



**San Francisco Bay  
Restoration Authority**

# Governing Board

## AGENDA

Wednesday, April 28, 2010  
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

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

For additional information, please contact:  
Clerk of the Governing Board, (510) 464 7910

Agenda and attachments available at:  
[www.sfbayrestore.org](http://www.sfbayrestore.org)

**1. Call to Order**

*Action*

Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer, California State Coastal Conservancy

**2. Roll Call**

**3. Public Comment**

**4. Announcements**

**5. Approval of Summary Minutes of January 27, 2010**

*Action*

*Attachment: Summary Minutes for January 27, 2010*

**6. Organizational Matters**

**A. Report on Selection of Public Opinion Polling/Research Firm**

*Information*

Subcommittee on the Selection of Public Opinion Polling/Research Firm (Cortese, Foust, McGlashan, Schuchat)

*Attachment: Kelly/McEnespy memo dated April 23, 2010*

Agenda

**B. Report and Action on the San Francisco Bay Improvement Act of 2010 (Speier)**

*Action*

Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer, California State Coastal Conservancy

*Attachment: Kelly/McEnespy memo dated April 23, 2010*

**C. Report on Legislation Changes to AB 2954**

*Information*

Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer, California State Coastal Conservancy

**D. Report on the Advisory Committee—Completion of Formation**

*Action*

Moira McEnespy, Deputy Program Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Program,  
California State Coastal Conservancy

*Attachment: Kelly/McEnespy memo dated April 23, 2010*

**7. Adjournment**

Agenda submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board:  
April 23, 2010

Agenda posted:

# Governing Board

## DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

Wednesday, January 27, 2010  
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

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

For additional information, please contact:  
Clerk of the Governing Board, (510) 464 7910

Agenda and attachments available at:  
[www.sfbayrestore.org](http://www.sfbayrestore.org)

### **1. Call to Order**

Sam Schuchat, Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m.

A revised agenda was distributed.

### **2. Roll Call**

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

Present were Sam Schuchat, Rosanne Foust, Charles McGlashan, John Sutter, Phil Ting.  
Absent were Dave Cortese and John Gioia.

### **3. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **4. Announcements**

Sutter reported on a tour of North Bay restoration projects which he found interesting and worthwhile. He recommended members to attend upcoming tours.

Beth Huning, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, announced a tour of South Bay restoration projects will be scheduled in the spring.

There were no other announcements.

## **5. Approval of Summary Minutes of October 28, 2009**

A motion to approve the summary minutes of the Governing Board meeting on October 28, 2009, was made by Foust and seconded by McGlashan. The motion passed unanimously.

## **6. Organizational Matters**

### **A. Presentation on Funding Options**

Joe Edmiston, Executive Director, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, and the Mountain Recreation and Conservation Authority, spoke about the SMMC and MRCA's programs and experience in raising local money for land acquisition and operation and management of park and recreation lands; its selection of a benefit assessment district over other fundraising options; and other ways the SMMC and MRCA have used to raise funds.

He commented on the collaborative effort to restore the San Francisco Bay, noted that the public is supportive of open space conservation and acquisition, and described efforts undertaken by the MRCA to garner public support for benefit assessment district measures. He commented on Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association v. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, the Assessment Act of 1913, Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972, and Benefit Assessment Act of 1982.

Members discussed benefit assessment district measures, court challenges, park and recreation lands management, the relationship between the SMMC and the MRCA.

### **B. Report on Funding Mechanisms and Expenditure of Grant Funds to Support Public Opinion Polling/Research Survey**

Schuchat reported on the expenditure of grant funds, the development of a request for proposals for a public opinion polling/research survey to develop future ballot measures, including comments from Pat O'Brien, East Bay Parks and Recreation District, and the RFP distribution list. He also reported that any polling/research firm that had seen the draft RFP was excluded from the distribution list.

Gardner noted that Cortese was at a Metropolitan Transportation Commission public meeting which had attracted a large audience.

Members reviewed the draft request for proposals, submitted additional polling/research firms to the distribution list, reviewed the RFP process and posting, and discussed the inclusion of testing sales taxes.

A motion to approve the proposed request for proposals for Phase I polling and research using San Francisco Foundation grant funds in the amount of \$50,000, and to accept an additional \$50,000 for this effort from the Hewlett Foundation for use in Phase II was made by Foust and seconded by Ting. The motion passed unanimously.

Members thanked Conservancy and ABAG staff for their work and recognized David Lewis, Save The Bay, for making the initial foundation contacts.

#### **C. Amendments to AB 2954**

Schuchat reported on proposed amendments to the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Bill (AB 2954) which will add clarifying language regarding the Legislature's intent regarding multi-county election; provide for the Authority to issue revenue bonds; address limitations on the maturity date of bonded indebtedness and levy of voter-approved assessment/taxes; and address limitations on the Authority's ability to incur bonded indebtedness.

Gardner noted that the proposed amendments will not change or reverse something that is expressly denied in the current legislation and that they clarify the legislation.

A motion to determine that the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority sponsor amendments to the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Bill (AB 2954) that will provide needed clarifying language in order for the Authority to carry out its purpose, and that the California State Coastal Conservancy staff will manage this legislative change was made by McGlashan and seconded by Ting.

Sutter commented on the scope of the requested authorization regarding election issues.

The motion was amended to include other measures that will ensure consistency and conformity in conducting multi-county elections.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### **D. Formation of Advisory Committee (Update)**

Moira McEnespy, Deputy Program Manager, California Coastal Conservancy, reported on developments regarding the Advisory Committee, including that Advisory Committee members have been notified of their appointment; a briefing webinar was held January 21, 2010 with additional webinars to be scheduled if needed; and Governing Board members can still make nominations.

Members requested that the letter inviting interest from potential Advisory Committee members be re-sent to them. Members also discussed the composition of the Advisory Committee and submitting additional nominations, and the selection of additional Advisory Committee members.

**7. Adjournment**

The Governing Board meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

The next Governing Board meeting is on April 28, 2010.

Submitted by the Clerk of the Governing Board  
April 23, 2010

Approved by the Governing Board

**DRAFT**

March 1, 2010

Paula Trigueros  
San Francisco Estuary Partnership/ABAG

Dear Ms. Trigueros:

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) is pleased to submit this proposal to conduct public opinion research on behalf of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (hereinafter the "Authority") to determine the public's level of support for bay restoration efforts, and a variety of mechanisms to fund them. The attached proposal outlines our firm's experience, the specific research approach we propose, and cost estimates associated with a range of research options.


We believe that a number of factors leave FM3 uniquely qualified to provide this research to the Authority:

- ✓ FM3 has conducted two prior region-wide surveys measuring voter attitudes toward restoration of San Francisco Bay, and testing their willingness to pay for it, that could provide a useful baseline for this research effort.
- ✓ FM3 has completed numerous studies of public attitudes toward specific bodies of water – from the Chesapeake Bay to Puget Sound – seeking to identify strategies to fund their protection.
- ✓ FM3 has completed literally hundreds of surveys for local government jurisdictions in California seeking to gauge public support for ballot measures to fund public services – many involving complex survey instruments that test multiple funding mechanisms simultaneously.
- ✓ FM3 has maintained a fully-staffed office in Oakland for over a decade, meaning that FM3 researchers are readily available for in-person meetings and presentations.

To complete the proposed research, FM3 recommends conducting a telephone survey of up to 1,200 total interviews, approximately 20 minutes in length, among voters in the nine-county Bay Area who are likely to cast ballots in November 2012. Our proposal presents a number of options for alternative research structures for the Authority's consideration, all keeping within the project budget of \$50,000.

FM3 would welcome the opportunity to assist you with this important project. If I can answer any further questions, please contact me directly at (510) 451-9521 or [dave@fm3research.com](mailto:dave@fm3research.com).

Sincerely yours,



David Metz  
Partner, Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz and Associates

# Request to Conduct Opinion Research for the



## *Opinion Survey-Phase I*

March 1, 2010

Submitted By:

**Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates**

**Contact:**

**Dave Metz**  
Partner

**Shakari Byerly**  
Senior Researcher

921-2242

*Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates - FM3*

*Public Opinion Research & Strategy*

SANTA MONICA • OAKLAND • MADISON • MEXICO CITY



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>PAGE</u>
A. STATEMENT OF WORK .....	2
B. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE .....	6
C. CLIENT REFERENCES.....	8
D. BUDGET.....	9
E. EXAMPLES OF WORK .....	10

## **A. STATEMENT OF WORK**

This section outlines the key components of our recommended methodology for the Phase I Survey. FM3 proposes to conduct a 20-minute telephone survey of up to 1,200 likely November 2012 voters in the nine-county area, potentially preceded by focus groups to help inform the design of the survey questionnaire. We believe that our recommended approach will provide the Authority with the most accurate and statistically valid information on voter attitudes toward a potential finance measure, the measure's viability in the current political and economic context, and strategic recommendations for securing voter approval.

**Context:** Based on our prior research, the Authority has a number of advantages as it begins its research effort. First, Bay Area voters view the Bay as critically important: in our past research, 93% rated it as important to their quality of life, and sizable majorities say that it is a major reason they have chosen to live in the region and that the presence of the Bay supports local property values. Second, voters have some understanding of threats facing the health of the Bay. Our prior research showed that about as many rate the health of the Bay as “only fair” or “poor” as rate it “excellent” or “good” – and a plurality expect it to get worse, rather than better, in coming years. Third, voters are open to the idea of additional public funding to restore the Bay. In 2004, 75 percent of regional voters supported increased public spending on programs to improve the condition of the Bay.

Of course, the Authority faces a number of challenges as well. First, rising unemployment and declining home values have likely weakened the willingness to support increased spending on the Bay that was evident just over five years ago. Second, even in better economic times our research showed that the condition of the Bay ranked well behind other issues like health care, traffic, and unemployment as a priority for voters in the region. Third, our recent research has shown rising distrust in government throughout California, which contributes to voter reluctance to support new taxes – especially dedicated taxes that require two-thirds voter approval. The research should be designed to determine whether some of the advantages noted above can be leveraged to overcome some of these challenges.

**Questionnaire Design:** In designing the research for the Authority, FM3 will draw on its knowledge of public opinion survey methodology, its understanding of Bay Area voter attitudes, past experience conducting conservation finance measure feasibility studies, and the input it receives from Authority staff and stakeholders.

The process will begin with an initial, in-person kickoff meeting between key FM3 staff and members of the Authority and its partners that will be involved in the project. The meeting will provide a comprehensive discussion of the funding needs of the Authority and the key issues that should be explored in the survey.

After the meeting, FM3 staff will begin drafting the questionnaire, while maintaining close phone and e-mail contact with Authority staff to follow up on issues discussed during the kickoff meeting. FM3 will then present a first draft of the survey questionnaire to Authority staff for their review. After collecting feedback from staff, FM3 will revise and refine the survey questionnaire. We foresee proceeding through several drafts of the survey, incorporating feedback from key staff before each revision to develop a questionnaire that is capable of obtaining all of the information desired. Before commencing interviewing, FM3 will obtain the approval of the appropriate Authority representative on the final version of the questionnaire.

We anticipate that the survey will take the average respondent approximately 20 minutes to complete. Per the RFP, we envision that the survey will not include a detailed exploration of messaging that might motivate support for Bay restoration. Instead, we expect it to focus on assessing voter support for a variety of revenue-raising ballot measure concepts – most likely not at the level of testing specific ballot

language, but rather through testing conceptual support for a variety of approaches that the Authority might consider. Wherever possible, we will track questions from prior FM3 regional surveys on the subject in order to detect shifts in public opinion over time.

Among the specific issues to be explored in the survey might be the following:

- ✓ What are voters' perceptions of the condition of the Bay and surrounding wetlands?
- ✓ How does concern with Bay quality and Bay wetland restoration compare with other local issues?
- ✓ Do voters perceive a need for additional funding to support Bay wetland restoration, improvements to water quality, preservation of fish and wildlife habitat and other relevant projects?
- ✓ Would voters be willing to support a parcel tax, sales tax, special assessment or other funding mechanism to support Bay wetlands restoration and related projects? Why or why not?
- ✓ Given realistic options, how do voters prefer that revenue from a finance measure to support Bay restoration efforts be spent? Which items among projects planned by the Authority are the highest priorities for voters? How do the voters react to some of the unique projects that might be undertaken?
- ✓ Is a region-wide nine-county finance measure viable or is a county-by-county measure more feasible? Are there sub-regions of the County where a measure might be more feasible?
- ✓ What dollar level of tax impact is likely to garner in excess of two-thirds support from likely voters?
- ✓ Do flood control or other potential "ecosystem services," such as clean water, economic benefits or reductions in global warming, strengthen support?
- ✓ To what extent do voters support general Bay wetland restoration as opposed to projects in their own county?
- ✓ What is the best election timing to pursue a potential measure?
- ✓ What are the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the ballot measure's supporters, opponents, and those who are undecided?

A critical element to explore will be the viability of a regional funding approach. Will voters in Santa Clara County, for example, be willing to tax themselves to fund wetland restoration efforts in the North Bay? Survey questions should make these implications of a regional funding measure explicit for the respondents.

**Focus Groups:** In the initial meeting, FM3 and Authority staff should explore the option of conducting focus groups to inform the design of the questionnaire. Focus groups would provide an opportunity to better understand public perceptions of the Bay; the urgency of perceived threats facing it; and reactions to the appropriateness, effectiveness and equity of a variety of mechanisms that might be proposed to fund restoration of the Bay. If conducted, it would probably be important to hold sessions in at least three locations, in order to capture the geographic and political diversity of the region. Participants should be limited to those groups who – based on prior research and a screening questionnaire – have concern about the Bay, but are ambivalent about supporting additional taxes to restore it.

Of course, focus groups provide qualitative data that cannot be generalized with any statistical reliability to the broader Bay Area population. As a result, focus groups should be considered a complement to robust survey research, and not a replacement for it. A focus group option probably only merits consideration if 1) the funding options that need exploration in the survey are limited enough in number that they can be addressed in a relatively short questionnaire; or 2) additional resources are available to support focus group research beyond the project's initial \$50,000 budget.

**Sample Methodology:** As noted previously, FM3 proposes surveying up to 1,200 likely voters in the nine-county region. A sample size in this range will allow for greater precision in the analysis of results within individual counties. In order to ensure that the results can be analyzed with reliability within sub-regions, FM3 recommends that the sampling plan incorporate oversamples of some of the smaller sub-regions. FM3 will work with the District to design a sampling plan within this range of sample sizes to fit within its budget and meet the project's research objectives.

Designing the sample is a challenge, given that a large share (36%) of likely November 2012 voters in the nine-county region fall within the two East Bay counties of Alameda and Contra Costa, while just 20 percent are in the four counties of Marin, Napa, Sonoma and Solano.

In order to better balance the number of interviews by sub-region, and facilitate more detailed analysis of geographic subgroups within the region, FM3 recommends setting a quota of 300 interviews in each of four sub-regions of the nine-county area: the North Bay, East Bay, South Bay, and the Peninsula. This approach would yield a margin of error of +/- 3.3% for the full region and a margin of error of +/-5.7% for each sub-regional area. **Table I** details the expected margin of error for each county in the region at three different sample sizes, as well as recommended interview quotas to achieve the target of 300 interviews in each sub-region.

**Table I: County Margin of Error Calculations**

County	N=800		N=1,000		N=1,200		
	Expected # of Interviews	Margin of Error	Expected # of Interviews	Margin of Error	Expected # of Interviews	Margin of Error	Recommended Interview Quota (Assuming N=300 Per Sub-Region)
<b>North Bay</b>							
Marin (5% of Sample)	40	+/-15.8%	50	+/-13.9%	60	+/-12.7%	<b>75</b>
Napa (2% of Sample)	16	+/-25.0%	20	+/-22.4%	24	+/-19.6%	<b>39</b>
Sonoma (8% of Sample)	64	+/-12.5%	80	+/-11.2%	96	+/-10.2%	<b>111</b>
Solano (5% of Sample)	40	+/-15.8%	50	+/-13.9%	60	+/-12.7%	<b>75</b>
<b>East Bay</b>							
Alameda County (21% of Sample)	168	+/-7.7%	210	+/-6.9%	252	+/-6.3%	<b>186</b>
Contra Costa County (15% of Sample)	120	+/-9.1%	150	+/-8.0%	180	+/-7.5%	<b>114</b>
<b>SF/Peninsula</b>							
San Francisco (12% of Sample)	96	+/-10.2%	120	+/-9.1%	144	+/-8.3%	<b>162</b>
San Mateo (10% of Sample)	80	+/-11.2%	100	+/-9.8%	120	+/-9.1%	<b>138</b>
<b>South Bay</b>							
Santa Clara (22% of Sample)	176	+/-7.5%	220	+/-6.7%	264	+/-6.2%	<b>300</b>

**Of course, this is only one of a wide variety of research structures that might accomplish the goals set forth in the RFP.** As stated previously, FM3 proposes to work with Authority staff to design a final sampling plan that meets the joint goals of obtaining valid region-wide data while also obtaining useful data for geographic sub-regions.

**Reports and Presentations:** Results of the survey will be presented both in-person and in writing. The report's components will include: a description of methodology and a summary of results, key findings and conclusions. After a draft report has been reviewed and commented upon by Authority staff, FM3 will make any necessary changes and submit the final report. Finally, FM3 will make a detailed presentation of the survey findings to the Governing Board of the Authority and its Advisory Committee using PowerPoint. After FM3's report and presentation have been completed, FM3 will remain available to answer follow-up questions from staff. FM3 views the responses to the survey as an on-going data resource. If the need arises, FM3 can do further analysis to provide answers to follow-up questions that may be posed by the Authority.

**Deliverables:** In summary, upon conclusion of the survey project, the Authority will have received from FM3 all of the documents listed below. All documents can be provided in hard-copy and electronic formats.

- ✓ **Final survey questionnaire**
- ✓ **Topline survey results** (the survey questionnaire with response percentages for each response code)
- ✓ **Cross-tabulated results** (responses to all survey questions segmented by demographic, geographic, attitudinal and behavioral subgroups of Bay Area voters)
- ✓ **Comprehensive written report** (a written summary and analysis of the survey's results – including tables and graphs – with conclusions and recommendations)
- ✓ **In-person PowerPoint presentation of key findings** (color slides highlighting important findings and conclusions)
- ✓ **Raw data from the survey in electronic form** (delivered in a file format chosen by the Authority)

#### **PROJECT TIMELINE**

FM3 is ready to begin work on opinion research on behalf of the Authority on April 1, 2010 as outlined in the Request for Proposals (RFP). A draft outline of the timeframe within which project milestones will be completed follows below; we are capable of extending or accelerating this timeline at the Authority's request:

##### ***April 1–11, 2010***

- Authorization to proceed; kick-off meeting
- Finalize draft sample specifications and survey methodology and processes
- Circulate first survey draft for comment

##### ***April 12–23, 2010***

- Revise initial survey draft based upon staff review and comments
- Present revised survey draft to staff for further review and refinement
- Finalize survey draft
- Acquire the survey sample

##### ***April 24–30, 2010***

- Conduct interviews
- Produce topline results
- Produce cross-tabulation report

##### ***May 1–21, 2010***

- Produce survey reports and analysis, including a summary of the survey's key findings and a graphic presentation of the results
- Conduct initial presentation of results

## **B. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE**

A number of aspects of FM3's background and experience leave the firm well-qualified to conduct this research:

- ✓ **Three decades of experience conducting public policy-oriented opinion research.** FM3 has specialized in providing public opinion research and strategic advice for government agencies, businesses, and non-profit organizations across the country since the company was first organized in 1981. On an annual basis, the company conducts more than three hundred surveys and one hundred focus groups. It designs the research instrument, specifies the sampling or recruitment plan, manages the data gathering process and analyzes and interprets the data. FM3's decades of research in California have given the firm an extensive library of data to draw on to provide context for new survey results.
- ✓ **Prior region-wide survey research regarding restoration of San Francisco Bay.** FM3 has conducted two prior regional surveys on attitudes toward San Francisco Bay: a baseline survey for the **National Audubon Society** and a follow-up survey developed for the **Bay Institute** and the **Sonoma County Water Agency**. The surveys included a wide variety of questions about resident attitudes toward the Bay, its role in the region's quality of life, willingness to pay for efforts to restore the Bay, and the impact of messages designed to promote Bay restoration. The results of these two surveys can provide valuable context for the upcoming research proposed by the Authority.
- ✓ **Experience conducting research in the nine-county Bay Area on a variety of other issues.** FM3 has conducted regional research in the nine-county Bay Area for a number of other clients, on a wide range of issues – including the **Bay Area Open Space Council**, the **California Alliance for Jobs**, the **Environmental Defense Fund**, and **BART**. FM3 has also conducted region-wide research on voter attitudes toward transit-oriented development, funded by the **San Francisco Foundation**.

FM3 has also conducted research for a wide range of public-sector clients within the nine-county Bay Area. These include community and voter surveys for cities including **San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, Alameda, Orinda, Palo Alto, Pleasanton, Saratoga, Fremont, San Ramon, Martinez, Santa Cruz, Los Gatos, Vallejo, Fairfield, and Concord**; counties including **Alameda, Marin, Napa, Santa Clara and Sonoma**; and agencies including **the East Bay Regional Park District, the Port of Oakland, the Delta Diablo Sanitation District, the Dublin San Ramon Services District, and the Contra Costa Mosquito and Vector Control District**. FM3 has also conducted numerous surveys for a diverse variety of local school districts on finance and policy issues, including the **Evergreen Unified School District, the Franklin-McKinley Unified School District, the Alum Rock Unified School District, the Albany Unified School District, the Fremont-Newark Community College District, the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, the Hayward Unified School District, the Berkeley Unified School District, the Contra Costa Community College District** and the **West Contra Costa Unified School District**.

- ✓ **Extensive experience conducting research to assess the feasibility of public finance ballot measures.** FM3 is a recognized leader in providing critical services and guidance to support the passage of ballot measures and initiatives at both the state and local levels. FM3 has conducted voter opinion research for more than 200 ballot measure campaigns, ranging from statewide measures to local school bonds and tax measures. Some specific examples of our ballot measure research include the following:
  - FM3 research contributed to the design and voter approval of five statewide park and water bonds: Propositions 12 and 13 (2000), Proposition 40 (2002), Proposition 50 (2002), and Proposition 84 (2006).

- FM3 has a record of helping win approval for ballot measures that require two-thirds supermajority approval. FM3 helped pass 13 such measures in 2008 alone.
  - FM3 research has supported planning and public outreach efforts that have culminated in voter approval of more than \$40 billion in bond measures for California school and community college districts. In the 2008 elections, FM3 provided opinion research to the sponsors of nineteen successful school bond and tax measures in California.
  - FM3 recently conducted research to gauge voter support for ratifying and extending utility users taxes that fund a wide variety of local services. Voters in all nine of these cities ultimately approved the extension or establishment of the taxes.
- ✓ **A broad background in conducting research on the protection and restoration of specific bodies of water.** FM3 has conducted state, regional, and local research on voter attitudes toward restoring a wide variety of bodies of water – including exploration of support for mechanisms to fund such restoration projects. These efforts, described briefly below, closely parallel the type of research the Authority proposes to carry out:
- Since 2004, FM3 has carried out a series of state and regional surveys in the Chesapeake Bay watershed on behalf of the **Chesapeake Bay Foundation**. These efforts have helped to guide the organization’s messaging, and have provided data to help it secure significant public funding for Bay restoration – including a major allocation of \$50 million by the Virginia State Legislature.
  - Since 2008, FM3 has been working with a variety of coalitions in Washington State (including the **Puget Sound Partnership** and **Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines**) to secure dedicated public funding to improve the health of Puget Sound.
  - In 2007, FM3 completed a major regional survey and focus group research project in communities surrounding the Mississippi River on behalf of the **Biodiversity Project** with funding from the **McKnight Foundation**. The survey explored voter attitudes toward the River, and support for a major federal investment in River restoration.
  - Last year, FM3 surveyed residents of coastal counties in Texas and Louisiana on behalf of **The Nature Conservancy** to assess their support for efforts to restore marine habitats and shellfish beds along the coast.
  - Beginning in 2003, FM3 also completed a series of research projects (both surveys and focus groups) related to restoration of the San Joaquin River – initially in Fresno and Madera counties, and eventually in counties surrounding the length of the river. The research was conducted for a broad and diverse coalition led by the **San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust**.
  - FM3 has also completed a series of survey and focus group projects along California’s Central Coast, funded by the **Resources Legacy Fund Foundation**, to understand public support for the establishment of marine protected areas on the Pacific Coast.
- ✓ **Experience conducting research on messaging on water issues.** FM3 has conducted message-oriented research on water issues for a variety of organizations, including the **Association of California Water Agencies**, **The Nature Conservancy**, **the Trust for Public Land**, **Resources Law Group**, **the Environmental Defense Fund**, and **the National Audubon Society**.

## **C. REFERENCES**

The following references from projects previously mentioned in this proposal can attest to FM3's research capabilities.

**The Nature Conservancy Conservation Campaigns Team** – Since 2000, FM3 has conducted survey and focus group research in several dozen states across the country on behalf of The Nature Conservancy in support of ballot measures and policy initiatives to provide funding to conserve land and protect water quality. *Length of Engagement: 2000 to present. Total Contract Amount: In excess of \$500,000.*

*Carol Baudler  
Director of Conservation Campaigns  
The Nature Conservancy  
(510) 655-0887 / cbaudler@tnc.org*

**The Bay Institute** – FM3 worked with former Bay Institute Executive Director Grant Davis on a variety of research projects, including research in Fresno and Madera Counties on restoration of the San Joaquin River and a survey of voters in nine Bay Area counties on Bay restoration. *Length of Engagement: 3 months per project. Total Contract Amount: Approximately \$30,000 per survey.*

*Grant Davis  
Former Executive Director, the Bay Institute  
Current Interim General Manager, the Sonoma County Water Agency  
(707) 526-5370*

**Chesapeake Bay Foundation** – Since 2004, FM3 has completed a variety of survey research on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation to measure public engagement with the Bay and evaluate support for a variety of legislative proposals to fund its restoration. *Length of Engagement: 2004 to present. Total Contract Amount: In excess of \$200,000.*

*Elizabeth Buckman  
Vice President - Communications  
The Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
(410) 268-8816 / ebuckman@cbf.org*

**City of San Jose** – Since 2000, FM3 has provided a wide variety of survey research to the City of San Jose. This has included community satisfaction surveys, budget prioritization surveys, employee surveys, and (of most relevance to the Authority's work) surveys to assess the relative feasibility of a variety of ballot measures to fund public services. *Length of Engagement: 2000 to present. Total Contract Amount: In excess of \$400,000.*

*Tom Manheim  
Communications Director  
City of San Jose  
(408) 535-8170 / tom.manheim@sanjoseca.gov*



**D. BUDGET**

In order to meet the research objectives of the Phase I Survey, FM3 recommends that the Authority conduct a 20 minute survey of up to 1,200 likely voters in the nine-county Bay Area. FM3 is prepared to conduct this recommended course of research for a total cost of up to \$47,000 depending upon the ultimate length and sample size selected. For comparison, a 15-minute survey of 1,200 voters would be \$37,750. A survey of 1,000 voters would be \$41,250 (20 minutes) or \$32,750 (15 minutes). A survey of 800 voters would be \$34,750 (20 minutes) or \$28,250 (15 minutes).

The RFP requests staff billing rates for project personnel and key project tasks. FM3 typically bills by the project, not by the hour or deliverable. We have, however, provided tables below detailing billing rates and an overview of costs associated with the project’s key tasks. The FM3 overhead rate (based on State of California audit) is 1.32.

**Billing Rates per Hour**

Title	Hourly Rate
Principal/Partner	\$200
Senior Researcher	\$120
Data Analyst	\$98
Operations Manager	\$85

**Overview of Costs**

Item	Cost at 20 Minutes		
	N=800	N=1,000	N=1,200
Sample acquisition	\$700	\$900	\$1,250
Preparation of survey instrument	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500
Telephone interviewing	\$20,000	25,350	\$29,725
Data Analysis	\$4,500	\$5,500	\$6,500
Report preparation and presentations	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,525
Office expenses such as reproductions, shipping, etc.	\$500	\$500	\$500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$34,750</b>	<b>\$41,250</b>	<b>\$47,000</b>

The total prices listed are comprehensive and reflect all costs for telephone interviewing, sample acquisition, questionnaire development, data entry, cross-tabulation, data analysis and preparation, presentation and reporting of survey results. FM3 is committed to creating, implementing and analyzing the research in the most cost-effective manner. FM3 will work directly with you to design a final research plan that both serves your research needs and also meets your budget.

**Supplemental Research Option: Focus Groups**

Should the Authority wish to conduct focus groups to inform the design of the survey, as discussed on the statement of work, the cost for each focus group session would be \$7,500. This price is comprehensive and includes all costs for recruitment and incentives for participants, facility rental, formation of moderator’s guide, session moderation, DVD copies of groups, transcripts of groups, conference call discussion of findings, memo of findings, and presentation of findings.

## **E. EXAMPLES OF WORK**

The following samples of our work demonstrate FM3's capabilities in conducting complex and high-quality opinion research, and also have some specific relevance to the research proposed by the Authority.

### ***1) 2004 San Francisco Bay Restoration Survey***

The following pages include topline results and a graphic report from a 2004 survey we conducted in the nine-county San Francisco Bay area to evaluate public attitudes toward the Bay; their willingness to pay to conserve it; and their reactions to a variety of messages that might be used to promote protection or restoration of the Bay. The survey was developed in consultation with the Bay Institute and the Sonoma County Water Agency. A number of the questions tracked the results of a similar survey that we completed in 2001 on behalf of the National Audubon Society.

While the research was more focused on developing messaging than on testing the feasibility of specific mechanisms to fund Bay restoration, it included a number of baseline questions about public attitudes that may be useful to track in the current study.

### ***2) 2008 City of San Jose Ballot Measure Feasibility Survey***

Following the San Francisco Bay study, we have included the final report from a July 2008 survey we conducted for the City of San Jose to explore voter support for five different potential revenue-generating ballot measures the City was considering placing on the ballot (topline results of the survey are included as an appendix to the report). The survey demonstrates our ability to concisely and accurately test a variety of ballot measure concepts within a single survey instrument; FM3 conducts dozens of comparable studies for local governments in California every year.

Ultimately, the survey results played a critical role in the City of San Jose's decision to place two measures on the November ballot, and helped guide the structure of the measures and the design of the ballot language. Both measures passed overwhelmingly.

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY ISSUES SURVEY**  
**320-220WT**  
**N = 600**

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_ from FMA, a public opinion research company. I am not trying to sell you anything. We're conducting a survey about issues that concern voters in the Bay Area. May I speak with \_\_\_\_\_? **(MUST SPEAK WITH VOTER LISTED. VERIFY THAT THE VOTER LIVES AT THE ADDRESS LISTED--OTHERWISE TERMINATE.)**

**FIRST, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AND SOME OF THE BODIES OF WATER THAT ARE PART OF IT, INCLUDING RICHARDSON BAY AND SAN PABLO BAY. THROUGHOUT THIS SURVEY, WHEN I REFER TO THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY I AM REFERRING TO ALL OF THESE INTERCONNECTED BODIES OF WATER.**

**(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)**

1. In a few words of your own, what are the main benefits that the San Francisco Bay provides for you as a resident of the Bay Area? **(OPEN-END, RECORD VERBATIM ANSWER BELOW AND CODE AFTERWARDS)**

- Pleasant environment/weather/view ----- 47%
- Recreation ----- 15%
- Wildlife ----- 7%
- Tourist attractions ----- 6%
- The water ----- 4%
- Transportation ----- 4%
- Convenient location ----- 3%
- Entertainment ----- 3%
- Creates jobs ----- 2%
- Bridges ----- 2%
- Food supply ----- 1%
- Low cost housing ----- 1%
- Don't know ----- 15%

**(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)**

2. In a few words of your own, what do you think is the biggest problem facing the San Francisco Bay? **(OPEN-END, DO NOT READ CHOICES – RECORD VERBATIM ANSWER BELOW, AND THEN CODE AFTERWARD)**

- Pollution ----- 41%
- Traffic ----- 10%
- Toxics ----- 5%
- Runoff ----- 4%
- Lack of public access ----- 3%
- Airport expansion ----- 2%
- Loss of wetlands/tidal marshes ----- 2%
- Politicians ----- 2%
- (OTHER-SPECIFY)** ----- 7%
- (DON'T KNOW/NA)** ----- 31%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

3. Next, I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. After I read each one, please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. **(ROTATE)**

	<u>EXT.</u> <u>SER.</u>	<u>VERY</u> <u>SER.</u>	<u>S.W.</u> <u>SER.</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>TOO</u> <u>SER.</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>AT ALL</u> <u>SER.</u>	<u>(DK/</u> <u>NA)</u>
<b>(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)</b>						
[ ]a. (T) Pollution of rivers and streams-----	20%	38%	24%	7%	3%	8%
[ ]b. (T) Loss of open space-----	20%	34%	28%	9%	4%	4%
[ ]c. (T) Crime-----	18%	35%	26%	14%	4%	3%
[ ]d. (T) The rate at which land is being developed-----	23%	36%	22%	9%	5%	6%
[ ]e. (T) Loss of farm land-----	21%	30%	21%	12%	10%	6%
[ ]f. (T) Government waste and inefficiency-----	28%	37%	20%	8%	3%	3%
[ ]g. (T) Overall levels of pollution in the San Francisco Bay-----	22%	31%	24%	13%	3%	7%
[ ]h. The quality of public schools-----	26%	39%	21%	8%	2%	5%
[ ]i. (T) Air pollution and smog-----	18%	26%	32%	17%	5%	0%
[ ]j. (T) Loss of wetlands-----	21%	29%	23%	14%	5%	8%
[ ]k. The cost of health care-----	48%	37%	6%	5%	2%	1%

**(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)**

[ ]l. (T) The quality of drinking water-----	12%	18%	25%	25%	16%	3%
[ ]m. (T) Traffic and congestion-----	43%	42%	12%	3%	1%	1%
[ ]n. (T) Pollution of the part of the San Francisco Bay nearest where you live-----	19%	27%	21%	15%	6%	11%
[ ]o. (T) Unemployment-----	27%	31%	21%	12%	5%	4%
[ ]p. Population growth-----	26%	32%	17%	15%	4%	5%
[ ]q. The loss of habitat for fish and wildlife-----	29%	31%	20%	9%	8%	4%
[ ]r. (T) The cost of housing-----	44%	34%	12%	7%	2%	2%
[ ]s. (T) The availability of public transportation-----	18%	25%	25%	13%	12%	6%
[ ]t. (T) The amount of money people have to pay in taxes-----	26%	25%	23%	13%	7%	5%
[ ]u. (T) The overall condition of the land around San Francisco Bay nearest where you live-----	13%	18%	18%	22%	21%	8%
[ ]v. Polluted runoff-----	21%	31%	15%	11%	8%	14%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

4. Next, how often would you say that you participate in the following activities at or around the San Francisco Bay: at least once per week, once per month, several times per year, once per year, less than once a year, or never? **(ROTATE)**

	<u>ONCE</u>	<u>ONCE/</u>	<u>SEVERAL/</u>	<u>ONCE/</u>	<u>LESS</u>		<u>(DK/</u>
	<u>WEEK</u>	<u>MONTH</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>THAN</u>	<u>NEVER</u>	<u>NA)</u>
					<u>ONC./YR.</u>		
[ ] a. Hiking on outdoor trails -----	17%	21%	20%	7%	6%	29%	0%
[ ] b. Boating or participating in water sports -----	6%	8%	15%	13%	9%	50%	0%
[ ] c. Going to parks or recreation areas -----	30%	24%	28%	7%	2%	9%	1%
[ ] d. Going fishing -----	5%	4%	8%	7%	6%	69%	1%
[ ] e. Swimming -----	12%	9%	13%	9%	6%	51%	1%
[ ] f. Biking -----	14%	13%	14%	5%	5%	49%	1%
[ ] g. Walking or jogging -----	56%	11%	15%	3%	2%	14%	0%
[ ] h. Hunting -----	1%	0%	1%	2%	2%	93%	1%
[ ] i. Birding -----	11%	4%	4%	3%	2%	73%	2%
[ ] j. Looking at or visually appreciating the Bay -----	52%	15%	19%	4%	1%	8%	1%

5. Next, I'm going to read you a list of statements about the San Francisco Bay. After I read each statement, I'd like you to tell me whether you generally agree or disagree. **(IF AGREE/DISAGREE, ASK: "Is that strongly AGREE/DISAGREE or just somewhat?") (ROTATE)**

	<u>STR.</u>	<u>S.W.</u>	<u>S.W.</u>	<u>STR.</u>	<u>(DK/</u>
	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>DISAG.</u>	<u>DISAG.</u>	<u>NA)</u>
[ ] a. San Francisco Bay is very important to my quality of life -----	68%	25%	4%	3%	1%
[ ] b. The presence of the Bay increases the value of homes throughout the Bay Area -----	64%	24%	4%	4%	4%
[ ] c. Being close to the Bay is a major reason why I have chosen to live where I live -----	38%	22%	19%	19%	2%

**MY NEXT QUESTIONS DEAL WITH THE CONDITION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY.**

6. Based on what you know, how would you rate the overall condition of the San Francisco Bay: **(READ LIST)**

Excellent -----	4%
Good -----	43%
Just fair, or -----	32%
Poor -----	13%
<b>(DON'T KNOW/NA)</b> -----	8%

7. Do you expect the condition of the San Francisco Bay to get better or worse in the next five years? (IF BETTER/WORSE, ASK: Is that much BETTER/WORSE or just somewhat?)

(T)

Much better-----	13%
Somewhat better-----	16%
<b>(NO DIFFERENCE)</b> -----	17%
Somewhat worse-----	31%
Much worse-----	16%
<b>(DON'T KNOW/NA)</b> -----	6%

8. In general, would you support or oppose increasing public spending on programs to improve the overall condition of the San Francisco Bay? (IF SUPPORT/OPOSE, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/ OPOSE or just somewhat?)

Strongly support-----	47%
Somewhat support-----	28%
Somewhat oppose-----	8%
Strongly oppose-----	10%
<b>(DK/NA)</b> -----	6%

9. Would you be willing to pay \_\_\_\_\_ more in a dedicated tax to fund programs to protect the San Francisco Bay? (IF WILLING/UNWILLING, ASK: Would you be very WILLING/UNWILLING to pay that amount, or just somewhat?) (DO NOT ROTATE)

	<u>VERY</u> <u>WILL.</u>	<u>S.W.</u> <u>WILL.</u>	<u>S.W.</u> <u>UNWILL.</u>	<u>VERY</u> <u>UNWILL.</u>	<u>(DK/</u> <u>NA)</u>
a. 100 dollars per year-----	31%	27%	13%	20%	9%
b. 75 dollars per year-----	33%	27%	13%	19%	9%
c. 50 dollars per year-----	35%	30%	11%	15%	9%
d. 25 dollars per year-----	39%	32%	8%	14%	8%
e. 10 dollars per year-----	44%	27%	8%	13%	8%

10. Next, I'm going to read you a list of activities that local residents can participate in to help protect the San Francisco Bay. After I read each one, please tell me how willing you would be to participate in that activity. (IF WILLING, ASK:) Is that very willing or only somewhat? (ROTATE)

	<u>VERY</u> <u>WILLING</u>	<u>SW</u> <u>WILLING</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>WILLING</u>	<u>(DON'T</u> <u>READ)</u> <u>DK/NA</u>
[ ] a. Signing up for an e-mail newsletter that provides information about the Bay-----	16%	27%	53%	3%
[ ] b. Sending an e-mail or writing a letter to your elected officials-----	25%	34%	37%	3%
[ ] c. Attending public meetings on Bay-related issues-----	16%	33%	50%	2%
[ ] d. Volunteering your time to an organization dedicated to protecting the Bay-----	18%	33%	46%	3%
[ ] e. Participating in a creek clean-up or restoration day-----	28%	34%	35%	3%
[ ] f. Making a donation to an organization dedicated to protecting the Bay-----	25%	41%	30%	4%

**NOW I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE YOU SOME MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY.**

11. I'm going to read you a list of facts about the condition of San Francisco Bay. After I read each one, please tell me how concerned you are about that item: extremely concerned, very concerned, somewhat concerned or not too concerned. **(ROTATE)**

	<u>EXT. CONC.</u>	<u>VERY CONC.</u>	<u>S.W. CONC.</u>	<u>NOT TOO CONC.</u>	<u>(DK/ NA)</u>
<b>(SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)</b>					
[ ] a. 18 species of fish, birds, and animals that live in San Francisco Bay have been designated as endangered-----	26%	32%	23%	17%	1%
[ ] b. In the year 2000, 94 percent of all Bay fish sampled were contaminated with harmful chemicals like PCBs, mercury and pesticides that made them unsafe to eat -----	39%	39%	13%	8%	2%
[ ] c. San Francisco Bay has shrunk by one-third in the last 150 years-----	27%	24%	24%	21%	4%

**(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)**

[ ] d. Three-quarters of the original wetland, marsh, and river habitat around the San Francisco Bay either no longer exists or has been developed-----	29%	32%	18%	16%	4%
[ ] e. Native fish populations in the Bay have declined by 50 percent since 1940, leading to a collapse of commercial and recreational fishing-----	29%	31%	21%	15%	4%
[ ] f. Many fish that are caught in the Bay are not safe to eat-----	44%	37%	8%	7%	4%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

12. Now I'm going to read you some statements from people who support increasing public spending on programs to protect the San Francisco Bay. After hearing each statement, please tell me if it makes you more inclined to support such programs. If you do not believe the statement, or if it has no effect on your thinking one way or the other, please tell me that too. **(IF MORE INCLINED, ASK: "Is that much more or just somewhat?") (ROTATE)**

	<u>MUCH MORE INCL.</u>	<u>SMWHT MORE INCL.</u>	<u>(LESS INCL.)</u>	<u>DON'T BELIEVE</u>	<u>NO EFFECT</u>	<u>(NO OPIN.)</u>
[ ] a. By attracting tourists, supporting commercial fishing, offering opportunities for recreation, and attracting quality employers to the region, the Bay contributes billions of dollars to our economy every year.-----	28%	29%	10%	8%	11%	14%
[ ] b. The Bay Area's population is expected to grow by nearly two million people in the next 25 years alone. We need to act now to protect San Francisco Bay, or it will become even more polluted as the area's growth skyrockets.-----	41%	33%	6%	6%	6%	9%

	<u>MUCH</u> <u>MORE</u> <u>INCL.</u>	<u>SMWHT</u> <u>MORE</u> <u>INCL.</u>	<u>(LESS</u> <u>INCL.)</u>	<u>DON'T</u> <u>BELIEVE</u>	<u>NO</u> <u>EFFECT</u>	<u>(NO</u> <u>OPIN.)</u>
[ ]c. San Francisco Bay has been a part of our community's economic and social life for hundreds of years, providing jobs and a place for recreation to generations of Bay Area residents. Preserving the Bay will protect this historical legacy. -----	40%	32%	4%	5%	10%	9%
[ ]d. By keeping San Francisco Bay clean, we can improve public health. Toxic pollutants that flow into the Bay end up contaminating the water, our coastline, and the fish that live in the Bay. Protecting the Bay will help ensure clean water, clean beaches, and fish that are safe to eat. -----	51%	32%	3%	6%	4%	5%
[ ]e. Protecting San Francisco Bay will preserve our local quality of life for future generations. By protecting the Bay, we can leave a legacy for our children and grandchildren and ensure that they will enjoy the benefits of the Bay just as much as we do. -----	47%	35%	3%	3%	7%	4%
[ ]f. San Francisco Bay defines our region and is central to our quality of life. Not only does it provide excellent places for hiking, boating, swimming, and fishing, but it offers unparalleled natural beauty and many quiet places to enjoy nature. Protecting the Bay preserves what makes our community special and unique. -----	46%	35%	2%	4%	7%	5%
13. Now that you have heard more about the idea, let me ask you again: would you support or oppose increasing public spending on programs to improve the overall condition of the San Francisco Bay? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?)						
		Strongly support-----				47%
		Somewhat support -----				27%
		Somewhat oppose-----				5%
		Strongly oppose -----				12%
		(DK/NA) -----				8%



14. And let me ask you again -- would you be willing to pay \_\_\_\_\_ more in a dedicated tax to fund programs to protect the San Francisco Bay? **(IF WILLING/UNWILLING, ASK: Would you be very WILLING/UNWILLING to pay that amount, or just somewhat?) (DO NOT ROTATE)**

	<u>VERY WILL.</u>	<u>S.W. WILL.</u>	<u>S.W. UNWILL.</u>	<u>VERY UNWILL.</u>	<u>(DK/ NA)</u>
a. 100 dollars per year-----	33%	22%	13%	24%	8%
b. 75 dollars per year-----	34%	22%	13%	23%	8%
c. 50 dollars per year-----	36%	26%	12%	18%	8%
d. 25 dollars per year-----	39%	29%	9%	16%	7%
e. 10 dollars per year-----	49%	22%	6%	16%	7%

15. Now I am now going to read you a list of persons and organizations that may take positions on issues related to San Francisco Bay. After I read each name, please tell me if you would find that person or organization very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible or not credible at all on these issues. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or do not have an opinion, you can tell me that too. **(ROTATE)**

	<u>VERY CRED.</u>	<u>SW CRED.</u>	<u>NOT TOO CRED.</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL CRED.</u>	<u>(NEVER HEARD OF)</u>	<u>(NO OPINION)</u>
[ ]a. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger-----	25%	27%	19%	21%	0%	7%
[ ]b. San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom-----	32%	31%	7%	11%	2%	15%
[ ]c. Fishermen-----	32%	34%	5%	5%	5%	18%
[ ]d. The <u>San Francisco Chronicle</u> newspaper ----	27%	33%	12%	12%	3%	13%
[ ]e. The Sierra Club -----	34%	31%	9%	9%	6%	11%
[ ]f. The California Department of Water Resources-----	39%	31%	3%	4%	4%	20%
[ ]g. Your local Chamber of Commerce-----	17%	37%	12%	10%	3%	21%
[ ]h. Farmers-----	37%	31%	8%	11%	1%	13%
[ ]i. Your local county supervisor -----	21%	29%	9%	11%	9%	20%
[ ]j. A-A-R-P, or the American Association of Retired Persons -----	25%	34%	11%	12%	1%	17%
[ ]k. Scientists -----	42%	36%	3%	4%	1%	13%
[ ]l. The Audubon Society-----	37%	32%	3%	4%	7%	16%
[ ]m. Save the Bay -----	31%	32%	4%	4%	14%	16%
[ ]n. The Aquarium of the Bay-----	27%	22%	4%	3%	23%	21%
[ ]o. Environmental organizations-----	29%	40%	5%	7%	2%	16%

**(SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)**

[ ]p. Oakland Mayor Jerry Brown-----	25%	37%	8%	7%	2%	20%
[ ]q. The California Farm Bureau -----	20%	23%	6%	3%	22%	27%
[ ]r. The Nature Conservancy -----	34%	25%	4%	3%	19%	15%
[ ]s. The <u>San Jose Mercury News</u> -----	23%	32%	9%	10%	5%	22%
[ ]t. The Bay Institute -----	17%	17%	2%	2%	38%	24%
[ ]u. Indian tribes-----	17%	25%	14%	17%	8%	20%
[ ]v. The Natural Resources Defense Council-----	20%	20%	3%	4%	34%	19%
[ ]w. Your local church-----	31%	26%	4%	12%	4%	23%
[ ]x. Biologists-----	44%	37%	2%	3%	4%	10%
[ ]y. A student involved in Bay clean-ups-----	34%	39%	5%	5%	6%	11%
[ ]z. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	34%	38%	10%	9%	2%	7%

						(DON'T READ)
	<u>VERY</u>	<u>SW</u>	<u>NOT</u>	<u>NOT</u>	<u>(NEVER</u>	<u>(NO</u>
	<u>CRED.</u>	<u>CRED.</u>	<u>TOO</u>	<u>AT ALL</u>	<u>HEARD</u>	<u>OPINION)</u>
			<u>CRED.</u>	<u>CRED.</u>	<u>OF)</u>	<u>OPINION)</u>
[ ]aa. Your local water agency -----	39%	41%	6%	4%	3%	7%
[ ]bb. A university professor -----	29%	42%	4%	6%	2%	17%
[ ]cc. The League of Women Voters -----	32%	32%	10%	9%	2%	14%
[ ]dd. The Steinhart Aquarium-----	41%	32%	3%	2%	10%	11%
[ ]ee. Conservation organizations -----	33%	33%	7%	3%	9%	16%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

16. There are many ways public agencies might try to reach members of the public with information about what they can do to help improve the condition of San Francisco Bay. For each one I mention, please tell me whether you would definitely pay attention, maybe pay attention, or definitely not pay attention to this information if it were presented to you in that way. **(ROTATE)**

					(DON'T
	<u>DEF</u>	<u>MAYBE</u>	<u>DEF. NOT</u>	<u>DEF. NOT</u>	<u>READ)</u>
	<u>PAY ATT.</u>	<u>PAY ATT.</u>	<u>PAY ATT.</u>	<u>PAY ATT.</u>	<u>DK/NA</u>
[ ]a. An ad that runs on networkTV -----	25%	44%	27%	4%	
[ ]b. A radio ad -----	21%	46%	32%	2%	
[ ]c. A written brochure or pamphlet-----	21%	49%	28%	2%	
[ ]d. An advertisement in the newspaper -----	21%	45%	32%	2%	
[ ]e. A banner ad on an Internet website-----	9%	34%	54%	3%	
[ ]f. A news article in your local newspaper-----	36%	46%	17%	1%	
[ ]g. A toll-free telephone number you could call to request information -----	16%	35%	47%	3%	
[ ]h. A billboard -----	21%	39%	38%	2%	
[ ]i. An ad on a ferry boat, bus or BART -----	19%	38%	40%	3%	
[ ]j. An ad that runs on <u>cable</u> TV -----	20%	44%	33%	3%	
[ ]k. A nature center -----	32%	39%	25%	4%	
[ ]l. The front pages of the phone book -----	13%	38%	47%	3%	
[ ]m. A message on a java jacket, available to go around your cup of coffee at your local coffee shop -----	13%	34%	50%	3%	
[ ]n. Classroom programs in schools -----	35%	32%	29%	4%	
[ ]o. An insert in your utility bill -----	21%	34%	42%	3%	
[ ]p. An ad on a bus shelter -----	15%	31%	51%	3%	

**WE'RE JUST ABOUT DONE. I'M ONLY GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW MORE QUESTIONS FOR CLASSIFICATION PURPOSES.**

17. How long have you lived in the Bay Area? **(OPEN-END—CODE IN APPROPRIATE CATEGORY)**

- Five years or less----- 4%
- 6-10 years----- 7%
- 11-15 years----- 6%
- 16-20 years----- 9%
- 21-25 years----- 5%
- 26 years or more ----- 34%
- Born and raised ----- 27%
- (DK/REFUSED/NA)**----- 8%

18. Do you have any school-aged children living at home?

- Yes----- 29%
- No ----- 69%
- (DON'T KNOW/NA)**----- 2%

19. What was the last level of school you completed?

- Grades 1-8 ----- 1%
- Grades 9-11 ----- 2%
- High school graduate(12)----- 15%
- Some college/vocational school ----- 28%
- College (4 years) ----- 29%
- Post-graduate work ----- 22%
- (DON'T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED** ----- 3%

20. With which racial or ethnic group do you identify yourself? **(READ RESPONSES)**

- Hispanic or Latino----- 9%
- Anglo/White----- 67%
- African-American or Black ----- 5%
- Asian----- 9%
- Something else----- 1%
- (DON'T READ) Refused/NA**----- 9%

THANK AND TERMINATE

GENDER (By Observation):

Male ----- 47%
Female ----- 53%

PARTY REGISTRATION:

Democrat----- 52%
Republican----- 26%
Decline to State----- 18%
Other ----- 4%

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

Cluster # \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_

Voter ID# \_\_\_\_\_

ZIP CODE \_\_\_\_\_

Assembly Dist. \_\_\_\_\_

PRECINCT \_\_\_\_\_

State Senate Dist. \_\_\_\_\_

AGE

18-29 ----- 11%
30-39 ----- 16%
40-49 ----- 23%
50-64 ----- 29%
65 + ----- 17%
NONE ----- 4%

VOTE BY MAIL

1 ----- 16%
2 ----- 6%
3 ----- 5%
4 ----- 4%
5 + ----- 12%
BLANK ----- 57%

FLAGS

P98 ----- 45%
G98 ----- 58%
P00 ----- 56%
G00 ----- 75%
P02 ----- 49%
G02 ----- 68%
R03 ----- 82%
P04 ----- 69%

COUNTY

Alameda ----- 20%
Contra Costa ----- 14%
Marin ----- 5%
Napa ----- 2%
San Francisco ----- 13%
San Mateo ----- 10%
Santa Clara ----- 23%
Solano ----- 5%
Sonoma ----- 8%



# 2004 San Francisco Bay Issues Survey

*August 2004*

320-220

*Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates*  
*Opinion Research & Public Policy Analysis*

---

Santa Monica, CA – Oakland, CA – Madison, WI – Mexico City



## Methodology:

- **Telephone interviews with 600 registered voters in the nine-county Bay Area**
- **Interviews conducted September 13-19, 2004**
- **Margin of sampling error of +/- 4.0%**
- **Selected comparisons to results of fall 2000 surveys of Bay Area residents and voters, and summer 2004 survey of voters in the Chesapeake Bay watershed**




## **Existing Perceptions of the San Francisco Bay**



## Voters see a pleasant environment, weather, and views as the primary benefits of the Bay.

*(Top Responses Only)*








## **Sample Responses – Benefits of the Bay**

- ***“I think that the San Francisco Bay provides a good climate, natural setting, and wildlife refuge.”***
- ***“Just to see it.”***
- ***“The main benefit is the different types of species that live in the Bay.”***
- ***“There are no real benefits that the San Francisco Bay provides for me. All I can say is it is a gorgeous place to live in.”***
- ***“One of the main benefits of the San Francisco Bay in our area is that it moderates the climate s that it is never too hot or too cold here. The temperatures basically stay at a constant level.”***
- ***“Listening to the sound of winds coming over the Bay.”***
- ***“The shipping industry is beneficial to the economy of the Bay Area.”***
- ***“The relaxation of boating and fishing.”***
- ***“The view from the Golden Gate Bridge.”***
- ***“Jogging along the many nature trails.”***
- ***“The scenic view of ships in the Bay.”***
- ***“Beauty, and provides healthful moisture and humidity, and seafood. It’s important to keep our environment intact; I enjoy it and I want it to be there.”***
- ***“The benefit I get from the Bay is I get to go boating. I simply enjoy the Bay itself. I get to take my kids on the ferry which I really enjoy.”***
- ***“The benefits are endless – it’s such a pleasing environment.”***



## Voters see pollution as the primary threat to the Bay.


*(Top Responses Only)*





## Perceptions of threats to the Bay have changed little since 2000.

*(Top Responses Only)*






## ***Sample Responses – Problems Facing the Bay***

- ***“I think the biggest problem facing the San Francisco Bay is pollution.”***
- ***“I would have to say the one biggest problem facing the San Francisco Bay is the destruction of the wetlands.”***
- ***“The loss of the Bay – it is shrinking.”***
- ***“The biggest problem facing the Bay is refineries and corporate dumping.”***
- ***“I think the biggest problem is President Bush.”***
- ***“Too many people living on the Bay and causing pollution.”***
- ***“All the landfills drain into the water.”***
- ***“ I feel that the biggest problems facing the San Francisco Bay are the landfills, pollution of the water, and the disruption of the wildlife because of the landfills and pollution.”***
- ***“Fumes from the cars.”***
- ***“Gasses contaminating the water, coming out of boats.”***
- ***“I think it is the human population and the misuse of the Bay by people.”***
- ***“Oil barges spilling oil into waterways.”***
- ***“Too many people, too many boaters in concentrated areas.”***




## Most voters at least occasionally participate in recreational activities around the Bay.





## Voters are divided in their assessment of the current condition of the Bay.






## Bay Condition Demographics: Political Party and Race/Ethnicity

■ Total Exc./Good ■ Total Fair/poor ■ Other

### Political Party


### Race/Ethnicity






## Chesapeake Bay voters are similarly divided in their evaluations of the Bay.

### Chesapeake Bay




### San Francisco Bay







## Watershed voters see the Bay as very important to their quality of life, but most do not think it is in good condition.




6a/b. Now I am going to mention some bodies of water in your area. For each one that I mention, please tell me how important you believe that body of water is to the overall quality of life in your area. Please use a scale from one to five, where one is "not at all important" and five is "extremely important." If you have never heard of that body of water, please tell me that too. (A/B)N=1215

7a/b. Now I am going to read you the same list of local bodies of water one more time. This time, after I read each one, please tell me how you would grade the overall condition of that body of water. Would you give it a grade of A, for excellent; B, for pretty good; C, for only fair; D, for poor; or F, for failing? (A/B) N=1211



## Voters think the Bay's condition will get worse in the next few years.






## That feeling of pessimism has held constant since 2000.

October 2000

September 2004




7. Do you expect the condition of the San Francisco Bay to get better or worse in the next five years? 2000 Results = All Residents, 2004 Results = Voters



## Traffic, health care, and housing costs are the top concerns for Bay Area voters.

Opinion Research &  
Public Policy Analysis



3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample



## Continued:

■ Ext./Very Ser. ■ S.W. Ser. ■ Not Too/At All Ser. ■ DK/NA

The rate at which land is being developed


Pollution of rivers and streams

Unemployment

Population growth

Loss of open space


Crime



3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample



## Continued:




3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample



## Continued:

■ Ext./Very Ser. ■ S.W. Ser. ■ Not Too/At All Ser. ■ DK/NA




3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample



## Concern about a number of issues has shifted significantly in recent years.

*(Total Extremely/Very Serious; Ranked by % Increase)*




3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample  
\*All residents





## Continued:

*(Total Extremely/Very Serious; Ranked by % Increase)*




3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample

\*All residents



## Measuring Shifts in Concern About the Bay

*(Total Extremely/Very Serious)*



3. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem.




## Overall Bay Pollution Demographics: Political Party and Gender

■ Total Ext./Very Serious Problem ■ Total SW/Not Serious Problem

Political Party

Gender



3g. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample




## Overall Bay Pollution Demographics: Age by Gender

■ Total Ext./Very Serious Problem ■ Total SW/Not Serious Problem

Men

Women



3g. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample




## Overall Bay Pollution Demographics: Party by Gender

■ Total Ext./Very Serious Problem ■ Total SW/Not Serious Problem

### Democrats

### Republicans

### DTS/Other



3g. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample




## Overall Bay Pollution Demographics: Education by Gender

■ Total Ext./Very Serious Problem ■ Total SW/Not Serious Problem

Non-college

College




3g. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample



## Overall Bay Pollution Demographics: Years in Bay Area

■ Total Ext./Very Serious Problem ■ Total SW/Not Serious Problem




3g. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample



## Overall Bay Pollution Demographics: Region

■ Total Ext./Very Serious Problem ■ Total SW/Not Serious Problem




3g. I'm going to read you a list of issues that some people say may be problems in the Bay Area. Please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious problem, or not at all a serious problem. Split Sample





## Chesapeake Bay area voters rate pollution of the Bay and local rivers as very serious problems.

Opinion Research &  
Public Policy Analysis




5. Next, I'm going to read you a list of issues, and I'd like you to tell me how serious a problem you think each one is in your area. After I read each one, please tell me if you think it is an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, or not a serious problem in your area. N=1215



## **Support for Activities to Improve the Bay**



## About one voter in four is “very willing” to donate money to improve the Bay.




10. I'm going to read you a list of activities that local residents can participate in to help protect the San Francisco Bay. Please tell me how willing you would be to participate in that activity.

# 2004 San Francisco Bay Issues Survey




**Three-quarters of voters believe that public spending on programs to improve the Bay should be increased.**






## Many voters are willing to pay as much as \$100 per year in a dedicated tax to improve the Bay.





## Support for a \$50 in additional annual taxes is similar in the San Francisco and Chesapeake Bay Areas.

■ Very Willing/Str. Supp. ■ Somewhat ■ Somewhat ■ Very Unwilling/Str. Opp. ■ DK/NA






## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Political Party and Gender

■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling □ DK/NA

### Political Party


### Gender





## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Age

■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA








## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Age by Gender

■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA

Men


Women





## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Years in Bay Area


■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA





## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Race/Ethnicity


■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA





## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Education

■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA






## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Education by Gender

■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA

### Non-college


### College





## \$50 Tax Increase Demographics: Region

■ Total Willing ■ Total Unwilling ■ DK/NA





## **Communicating with Voters About the Bay**




## Voters are most concerned about the impact of pollution on fish.

Opinion Research &  
Public Policy Analysis

Many fish that are caught in the Bay are not safe to eat

In the year 2000, 94 percent of all Bay fish sampled were contaminated with harmful chemicals like PCBs, mercury and pesticides that made them unsafe to eat

Three-quarters of the original wetland, marsh, and river habitat around the San Francisco Bay either no longer exists or has been developed








## Continued


Opinion Research &  
Public Policy Analysis

■ Ext. Conc. ■ Very Conc. ■ S.W./Not Too Conc. ■ DK/NA


**Native fish populations in the Bay have declined by 50 percent since 1940, leading to a collapse of commercial and recreational fishing**



**San Francisco Bay has shrunk by one-third in the last 150 years**



**18 species of fish, birds, and animals that live in San Francisco Bay have been designated as endangered**



0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%



## Voters see the Bay as important to their quality of life, and believe that it increases property values.


Opinion Research &  
Public Policy Analysis

■ Strng Agr. ■ S.W. Agr. ■ S.W./Strng. Disagr. ■ DK/NA

**San Francisco Bay is very important to my quality of life**

**The presence of the Bay increases the value of homes throughout the Bay Area**

**Being close to the Bay is a major reason why I have chosen to live where I live**





## Proximity to the Bay is most important for East Bay and Peninsula voters.

*Being close to the Bay is a major reason why I  
have chosen to live where I live*

	North Bay	East Bay	San Francisco/ Peninsula	South Bay
Strongly Agree	28%	40%	50%	33%
S.W. Agree	25%	23%	20%	18%
Total Disagree	45%	34%	29%	47%
DK/NA	2%	3%	1%	2%




## Among all voters, a message stressing toxics is generally most persuasive.

*(Ranked by Much More Inclined to Support)*

**By keeping San Francisco Bay clean, we can improve public health. Toxic pollutants that flow into the Bay end up contaminating the water, our coastline, and the fish that live in the Bay. Protecting the Bay will help ensure clean water, clean beaches, and fish that are safe to eat.**

**Protecting San Francisco Bay will preserve our local quality of life for future generations. By protecting the Bay, we can leave a legacy for our children and grandchildren and ensure that they will enjoy the benefits of the Bay just as much as we do.**

**San Francisco Bay defines our region and is central to our quality of life. Not only does it provide excellent places for hiking, boating, swimming, and fishing, but it offers unparalleled natural beauty and many quiet places to enjoy nature. Protecting the Bay preserves what makes our community special and unique.**



12. I'm going to read you some statements from people who support increasing public spending on programs to protect the San Francisco Bay. After hearing each statement, please tell me if it makes you more inclined to support such programs. If you do not believe the statement, or if it has no effect on your thinking one way or the other, please tell me that too.




## Continued

*(Ranked by Much More Inclined to Support)*

The Bay Area's population is expected to grow by nearly two million people in the next 25 years alone. We need to act now to protect San Francisco Bay, or it will become even more polluted as the area's growth skyrockets.

San Francisco Bay has been a part of our community's economic and social life for hundreds of years, providing jobs and a place for recreation to generations of Bay Area residents. Preserving the Bay will protect this historical legacy.

By attracting tourists, supporting commercial fishing, offering opportunities for recreation, and attracting quality employers to the region, the Bay contributes billions of dollars to our economy every year.




12. I'm going to read you some statements from people who support increasing public spending on programs to protect the San Francisco Bay. After hearing each statement, please tell me if it makes you more inclined to support such programs. If you do not believe the statement, or if it has no effect on your thinking one way or the other, please tell me that too.



## Messaging leads to only slight increases in voters' willingness to pay additional taxes.

(% Very Willing)

■ After Messages    ■ Before Messages




9. Would you be willing to pay \_\_\_\_\_ more in a dedicated tax to fund programs to protect the San Francisco Bay?

14. And let me ask you again -- would you be willing to pay \_\_\_\_\_ more in a dedicated tax to fund programs to protect the San Francisco Bay?



## The most credible messengers are biologists, scientists, and the Steinhart Aquarium.

■ Very Cred. ■ S.W. Cred. ■ Not Too/Not at all Cred. ■ NHO/No Opin.




15. I am now going to read you a list of persons and organizations that may take positions on issues related to San Francisco Bay. Please tell me if you would find that person or organization very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible or not credible at all on these issues. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or do not have an opinion, you can tell me that too. Split Sample




## Continued

■ Very Cred. ■ S.W. Cred. ■ Not Too/Not at all Cred. ■ NHO/No Opin.


**A student involved in Bay clean-ups**




**The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**




**The Sierra Club**




**The Nature Conservancy**




**Conservation organizations**



**Fishermen**



**The League of Women Voters**



0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

15. I am now going to read you a list of persons and organizations that may take positions on issues related to San Francisco Bay. Please tell me if you would find that person or organization very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible or not credible at all on these issues. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or do not have an opinion, you can tell me that too. Split Sample







## Continued

■ Very Cred. ■ S.W. Cred. ■ Not Too/Not at all Cred. ■ NHO/No Opin.


**San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom**




**Save the Bay**




**Your local church**




**A university professor**



**Environmental organizations**



**The San Francisco Chronicle newspaper**




15. I am now going to read you a list of persons and organizations that may take positions on issues related to San Francisco Bay. Please tell me if you would find that person or organization very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible or not credible at all on these issues. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or do not have an opinion, you can tell me that too. Split Sample



## Continued

■ Very Cred. ■ S.W. Cred. ■ Not Too/Not at all Cred. ■ NHO/No Opin.




15. I am now going to read you a list of persons and organizations that may take positions on issues related to San Francisco Bay. Please tell me if you would find that person or organization very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible or not credible at all on these issues. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or do not have an opinion, you can tell me that too. Split Sample




## Continued

■ Very Cred. ■ S.W. Cred. ■ Not Too/Not at all Cred. ■ NHO/No Opin.

**The California Farm Bureau**



**The Natural Resources Defense Council**




**Your local Chamber of Commerce**



**Indian tribes**



**The Bay Institute**



0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%


15. I am now going to read you a list of persons and organizations that may take positions on issues related to San Francisco Bay. Please tell me if you would find that person or organization very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible or not credible at all on these issues. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or do not have an opinion, you can tell me that too. Split Sample



## Newspaper articles and classroom programs are the best ways to reach voters.

Opinion Research &  
Public Policy Analysis

■ Def. Pay Attn. ■ Maybe Pay Attn. ■ Def. Not Pay Attn. ■ DK/NA




16. There are many ways public agencies might try to reach members of the public with information about what they can do to help improve the condition of San Francisco Bay. For each one I mention, please tell me whether you would definitely pay attention, maybe pay attention, or definitely not pay attention to this information if it were presented to you in that way.




## Continued

■ Def. Pay Attn. ■ Maybe Pay Attn. ■ Def. Not Pay Attn. ■ DK/NA


**An advertisement in the newspaper**




**A billboard**




**An insert in your utility bill**



**An ad that runs on cable TV**



**An ad on a ferry boat, bus or BART**



0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%



## Continued

■ Def. Pay Attn. ■ Maybe Pay Attn. ■ Def. Not Pay Attn. ■ DK/NA


**A toll-free telephone number you could call to request information**

**An ad on a bus shelter**

**The front pages of the phone book**

**A message on a java jacket, available to go around your cup of coffee at your local coffee shop**

**A banner ad on an Internet website**





## **Targeting Voters for Outreach**



## \$50 for Bay Protection: Segmenting the Electorate

Consistently Very Willing	Swing Voters	Consistently Unwilling
<b>28% of Electorate</b>	<b>49% of Electorate</b>	<b>23% of Electorate</b>
San Francisco	Marin/Napa Counties	Republicans (esp. under 50)
Independent women	Democratic men	Solano County
Latinos	Latinos	Santa Clara County
Democrats under age 50	African-Americans	Sonoma County
Residents for less than 25 yrs.	College-educated men	Contra Costa County
Contra Costa County	Democrats 50 and over	Residents for 26+ years
College-educated women	San Mateo County	
Voters in their 30's	Independent men	
Independents 50 and over	Seniors	
Democratic women		





## Communicating with Swing Voters

### Key Messages:

- **Cleaning the Bay improves public health. (45% “much more inclined”)**
- **Protecting the Bay preserves our quality of life for future generations. (45%)**
- **Protecting the Bay preserves what makes our quality of life special and unique. (44%)**

### Key Messengers:

**Biologists, scientists, Steinhart Aquarium, your local water agency, farmers, the Environmental Protection Agency, the California Department of Water Resources**

### Key Modes of Communication:

**Articles in local papers, ads on network TV, nature centers, brochures/pamphlets, newspaper ads, classroom programs**




## Mobilizable Base Voters:

- Rate condition of Bay as “fair” or “poor”
- Believe condition of the Bay will worsen in the next five years
- “Strongly support” increased public spending on the Bay
- Are willing to pay \$50 in a dedicated tax to improve the Bay
- Are at least “somewhat willing” to volunteer time, donate money, or participate in a creek clean-up or restoration day
- **12% of the electorate**



## Demographic Profile of Mobilizable Base Voters



0%

20%



## **Communicating with Mobilizable Base Voters**

### **Key Messages:**

- **Cleaning the Bay improves public health. (76% “*much more inclined*”)**
- **Protecting the Bay preserves what makes our quality of life special and unique. (74%)**
- **Protecting the Bay preserves our quality of life for future generations. (72%)**

### **Key Messengers:**

**Biologists, Steinhart Aquarium, conservation groups, scientists, the Audubon Society, the California Department of Water Resources, the Nature Conservancy, the League of Women Voters**

### **Key Modes of Communication:**

**Articles in local papers, nature centers, brochures/pamphlets, newspaper ads, cable TV ads, network TV ads, classroom programs**



## Conclusions:

- **Voters see many benefits to the Bay, but most often cite its natural beauty, its moderating effect on the climate, and recreational opportunities.**
- **Voters see pollution as the greatest threat to the Bay.**
- **While voters do not rate pollution of the Bay as a top-tier concern, nearly half think it is in bad condition and a plurality think it is getting worse.**
- **Three-quarters of voters believe that public spending on the Bay should be increased.**
- **Majorities of voters are willing to pay as much as \$100 in support of a dedicated tax to protect the Bay, although support is soft.**
- **Voters are most highly concerned about the threats to human health posed by contaminated fish.**



## Continued:

- **Messages that stress public health, the need to preserve the Bay for future generations, and the Bay's central role in the community's quality of life are generally most persuasive.**
- **Voters rank biologists, scientists, the Steinhart Aquarium, local water agencies, the California Department of Water Resources, the Audubon Society, and farmers as among the most credible sources of information on the Bay.**
- **Voters say they would be most likely to pay attention to information in newspaper articles, classroom programs, nature centers, or television advertising.**
- **Given voters' concern about the Bay and their willingness to pay to protect it, there should be ample opportunity to build support for policy initiatives to protect the Bay.**



# 2004 San Francisco Bay Issues Survey

*August 2004*

320-220

*Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates*  
*Opinion Research & Public Policy Analysis*

---

Santa Monica, CA – Oakland, CA – Madison, WI – Mexico City



# **City of San Jose 2008 Ballot Measure Refinement Survey**

**Report of Survey Results**

**August 5, 2008**

220-2596

***Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates***  
***Opinion Research & Public Policy Analysis***

---

Santa Monica, CA – Oakland, CA – Madison, WI – Mexico City



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....3**

**METHODOLOGY.....5**

**I. SUPPORT FOR INCREASING THE BUSINESS TAX ON CARD ROOMS .....6**

**II. SUPPORT FOR REPLACING THE EMERGENCY SERVICES FEE .....8**

**III. SUPPORT FOR UPDATING THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS TAX .....11**

**IV. SUPPORT FOR CHANGING THE AUTHORIZED TERMS OF PARK AGREEMENTS .....14**

**V. SUPPORT FOR CHANGING SALARY-SETTING PROCEDURES.....16**

**VI. ATTITUDES TOWARD THE BALLOT MEASURES AS A GROUP .....18**

**VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....20**


**APPENDIX A: TOPLINE SURVEY RESULTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates (FMM&A) recently completed a survey of 804 registered voters in the City of San Jose who are considered likely to cast ballots in the November general election. (This was a follow-up survey to a similar ballot measure assessment survey conducted in June 2008 for the City.) The primary goal of the survey was to assess support for five potential ballot measures to provide data for the City to consider in making a determination about whether to place them on the ballot. This survey followed an earlier feasibility survey our firm conducted in June 2008 to narrow the range of possible ballot measures to be tested.

Survey respondents were presented with draft ballot language for five potential measures that might be placed on the ballot, and their initial levels of support based on that language are shown in **Figure 1** below. Nearly two-thirds of voters back a measure to increase business taxes on card rooms, while somewhat less firm majorities support a measure eliminating the City’s existing Emergency Communications Support System (ECSS) fee and replacing it with a new, reduced tax; a measure to reduce and modernize the City’s telecommunications users tax; and a charter amendment to authorize the City Council to enter into long-term agreements for the use of certain parks. These three latter measures should stand a reasonably good chance of winning approval, depending on the volume of information that members of the public receive from supporters and opponents of each measure. A fifth measure, a charter amendment to change the way salaries for the Mayor and City Council are determined, does not appear likely to receive majority support.

**FIGURE 1:  
 Initial Support for Ballot Measures Given Draft Ballot Language**



At the same time, the survey results showed that voter support for three of the measures (the ECSS fee replacement, the telecommunications users tax modernization, and the charter amendment addressing long-term parks agreements) all showed a certain volatility of support. None of the measures began with more than about one-third of voters saying they would “definitely” vote “yes.” And while more information about the

parks measure tended to increase support, support for the other two measures rose after positive arguments but then fell notably after the negative arguments – particularly for the ECSS measure – while still remaining over the majority threshold required for approval. This fluidity of support suggests that the information voters receive in the time before Election Day could significantly impact their support.

Survey respondents were also presented with two comprehensive arguments designed to address all five measures as a package: one which said a “yes” vote on all the measures was merited because together they would be revenue neutral and would ensure stable funding for City services, and a second which said that given the economy and multiple other measures from other jurisdictions on the ballot, voters should only vote “yes” on some of the measures. By a 44 percent to 38 percent margin, voters chose the statement calling for a “no” vote on at least some measures; however, in a follow-up question which asked voters for their final position on each of the five measures individually, none of them showed a significant drop-off in support. These results suggest that while a majority of voters support four of the five measures in the package, they want to reserve the right to oppose one or more of them come November.

The remainder of this report presents these and other results of the survey in more detail.

## **METHODOLOGY**

---

Between July 15 and 20, 2008, Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates (FMM&A) conducted a telephone survey of 804 San Jose voters. Survey respondents were randomly selected from a pool of registered voters who, based on their past voting behavior, are considered likely to cast ballots in November 2008. Upon completion of interviewing, the sample was weighted slightly to conform to demographic data on the population of likely voters.

The margin of sampling error for the survey sample as a whole is plus or minus 3.5 percent. The margin of error for smaller subgroups within the sample will be larger. For example, statistics reporting the opinions and attitudes of female voters – who make up 52 percent of the sample – have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 4.8 percent. Therefore, the smaller the size of the subgroup being analyzed, the more the interpretation of the survey’s findings is suggestive rather than definitive and should be treated with a certain caution. Some figures may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Survey questions were developed in consultation with City staff. The survey presented draft ballot language for five potential ballot measures and charter amendments that may be presented to voters in the November election. The order in which the five measures were presented to individual survey respondents was randomized, in order to minimize any bias that might result from the sequence of the questions. One-fifth of all survey respondents were presented with each ballot measure first in the rotation, followed by an open-ended question asking that subgroup of respondents their reason for voting “yes” or “no.” At certain places in the report, results among these sub-samples are isolated to highlight differences in reactions among those respondents who were offering a “clean” reaction to each ballot measure, unbiased by descriptions of other measures that may have preceded it.

In order to reduce the length and complexity of the survey for each individual respondent, survey respondents were further randomly divided into two subgroups; one half of the sample was asked a more detailed series of questions about the telecommunications users tax modernization measure, and the other half was asked more detailed questions about the 911 fee reduction and replacement measure. For questions asked of each of these subsamples, the margin of sampling error is plus or minus 4.9 percent.

The topline results of the survey are included at the end of the report in Appendix A. Cross-tabulated results have been presented under separate cover.

At several places in the report, references are made to the results of the ballot measure assessment survey conducted by FMM&A in June of this year. That survey – of 602 likely voters, with a margin of sampling error of plus or minus four percent – asked about some of the same proposed ballot measures, though in a more conceptual fashion.

**PART I: SUPPORT FOR INCREASING THE BUSINESS TAX ON CARD ROOMS**

One of the potential ballot measures presented to survey respondents would increase the business tax on card room revenues from 13 percent to 18 percent, with revenues dedicated to general City services. The draft ballot language tested for the measure is shown below:

*“THE SAN JOSE VITAL CITY SERVICES PRESERVATION MEASURE. To help prevent cuts in general City services such as police and fire, street maintenance, parks and libraries, shall an ordinance be adopted to increase the existing business tax on card room revenues from 13 percent to 18 percent, subject to existing annual audits?”*

Survey respondents were also asked about the measure again at the conclusion of the survey, after they had heard more information about the other four measures under consideration as well. Voters’ responses to these two questions are shown in **Figure 2** below. Fully two-thirds of voters (67%) support the measure after hearing the initial language while fewer than one-quarter (24%) oppose it. Nearly half of voters initially respond that they would “definitely” vote in favor of the measure, indicating a solid base of support. That support increases further by the end of the survey, where 73 percent indicate that they would vote for the measure, including a 51-percent majority who say they would “definitely” support it.

**FIGURE 2:  
 Support for a Ballot Measure Increasing the  
 Business Tax on Card Rooms**

<b>Vote</b>	<b>Ballot Language</b>	<b>Conclusion of Survey</b>	<b>Change</b>
Definitely yes	45%	51%	+6%
Probably/lean yes	21%	22%	+1%
<b>TOTAL YES</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>+6%</b>
Definitely no	14%	13%	-1%
Probably/lean no	10%	10%	0%
<b>TOTAL NO</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>-1%</b>
<b>UNDECIDED</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>-5%</b>

Based on responses to the initial open-ended question, support for the measure seems to come primarily from two sources: voters who see it as appropriate to tax gambling (35% of initial “yes” voters) and those who like the idea that revenue from the measure would fund a variety of important City services (30%). Opposition comes primarily from respondents who are opposed to tax increases (39% of initial “no” voters), as well as those who do not trust that the money would be spent effectively, or who believe that the tax will discourage economic growth.

The demographic base of the initial support for the measure is broad. It receives the backing of at least 60 percent of voters in every major subgroup of the electorate, with

the exception of Republicans who are male or under 50 – but even among those groups, majorities support it. As a general matter, the measure receives somewhat stronger support from Democrats than from Republicans or independents, and from women than from men.

Over the course of the survey, support for the measure rises across the board but somewhat more notably among Republican and independent women, as well as among Asian-Americans. What leads to this increase in support is hard to determine precisely, given that the survey did not test detailed pro or con messages on the measure. However, it may be that the discussion of other revenue-raising measures in the survey – none of which were as favorably received – may have made the increase in taxes on card rooms even more appealing by comparison.

Taken together, the results show that the measure to increase the business tax on card rooms has broad and strong support, and stands a good chance of winning approval if placed on the November ballot.

## **PART II: SUPPORT FOR REPLACING THE EMERGENCY SERVICES FEE**

---

Survey respondents were presented with the following ballot language for a measure to replace the City’s existing Emergency Communications Systems Support (ECSS) fee:

*“REDUCTION AND REPLACEMENT OF 9-1-1 FEE. Shall an ordinance be adopted to:*

- *Eliminate the one dollar and 75 cent fee per telephone line and replace it with a reduced tax of one dollar and 65 cents, with a proportionally reduced amount for trunk lines, to support essential City services such as police, fire, street maintenance, and libraries;*
- *Limit annual inflation adjustments to three percent; and*
- *Continue lifeline exemptions for low-income senior citizen or low-income disabled households,*

*subject to existing annual audits?”*

Half of all respondents were also offered more follow-up information: a basic explanation of the measure (shown below), as well as a series of three arguments in favor of the measure and three arguments opposed to it. All respondents were also asked about the measure a final time – along with the other four proposed measures – at the conclusion of the survey.

*“The City of San Jose currently charges residents a monthly charge of one dollar and 75 cents per phone line in order to help pay for 9-1-1 emergency dispatch services. Due to a recent court decision, a number of California cities that charge such fees have decided to submit them to voters for approval.*

*“This measure would create a new tax on phone lines to replace the fees customers are currently paying, and would reduce the monthly amount of the tax to one dollar and 65 cents per line, with annual inflation adjustments limited to three percent. If approved, the measure will continue generating 23 million dollars per year for the City, which could be used for vital City services including police, fire, street repair, parks and libraries. If the measure is rejected by voters, the city may have to cut 23 million dollars from existing City services.”*

As indicated in **Figure 3** on the following page, a 64-percent majority of voters initially indicate that they would vote for the proposal. This proportion is well over the simple majority that would be required for approval, but only slightly more than half of the “yes” voters say that they would “definitely” vote for the measure. Support is stronger among women (68% “yes”) than among men (59%), and stronger among Democrats (65%) and independents (71%) than among Republicans (54%) – though most of this difference is attributable to Republican men, less than half of whom initially support the proposal. Support also tends to decline with household income.

**FIGURE 3:**  
**Changes in Support for a Ballot Measure Replacing the Emergency Services Fee with a Tax in the Same Amount**

Vote	Ballot Language	After Explanation*	After Positive Arguments*	After Negative Arguments*	Conclusion of Survey
Definitely yes	35%	36%	34%	22%	33%
Probably/lean yes	30%	31%	38%	35%	33%
<b>TOTAL YES</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>66%</b>
Definitely no	10%	12%	13%	16%	16%
Probably/lean no	12%	11%	9%	17%	14%
<b>TOTAL NO</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>UNDECIDED</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4%</b>

\*Split sampled

The survey results show some volatility in support for the measure, as reflected in **Figure 3**. The positive arguments push support for the measure over 70 percent (to 72%), though it drops down to 57 percent after voters hear opposition arguments. At the conclusion of the survey, support returns to approximately its initial level, at 66 percent. While support never drops below the simple majority that would be required for approval, the “definite yes” vote also never climbs much over one-third, indicating that voters’ positions on the issue are fairly tentative.

Several questions shed light on the aspects of the measure that voters like and dislike. The first is the open-ended question after the initial ballot language. Supporters of the measure point to the reduction in costs that the measure would produce (a feature volunteered by 35 percent of “yes” voters), as well as the idea that money would fund critical City services (20%). Opponents generally cite opposition to taxes. Respondents were also asked to indicate their support for, or opposition to, a variety of specific elements of the measure, as indicated in **Figure 4** below. Each element drew strong majority support, particularly the continuation of exemptions and the reduction in the tax amount, each of which was “strongly supported” by a solid majority of those polled.


**FIGURE 4:**  
**Support for Individual Provisions of the Measure**  
*(Split Sampled)*

Provision	TOTAL SUPPORT	Str. Supp.	SW Supp.	SW Opp.	Str. Opp.	DK/ NA
Continues current lifeline exemptions for low-income senior-citizen and disabled households	<b>90%</b>	75%	15%	3%	5%	3%
Reduces the current cost of one dollar and 75 cents per month per phone line to one dollar and 65 cents	<b>76%</b>	54%	22%	6%	13%	5%
Replaces the existing fee on emergency communications service with a tax in a reduced amount	<b>70%</b>	45%	25%	8%	14%	8%
Allows annual adjustments based on inflation limited to three percent per year	<b>57%</b>	30%	27%	10%	23%	11%



A 57-percent majority of voters also support the provision of the measure allowing limited annual inflation adjustments; however, a significant minority (33%) also oppose that provision. To evaluate the impact of the inflation adjustment more precisely, those respondents who indicated they were opposed to or undecided on the measure after hearing the detailed explanation were asked how they would vote if the inflation adjustment were removed. As **Figure 5** makes clear, that change to the proposal led to a ten-point increase in support.

**FIGURE 5:**  
**Support for the Measure Without an Inflation Adjustment**



Overall, the results suggest that few voters initially focus on the inflation adjustment, and most are willing to accept it. Removing it, however, could potentially expand support for the measure.

In general, the ECSS fee replacement measure appears viable. It receives consistent majority support, even after voters have heard both pro and con arguments.

**PART III: SUPPORT FOR UPDATING THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS TAX**

A third potential ballot measure explored in the survey was a modernization of the telecommunications users tax, presented to survey respondents using the potential ballot language shown below:

*“REDUCTION OF TAX RATE AND MODERNIZATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS TAX. Shall an ordinance be adopted to reduce the City’s tax on telecommunications users from five percent to four point seven-five percent; modernize the ordinance to apply to all out-of-state calls and treat taxpayers equally regardless of technology used; and continue to use revenue to fund essential City services, such as police, fire protection, street maintenance, parks and libraries; subject to existing annual audits?”*

A more detailed follow-up explanation of the proposed measure was presented to half the sample of voters, and read as follows:

*“San Jose currently charges a five percent utility users tax that covers several utilities, including telephone service. It is applied to some, but not all, out-of-state telephone calls, text messaging, paging services, and other new technologies.*

*“This measure would reduce the existing tax rate for telecommunications services from five percent to four point seven-five percent. It would also update the telecommunications users tax to apply equally to all San Jose consumers for all telecommunications services, regardless of the technology they use, and enable the City to adapt the telecommunications users tax to new and developing technologies in the future.”*

As shown in **Figure 6**, support for the measure remained fairly steady at about six in ten voters after the ballot language (61%), the more detailed explanation (62%), and the positive arguments (62%). In each case, the proportion saying they would “definitely” vote “yes” remained at about one-third of all voters. .

**FIGURE 6:  
 Changes in Support for a Ballot Measure Updating  
 the City’s Telecommunications Users Tax**

<b>Vote</b>	<b>Ballot Language</b>	<b>After Explanation</b>	<b>After Positive Arguments*</b>	<b>After Negative Arguments</b>	<b>Conclusion of Survey</b>
Definitely yes	31%	33%	33%	26%	31%
Probably/lean yes	30%	29%	29%	32%	30%
<b>TOTAL YES</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>61%</b>
Definitely no	12%	16%	18%	19%	16%
Probably/lean no	10%	12%	10%	15%	17%
<b>TOTAL NO</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>UNDECIDED</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>

\* Split Sampled

However, the level of opposition to the measure rose notably across the same series of questions, from 22 percent to 28 percent. And after the negative arguments, support dropped to 58 percent (and “definite yes” votes to 26%) while opposition further spiked up to 34%

Initial support for the measure ran higher among voters of color (65%) than among whites (55%). It also fared better among independents (69%) than among Democrats (57%) or Republicans (56%). On the whole, though, the measure receive solid majority support from most major subgroups of the San Jose electorate, and revealed less demographic division than many of the other measures tested.

Overall, supporters of the measure are largely focused on the rate reduction, even more so than with the ECSS fee replacement. Fully 42 percent of “yes” voters offered the rate reduction as their main reason for supporting the measure, dwarfing any other individual response. Among “no” voters, just over half mentioned a general opposition to tax measures as the reason for their opposition, while 36 percent more explicitly expressed opposition to the idea of a tax on telecommunications services.

**Figure 7** below shows voters’ reactions when specifically prompted about many of the individual elements of the ballot measure. Voters were highly enthusiastic about reducing the tax rate and modernizing it to ensure equal treatment of taxpayers (with each provision receiving more than 70 percent support). However, voters were more ambivalent about expanding the scope of the tax to cover services like text messages, Internet telephone services, and all out-of-state telephone calls. On each case, a solid majority of voters supported expanding the scope of the ordinance, but only about one-third supported it “strongly.”

**FIGURE 7:**  
**Support for Individual Provisions of the Measure**  
*(Split Sampled)*

Provision	TOTAL SUPP.	Str. Supp.	SW Supp.	SW Opp.	Str. Opp.	DK/ NA
Reduces the tax rate from five percent to four point seven-five percent	<b>78%</b>	56%	22%	8%	10%	4%
Modernizes the existing ordinance in response to new communication technologies so that all taxpayers are treated the same regardless of technology used	<b>72%</b>	45%	27%	6%	17%	5%
Replaces the existing telecommunications ordinance with a modern ordinance that responds to changes in federal law	<b>61%</b>	33%	28%	7%	15%	17%
Allows the telecommunications users tax to be applied to newer services like voice over Internet telephone services	<b>58%</b>	34%	24%	7%	27%	7%
Allows the telecommunications users tax to be applied to all out-of-state telephone calls	<b>56%</b>	33%	23%	7%	29%	8%
Allows the telecommunications users tax to be applied to newer services like text messaging	<b>55%</b>	32%	23%	11%	29%	5%

Overall, the telecommunications users tax modernization measure appears viable. It receives consistent majority support from about three in five voters, and most individual elements of the measure receive solid support as well. However, the proportion of voters who “definitely” favor the measure is relatively low, and the negative arguments do significantly narrow the margin of support – particularly among Republicans. The information voters receive once the measure has been placed on the ballot could significantly impact their level of support.

#### **PART IV: SUPPORT FOR CHANGING THE AUTHORIZED TERMS OF PARK AGREEMENTS**

---

A fourth potential ballot measure explored in the survey would amend the City Charter to change the City Council’s ability to negotiate agreements for the use of certain parks, as described in the draft ballot question below:

*“LONG TERM AGREEMENTS IN CERTAIN CITY PARKS. To generate revenue for park improvements and other recreational purposes, shall the City Charter be amended to allow the City Council to approve park use agreements for up to 30 years in parks larger than five acres, provided the agreements enhance the recreational purposes of the park?”*

A somewhat more detailed explanation, shown below, was offered to respondents as a follow-up question:

*“Currently, the City Charter only allows the City Council to enter into such agreements for three years at a time in the majority of City parks. The three-year maximum limits the City's ability to attract private companies to enter into sponsorship and operating agreements, which in turn provide funding for the improvement of facilities, such as pools, community centers and soccer fields.*

*“The proposed revision would allow private companies to make financial investments in exchange for lease periods long enough to obtain a return on their investments. The Charter provision would require that the long-term agreement must enhance the recreational opportunities of the park.”*

Respondents were also asked about their support for the proposed charter amendment one final time, along with the other four ballot measures, at the end of the survey. The results showed general acceptance of the idea, though support was tentative, as shown in **Figure 8**. A 55-percent majority initially supports the idea – almost three times the proportion that opposes it (20%). But fewer than three in ten voters say that they will “definitely” vote “yes,” and more than three in five (61%) are either undecided or only softly committed to a “yes” or “no” vote. In the open-ended question following the initial ballot question, supporters of the measure overwhelmingly indicate that they believe it will be good for the parks, while opponents either say the 30-year time period is too long (a position offered by 37% of “no” voters); indicate that they do not trust City government to negotiate beneficial agreements (24%); or think that there are better ways to generate money for the parks (17%).

**FIGURE 8:  
 Support for a Ballot Measure Changing the Authorized  
 Term of Park Leases**

<b>Vote</b>	<b>Ballot Language</b>	<b>After Explanation</b>	<b>Conclusion of Survey</b>	<b>Change</b>
Definitely yes	29%	36%	38%	+9%
Probably/lean yes	26%	25%	28%	+2%
<b>TOTAL YES</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>+11%</b>
Definitely no	10%	14%	14%	+4%
Probably/lean no	10%	12%	11%	+1%
<b>TOTAL NO</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>+5%</b>
<b>UNDECIDED</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>-16%</b>

There are a number of noteworthy demographic differences in initial support for the charter amendment. It receives more support from renters (65%) than from homeowners (53%); from Latinos (66%) and Asian-Americans (61%) as opposed to whites (51%); and from voters under 50 (64%) as opposed to those age 50 and over (46%). Women (59%) are more likely to back the amendment than are men (51%), and independents (60%) and Democrats (59%) are more enthusiastic than are Republicans (44%).

Support for the amendment generally increases as voters get more information, rising to 61% after the more detailed explanation and to 66% at the conclusion of the survey. Opposition to the amendment rises as well, but to a lesser degree than support goes up. The greatest increases in support for the amendment are evident among men, whose “yes” vote rises a full 15 points by the end of the survey.

Taken together, the survey findings suggest that support for this charter amendment is tenuous, given that it addresses an unfamiliar issue for most local voters. That said, few voters are outright opposed to the measure, and with additional information the margin of support steadily increases. The measure appears to be viable.

**PART V: SUPPORT FOR CHANGING SALARY-SETTING PROCEDURES**

The fifth and final potential ballot measure offered to survey respondents was a charter amendment to change the method for setting compensation for the Mayor and City Council, presented to respondents with the following draft ballot language:

*“COUNCIL COMPENSATION. Shall the authority of the City Council to set their salaries based on recommendations of the Salary Setting Commission be changed by amending the City Charter to instead require that the annual salary of the Mayor and Councilmembers be 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of the salary established for a California Superior Court Judge, and other benefits be equivalent to City executive managers?”*

Respondents were also given the following more detailed explanation of what the amendment would do:

*“Now I would like to ask you about the charter amendment that would remove the City Council’s ability to set its own salaries, and instead would set the Mayor and City Council’s salaries equal to 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of the salary of a superior court judge. This measure would greatly simplify the City’s salary-setting process, would eliminate the need for a salary-setting commission, and would remove the conflict of interest involved in having City Council members vote on their own salaries. It would also lead to a sizeable increase in the salaries paid to the Mayor and City Council.”*

The results of these questions – as well as a final question about the amendment at the end of the survey – are shown in **Figure 9** below. Voters initially oppose the idea by a 40 percent to 31 percent margin, and though support does increase over the course of the survey as voters get more information, it never comes close to reaching a majority of voters polled. Opposition runs strongest among men, whites, voters age 50 and over, homeowners, and upper-income voters. Based on the results of the open-ended question, opponents primarily believe that the compensation system embodied in the measure would be unfair, inappropriate, or too lucrative for elected officials.

**FIGURE 9:  
 Support for a Ballot Measure Changing the  
 Process for Setting the Salary of the Mayor and Councilmembers**

<b>Vote</b>	<b>Ballot Language</b>	<b>After Explanation</b>	<b>Conclusion of Survey</b>	<b>Change</b>
Definitely yes	16%	17%	20%	+4%
Probably/lean yes	16%	24%	23%	+7%
<b>TOTAL YES</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>+12%</b>
Definitely no	22%	26%	27%	+5%
Probably/lean no	18%	19%	19%	+1%
<b>TOTAL NO</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>+6%</b>
<b>UNDECIDED</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>-18%</b>


Given the consistently low level of support for this charter amendment – both before and after voters receive more information – its prospects for winning approval on the November ballot are not good.



## PART VI: ATTITUDES TOWARD THE BALLOT MEASURES AS A GROUP

After respondents heard the initial ballot labels, as well as more detailed follow-up questions about the measures, they were asked to choose between two broad statements characterizing the overall package of measures, as shown in **Figure 10** below. A 44-percent plurality agreed that they thought at least some of the measures should be voted down – given concerns about their impact on taxes and given other measures likely to be on the ballot. A slightly smaller group (38% of those polled) agreed that the measures deserved public support because of their revenue neutrality and the funding they would provide for critical City services.

**FIGURE 10:**  
**Choice of Statements About the Five Ballot Measures as a Group**



Demographically, there were few dramatic differences in responses to the question. Renters, Democrats, voters of color, women, and middle-income voters were all modestly more likely than others to agree that the measures merited public support, while whites, upper-income voters, and Republicans were particularly likely to disagree. The net impact of the two statements, however, seemed to be minor. In the final vote questions on all five measures, which immediately followed the two statements, voters were just as supportive – and in most cases more so – of each measure as they were in the preceding questions.

## **PART VII: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The results of the refinement survey lead us to the following recommendations regarding the five ballot measure concepts we presented to voters:

- An increase in business taxes on card rooms remains clearly viable. It receives support from two-thirds of voters as soon as they hear draft ballot language, and nearly half of voters say they will “definitely” support it. And support for the measure actually increases as voters hear more about some of the other items that may be on the ballot. While the survey did not test full pro and con messages that might impact support for the proposal, it appears to have solid enough support to withstand some erosion and still win approval.
- A ballot measure replacing the City’s ECSS fee with an equivalent tax also has broad support, starting at 64 percent of all voters. That support increases as voters learn more information and hear positive arguments about the measure, but declines after they hear negative arguments (to 57%). Still, the measure remains consistently over the simple majority threshold required for approval.

A critical issue related to the ECSS fee replacement is the degree to which including an automatic inflation adjustment, limited to three percent per year, might impact support. Such a provision was included in the initial ballot language presented to survey respondents, and while a minority of voters objected to it it did not prevent the measure from receiving three-to-one majority support. When the provision is isolated and asked about separately, a majority support it – and even after a negative argument focused on the issue, support remains at 57 percent.

That said, when asked if removing the inflation adjustment would impact their support, a significant proportion of voters who were initially opposed or undecided indicate that they would be likely to vote “yes” – enough to move support for the measure to 77 percent. The bottom line seems to be that the measure could probably pass with the inflation adjustment included, though removing it certainly would not hurt and potentially could increase support.

- A measure to reduce and modernize the City’s telecommunications users tax also has majority support, though it appears to vary less with additional information than does support for the ECSS fee replacement. A total of 61 percent of voters initially back the measure based on draft ballot language, and support remains between 58 and 62 percent as voters receive more information and pro and con arguments. Relatively few voters have firmly made up their minds about the measure, however, with between one-quarter and one-third saying that they will “definitely” vote “yes.” The measure appears viable, but again a substantial number of voters are not certain of how they will cast their ballots.
- The charter amendment regarding long-term park agreements appears viable, but is also highly volatile. Voters initially back the measure, based on draft ballot language, by nearly a three-to-one margin (55% to 20%). However, only 29 percent of voters say they will “definitely” vote for the measure, and nearly as many (25%) are undecided. More than the other measures tested, this amendment is likely to be

impacted by the information voters receive over the course of a campaign. However, the results do suggest that as voters learn more about the measure their support becomes both broader and stronger.

- The charter amendment to change the procedures for setting salaries for the Mayor and City Council does not appear viable. Initially, voters oppose the proposal by a margin of 40 percent to 31 percent based solely on the ballot language. The margin of opposition narrows as voters learn more; but even at the end of the survey support does not reach the required simple majority, and a plurality of voters continue to oppose it (46% to 43%).

Accordingly, from the perspective of public support we recommend that the City consider placing the first four measures on the ballot, and defer changes to the charter regarding salaries for elected officials to a later date. The survey results suggest that the other four measures stand a reasonably good chance of winning approval, even when placed on the ballot simultaneously.

Of course, the results of a poll are merely a snapshot of public opinion at a given moment in time, and are subject to change given events between now and November. Other than the increase in the business tax on card rooms, support for the remaining measures varied significantly as voters received more information about each measure. “Yes” or “no” campaigns that may be formed by private citizen groups could have a significant impact on the outcome of each of these measures.

**APPENDIX A:**  
**TOPLINE SURVEY RESULTS**

**SAN JOSE BALLOT MEASURE REFINEMENT SURVEY**  
**220-2596**  
**WFT N = 804**  
**A/B/C/D/E AND F/G SPLITS**

Time Began \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time Ended \_\_\_\_\_  
 Minutes \_\_\_\_\_

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_ from F-M-M-A, a public opinion research company. I am definitely NOT trying to sell you anything. We are conducting an opinion survey about issues that interest people living in San Jose, and we are only interested in your opinions. May I speak to \_\_\_\_\_? **(YOU MUST SPEAK TO THE VOTER LISTED. VERIFY THAT THE VOTER LIVES AT THE ADDRESS LISTED, OTHERWISE TERMINATE.)**

1. In November there will be an election for President, Congress, and state and local ballot measures. I know it is a long way off, but looking ahead, how likely are you to vote in this election – will you definitely vote, probably vote, are the chances 50-50 that you will vote, or will you probably not vote?

Definitely vote ----- 96%  
 Probably vote----- 3%  
 50-50 ----- 1%  
 Probably not vote ----- **TERMINATE**  
**(DEFINITELY NOT VOTE)----- TERMINATE**  
**(DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE)----- TERMINATE**

**NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT SOME MEASURES THAT MAY APPEAR ON THE CITY OF SAN JOSE BALLOT IN NOVEMBER. FOR EACH, I WILL READ YOU THE LANGUAGE OF THE MEASURE AS IT MIGHT APPEAR ON THE BALLOT. PLEASE LISTEN CAREFULLY, AND THEN TELL ME HOW YOU THINK YOU MIGHT VOTE.**

**HERE'S THE FIRST ONE...**

**ROTATION INSTRUCTIONS:**

- **SPLIT SAMPLE A, READ Q2-3 FIRST, THEN RANDOMIZE Q4/Q6/Q8/Q10**
- **SPLIT SAMPLE B, READ Q4-5 FIRST, THEN RANDOMIZE Q2/Q6/Q8/Q10**
- **SPLIT SAMPLE C, READ Q6-7 FIRST, THEN RANDOMIZE Q2/Q4/Q8/Q10**
- **SPLIT SAMPLE D, READ Q8-9 FIRST, THEN RANDOMIZE Q2/Q4/Q6/Q10**
- **SPLIT SAMPLE E, READ Q10-11 FIRST, THEN RANDOMIZE Q2/Q4/Q6/Q8**

**READ EACH ITEM SLOWLY AND CAREFULLY, AND REPEAT AS NECESSARY.**

2. The **FIRST/NEXT** measure is entitled REDUCTION OF TAX RATE AND MODERNIZATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS TAX, and reads as follows:

“Shall an ordinance be adopted to reduce the City’s tax on telecommunications users from five percent to four point seven-five percent; modernize the ordinance to apply to all out-of-state calls and treat taxpayers equally regardless of technology used; and continue to use revenue to fund essential City services, such as police, fire protection, street maintenance, parks and libraries; subject to existing annual audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)** “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”

Definitely yes -----	31%
Probably yes -----	19%
Undecided, lean yes-----	10%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>60%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	3%
Probably no -----	7%
Definitely no -----	12%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>2%</b>

(ASK Q3 ONLY IF SPLIT SAMPLE A AND ANSWERED YES OR NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q2)

3. In a few words of your own, can you tell me why you voted (YES/NO) this ballot measure?

a. Yes

Tax reduction/cost reduction-----	42%
Telecommunications technology tax-----	13%
Funding method/tax money is needed-----	12%
Equal treatment/fair -----	9%
Combination of items included/city services (general) -----	8%
Police services -----	8%
General positive/good idea/need it/important -----	6%
Community benefits/helps people -----	6%
Need more information/details -----	6%
Fire protection services -----	4%
Parks -----	1%
DK/NA/Refused -----	12%

b. No

Tax reduction/oppose tax measures -----	52%
Telecommunications technology tax-----	36%
Need more information/details -----	16%
General negative/bad idea/other issues are more important-----	10%
Combination of items included/too complicated/too broad-----	5%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

4. The **FIRST/NEXT** measure is entitled REDUCTION AND REPLACEMENT OF 9-1-1 FEE, and reads as follows:

“Shall an ordinance be adopted to:

- Eliminate the one dollar and 75 cent fee per telephone line and replace it with a reduced tax of one dollar and 65 cents, with a proportionally reduced amount for trunk lines, to support essential City services such as police, fire, street maintenance, and libraries;
- limit annual inflation adjustments to three percent; and
- continue lifeline exemptions for low-income senior citizen or low-income disabled households,

subject to existing annual audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”**

Definitely yes -----	35%
Probably yes -----	21%
Undecided, lean yes-----	9%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>64%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	3%
Probably no -----	9%
Definitely no -----	10%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>1%</b>



**(ASK Q5 ONLY IF SPLIT SAMPLE B AND ANSWERED YES OR NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q4)**

5. In a few words of your own, can you tell me why you voted **(YES/NO)** this ballot measure?

a. Yes

Tax reduction/cost reduction-----	35%
Combination of items included/city services (general) -----	20%
General positive/good idea/need it/important -----	13%
Funding method/money is needed-----	9%
Police services/911 response -----	8%
Community benefits/helps people -----	7%
Exemptions for low-income/senior citizen/disabled households-----	6%
Fire protection services -----	4%
Telephone line/technology tax -----	3%
Need more information/details -----	3%
Equal treatment/fair -----	2%
Inflation adjustments favored -----	0%
 DK/NA/Refused -----	 7%

b. No

Taxes opposed/no more/too many taxes-----	27%
Cost/can't afford/shouldn't charge-----	25%
General negative/bad idea/oppose change/should leave as is -----	17%
Need more information/details -----	15%
Inflation adjustments-----	12%
Tax reduction opposed -----	12%
 DK/NA/Refused -----	 2%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

6. The **FIRST/NEXT** measure is entitled THE SAN JOSE VITAL CITY SERVICES PRESERVATION MEASURE, and reads as follows:

“To help prevent cuts in general City services such as police and fire, street maintenance, parks and libraries, shall an ordinance be adopted to increase the existing business tax on card room revenues from 13 percent to 18 percent, subject to existing annual audits?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)** “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”

Definitely yes -----	45%
Probably yes -----	14%
Undecided, lean yes -----	7%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>67%</b>

Undecided, lean no -----	3%
Probably no -----	7%
Definitely no -----	14%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>24%</b>

<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>1%</b>

(ASK Q7 ONLY IF SPLIT SAMPLE C AND ANSWERED YES OR NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q6)

7. In a few words of your own, can you tell me why you voted (YES/NO) this ballot measure?

a. Yes

Card room/business revenue tax/gamblers should pay -----	35%
Combination of items included/city services (general) -----	30%
Funding method/money is needed -----	23%
Community benefits/helps people -----	9%
General positive/good idea/need it/important -----	8%
Police services -----	6%
Parks -----	1%
Need more information/details -----	1%
Fire protection services -----	0%
DK/NA/Refused -----	7%

b. No

Taxes opposed (general)/no more/too many taxes -----	39%
Spending concern/money may not go where it's supposed to go -----	17%
Business tax/will hurt businesses/economic growth -----	15%
Cost/increase too high -----	12%
Card room tax/oppose gambling -----	8%
General negative/oppose ballot initiatives -----	6%
Need more information/details -----	2%
DK/NA/Refused -----	12%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

8. The **FIRST/NEXT** measure is entitled COUNCIL COMPENSATION, and reads as follows:

“Shall the authority of the City Council to set their salaries based on recommendations of the Salary Setting Commission be changed by amending the City Charter to instead require that the annual salary of the Mayor and Councilmembers be 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of the salary established for a California Superior Court Judge, and other benefits be equivalent to City executive managers?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)** “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”

Definitely yes -----	16%
Probably yes -----	11%
Undecided, lean yes -----	5%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>31%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	5%
Probably no -----	13%
Definitely no -----	22%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>4%</b>

**(ASK Q9 ONLY IF SPLIT SAMPLE D AND ANSWERED YES OR NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q8)**

9. In a few words of your own, can you tell me why you voted **(YES/NO)** this ballot measure?

a. Yes

Salary setting method/fair way to do it-----	34%
Salary percentages/good pay standard-----	21%
General positive/good idea/they deserve it -----	17%
Need more information/details -----	10%
DK/NA/Refused -----	18%

b. No

Salary increases/percentages too high/they make enough/ too much money now -----	48%
Need more information/details -----	20%
Salary setting method/percentages are unfair/inappropriate job comparisons-----	12%
General negative/poor idea/other issues are more important -----	8%
Salary increases/percentages too low/too restricted -----	3%
They would be setting their own salaries -----	2%
Too complicated/too many things in one measure -----	2%
Taxes will increase/no more taxes-----	0%
DK/NA/Refused -----	8%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)**

10. The **FIRST/NEXT** measure is entitled LONG TERM AGREEMENTS IN CERTAIN CITY PARKS, and reads as follows:

“To generate revenue for park improvements and other recreational purposes, shall the City Charter be amended to allow the City Council to approve park use agreements for up to 30 years in parks larger than five acres, provided the agreements enhance the recreational purposes of the park?”

If there were an election today, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”)** **(IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”**

Definitely yes -----	29%
Probably yes -----	17%
Undecided, lean yes -----	9%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>55%</b>

Undecided, lean no -----	3%
Probably no -----	7%
Definitely no -----	10%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>20%</b>

<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>2%</b>

(ASK Q11 ONLY IF SPLIT SAMPLE E AND ANSWERED YES OR NO – CODES 1-6 – IN Q10)

11. In a few words of your own, can you tell me why you voted (YES/NO) this ballot measure?

a. Yes

General positive/good idea/park are important/like parks -----	30%
Parks improvement/better/safer parks-----	20%
Parks maintenance/take care of parks-----	15%
Children/families benefit -----	12%
Parks/recreation facilities -----	9%
Need more information/details -----	9%
Community benefits/quality of life/good for everyone -----	7%
Parks funding/money is needed -----	6%
Taxes aren't increased -----	3%
Time period/30 years is good -----	1%
Job opportunities-----	0%
DK/NA/Refused -----	9%

b. No

Time period/30 years is too long-----	37%
City council/government control/involvement -----	24%
Funding method/should find other way to get money -----	17%
Need more information/details -----	15%
General negative/not needed/other issues are more important-----	9%
Parks funding/money isn't needed/need wiser use of current funds -----	2%

**(ASK Q12-Q17 OF SPLIT SAMPLE F ONLY)**

12. Let me ask you a few more questions about the measure that would reduce the City’s telecommunications users tax rate and modernize it to apply equally to all San Jose consumers, regardless of the technology they use. San Jose currently charges a five percent utility users tax that covers several utilities, including telephone service. It is applied to some, but not all, out-of-state telephone calls, text messaging, paging services, and other new technologies.

This measure would reduce the existing tax rate for telecommunications services from five percent to four point seven-five percent. It would also update the telecommunications users tax to apply equally to all San Jose consumers for all telecommunications services, regardless of the technology they use, and enable the City to adapt the telecommunications users tax to new and developing technologies in the future.

Having heard this, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”**

Definitely yes -----	33%
Probably yes -----	20%
Undecided, lean yes -----	9%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>61%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	4%
Probably no -----	8%
Definitely no -----	16%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>1%</b>

13. Next, I'm going ask you about a variety of specific aspects of this ballot measure. After I read each one, please tell me whether you support or oppose that aspect of the measure. **(IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: "Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?") (RANDOMIZE)**

	<u>STR</u> <u>SUPP</u>	<u>SW</u> <u>SUPP</u>	<u>SW</u> <u>OPP</u>	<u>STR</u> <u>OPP</u>	<u>(DK/NA)</u>
[ ]a. Allows the telecommunications users tax to be applied to all out-of-state telephone calls -----	33%	23%	7%	29%	8%
[ ]b. Modernizes the existing ordinance in response to new communication technologies so that all taxpayers are treated the same regardless of technology used -----	45%	27%	6%	17%	5%
[ ]c. Allows the telecommunications users tax to be applied to newer services like text messaging-----	32%	23%	11%	29%	5%
[ ]d. Replaces the existing telecommunications ordinance with a modern ordinance that responds to changes in federal law-----	33%	28%	7%	15%	17%
[ ]e. Allows the telecommunications users tax to be applied to newer services like voice over Internet telephone services -----	34%	24%	7%	27%	7%
[ ]f. Reduces the tax rate from five percent to four point seven-five percent -----	56%	22%	8%	10%	4%

14. Next, I am going to read you some statements from people who support the telecommunications users tax reduction and modernization measure we have been discussing. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to support such a measure. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. **(RANDOMIZE)**

	<u>VERY</u> <u>CONV.</u>	<u>SMWHT</u> <u>CONV.</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>CONV.</u>	<u>DON'T</u> <u>BELIEVE</u>	<u>(DK/NA)</u>
[ ]a. The measure modernizes the existing communication user's tax to include technologies that did not exist when the tax was introduced. It treats all taxpayers, regardless of the technology they use, equally so that everyone pays their fair share.-----	36%	34%	19%	9%	2%
[ ]b. This measure will preserve 24 million dollars in existing funding for City services, including police, fire, parks, libraries or other vital services. -----	38%	35%	16%	9%	2%
[ ]c. Voting yes on this measure will <u>reduce</u> the tax rates San Jose residents pay on communications services.-----	42%	23%	18%	16%	1%



15. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about the measure to reduce the telecommunications users tax rate and modernize the law. Do you think you would vote "yes" in favor of this measure or "no" to oppose it? (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?") (IF UNDECIDED, DON'T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) "Do you lean toward voting yes or no?"

Definitely yes ----- 33%  
 Probably yes ----- 19%  
 Undecided, lean yes ----- 10%  
**TOTAL YES ----- 62%**

Undecided, lean no ----- 4%  
 Probably no ----- 6%  
 Definitely no ----- 18%  
**TOTAL NO ----- 29%**

(DON'T READ) Need more info ----- 8%  
 (DON'T READ) DK/NA ----- 1%

16. Next, I am going to read you some statements from people who oppose the telecommunications users tax reduction and modernization measure we have been discussing. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to oppose such a measure. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. (RANDOMIZE)

	<u>VERY CONV.</u>	<u>SMWHT CONV.</u>	<u>NOT CONV.</u>	<u>DON'T BELIEVE</u>	<u>(DK/NA)</u>
[ ]a. This measure would actually apply a <u>new</u> tax to services that are not currently taxed – like out-of-state phone calls, text messaging, and phone calls made over the Internet. -----	37%	25%	30%	4%	4%
[ ]b. We cannot trust the City to spend the money generated by this ballot measure. It will just be mis-spent or wasted. -----	30%	24%	27%	14%	5%
[ ]c. The City is placing a second measure on the ballot that would place a new tax on telephone service. We cannot afford to vote for two different City taxes on phone service. -----	33%	26%	28%	8%	5%

17. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about the measure to reduce the telecommunications users tax rate and modernize the law. Do you think you would vote "yes" in favor of this measure or "no" to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?") (IF UNDECIDED, DON'T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)**  
"Do you lean toward voting yes or no?"

Definitely yes ----- 26%  
Probably yes ----- 23%  
Undecided, lean yes ----- 9%  
**TOTAL YES ----- 58%**

Undecided, lean no ----- 5%  
Probably no ----- 10%  
Definitely no ----- 19%  
**TOTAL NO ----- 35%**

**(DON'T READ) Need more info ----- 7%**  
**(DON'T READ) DK/NA ----- 1%**

**(ASK Q18-Q24 OF SPLIT SAMPLE G ONLY)**

18. Now I would like to ask you more about the measure that would replace the city’s existing emergency services fee on each telephone line with a reduced tax.

The City of San Jose currently charges residents a monthly charge of one dollar and 75 cents per phone line in order to help pay for 9-1-1 emergency dispatch services. Due to a recent court decision, a number of California cities that charge such fees have decided to submit them to voters for approval.

This measure would create a new tax on phone lines to replace the fees customers are currently paying, and would reduce the monthly amount of the tax to one dollar and 65 cents per line, with annual inflation adjustments limited to three percent. If approved, the measure will continue generating 23 million dollars per year for the City, which could be used for vital city services including police, fire, street repair, parks and libraries. If the measure is rejected by voters, the city may have to cut 23 million dollars from existing City services.

Having heard this, do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”**

Definitely yes -----	36%
Probably yes -----	21%
Undecided, lean yes -----	10%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>68%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	1%
Probably no -----	10%
Definitely no -----	12%
<b>TOTAL NO -----</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA -----</b>	<b>1%</b>

**(ASK Q19 IF CODES 4-8 IN Q18)**

19. Suppose that this measure did not include a provision to adjust the amount of the tax annually for inflation, and would remain the exact same rate on an ongoing basis. In that case, do you think you would vote "yes" in favor of this measure or "no" to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?") (IF UNDECIDED, DON'T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)** "Do you lean toward voting yes or no?"

Definitely yes ----- 8%  
 Probably yes ----- 15%  
 Undecided, lean yes ----- 7%  
**TOTAL YES ----- 29%**

Undecided, lean no ----- 5%  
 Probably no ----- 19%  
 Definitely no ----- 22%  
**TOTAL NO ----- 46%**

**(DON'T READ)** Need more info ----- 21%  
**(DON'T READ)** DK/NA ----- 3%

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS IN SPLIT SAMPLE G)**

20. Next, I'm going ask you about a variety of specific aspects of this ballot measure. After I read each one, please tell me whether you support or oppose that aspect of the measure. **(IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: "Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?") (RANDOMIZE)**

	<u>STR</u> <u>SUPP</u>	<u>SW</u> <u>SUPP</u>	<u>SW</u> <u>OPP</u>	<u>STR</u> <u>OPP</u>	<u>(DK/NA)</u>
[ ]a. Replaces the existing fee on emergency communications service with a tax in a reduced amount -----	45%	25%	8%	14%	8%
[ ]b. Reduces the current cost of one dollar and 75 cents per month per phone line to one dollar and 65 cents-----	54%	22%	6%	13%	5%
[ ]c. Allows annual adjustments based on inflation limited to three percent per year-----	30%	27%	10%	23%	11%
[ ]d. Continues current lifeline exemptions for low-income senior-citizen and disabled households-----	75%	15%	3%	5%	3%

21. Next, I am going to read you some statements from people who support the measure to replace the City’s emergency communications fee with a reduced tax. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to support such a measure. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. **(RANDOMIZE)**

	<u>VERY CONV.</u>	<u>SMWHT CONV.</u>	<u>NOT CONV.</u>	<u>DON'T BELIEVE</u>	<u>(DK/NA)</u>
[ ]a. This measure would <u>reduce</u> the amount that San Jose phone customers pay to one dollar and sixty-five cents per month per phone line-----	43%	29%	17%	8%	3%
[ ]b. This measure will preserve 23 million dollars in existing funding for City services, including police, fire, parks, libraries or other vital services. -----	51%	26%	12%	7%	4%
[ ]c. All funds raised by this measure will be subject to audits and full public review of all spending, to ensure that the money is spent properly.-----	51%	26%	12%	9%	2%

22. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about the measure to replace the City’s emergency communications fee with a reduced tax. Do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”**

Definitely yes -----	34%
Probably yes -----	26%
Undecided, lean yes -----	12%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>72%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	2%
Probably no -----	7%
Definitely no -----	13%
<b>TOTAL NO-----</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA-----</b>	<b>0%</b>

23. Next, I am going to read you some statements from people who oppose the measure to replace the City’s emergency communications fee with a reduced tax. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to oppose such a measure. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. **(RANDOMIZE)**

	<u>VERY CONV.</u>	<u>SMWHT CONV.</u>	<u>NOT CONV.</u>	<u>DON'T BELIEVE</u>	<u>(DK/NA)</u>
[ ]a. This measure includes a provision that would allow increases in the tax every year for inflation. Essentially, it approves automatic tax increases on phone users every single year. -----	37%	29%	25%	6%	3%
[ ]b. Currently, funding from this fee is dedicated to the City’s 9-1-1 emergency communications system. But this measure would remove those limitations, and allow the City to spend it on any program they want. -----	36%	22%	30%	8%	5%
[ ]c. The City is placing a second measure on the ballot that would place taxes on a wide range of telecommunications services, including phones. We cannot afford to vote for two different City taxes on phone service. -----	35%	28%	26%	7%	4%

24. Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you again about the measure to replace the City’s emergency communications fee with a reduced tax. Do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:) “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”**

Definitely yes -----	22%
Probably yes -----	21%
Undecided, lean yes -----	14%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>58%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	5%
Probably no -----	12%
Definitely no -----	16%
<b>TOTAL NO -----</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA -----</b>	<b>2%</b>

**(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS; ROTATE Q25 AND Q26)**

25. Now I would like to ask you about the charter amendment that would remove the City Council’s ability to set its own salaries, and instead would set the Mayor and City Council’s salaries equal to 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of the salary of a superior court judge.

This measure would greatly simplify the City’s salary-setting process, would eliminate the need for a salary-setting commission, and would remove the conflict of interest involved in having City Council members vote on their own salaries. It would also lead to a sizeable increase in the salaries paid to the Mayor and City Council.

Having heard this, let me ask you again – do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)** “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”

Definitely yes -----	17%
Probably yes -----	14%
Undecided, lean yes -----	10%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>41%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	6%
Probably no -----	13%
Definitely no -----	26%
<b>TOTAL NO -----</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA -----</b>	<b>2%</b>

**(ROTATE Q26 AND Q25)**

26. Now I would like to explain a little more about the charter amendment giving the City Council the right to approve park use agreements for up to 30 years. Currently, the City Charter only allows the City Council to enter into such agreements for three years at a time in the majority of City parks. The three-year maximum limits the City's ability to attract private companies to enter into sponsorship and operating agreements, which in turn provide funding for the improvement of facilities, such as pools, community centers and soccer fields.

The proposed revision would allow private companies to make financial investments in exchange for lease periods long enough to obtain a return on their investments. The Charter provision would require that the long-term agreement must enhance the recreational opportunities of the park.

Having heard this, let me ask you again – do you think you would vote “yes” in favor of this measure or “no” to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK: “Is that definitely or just probably?”) (IF UNDECIDED, DON’T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NEED MORE INFORMATION ASK:)** “Do you lean toward voting yes or no?”

Definitely yes -----	36%
Probably yes -----	16%
Undecided, lean yes -----	9%
<b>TOTAL YES -----</b>	<b>61%</b>
Undecided, lean no -----	5%
Probably no -----	7%
Definitely no -----	14%
<b>TOTAL NO -----</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) Need more info -----</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>(DON’T READ) DK/NA -----</b>	<b>2%</b>



27. Now I am going to read you statements from supporters and opponents of all of these City of San Jose ballot measures. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your opinion. Please choose just one, even if it's hard to decide. **(ROTATE)**

[ ] Supporters say these measures deserve our support. They will ensure continued funding for vital City services and help to prevent significant cuts. In addition, as a group the measures are revenue neutral, and will not increase the total tax dollars collected by the City. ----- 38%

**OR**

[ ] Opponents say we should oppose at least some of these measures, because they will continue, broaden, or increases taxes or fees that would otherwise be phased out or struck down by the courts. In addition, there may be other, more important local funding measures on the ballot to rebuild Valley Medical Center and improve public transportation. ----- 44%

**(DON'T READ)**  
**(BOTH)**----- 5%  
**(NEITHER)** ----- 9%  
**(DON'T KNOW/NA)**----- 4%

28. Now I am going to ask you about the five measures that may appear on the November ballot in San Jose one last time. After I read each one, please tell me whether you would you vote yes to support it, or no to oppose it? **(IF YES/NO, ASK:)** "Is that definitely **(YES/NO)** or just probably?" **(IF UNDECIDED, ASK: "Well, do you lean towards voting yes or no?" )**

- (SPLIT SAMPLE A, ASK ITEM a. FIRST THEN RANDOMIZE THE OTHERS)
- (SPLIT SAMPLE B, ASK ITEM b. FIRST THEN RANDOMIZE THE OTHERS)
- (SPLIT SAMPLE C, ASK ITEM c. FIRST THEN RANDOMIZE THE OTHERS)
- (SPLIT SAMPLE D, ASK ITEM d. FIRST THEN RANDOMIZE THE OTHERS)
- (SPLIT SAMPLE E, ASK ITEM e. FIRST THEN RANDOMIZE THE OTHERS)

	<u>DEF</u> <u>YES</u>	<u>PROB</u> <u>YES</u>	<u>LEAN</u> <u>YES</u>	<u>LEAN</u> <u>NO</u>	<u>PROB</u> <u>NO</u>	<u>DEF</u> <u>NO</u>	<u>(DK/</u> <u>NA)</u>
[ ]a. A measure to reduce the City's Telecommunications Users Tax from five percent to four point seven-five percent, and to modernize the ordinance to apply to all out-of-state calls and treat taxpayers equally regardless of the technology used, to fund City services such as police and fire, street repair, parks, and libraries.	31%	23%	7%	7%	10%	16%	6%
[ ]b. A measure to eliminate the existing City emergency communications fee of one dollar and 75 cents per month and replace it with a reduced tax of one dollar and 65 cents per month, charged to each telephone line, to fund City services such as police and fire, street repair, parks, and libraries.	33%	25%	8%	7%	7%	16%	5%
[ ]c. A measure to help prevent cuts in City services like police, fire, street repair, parks and libraries by increasing the tax on card room revenues in San Jose from 13 percent to 18 percent	51%	16%	6%	4%	6%	13%	3%
[ ]d. A charter amendment that would do away with a Salary Setting Commission, and instead would set the Mayor and City Council's salaries equal to 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of the salary of a superior court judge.	20%	15%	8%	9%	10%	27%	11%
[ ]e. A charter amendment to generate revenue for park improvements and other recreational purposes by allowing the City Council to approve park use agreements for city parks larger than 5 acres for up to 30 years, provided such agreements enhance the recreational purposes of the park.	38%	20%	8%	4%	7%	14%	8%

**HERE ARE MY LAST QUESTIONS, AND THEY ARE FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY.**

29. Do you own or rent the house or apartment where you live?
- Own ----- 78%
  - Rent ----- 20%
  - (DON'T READ)** Don't know/Refused--- 2%
30. Please stop me when I come to the category that best describes the ethnic or racial group with which you identify yourself. Is it....?
- Hispanic/Latino----- 17%
  - African-American----- 3%
  - Asian/Pacific Islander ----- 16%
  - Caucasian/White ----- 57%
  - Native American/Indian----- 1%
  - Some other group or identification ----- 4%
  - (DON'T READ)** Refused ----- 2%
31. In what year were you born?
- 1990-1984 (18-24) ----- 5%
  - 1983-1979 (25-29) ----- 5%
  - 1978-1974 (30-34) ----- 7%
  - 1973-1969 (35-39) ----- 8%
  - 1968-1964 (40-44) ----- 11%
  - 1963-1959 (45-49) ----- 11%
  - 1958-1954 (50-54) ----- 12%
  - 1953-1949 (55-59) ----- 10%
  - 1948-1944 (60-64) ----- 8%
  - 1943-1934 (65-74) ----- 10%
  - 1933 or earlier (75 & over) ----- 7%
  - (DON'T READ)** Refused ----- 6%
32. I don't need to know the exact amount but I'm going to read you some categories for household income. Please stop me when I read the category for the total combined income for all people in your household before taxes in 2007?
- \$30,000 and under----- 9%
  - \$30,001 - \$60,000 ----- 15%
  - \$60,001 - \$75,000 ----- 14%
  - \$75,001 - \$100,000 ----- 19%
  - \$100,001 - \$150,000 ----- 13%
  - More than \$150,000 ----- 9%
  - (DON'T READ)** Refused ----- 22%

THANK AND TERMINATE

GENDER (BY OBSERVATION):

Male ----- 48%
Female ----- 52%

PARTY REGISTRATION:

Democrat ----- 49%
Republican ----- 27%
Decline to State ----- 21%
Other ----- 3%

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone# \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Voter ID# \_\_\_\_\_

Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Cluster # \_\_\_\_\_

Verified by \_\_\_\_\_

Page # \_\_\_\_\_

FLAGS

P02 ----- 38%
G02 ----- 54%
R03 ----- 63%
P04 ----- 54%
G04 ----- 88%
N05 ----- 65%
P06 ----- 55%
G06 ----- 76%
F08 ----- 77%

VOTE BY MAIL

1 ----- 22%
2 ----- 8%
3 + ----- 30%
Blank ----- 39%

PERMANENT ABSENTEE

Yes ----- 61%
No ----- 39%

HOUSEHOLD PARTY TYPE

Dem 1 ----- 21%
Dem 2 + ----- 18%
Rep 1 ----- 9%
Rep 2 + ----- 10%
Ind 1 + ----- 16%
Mix ----- 26%

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT

1 ----- 9%
2 ----- 10%
3 ----- 7%
4 ----- 11%
5 ----- 6%
6 ----- 12%
7 ----- 7%
8 ----- 12%
9 ----- 13%
10 ----- 13%

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT

1 ----- 28%
2 ----- 26%
3 ----- 19%
4 ----- 25%
5 ----- 2%

SFBRA_PHASE I PROPOSAL RANKING							
RANK	FIRM	LOCATION	RFP SENT	REVIEWER	REVIEWER	REVIEWER	TOTAL
				J KELLY	P Trigueros	M. McEnespy	
13	Delixus	Concord, CA		60	53	68	181
<b>1</b>	<b>EMC/SCI</b>	<b>Oakland, CA</b>	X	<b>93</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>279</b>
14	ETC Institute	Kansas		56	54	67	177
<b>3</b>	<b>FM3</b>	<b>Oakland, CA</b>	X	<b>87</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>268</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Godbe Research</b>	<b>San Mateo, CA</b>	X	<b>87</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>275</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Goodwin Simon</b>	<b>Oakland, CA</b>		<b>86</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>259</b>
15	ICF (Jones&Stokes)/Bartle Wells	Oakland, CA	B/W	42	41	77	160
7	Lake Reserch Partners	Berkeley, CA	X	75	73	87	235
16	Market Dimensions	Canada??		47	47	51	145
12	National Research Center	Boulder, CO		61	55	78	194
10	New England Research	Middlebury, VT		74	69	72	215
14	Opinion Research Corporation	Seattle, WA		64	60	53	177
6	Probolsky	Laguna Hills, CA		86	87	73	246
11	Responsive Management	Harrisonburg, VA		70	59	72	201
8	SA/Opinion Research	San Francisco		79	62	80	221
<b>5</b>	<b>Tulchin Research</b>	<b>San Jose</b>	X	<b>83</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>253</b>
9	UC Riverside	Riverside		69	64	84	217

**DRAFT**

**RFP Ranking Criteria**

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY- PHASE I SURVEY RFP EVALUATION**

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Score points 1(lowest) to 30 (highest)-Total of 100 points possible**

- 1. Includes transmittal letter highlighting unique features (10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Includes statement of work describing in detail procedures and methods for accomplishing the public opinion survey and revenue measure feasibility analysis including focus group option; election timeline, etc. (30 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Summarizes relevant experience: \_\_\_\_\_
  - a) Public opinion research
  - b) Revenue measure formation services
  - c) Developing financial feasibility studies(30 points possible)
- 4. Includes list of client references (5 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Includes examples of work (10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Includes budget and standard billing information (5 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Responds to all requirements of RFP (10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. Identifies key personnel, education, relevant similar work and includes resumes or CVs. Extra credit though not requested in RFP \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_



Date: April 23, 2010  
To: Governing Board  
From: Judy Kelly  
Director, San Francisco Estuary Partnership

Moira McEnespy  
Deputy Program Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Program  
California State Coastal Conservancy

Subject: **Selection of Firm to Conduct Public Opinion Polling/Research**

Proposed Action

None

Summary

At its October 19, 2009 meeting, the Board approved the workplan for Phase I polling and research using San Francisco Foundation (SFF) grant funds, which directed a subcommittee of the Governing Board to approve the contractor. The subcommittee (Schuchat, McGlashen, Foust, Cortese) was directed to review the responses to the RFP for Phase 1 of the polling effort, choose a firm to conduct the polling, and work with the selected firm to create questions for the polling effort.

At its January 27, 2010 meeting, the Board (1) approved the Proposed RFP for Phase I polling and research using expenditure of SFF grant funds in the amount of \$50,000 and (2) accepted an additional \$50,000 of funding for this effort received on behalf of the Restoration Authority from the Hewlett Foundation. Phase I of the polling effort consists of a baseline survey to determine the public's level of support for Bay restoration and to determine what projects garner the most voter support. Phase II will build on this first phase with questions related to a specific course of action developed out of the research and recommendations of Phase I.

The RFP was sent out from ABAG on January 28, 2010 and ABAG received 17 responses to the RFP. Staff drafted a Review Criteria sheet, which was then reviewed and modified by the subcommittee, and applied by staff to the review and ranking of the 17 proposals.

Staff [Judy Kelly, Paula Trigueros, and Moira McEnespy] first individually reviewed and ranked the 17 project proposals. They then met on March 25, 2010 to determine the top five proposals to

Selection of Firm to Conduct Public Opinion Polling/Research

April 23, 2010

2

forward to the subcommittee for final selection. The three reviewers were in agreement on the top three proposals, and came to agreement on the next two: EMC/SCI, FM3, Godbe Research, Goodwin-Simon and Tulchin Research. These five final proposals were reviewed and discussed by the subcommittee in a conference call April 12<sup>th</sup> and the subcommittee chose FM3 to conduct the polling effort. ABAG staff is now preparing to contract with FM3.

The Ranking Criteria sheet, the staff ranking table, and the winning FM3 proposal are attached.

Attachments:

- A. Ranking Criteria
- B. Staff Ranking Table
- C. FM3 Proposal





**Office of Congresswoman Jackie Speier**

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010**

**FACT SHEET**

For More Information Contact:  
Peter Viola, Office of Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
[Peter.Viola@mail.house.gov](mailto:Peter.Viola@mail.house.gov) / 202-225-3532

**What the bill does:**

- Authorizes \$100 million annually for ten years to the U.S. EPA to fund projects, programs, and studies that implement priority objectives of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership's Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP)
- Establishes a San Francisco Bay Program Office within Region 9 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and authorizes the EPA Administrator to appoint a Director of that Program Office to oversee that funding.
- Establishes a San Francisco Bay Program Advisory Committee to provide advice to the Administrator on implementing the identified goals and objectives of the CCMP, with representation from appropriate Federal and State departments and agencies, and the Director of the SFEP
- Provides that the President's annual budget submission to Congress shall provide information on federal agency expenditures for the protection and restoration of San Francisco Bay.

**Why the bill is needed:**

1. The San Francisco Bay estuary and its watersheds are a national treasure and a resource of worldwide significance that contributes to federal, state and local public health and economic vitality. As the largest estuary on the West Coast of the United States, the San Francisco Bay is home to more than 100 endangered species. The San Francisco Bay and its tidal and seasonal wetlands and other natural shoreline habitats are a significant part of the Pacific coastal resources of the United States, and a healthy bay is necessary to support human and wildlife populations.

2. A healthy San Francisco Bay is essential to a healthy ocean ecosystem, as forty percent of the land in the State of California drains to the San Francisco Bay. The San Francisco Bay estuary is a critical nursery for many ocean species, and the bay's wetlands and fertile mixing zone of fresh and salt water support the base of the ocean's food chain.
3. Over many years, the water quality and health of the San Francisco Bay estuary have been diminished by pollution, invasive species, loss of wetland habitat and other factors. Pollution from cars, homes, and communities drains into creeks, streams, and rivers that flow to the bay and the Pacific Ocean. Much of the bay and its tributaries are designated as impaired water bodies, contaminated by trash; heavy metals, including mercury, copper and selenium; PCBs; pesticides including diazinon, chlordane and dieldrin; bacteria, including fecal coliform; and other pollutants of concern. Contaminant sources in the bay include sediment from historic mining and industrial activity, stormwater discharge, agricultural runoff, air deposition, sewage treatment, and other regulated discharging facilities. Regulations relating to total maximum daily loads have been mandated for numerous contaminants.
4. More than 90 percent of the shoreline wetlands of the San Francisco Bay have been destroyed by diking, filling, and development. The restoration, preservation, and maintenance of vital wetlands and San Francisco Bay habitat, are immediate federal, state and regional priorities that are necessary to address continuing serious threats posed by pollution and sprawl. The importance of protecting and restoring the tidal wetlands and other natural habitats of San Francisco Bay is well documented in regional plans and reports, including the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership; the San Francisco Bay Plan of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Report of the San Francisco Bay Area Wetlands Ecosystem Goals Project; the "Restoring the Estuary" implementation strategy of the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture; the "California's Ocean Economy" report of the California Resources Agency; and the "Greening the Bay" report of Save The Bay. More than 36,000 acres of San Francisco Bay shoreline is publicly owned and planned for restoration to tidal marsh at an estimated cost of \$1,430,000,000 over the next 50 years.
5. Wetland restoration in the San Francisco Bay is necessary to address the growing danger that climate change and rises in sea level pose to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and environment of the State of California. Tidal wetlands can assist with tidal and fluvial flood management and adapt to rises in sea level by accreting sediment and rising in elevation. Leading scientists from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the federal government have found that the restoration of lost wetlands represents an immediate and substantial opportunity for enhancing terrestrial carbon sequestration. The 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy identifies restoration of San Francisco Bay tidal wetlands as a priority opportunity for the state.
6. The federal government, acting through the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in collaboration with other agencies of the federal government, the State of

California, local governments, non-governmental agencies and other stakeholders, have committed to a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, to achieve improved water quality and improvements in the health of the living resources of the San Francisco Bay including the protection of public water supplies, the protection and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife, and the maintenance of recreational activities in and on water, which require improved control of point and nonpoint sources of pollution to supplement existing pollution controls.

7. The San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) is the National Estuary Program for San Francisco Bay, established in 1987 under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The SFEP is a Federal, State and local effort working to improve the health of the San Francisco Bay through its strategic plan for accelerated implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). The Plan, produced in 1993 and revised in 2007 with the collaboration of many partners, is a roadmap for restoring physical, chemical and biological health to the San Francisco Bay through more than 200 implementation actions in the areas of aquatic resources; wildlife; wetlands management; water use; pollution prevention and reduction; dredging and waterway modification; land use management; public involvement and education; and research and monitoring. The Plan includes a conservative total cost estimate of \$4.5 billion for implementation of its priority recommendations. The Partnership was selected in 2008 by the Ocean and Coastal Protection Division of the Office of Water of the EPA as a lead participant in the climate ready estuary pilot program to assess the vulnerability of San Francisco Bay to a range of climate effects and to create and implement an adaptation plan.
8. Funds provided for CCMP implementation will advance the goals of the Clean Water Act – to protect and restore water quality and ecological health of the San Francisco Bay watershed and its habitats through partnerships, interagency coordination, and project grants. Federal investments have and can continue to leverage significant State and local government funding, as well as private and in-kind contributions. Demand for grants to address the identified ecological needs of the San Francisco Bay is significantly greater than available resources, particularly to achieve identified improvement goals for:
  - Invasive species prevention and management
  - Reduction of trash and other pollution in waterways
  - Wetlands protection and restoration
  - Stormwater management, including urban stream restoration, low impact development, and green infrastructure promotion
  - Water quality through implementation of total maximum daily loads, national pollutant discharge elimination system permits, watershed plans, and upgrading aging infrastructure
  - Predicting, mitigating and adapting to climate change impacts on water quality.

There is an urgent need to expand Federal funding support for these purposes.

**[DISCUSSION DRAFT]**111<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION**H. R.** \_\_\_\_\_

To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of the San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes.

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. SPEIER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on \_\_\_\_\_

---

**A BILL**

To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of the San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “San Francisco Bay  
5 Improvement Act of 2010”.

1 **SEC. 2. SAN FRANCISCO BAY.**

2 Title I of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act  
3 (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end  
4 the following:

5 **“SEC. 123. SAN FRANCISCO BAY.**

6 “(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following  
7 definitions apply:

8 “(1) COMMITTEE.—The term ‘Committee’  
9 means the San Francisco Bay Program Advisory  
10 Committee established under subsection (d).

11 “(2) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—The term ‘com-  
12 prehensive plan’ means the comprehensive conserva-  
13 tion and management plan for the San Francisco  
14 Bay established under section 320, including any  
15 amendments thereto.

16 “(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means  
17 the Director of the Office, except with respect to  
18 subsections (d)(2) and (e).

19 “(4) OFFICE.—The term ‘Office’ means the  
20 San Francisco Bay Program Office established  
21 under subsection (b).

22 “(5) REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM.—The  
23 term ‘Regional Monitoring Program’ means the pro-  
24 gram of the San Francisco Estuary Institute estab-  
25 lished in 1993 by the San Francisco Bay Regional  
26 Water Quality Control Board to monitor contamina-

1           tion in the San Francisco Bay and to provide data  
2           to water quality regulators for effective management  
3           of such Bay.

4           “(6) SAN FRANCISCO BAY.—The term ‘San  
5           Francisco Bay’ means the areas comprising the San  
6           Francisco Bay as determined by the Director.

7           “(7) SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY PARTNER-  
8           SHIP.—The term ‘San Francisco Estuary Partner-  
9           ship’ means the agency established in 1987 under  
10          section 320 to develop and implement a comprehen-  
11          sive conservation and management plan to restore  
12          and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological  
13          integrity of the San Francisco Bay.

14          “(b) PROGRAM OFFICE.—

15          “(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator  
16          shall establish in the Environmental Protection  
17          Agency a San Francisco Bay Program Office. The  
18          Office shall be located at the headquarters of region  
19          9 of the Environmental Protection Agency.

20          “(2) APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR.—The Ad-  
21          ministrator shall appoint a Director of the Office,  
22          who, by reason of management experience and tech-  
23          nical expertise relating to the San Francisco Bay,  
24          shall be highly qualified to support the development

1 and implementation of projects, programs, and stud-  
2 ies necessary to implement the comprehensive plan.

3 “(3) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; STAFFING.—

4 The Administrator shall delegate to the Director  
5 such authority and provide such staff as may be nec-  
6 essary to carry out this section.

7 “(c) DUTIES.—

8 “(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this sec-  
9 tion, the Administrator, acting through the Director,  
10 shall—

11 “(A) assist and support the implementa-  
12 tion of the comprehensive plan;

13 “(B) provide funding and make grants for  
14 implementation of the comprehensive plan and  
15 projects, programs, and studies consistent with  
16 the priorities of the comprehensive plan;

17 “(C) promote innovative methodologies and  
18 technologies that are cost-effective and con-  
19 sistent with the identified goals and objectives  
20 of the comprehensive plan and Environmental  
21 Protection Agency permitting processes;

22 “(D) coordinate the major functions of the  
23 Federal Government related to the implementa-  
24 tion of the comprehensive plan, including

1 projects, programs, and studies with respect  
2 to—

3 “(i) water quality improvement;

4 “(ii) wetland, riverine, and estuary  
5 restoration and protection;

6 “(iii) nearshore and endangered spe-  
7 cies recovery; and

8 “(iv) adaptation to climate change;

9 “(E) coordinate research and planning  
10 projects authorized under this section with the  
11 San Francisco Estuary Partnership, Federal  
12 departments and agencies, State agencies, local  
13 governments, federally recognized Indian tribes,  
14 universities, and other public or nonprofit pri-  
15 vate organizations to advance implementation of  
16 the comprehensive plan;

17 “(F) track progress with respect to meet-  
18 ing the identified goals and objectives of the  
19 comprehensive plan by—

20 “(i) implementing and supporting a  
21 project, program, and study monitoring  
22 system consistent with the systems used by  
23 the San Francisco Estuary Partnership;  
24 and



1           “(ii) coordinating, managing, and re-  
2           porting environmental data relating to San  
3           Francisco Bay in a manner consistent with  
4           methodologies utilized by the Regional  
5           Monitoring Program, including, to the ex-  
6           tent practicable, making such data and re-  
7           ports on such data available to the public,  
8           including on the Internet, in a timely fash-  
9           ion; and

10           “(G) collect and make available to the pub-  
11           lic, including on the Internet, publications and  
12           other forms of information relating to the envi-  
13           ronmental quality of the San Francisco Bay.

14           “(2) IMPLEMENTATION METHODS.—The Ad-  
15           ministrator, acting through the Director, may enter  
16           into interagency agreements, make intergovern-  
17           mental personnel appointments, provide funding,  
18           and make grants in carrying out the duties under  
19           this subsection.

20           “(d) SAN FRANCISCO BAY PROGRAM ADVISORY COM-  
21           MITTEE.—

22           “(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall es-  
23           tablish a San Francisco Bay Program Advisory  
24           Committee to provide advice to the Administrator on

1 the implementation of the identified goals and objec-  
2 tives of the comprehensive plan.

3 “(2) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall con-  
4 sist of the Director and Steering Committee of the  
5 San Francisco Estuary Partnership, and representa-  
6 tives of appropriate Federal and State departments  
7 and agencies that may affect or implement projects  
8 or programs identified in the comprehensive plan.  
9 Participation on the Committee shall be voluntary  
10 for any individual that is not an employee of the  
11 Federal Government.

12 “(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Director shall serve  
13 as the chairperson of the Committee.

14 “(4) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet at  
15 least twice per year—

16 “(A) to assess the progress of the Office in  
17 meeting the identified goals and objectives of  
18 the comprehensive plan;

19 “(B) to identify improvements necessary  
20 for meeting the identified goals and objectives  
21 of the comprehensive plan; and

22 “(C) to assess Federal department and  
23 agency budget needs with respect to imple-  
24 menting the comprehensive plan.

1           “(5) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—A member  
2 of the Committee shall serve without compensation.

3           “(6) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Subject to the avail-  
4 ability of appropriations, the Administrator shall re-  
5 imburse a member of the Committee for travel ex-  
6 penses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at  
7 rates authorized for an employee of a Federal agen-  
8 cy under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5,  
9 United States Code, while away from home or the  
10 regular place of business of the member in perform-  
11 ance of services for the Committee.

12          “(e) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date  
13 of enactment of this section, and biennially thereafter, the  
14 Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the  
15 San Francisco Estuary Partnership, shall submit to Con-  
16 gress a report that—

17           “(1) summarizes progress with respect to imple-  
18 menting the comprehensive plan and achieving the  
19 identified goals and objectives described in the com-  
20 prehensive plan;

21           “(2) summarizes any modifications to the com-  
22 prehensive plan made in the 2-year period preceding  
23 such report;

24           “(3) includes specific recommendations for im-  
25 plementation of the comprehensive plan; and

1           “(4) summarizes the roles and progress of each  
2           Federal department or agency that has jurisdiction  
3           in the San Francisco Bay with respect to meeting  
4           the identified goals and objectives of the comprehen-  
5           sive plan.

6           “(f) IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—

7           “(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, acting  
8           through the Director and in consultation with the  
9           San Francisco Estuary Partnership, shall carry out  
10          projects, programs, and studies to implement the  
11          comprehensive plan.

12          “(2) PRIORITY PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND  
13          STUDIES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Ad-  
14          ministrator shall give priority to projects, programs,  
15          and studies that are identified as priorities by the  
16          San Francisco Estuary Partnership in the com-  
17          prehensive plan.

18          “(3) GRANTS.—

19          “(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator,  
20          acting through the Director, is authorized to  
21          make grants for projects, programs, and studies  
22          to implement the comprehensive plan.

23          “(B) ALLOCATIONS.—In making grants  
24          under this paragraph, the Administrator shall  
25          use—

1           “(i) 2.5 percent of the funds appro-  
2           priated for making grants under this para-  
3           graph for a fiscal year to make a com-  
4           prehensive grant to the San Francisco Es-  
5           tuary Partnership to manage implementa-  
6           tion of the comprehensive plan; and

7           “(ii) 97.5 percent of funds appro-  
8           priated for making grants under this para-  
9           graph for a fiscal year to make grants to  
10          State and regional water pollution control  
11          agencies and entities, including the San  
12          Francisco Estuary Partnership, federally  
13          recognized Indian tribes, State coastal zone  
14          management agencies, local governments,  
15          and public or nonprofit private agencies,  
16          institutions, or organizations to implement  
17          projects, programs, and studies that ad-  
18          vance implementation of the comprehensive  
19          plan.

20          “(C) GRANT ELIGIBILITY.—An entity shall  
21          be eligible for grants under this paragraph only  
22          if grant funds shall be used for projects, pro-  
23          grams, and studies that are pursuant to the  
24          comprehensive plan.

25          “(4) FEDERAL SHARE.—

1           “(A) MANAGEMENT GRANTS.—The Fed-  
2           eral share of the cost of management activities  
3           carried out using funds from a grant under  
4           paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall not exceed 75 per-  
5           cent.

6           “(B) PROJECT, PROGRAM, AND STUDY  
7           GRANTS.—The Federal share of the cost of a  
8           project, program, or study carried out using  
9           funds from a grant under paragraph (3)(B)(ii)  
10          shall not exceed 50 percent.

11          “(g) ANNUAL BUDGET PLAN.—The President, as  
12          part of the annual budget submission of the President  
13          under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall  
14          submit information regarding each Federal department  
15          and agency involved in San Francisco Bay protection and  
16          restoration, including—

17                 “(1) a report that displays for each Federal  
18          agency—

19                         “(A) the amounts obligated in the pre-  
20                         ceding fiscal year for protection and restoration  
21                         projects, programs, and studies relating to the  
22                         San Francisco Bay; and

23                         “(B) the proposed budget for protection  
24                         and restoration projects, programs, and studies  
25                         relating to the San Francisco Bay; and

1           “(2) a description and assessment of the Fed-  
2           eral role in the implementation of the comprehensive  
3           plan and the specific role of each Federal depart-  
4           ment and agency involved in San Francisco Bay pro-  
5           tection and restoration, including specific projects,  
6           programs, and studies conducted or planned to  
7           achieve the identified goals and objectives of the  
8           comprehensive plan.

9           “(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There  
10          is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to  
11          carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal  
12          years 2011 through 2021. Such sums shall remain avail-  
13          able until expended.”.



**San Francisco Bay  
Restoration Authority**

Date: April 23, 2010  
To: Governing Board  
From: Judy Kelly  
Director, San Francisco Estuary Partnership

Moira McEnespy  
Deputy Program Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Program  
California State Coastal Conservancy

Subject: **Support of the San Francisco Bay Improvement Act of 2010—HR 5061**

Proposed Action

Staff is requesting the Governing Board sign a letter of support for the San Francisco Bay Improvement Act of 2010—HR 5061.

Summary

On Thursday, April 15th, Representative Jackie Speier introduced federal legislation that would create a San Francisco Bay Program at US EPA Region 9, and authorize up to \$100 million annually for the next 10 years to support projects that advance implementation of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership's Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan. As of April 15th, the co-sponsors of the bill include Representatives Garamendi, Lee, Stark, Woolsey, Honda, Thompson, McNerney, Eshoo, Miller and Loftgren.

The new Program Office at EPA Region 9 headquarters would be charged with grant-making to further implement the National Estuary Program priorities for San Francisco Bay. Grant funds would go toward addressing the full array of challenges the Bay faces, including: pollution and toxic cleanup, wetlands and stream restoration, fish and wildlife preservation, watershed and land use planning, water use conservation and climate change adaptation efforts.



Support of the San Francisco Bay Improvement Act of 2010—HR 5061

April 23, 2010

2

Restoration of San Francisco Bay tidal marsh and related habitats is a top priority of the CCMP and funds from this bill could substantially increase the opportunity to achieve regional wetland restoration goals.

Attachments:

- A. San Francisco Bay Improvement Act of 2010—HR 5061
- B. HR 5061 Fact Sheet
- C. Draft Letter of Support

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority  
**Governing Board**

Appointed March 19, 2009  
By the Executive Board of the Association of Bay Area Governments

**Chair**

Samuel Schuchat  
Executive Officer  
California State Coastal Conservancy  
1330 Broadway, 13th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Tel.: 510 286 1015  
Fax: 510 286 0470  
Email: [sschuchat@scc.ca.gov](mailto:sschuchat@scc.ca.gov)

**West Bay**

Phil Ting  
Assessor Recorder  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 190  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Tel.: 415 554 4999  
Fax: 415 554 5553  
Email: [phil.ting@sfgov.org](mailto:phil.ting@sfgov.org)

**East Bay**

John Gioia  
Supervisor  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Contra Costa  
11780 San Pablo Avenue, Suite D  
El Cerrito, CA 94530  
Tel.: 510 374 3231  
Fax: 510 374 3429  
Email: [jgioia@bos.cccounty.us](mailto:jgioia@bos.cccounty.us)

**North Bay**

Charles McGlashan  
Supervisor  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Marin  
Civic Center  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 325  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
Tel.: 415 499 7331  
Fax: 415 499 3645  
Email: [cmcglashan@co.marin.ca.us](mailto:cmcglashan@co.marin.ca.us)

**South Bay**

Rosanne Foust  
Mayor  
City Council  
City of Redwood City  
City Hall  
1017 Middlefield Road  
Redwood City, CA 94064  
Tel.: 650 780 7220  
Fax: 650 261 9102  
Email: [rfoust@redwoodcity.org](mailto:rfoust@redwoodcity.org)

**Bayside City/County**

Dave Cortese  
Supervisor  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Santa Clara  
County Government Center  
70 West Hedding Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Tel.: 408 299 5030  
Fax: 408 298 6637  
Email: [dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org](mailto:dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org)

**Bayside City/Park District**

John Sutter  
Director  
East Bay Regional Park District  
2950 Peralta Oaks Road  
P.O. Box 5381  
Oakland, CA 94605  
Tel.: 510 530 3711  
Tel.: 888 327 2757  
Email: [jsutter@ebparks.org](mailto:jsutter@ebparks.org)

**Director**

Henry Gardner  
Executive Director  
Association of Bay Area Governments  
101 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Tel.: 510 464 798  
Fax: 510 464 7985  
Email: [henryg@abag.ca.gov](mailto:henryg@abag.ca.gov)

April 28, 2010

«FirstName» «LastName»  
«Title»  
«Organization»  
«Address»  
«City», California «Zip»

Re: San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority—Advisory Committee

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

With the passage of state legislation in 2008, the newly formed San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Restoration Authority) is taking on the challenge of raising regional revenues to fund wetland restoration projects and associated flood management and public access in the San Francisco Bay area (see enclosures). The Association of Bay Area Governments and the State Coastal Conservancy are staffing the effort on a voluntary basis, and will provide logistical and technical support for the Advisory Committee.

The Restoration Authority's Governing Board has the principal objectives of identifying opportunities for revenues and leading the effort to implement wetland restoration. One of the Governing Board's first steps will be naming an Advisory Committee to counsel and assist it in this ground breaking effort. The Governing Board seated an initial slate of advisors at its October 28, 2009 meeting, but intends to continue with its selection process and to seat the full complement of Advisors in the next few months.

**[From Governing Board member.]** I believe you can make a difference based on your experience, expertise, and proven dedication to the health of the San Francisco Bay and wetlands, and, therefore, I would like to submit your name to the Governing Board for consideration for an appointment to the Advisory Committee. Advisors will serve a three-year term, with options for reappointment, and will form subgroups as needed. If you are interested in being considered to serve on the Advisory Committee, please contact Fred Castro, Clerk of the Governing Board, at (510) 464 7913 or [fredc@abag.ca.gov](mailto:fredc@abag.ca.gov), and he will forward your name to the Governing Board.

**[From Clerk of the Governing Board.]** In discussing possible appointments, a member of the Governing Board has identified you as a prime candidate for the Advisory Committee based on your experience, expertise, and proven dedication to the health of the San Francisco Bay and

Attachment

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority—Advisory Committee

April 28, 2010

2

wetlands, and, therefore, would like to submit your name to the Governing Board for consideration. Advisors will serve a three-year term, with options for reappointment, and will form subgroups as needed. If you are interested in being considered to serve on the Advisory Committee, please contact me directly at (510) 464 7913 or [fredc@abag.ca.gov](mailto:fredc@abag.ca.gov).

Please visit the Restoration Authority's website at <http://www.sfbayrestore.org/> for more information. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Judy Kelly, Director, San Francisco Estuary Partnership, at (510) 622 8137 or [JAKelly@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:JAKelly@waterboards.ca.gov), or Amy Hutzel, Regional Manager, at (510) 286 4180 or [ahutzel@scc.ca.gov](mailto:ahutzel@scc.ca.gov), or Moira McEnespy, Deputy Regional Manager, at (510) 286 4165 or [mmcenespy@scc.ca.gov](mailto:mmcenespy@scc.ca.gov), both from the California State Coastal Conservancy.

Sincerely,

***[Governing Board Member or Clerk of the Governing Board]***

Enclosures

Restoration projects


Wetlands regional map

Governing Board roster

Attachment

## SAN FRANCISCO BAY ESTUARY – TIDAL WETLANDS, THEN AND NOW

★ *Wetland restoration at these sites will nearly double the Bay's tidal marsh.*



## Planned Restoration Projects List

*Completing these planned restoration projects will nearly double the Bay's tidal marsh*

Tidal Wetland Restoration Project	Investment to Date: \$370 Million				Funds Needed to Complete: \$1.43 Billion				
	Tidal Acres	Landowning Agency (Year Acquired)	Acquisition	Planning & Implementation	Planning	Implementation	Monitoring (10 years)	Operations & Maintenance (50 years)	Total Needed:
Montezuma Wetlands	1,876	Montezuma Wetlands, LLC (late 1980s)	\$4,450,000	\$44,500,000	\$0	\$100,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$110,000,000
Napa-Sonoma Marsh	10,000	CA Dept of Fish & Game (1994)	\$10,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$3,140,000	\$3,000,000	\$46,140,000
Cullinan Ranch	1,564	US Fish & Wildlife Service (1996)	\$6,000,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$500,000	\$9,500,000	\$22,000,000
Eden Landing	722	CA Dept of Fish & Game (1996)	\$12,500,000	\$1,600,000	\$0	\$3,300,000	\$625,000	\$1,500,000	\$5,425,000
Bair Island	1,400	US Fish & Wildlife Service (1999)	\$15,000,000	\$1,824,000	\$0	\$8,175,942	\$720,000	\$1,710,000	\$10,605,942
Pond A4	310	Santa Clara Valley Water District (2000)	\$5,890,000	n/a	n/a	\$1,550,000	\$465,000	n/a	\$2,015,000
Napa Plant Site	1,460	CA Dept of Fish & Game (2003)	part of SBSP	\$850,000	\$0	\$4,500,000	\$625,000	\$2,250,000	\$7,375,000
Hamilton Field/ Bel Marin Keys	2,434	CA Coastal Conservancy (2003)	\$16,000,000	\$25,500,000	\$0	\$165,800,000	\$6,500,000	\$4,430,000	\$176,730,000
Bahia	418	Marin Audubon Society (2003)	\$15,800,000	\$350,000	\$0	\$2,200,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,200,000
South Bay Salt Ponds	13,000	US Fish & Wildlife Service / CA Dept of Fish & Game (2003)	\$100,000,000	\$33,000,000	\$0	\$750,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$200,000,000	\$980,000,000
Dutch Slough	1,166	CA Dept of Water Resources (2003)	\$38,000,000	n/a	\$4,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$750,000	n/a	\$34,750,000
Sears Point	970	Sonoma Land Trust (2005)	\$17,000,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,380,000	\$15,700,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,500,000	\$20,780,000
Pond A18	856	City of San Jose (2005)	\$13,500,000	n/a	n/a	\$4,280,000	\$1,284,000	n/a	\$5,564,000
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>36,176</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>\$254,140,000</b>	<b>\$116,324,000</b>	<b>\$6,380,000</b>	<b>\$1,137,505,942</b>	<b>\$51,809,000</b>	<b>\$229,890,000</b>	<b>\$1,425,584,942</b>

Source: *Greening the Bay: Financing Wetland Restoration in San Francisco Bay*, Save The Bay, August 2007



**San Francisco Bay  
Restoration Authority**

Date: April 23, 2010  
To: Governing Board  
From: Moira McEnespy  
Deputy Program Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Program  
California State Coastal Conservancy

Judy Kelly  
Director, San Francisco Estuary Partnership

Subject: **Advisory Committee—Completion of Formation**

Proposed Action

Action to complete formation of the Advisory Committee.

Summary

At its October 28, 2009 meeting, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Board (the Authority) acted to seat 15 initial members to its Advisory Committee. Staff subsequently notified these 15 nominees of their selection to the committee, notified the remaining six vetted<sup>1</sup> potential candidates that their addition to the committee was still pending, and provided Board members with a letter with which to solicit interest from any additional desired candidates. Staff held an orientation webinar for seated members on January 21, 2010.

At its January 27, 2010 meeting the Authority heard an update on the status of the Advisory Committee. Staff indicated it had not received any new nominations from Board members, and again requested that Board members solicit any additional desired candidates. Staff is transmitting the letter with which to solicit interest from additional desired candidates electronically as an attachment to this memo.

To date, two of the “vetted but still pending” nominees have since requested to be removed from consideration (Draper and Klehs), and one has reiterated interest in serving on the committee (Thompson). The following table summarizes member/nominee status to date. Staff has not received any additional nominee names from any Board member.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this memo, “vetted” refers to a candidate for the advisory committee that has been nominated by staff or a member of Governing Board and who has expressed a willingness to serve.

Advisory Committee—Completion of Formation

April 23, 2010

2

Table: Status of Advisory Committee Members and Vetted Nominees

	Name	Status	Orientation Webinar January 21, 2010
1.	<b>Steve Abbors</b> , General Manager, Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District	Seated October 28, 2009	
2.	<b>Cindy Chavez</b> , Executive Officer, South Bay Labor Council	Seated October 28, 2009	
3.	<b>Patrick Congdon</b> , General Manager, Santa Clara County Open Space Authority	Seated October 28, 2009	
4.	<b>Grant Davis</b> , Assistant General Manager, Sonoma County Water Agency	Seated October 28, 2009	
5.	<b>Beth Huning</b> , Coordinator, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
6.	<b>Ellen Johnck</b> , Executive Director, Bay Planning Coalition	Seated October 28, 2009	
7.	<b>Jerry Kent</b> , Former Acting General Manager, East Bay Park and Recreation District	Seated October 28, 2009	
8.	<b>David Lewis</b> , Executive Director, Save The Bay	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
9.	<b>Cynthia Murray</b> , President/CEO, North Bay Leadership Council	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
10.	<b>Bruce Raful</b> , Proprietor, Raful & Associates	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
11.	<b>Curt Riffle</b> , Program Operations Manager, Conservation and Science, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
12.	<b>Patrick Rutten</b> , Implementation Team Chair, NOAA Restoration Center	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
13.	<b>Bob Spencer</b> , Economist/Financial Consultant	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
14.	<b>Mendel Stewart</b> , Project Leader, Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge	Seated October 28, 2009	yes
15.	<b>Will Travis</b> , Executive Director, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission	Seated October 28, 2009	
	<b>Dion Aroner</b> ; former member of State Assembly; Partner, Aroner, Jewel & Ellis	Nomination vetted by staff;	
X	<del><b>Ann Draper</b>, Santa Clara Valley Water District</del>	Nomination vetted by staff; declined to serve on Jan 5, 2010	
X	<del><b>Johan Klehs</b>, former member of State Assembly, Board of Equalization, Franchise Tax Board</del>	Nomination vetted by staff; declined to serve on Jan 5, 2010	
	<b>Sally Lieber</b> ; sponsor of AB2954; former member of State Assembly	Nomination vetted by staff	
	<b>Pat O'Brien</b> , General Manager, East Bay Regional Park District	Nomination vetted by staff	
	<b>Laura Thompson</b> , Manager, San Francisco Bay Trail Project	Nomination vetted by staff; reaffirmed interest in serving on Apr 8, 2010	



Advisory Committee—Completion of Formation

April 23, 2010

3

Staff now recommends that the Authority adopt a process to close the Advisory Committee formation process by setting deadlines for (a) individual Board members to vet their potential nominees and (b) the subcommittee (Foust, Gioia, Ting) to meet and make recommendations from among the vetted candidates for Board action at its July 28, 2010 meeting.

Attachment:

Letter to Solicit Interest from Potential Advisory Committee Candidates (sent electronically)

