local economy with thousands of new good-paying jobs.

### **What is the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority?**

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Restoration Authority) is a regional agency with a Governing Board made up of local elected officials and the Executive Officer of the California State Coastal Conservancy. Its purpose is to raise and allocate local resources for the restoration, enhancement, protection, and enjoyment of wetlands and wildlife habitat in San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline.

Following years of budget cuts, innovative and robust strategies are needed to fund this critical work. The Restoration Authority was created by the California Legislature in 2008 to find solutions to the need for new, local funding.

The Legislature has given the Restoration Authority the unique capacity to raise funds from local sources throughout the Bay Area and the oversight capacity to ensure transparency and prevent waste. Its purpose is restoration, not regulation. The Restoration Authority does not duplicate the missions of other public agencies and private organizations working on Bay restoration; it is designed to deliver essential local funding to restoration project developed by others.

### **How will these local funds be raised?**

The Authority is considering placing a regional revenue measure on the ballot in November 2014. Any decision on whether to place a measure on the ballot, and how much revenue would be sought, must be approved by a majority of the Governing Board of the Authority. Polling conducted in 2011 shows that Bay Area residents are strongly supportive of paying a modest amount (on the order of \$10-20 per year) to fund this critical work.

### **Will these projects really create jobs?**

Absolutely. Small Bay restoration projects that have been completed around the Bay have already created dozens of full and part time jobs. Restoration of former salt ponds at the Green Island Unit in southern Napa created over 50 full- and part-time positions between 2007 and 2008. Wetland restoration projects will create good paying jobs from project planning through implementation – putting our communities back to work building levees, transporting material, creating new bicycle and walking paths, as well as assessing tidal flows and habitat needs, and monitoring sites into the future.

### **How can we be sure our tax dollars are used effectively?**

The Authority is committed to including strong safeguards to ensure funds are spent where they will do the most good.

Examples of safeguards that are regularly used include citizens' oversight boards and annual audits to ensure that taxpayers' hard-earned dollars are spent appropriately.

### **How can we afford this when education and public safety are being cut?**

With strict oversight and the ability to create hundreds of new jobs, restoring the Bay is not an either/or issue.

The Bay is an economic powerhouse, responsible for tens of thousands of regional jobs. Each year, over \$60 billion worth of goods pass through the narrow channel of the Golden Gate. For a few dollars each year, Bay Area residents can take a stand to protect our local economy, provide vital habitat for fish and wildlife, and further improve our quality of life.

### **There aren't any projects near where I live. Why should I support this?**

You don't have to live right next to the shoreline to see the benefits of restoring the Bay. In addition to creating hundreds of jobs, this measure will help keep toxic pollutants out of the Bay, reduce threats from erosion by slowing water in local creeks and expand public access to the shoreline.