San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
Independent Citizens Oversight Committee
Annual Report FY2024-2025
June 1, 2026

Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
1515 Clay Street, 10th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Chair Gioia and Members of the Governing Board:

The Independent Citizens Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) is pleased to provide its eighth annual report regarding the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority's (Authority's) financial operations and conformance with the provisions of Measure AA for FY2024-2025**.**

The six members of the Oversight Committee are:

Jim Fiedler, Chair, East Bay Representative, Contra Costa County
Garth Hall, Vice-Chair, South Bay Representative, Santa Clara County
Arthur Deicke, At-Large Representative, Sonoma County
Demece Garepis, West Bay Representative, San Francisco County
Susan Ives, North Bay Representative, Marin County
Terry Young, At-Large Representative, Alameda County

In preparing its annual letter to the Governing Board, the Oversight Committee reviewed the Authority's FY2024-2025 financial statements, audit, budget, workplan, Annual Report, project-related Authority Staff (Staff) recommendations, the BRRIT 2025 Annual Report, and other relevant documents.

Summary Finding: Based on our review, the Oversight Committee continues to find that Measure AA funds are being allocated appropriately for the purposes specified, the Authority is managing its project portfolio well, and its administrative services are well organized.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1a: Similar to what was presented to the Governing Board at its September 5, 2025 Meeting, we recommend that the Authority update its analysis of projected administrative costs and the funds available to cover those costs (including interest income) every four years.

Recommendation 1b: The Authority should encourage counties that charge high fees for Measure AA tax collection to look at how other counties approach parcel tax collection. Adopting new approaches and efficiencies could increase revenues available to the Authority to fund its mission of restoring the Bay.

Recommendation 2a: The Authority should continue to report routinely on tidal marsh extent, marsh patch measurements, marsh condition, and "people and wetlands." We further recommend that the Authority begin to report on the extent, location, and condition of estuarine-upland transition zones, shellfish beds, and submerged aquatic vegetation as soon as those indicator suites are developed. Finally, we encourage the Authority to continue working toward using shared data aggregation platforms with other organizations to develop tracking, data visualization, and performance measures for restoration projects in the Authority's portfolio that include such habitats.

Recommendation 2b: The Authority should continue to encourage and report on workforce development among grantees through project selection as well as within the WRMP.
We again recommend that the Authority create opportunities for EDC internships. The Authority should survey EDC members to measure their assessment and reaction to the efforts being undertaken by the Authority to achieve benefits in their communities.

Recommendation 2c: Staff should continue collaborating with MTC Bay Trail staff and other partners to analyze what Bay Trail projects may be eligible for Measure AA funding. That analysis should evaluate whether it is feasible to achieve the projected gap of 8.8 miles of Bay Trail.

Recommendation 2d: The Authority should continue its efforts to restore habitats for shellfish and SAVs to achieve 100 percent of Measure AA campaign goals for these two habitat types.

Recommendation 3a: To better assess project status, the Oversight Committee recommends that the status of construction projects be prepared biennially. These future reports should include a Staff assessment, either graphically or in words, of whether the project is on track in terms of scope completion together with a brief description of any significant issues that may hinder the project's completion by the approved completion date. This information should be reported alongside the information stated in the Finding above.

Recommendation 4a: If, in the future, the Authority finds that increasing the capacity of the BRRIT will enable more projects to be funded and implemented on shorter timelines, then BRITT funding should be increased, including consideration of using investment interest income.

Recommendation 5a: Given the significant time and resources to produce the annual report, we encourage the Authority to rethink the annual report as a vehicle not only for disseminating information internally, but also for public engagement.

Recommendation 5b: To help the Oversight Committee better understand the Authority's communications goals, target audiences and outreach strategies we would like to have Staff provide the Oversight Committee with a communication "matrix". A communications "matrix" would provide an overview of communications vehicles currently in use. It would include the Authority's target audience and the intended purpose of each communication.

Recommendation 5c: The 10th anniversary communications plan should emphasize:

- Collaboration and resource sharing with Bay Area governments, agency partners, and NGOs to maximize audience.
- Consistent messaging among Authority partners
- The cumulative benefits of Measure AA to climate preparedness, habitat restoration, recreation, and quality of life for Bay Area residents.

Recommendation 6a. Capturing and archiving experiences encountered in project management and sharing those lessons with grantees and future public officials attempting large-scale restoration projects helps create a culture of institutional learning and informs future restoration efforts.

1. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The Oversight Committee reviewed the Authority's budget, financial statements, and audit. We find that the information is presented clearly in appropriate detail and reflects sound management of the public's tax dollars. We congratulate the Authority on another clean audit.

In FY2024-2025, the Authority's revenue totaled $30.8 million with $25.9 million derived from the Measure AA Special Tax and $4.5 million from investment income. Expenditures totaled $23.8 million with $22.2 million for restoration/preservation and $1.6 million for general administrative expenses. The ending balance of funds available was $94.8 million—up $7.0 million from the prior year.

In last year's annual letter, the Oversight Committee raised concerns that changes in federal policies and funding may impact the Authority's progress. We have since learned from Staff that these changes have not significantly impacted the Authority's progress to date.

a. Allocation of Funds

Allocation to projects: The Committee finds that the Authority is proceeding with appropriate speed to approve grants for restoration projects.

A measure of the Authority's fiscal management is the extent to which it is allocating funds to restoration projects in a timely manner. For FY2024-2025 a total of $18.8 million in project grants were awarded from the $24.6 million available. During the first eight years of Measure AA, $181.8 million of the $195.3 million available to fund projects was allocated to projects; thus $13.5 million (seven percent) remains unallocated.

Project completions: Projects approved by the Governing Board are proceeding towards completion at a reasonable pace. Some delays have occurred owing to the complex process of securing dredging material suitable for shoreline habitat restoration. However, Staff have worked with grantees and project co-sponsors to minimize delays.

The notable exception to this year's project timeline is the South Francisco Bay Shoreline Project. The remaining grant balance at the end of FY2024-2025 was $25.8 million— 42 percent of the $61.5 million awarded from FY 2017-2018 through FY 2022-2023. This balance is larger than expected, given the timeline for completion. Staff explained that the timing of the release of funds is being coordinated with federal agencies and other project sponsors, which has slowed the process. Staff anticipate the majority of the remaining Measure AA grant funding for this project will be utilized over the next two years.

Administrative costs: The Oversight Committee considers the administrative costs acceptable. Cumulative administrative costs over the first eight years totaled $10.4 million (including ballot costs) and very close to the $10.3 million available for administrative costs based on 5 percent of Measure AA tax revenue.

Separately, the Oversight Committee, in its May 8, 2025, letter (addressing the FY2023-2024 Annual Report), raised the question of how the Authority might consider allocating investments proceeds, composed of US Treasury and Federal Home Loan Bank securities, which had increased substantially. (By the end of FY2024-2025, the administrative-based fund had a positive balance of $12.9 million.)

At its September 5, 2025 meeting, the Governing Board addressed this question (in the meeting's Agenda Item #11). An analysis by Staff concluded, based on projected revenue and administrative costs for Measure AA, the Authority could fund administrative operations through the twenty years of Measure AA, including a multi-year wind down after the measure sunsets in 2036. In addition, projections show that the Authority would have sufficient funds to cover expected or estimated ballot costs. Staff also suggested that unneeded funds, if any, might be reallocated for other purposes. The Oversight Committee supports this approach.

Finding 1a: The Oversight Committee's review of the audit, financial statements, and project budgets demonstrates that the Authority's fiscal management remains sound. In addition, the Committee supports the Governing Board's direction at its September 5, 2025 meeting regarding use of investment income.

Recommendation 1a: Similar to what was presented to the Governing Board at its September 5, 2025 Meeting, we recommend that the Authority update its analysis of projected administrative costs and the funds available to cover those costs (including interest income) every four years.

b. County Collection Fees

In its May 8, 2025, letter to the Governing Board, the Oversight Committee expressed concern that collection fees counties charge to levy and collect the Measure AA parcel tax vary widely across the nine Bay Area counties. This issue has been raised by the Oversight Committee in prior annual reports to the Governing Board.

The Oversight Committee recognizes there are no apparent guidelines or restrictions on what counties may charge the Authority to collect the parcel tax. Fees range from 0.85% to 6.34% of the individual county's levy.

Finding 1b: There appears to be no guidelines or restrictions on what counties may charge to collect parcel taxes. The Authority's ability to seek more equity in fees charged across counties is limited.

Recommendation 1b: The Authority should encourage counties that charge relatively high fees for Measure AA tax collection to look at how other counties approach parcel tax collection. Adopting new approaches and efficiencies could increase revenues available to the Authority to fund its mission of restoring the Bay.

2. PROJECT PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

Impacts and benefits of restoration projects extend well beyond individual projects. The Oversight Committee believes that the cumulative impacts and benefits of the Authority's restoration portfolio are greater than the sum of its parts.

a. Project Selection

The Authority's eighth Request for Proposals, issued in July 2024, resulted in seventeen applications requesting over $40 million dollars for restoration projects. The Authority's authorization of new projects continues to be in line with Measure AA campaign goals for funding projects across the Bay Area Regions in proportion to population. Yet, approvals for construction (excluding project planning and community grants), when aligned with Measure AA Campaign Goals as depicted on page 5 of the FY2024-2025 Annual Report, fall below targets in shellfish habitat restoration, submerged aquatic vegetation restoration and Bay Trail construction.

However, the Authority is focused on strategies to bring all restoration categories closer to targets. (Discussion of shellfish habitat restoration, submerged aquatic vegetation restoration and Bay Trail construction is below).

The Committee is pleased with the ongoing progress with Community Grant awards, including two new grants and two augmentations to prior grants.

b. Landscape-Scale Attributes

In previous annual letters to the Governing Board, the Oversight Committee recommended the Authority work to optimize region-wide, landscape-scale benefits. These include increased complexity of the habitat matrix, connectivity between wildlife corridors and transition zones that can provide refugia, as well as marsh migration with expected/predicted sea level rise.

The Oversight Committee is pleased that the Authority includes in its FY2024-2025 Annual Report the tidal marsh metrics developed by the Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program (WRMP). The graph provided on page 17 now represents *marsh extent*. For context, as of 2020 Authority-funded projects contributed to 16,600 acres of connected tidal marsh habitat. It is our understanding that additional metrics, including *marsh condition* measures, as well as a depiction of "*people and wetlands"* will be added to the WRMP data.

The Committee recognizes the importance of landscape-scale measurements and what it takes to accomplish a fully useful data set. The Committee encourages the Authority to continue to collaborate with entities like universities and perhaps the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) to measure landscape attributes for habitats, including not only wetlands, but also estuarine-upland transition zones, shellfish beds, possible sites suitable for submerged aquatic vegetation, and other estuarine habitats. We note that such metrics are anticipated as part of the WRMP, and that habitat goals for these measurements are included in the 2022 Implementation Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture.[1] Moreover, a "collaborative program of …transition zone site assessment" was recommended in the 2015 Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals update.[2]

Finding 2a: The Authority has appropriately focused upon the WRMP for performance measures for tidal marsh restoration projects. The Oversight Committee anticipates that performance measures, among other tools, will help drive project selection to advance landscape-wide tidal marsh benefits.

Recommendation 2a: The Authority should continue to report routinely on tidal marsh extent, marsh patch measurements, marsh condition, and "people and wetlands." We further recommend that the Authority begin to report on the extent, location, and condition of estuarine-upland transition zones, shellfish beds, and submerged aquatic vegetation as soon as those indicator suites are developed. Finally, we encourage the Authority to continue working toward using shared data aggregation platforms with other organizations to develop tracking, data visualization, and performance measures for restoration projects in the Authority's portfolio that include such habitats.

---

[1] San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, "Restoring the Estuary To Benefit Wildlife and People: A Framework for the Restoration of Wetland and Wildlife in the San Francisco Bay Area: 2022 Implementation Strategy of the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture", Richmond, CA, p. 21. and Appendix B: How the SFBJV Indicators Were Developed pages 125-137.

[2] California State Coastal Conservancy, *"The Baylands and Climate Change: What We Can Do. Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Science Update 2015",* Oakland, CA*,* p. 115

c. Economically Disadvantaged Communities

Providing benefits to economically disadvantaged communities (EDCs) is among Measure AA priorities. [3] The Authority is committed to advancing justice, equity, diversity and inclusion through its grant programs and throughout its operations.

Over the past few years, the Authority has undertaken to determine how best to engage with and benefit EDCs. It has adopted Equity Guidelines and methods for prioritizing eligible projects. The Authority's FY2024-25 Annual Report provides background and metrics on project benefits to EDCs, and documents that 77 percent of the projects authorized by the Governing Board provided benefits to EDCs. The Annual Report also details benefits to EDCs by project type, habitat type, acres and functionality, such as public access facilities, trails, levees). In the future Staff will track additional metrics in accordance with the Five-Year Equity Work Plan.

To address three of Measure AA priorities: EDCs, workforce development and monitoring, last year the Oversight Committee supported instituting training programs for EDCs to do permit-related or regional monitoring.

The Authority also has taken important steps to bring economic and social benefits to EDCs through Authority-funded projects. Two new Community Grant projects were funded in FY2024-2025: Literacy for Environmental Justice to implement the Southeast San Francisco Shoreline Stewards Project and San Bruno Mountain Watch for the Healing a Wounded Watershed with the Colma Creek Collective. Additionally, two augmentations, totaling $115,000, were approved for ongoing Community Grant Projects.

Finding 2b: The Authority is currently contributing funds to the WRMP, which has in its 5-year outlook evaluating the feasibility of workforce training for EDCs and Tribes to assist with regional monitoring. The Authority continues direct community engagement to maximize the social, economic and environmental benefits of Authority-funded projects to EDCs.

Recommendation 2b: The Authority should continue to encourage and report on workforce development among grantees through project selection as well as within the WRMP.
We again recommend that the Authority create opportunities for EDC internships. The Authority should survey EDC members to measure their assessment and reaction to the efforts being undertaken by the Authority to achieve benefits in their communities.

d. The Bay Trail

[3] The Authority's Grant Program Guidelines state that: "An economically disadvantaged community (EDC) is defined as a community with a median household income less than 80% of the area median income (AMI). Within this set of low-income communities, communities of particular concern include those that: are historically underrepresented in the environmental policymaking and/or projects, bear a disproportionate environmental and health burden, are most vulnerable to climate change impacts due to lack of resources required for community resilience, or are severely burdened by housing costs, increasing the risk of displacement."

Measure AA Campaign Goals include constructing twenty-five miles of the Bay Trail. According to the Authority's FY2024-2025 Annual Report, progress constructing Bay Trail remains at 13% (3.3 miles).

Staff recognize the need to accelerate project funding to achieve the goal. In its October 18, 2024 memorandum to the Governing Board, Staff indicate "If all the design projects were funded through the construction phase, this would result in 16.2 miles of Bay Trail, leaving a gap of 8.8 miles to reach the goal of 25 miles." Staff advises that it is considering including significant upgrades to portions of the existing Bay Trail, where degradation has occurred, as valid project(s) towards meeting the twenty-five-mile goal.

The Oversight Committee acknowledges that for improved public access or recreational amenities to be eligible for Authority funding, they must be included in a project that restores, enhances, or protects tidal wetlands, managed ponds or natural habitats.

Finding 2c: To address the gap in current completion of the Bay Trail, as identified in the campaign goals, Staff are collaborating with MTC Bay Trail staff and other parties to assess trail projects that may be eligible for Measure AA funding.

Recommendation 2c: Staff should continue collaborating with MTC Bay Trail staff and other partners to analyze what Bay Trail projects may be eligible for Measure AA funding. That analysis should evaluate whether it is feasible to achieve the projected gap of 8.8 miles of Bay Trail.

e. Shellfish and Submerged Aquatic Vegetation

Measure AA campaign goals include increasing shellfish habitat and submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) habitat. To date, Measure AA has funded projects that will restore 2 percent of the 500-acre goal for shellfish habitat and 2 percent of the 150-acre goal for SAV habitat. The limited progress to date is reportedly due to several issues, including complex property ownership of intertidal and subtidal areas and a lack of habitat restoration experience among potential grantees. Importantly, in 2026, the Authority has received proposals for shellfish habitat development and SAV and will be evaluating each for funding.

.

Staff, in collaboration with State Coastal Conservancy, SFEI, and other agencies, are successfully expanding these target habitat types,[4] including sites targeted in the Regionally Advancing Living Shorelines (RALS) project. If funded, these projects could reach a total of 250 acres of shellfish enhancement and seventy-five acres of SAV habitat--approximately 50 percent of their respective Measure AA campaign goals. Equally important, RALS will provide engineering and permit-related tools to accelerate the development of future projects that expand shellfish and SAV habitat.

---

[4] Staff memo to Governing Board on Plan to Achieve the Measure AA Campaign Goals and Distribution of Funding by Region, October 18, 2024.

Finding 2d: The Authority has made progress to enhance shellfish habitat and SAV habitat and is moving forward in partnership to identify additional shellfish and SAV project sites and develop plans for these sites. Potential grantees with the necessary skills are now beginning to submit proposals to undertake this work.

Recommendation 2d: The Authority should continue its efforts to restore habitats for shellfish and SAVs to achieve 100 percent of Measure AA campaign goals for these two habitat types.

3. PROJECT TRACKING

When the Authority authorizes a new project, such as a construction project, the costs for that project are distributed over the lifetime of the project. The Authority regularly tracks and reports on the yearly grant amounts, cumulative expenses, and remaining grant balances for each of the Authority-funded Projects.

Of the $181,771,715 approved for projects in the first eight years of the Measure AA program, 60 percent of the total funds ($109,236,476), was disbursed as of the end of FY 2024-2025, leaving 40 percent ($72,535,239) for completing these previously approved projects. Clearly, a substantial amount of work remains to be completed on a number of the approved projects, particularly, construction projects, which may be subject to cost increases due to changes in scope, inflation, and other factors. Staff generally describes these cost-increase-driven conditions as requiring "augmentation." In FY 2024-2025, augmentation was approved for an additional project[5], beyond the two augmentations described in the Committee's May 8, 2025, letter.

a. Forecasting and Budgeting

The Committee has previously noted that the Authority disburses project grant funds in phases. To better anticipate the need for potential "augmentation" it may be helpful for Staff to communicate the progress of a project over time, both in terms of the funds expended and work performed. Reporting both the percentage of funds expended and progress toward completion will aid the Authority Governing Board and the Oversight Committee in anticipating whether a project may need augmentation. It will also call out whether a project may be delayed, including whether it may extend beyond the sunset of Measure AAA, prompting consideration of whether funding may be available and can be authorized beyond the Measure AA sunset date.

Staff prepared a September 20, 2025 memo to the Oversight Committee, titled "Status of Restoration Authority Construction Projects Portfolio." For each of fifteen construction projects, the memo stated the funds awarded, cumulative expended funds, dollar augmentations (if any), and the total awarded funds yet to be expended. It also provides the currently approved completion year. Tabulation in this memo does <u>not</u> quantify the work performed to date and work remaining. In the absence of this data, the Oversight Committee requests that future reports

---

[5] Augmentation of $386,000 was made to the originally approved $3,082,000 grant for the Tiscornia Marsh Restoration and Sea Level Rise Adaptation project to reflect a change in the proposed phasing of construction and anticipated construction costs for the first phase. Final design and permitting have since been delayed due to design changes to address utility infrastructure concerns, so the grant completion date was extended to March 31, 2027.

on status of construction projects include a Staff assessment, either graphically or in words, of whether the project is on track, with a brief description of any significant issues that may impact the project's timeline.

Finding 3a: The Authority tracks and reports each Authority-funded construction project: grant amount, augmentation amount (if any), cumulative expenses, remaining grant balance, and approved project completion date.

Recommendation 3a: To better assess project status, the status of construction projects be prepared biennially. These future reports should include a Staff assessment, either graphically or in words, of whether the project is on track in terms of scope completion together with a brief description of any significant issues that may hinder the project's completion by the approved completion date. This information should be reported alongside the information stated in the Finding above.

4. BAY RESTORATION REGULATORY INTEGRATION TEAM

The Oversight Committee iterates its support for the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT). In the last five years, thirty-five multi-benefit restoration projects have come before the BRRIT, eleven of which have been fully permitted.

We reviewed the BRRIT 2025 Annual Report and noted these accomplishments and progress:

- BRRIT completed permitting for the Deer Island Tidal Wetlands Restoration Project in Marin County.
- BRRIT has seven projects in the application phase and seventeen in the pre-application phase.
- BRRIT provided agency-coordinated guidance and feedback to project proponents in a timely manner following pre-application meetings, with 76 percent of responses sent within 30 days (the target timeframe set by the BRRIT).

In June 2024, the Authority and BRRIT developed a new online survey tool to request feedback from project proponents. Surveys confirmed that using the BRRIT resulted in a better project that was more beneficial for species and habitat, recreation, flood protection, and water quality. However, only half of respondents agreed that permitting requirements, efficiencies, and strategies for multi-benefit restoration projects were well-communicated by the BRRIT. These surveys provide valuable feedback that informs the BRRIT on what is working well and the areas for improvement.

Fundraising for the second five-year funding period is complete with a total of $8,900,000. secured. The Oversight Committee supports the continued funding for BRRIT.

Finding 4a: The Oversight Committee reiterates its strong support for the BRRIT and the improvements it continues to achieve in the permitting process.

Recommendation 4a: If, in the future, the Authority finds that increasing the capacity of the BRRIT will enable more projects to be funded and implemented on shorter timelines, then BRITT funding should be increased, including consideration of using investment interest income.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

a. Annual Report

The Authority's annual report is currently targeted at internal audiences (Governing Board, Oversight Committee, other agencies focused on the Bay). It describes the Authority's mission (presumably well known to internal audiences) and includes charts displaying costs and other project metrics—information that might be provided in a simple document and posted online.

Given the time and effort to produce the 32-page, full color annual report, it ideally would be a workhorse for the Authority's outreach efforts, targeted to external audiences as well—describing the projects the Authority funded, the benefits these projects confer to the public, that collaboration makes these restoration projects possible and the benefits taxpayers derive from these projects.

b. Communications Overview

In addition to maintaining a robust website and producing the annual report, the Authority produces an array of communications materials. It would be helpful to the Oversight Committee (and potentially the Authority) to better understand what collateral materials are in use, their intended purpose, and the target audiences for these communications investments. A communications "matrix" could provide such an overview.

A communications matrix can help inform the Authority's priorities for future communications. It lists outreach tools (website, brochures, press releases, videos, etc.), their intended purpose and target audiences. The matrix can be useful in determining whether all of the Authority's audiences are being reached effectively and ensure that messaging and graphical identity are consistent across platforms.

c. Measure AA Ten-year Anniversary

The Authority's 10-year anniversary is an opportunity to showcase its impressive track record. The Oversight Committee is pleased to learn of plans in the works to develop a communications plan for this benchmark.

Given the Authority's limited communications capacity, the Committee encourages the Authority to collaborate with related agencies and NGOs to leverage the Authority's communications campaign. A joint communications plan in collaboration agencies and partners could leverage efforts to reach political and media contacts and expand public engagement and support for Measure AA's potential renewal.

The Oversight Committee sees the Authority's communications as emphasizing the cumulative benefits of the public's investment in the Bay (restoring the Bay environment, addressing climate threats, and improving quality of life for the entire Bay Area).

Finding 5a: The Authority produces an annual report that targets internal audiences, which limits the report's usefulness to raise awareness, understanding and support for the Authority's mission among external audiences.

Recommendation 5a: Given the significant time and resources to produce the annual report, we encourage the Authority to rethink the annual report as a vehicle not only for disseminating information internally, but also for public engagement.

Finding 5b: The Oversight Committee received a summary of the Authority's communication materials at its May 1, 2026 committee meeting.

Recommendation 5b: To help the Oversight Committee better understand the Authority's communications goals, target audiences and outreach strategies we would like to have Staff provide the Oversight Committee with a communication "matrix". A communications "matrix" would provide an overview of communications vehicles currently in use. It would include the Authority's target audience and the intended purpose of each communication.

Finding 5c: The Oversight Committee recognizes the 10th anniversary of Measure AA as an opportunity to showcase the cumulative impacts of the Authority's grant making with an eye to building public support for the Measure's potential renewal.

Recommendation 5c: The 10th anniversary communications plan should emphasize:
- Collaboration and resource sharing with Bay Area governments, agency partners, and NGOs to maximize audience.
- Consistent messaging among Authority partners
- The cumulative benefits of Measure AA to climate preparedness, habitat restoration, recreation, and quality of life for Bay Area residents.

6. APPLYING LESSONS LEARNED

When a project is completed, Staff provides the grantee with a report template to capture lessons learned and other critical information, such as in what ways the project was successful and advice the grantee might offer to a similar project. Grantees also complete a Grantee Feedback Survey to help improve the grantmaking process.

In February 2026, Staff provided the Authority's Advisory Committee with an overview of major lessons learned from the twenty-five completed Authority projects. Staff will continue to collect Lessons Learned Reports. Staff may provide this overview document to grantees as needed, or update and post it online periodically for grantees and the public to access.

Finding 6a: Staff provides a feedback mechanism for grantees to give input to improve the grant process.

Recommendation 6a. Capturing and archiving experiences encountered in project management and sharing those lessons with grantees and future public officials attempting large-scale restoration projects helps create a culture of institutional learning and informs future restoration efforts.

7. LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The Oversight Committee acknowledges that the changing political, legal, and regulatory environment may have impacts on the Authority's capacity, project selection, monitoring, and reporting. At the same time, the Oversight Committee recognizes that new funding challenges and opportunities could affect future Authority projects.

In our view, the passage of Measure AA in 2016 remains visionary, and the work of the Authority since then has helped to lead the way for an accelerating pace of adaptation and restoration. Towards that end we are encouraged by the excellent work of the Authority. We look forward to continuing collaboration with the Authority and the Governing Board to achieve the goals we all share.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Fiedler
Chair, Independent Citizens Oversight Committee