



## San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

Date: January 17, 2012

To: Governing Board

From Amy Hutzel  
San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program Manager  
State Coastal Conservancy

Subject: **Report on Feedback Regarding Concept of Expanding Upstream**

Sam Schuchat and I have held a series of meetings in an effort to gauge interest in the idea of expanding the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority's purposes and jurisdiction to include upstream activities. We have met with the Executive Directors or Regional Directors of the following organizations: East Bay Regional Parks District, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, Greenbelt Alliance, MidPeninsula Regional Open Space District, The Nature Conservancy, Marin Agricultural Land Trust, Marin County Open Space District, Napa County Regional Parks and Open Space District, Peninsula Open Space Trust, Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, Save Mount Diablo, Save The Redwoods League, and Sonoma Land Trust, and spoken to the Executive Committee of the Bay Area Open Space Council.

There is interest among the Bay Area Open Space community in investigating further the potential for a regional funding measure that includes upland activities (ranging from the inclusion of protection and restoration of creeks and rivers that drain to San Francisco Bay to the inclusion of a wider gamut of upland activities, such as watershed protection, protection and restoration of upland habitat, completion of regional trails, agricultural protection, etc.). Next steps include polling to determine what additional purposes would positively impact voter approval, a determination of what level of funding the open space community could contribute to a campaign, further discussion regarding potentially competing local ballot measures for open space, continued discussions with the Authority board and staff and the bay community about this concept, and analysis of the legislation needed for an expansion and the likelihood of legislative success.

The potential drawbacks to expansion include a reduction in funds that could be spent directly on San Francisco Bay and its shoreline, a dilution of the message and voter confusion over purposes of the ballot measure, a reduction in support by the bay/wetlands community, and the challenges associated with obtaining legislation. The potential advantages include greater voter support for a measure, an increase in the tax rate that voters are willing to vote for and a no reduction in funding for the Bay and its shoreline, a greater number of supportive opinion leaders, a larger pool of funding for the election costs and the campaign, and the opportunity for the Authority to engage in a wider array of conservation activities in the Bay Area.