



2950 PERALTA OAKS COURT P.O. BOX 5381 OAKLAND CALIFORNIA 94605-0381 T. | 888 EBPARKS F. 510 569 4319

**DRAFT**

## **AGENDA** **BOARD LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Friday, November 18, 2011**  
**12:45 p.m., Peralta Oaks Board Room**

The following agenda items are listed for Committee consideration. In accordance with the Board Operating Guidelines, no official action of the Board will be taken at this meeting; rather, the Committee's purpose shall be to review the listed items and to consider developing recommendations to the Board of Directors.

### AGENDA

<u>STATUS</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>STAFF</u>
	12:45 p.m.	1. STATE LEGISLATION / ISSUES A. NEW LEGISLATION a. N/A (Legislature is adjourned)	
(I)		B. ISSUES a. State Parks Hearing b. Pension Reform c. California Forward Ballot Initiative	Doyle/Pfuehler
		2. STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS	
(R)		3. FEDERAL LEGISLATION / ISSUES A. NEW LEGISLATION a. H.R. 2513 (Baldwin) and S. 1354 (Hagan) Healthy Media for Youth Act	Doyle/Pfuehler
(I)		B. ISSUES a. Transportation Issues	Doyle/Pfuehler
(D)		4. Quagga / Zebra Mussel Discussion	O'Connor/Pfuehler
		5. PUBLIC COMMENTS	
		6. CORRESPONDENCE & ARTICLES	

(R) Recommendation for Future Board Consideration  
(I) Information  
(D) Discussion

Future 2011 Meetings: December 16, 2011

Legislative Committee Members:

Ted Radke, Chair, Doug Siden, Ayn Wieskamp, Beverly Lane, Alternate  
Erich Pfuehler, Staff Coordinator

Board of Directors

Beverly Lane President Ward 6	Carol Severin Vice-President Ward 3	John Sutter Treasurer Ward 2	Ayn Wieskamp Secretary Ward 5	Whitney Dotson Ward 1	Doug Siden Ward 4	Ted Radke Ward 7	Robert E. Doyle General Manager
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------------------------

Distribution/Agenda Only

Afton Crooks  
Michael Kelley  
Stana Hearne  
Peter Rauch  
Johan Klehs  
Judi Bank  
Ted Radosevich  
Mimi Waluch

Distribution/Agenda Only

Dan Levy  
Pete Wilson  
Robert Follrath, Sr.  
Fred W. Lopez  
Yolande Barial  
Bruce Beyaert  
Norman LaForce  
Rick Parmer

Distribution/Full Packet

Board of Directors  
Bob Doyle  
Carol Johnson  
Dave Collins  
Jim O'Connor  
Mike Anderson  
Tim Anderson  
Kristin Vorderbrueggen

Distribution/Full Packet

Allen Pulido  
Shelly Lewis  
Tyrone Davis  
Nancy Wenninger  
Carol Victor  
Pat O'Brien  
Ann Grodin  
Sharon Corkin

Distribution/Full Packet

Hulet Hornbeck  
Dr. George Manross  
Glenn Kirby  
Di Rosario  
Jon King  
Doug Houston  
Peter Umhofer  
Dave Weiman



## 2011/12 Status of Recommendations

The following is a record of bills that the board has taken action on.

1. [ACA 4 \(Blumenfield\)](#) **Local government financing: voter approval. (12/06/2010)**  
**Status:** 8/29/2011 – Ordered to inactive file at the request of Assembly Member Blumenfield.  
**Location:** 8/29/2011 – ASSEMBLY – INACTIVE FILE  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation ACA 4.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-2-029  
**Notified Author:** March 24, 2011
  
2. [S.29 \(Feinstein\)](#) **Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment. (1/25/2011)**  
**Status:** 1/25/2011 – Read twice and referred to Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
**Location:** 1/25/2011 – Referred to SENATE COMMITTEE  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation S.29**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-3-069  
**Notified Author:** March 24, 2011  
  
[H.R. 486 \(Garamendi\)](#) **Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act. (1/26/11)**  
**Status:** 2/7/2011 – Referred to HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE.  
**Location:** 2/7/2011 – Referred to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands.  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation H.R. 486.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-2-3-069  
**Notified Author:** March 24, 2011
  
3. [S. 97 \(Feinstein\)](#) **San Francisco Bay Restoration Act. (1/25/2011)**  
**Status:** 1/25/2011 – Referred to Senate Committee.  
**Location:** 1/25/2011 – Read twice and referred to the COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation S.97.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-3-068  
**Notified Author:** March 24, 2011
  
4. [AB 36 \(Perea\)](#) **Income and employment taxes: federal conformity: Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. (12/6/2010)**  
**Status:** 4/7/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 17, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 4/7/2011 – **ASSEMBLY - CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation AB 36.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-6-116  
**Notified Author:** N/A – Chaptered



## 2011/12 Status of Recommendations

5. [AB 612 \(Gordon\)](#) Parks and recreation: districts: repayment of indebtedness. (2/16/2011)  
**Status:** 7/25/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 104, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 7/25/2011 – **ASSEMBLY - CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENTS pending legislation AB 612.**  
**Resolution No.:** Pending  
**Notified Author:** Pending
  
6. [H.R. 709](#) (Sires) Urban Revitalization and Livable Communities Act of 2011; Grants for improvement and construction of parks in urban areas. (2/15/2011)  
**Status:** 3/23/2011 – Referred to House Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity  
**Location:** 3/23/2011 – Referred to HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation H.R. 709.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-6-117  
**Notified Author:** June 8, 2011
  
7. [S. 174](#) (Harkin) Healthy Lifestyles and Prevention America Act (HeLP); Improving physical activity for all ages. (1/25/2011)  
**Status:** 1/25/2011 – Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance  
**Location:** 1/25/2011 – Referred to SENATE COMMITTEE  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation S. 174.**  
**Resolution No.:** Pending  
**Notified Author:** Pending
  
8. [AB 147](#) (Dickinson) Transportation impact mitigation fees for bike and ped projects. (1/14/2011)  
**Status:** 9/06/2011 – CHAPTERED  
**Location:** 9/06/2011 – **ASSEMBLY - CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation AB 147.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A
  
9. [SB 653](#) (Steinberg) – Enabling counties and school districts to have more local taxation authority. (2/18/11)  
**Status:** 8/22/2011 – Ordered to inactive file on request of Senator Steinberg  
**Location:** 8/22/2011 – SENATE – INACTIVE FILE  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENTS pending legislation SB 653.**  
**Resolution No.:** Pending  
**Notified Author:** Pending



## 2011/12 Status of Recommendations

10. [SB 668](#) (Evans) – Williamson Act agreements between and owner's and open space districts (2/18/11)  
**Status:** 9/6/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 254, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 9/6/2011 – **SENATE-CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to WATCH pending legislation SB 668.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A
  
11. [SB 356](#) (Blakeslee) – Local operating agreements for state parks (2/15/11)  
**Status:** 10/4/2011 – Vetoed by the Governor  
**Location:** 10/4/2011 – **SENATE- VETOED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to WATCH pending legislation SB 356.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A
  
12. [SB 386](#) (Harman) – State Park closure notification (2/15/11)  
**Status:** 9/21/2011 – Vetoed by the Governor  
**Location:** 9/21/2011 – **STATE - VETOED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to WATCH pending legislation SB 386.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A
  
13. [SB 769](#) (Fuller) – Allowing display of and exhibition of legally-possessed mountain lion carcasses for scientific or education purposes (2/18/11)  
**Status:** 9/30/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 368, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 9/30/2011 – **SENATE - CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation SB 769.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-8-166  
**Notified Author:** August 11, 2011
  
14. [SB 436](#) (Kehoe) – Land use: mitigation lands: nonprofit organizations (7/13/11)  
**Status:** 10/8/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 590, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 10/8/2011 – **SENATE- CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation SB 436.**  
**Resolution No.:** 2011-8-165  
**Notified Author:** August 11, 2011
  
15. [AB 1036](#) (Allen) – Sonoma County Parks Bill  
**Status:** 10/8/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 581, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 10/8/2011 – **ASSEMBLY-CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to WATCH pending legislation AB 1036.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A



## 2011/12 Status of Recommendations

15. [H.R. 481](#) (Connolly) – The Complete America’s Great Trails Act  
**Status:** 2/4/2011 – Referred to House subcommittee.  
**Location:** 2/04/2011 – Referred to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation H.R. 481.**  
**Resolution No.:** Pending  
**Notified Author:** Pending
  
16. [H.R. 2547 and S. 1372](#) (Reed) (Sarbanes) – No Child Left Inside Act (7/14/2011)  
**Status:** 9/8/2011 – Referred to House subcommittee.  
**Location:** 9/8/2011 – Referred to the House subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation H.R. 2547 and S. 1372.**  
**Resolution No.:** Pending  
**Notified Author:** Pending
  
17. [S. 1265](#) (Bingaman)- Full Funding for Land and Water Conservation (6/23/2011)  
**Status:** 6/23/2011 – Referred to Senate committee.  
**Location:** 6/23/2011 – Read twice and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation S. 1265.**  
**Resolution No.:** Pending  
**Notified Author:** Pending
  
18. [AB 42](#) (Huffman)- Allowing Qualified Nonprofits to Operate a State Park Unit (12/6/2010)  
**Status:** 10/4/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 450, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 10/4/2011 – **ASSEMBLY-CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation AB 42.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A
  
19. [AB 703](#) (Gordon)- Extend Property Tax Exemption for Open Space Lands (12/6/2010)  
**Status:** 10/8/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 575, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 10/8/2011 – **ASSEMBLY-CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation AB 703.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A
  
20. [SB 328](#) (Kehoe)- Conservation Easements and Eminent (2/15/2011)  
**Status:** 10/8/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 589, Statutes of 2011  
**Location:** 10//2011 – **SENATE-CHAPTERED**  
**The Board unanimously voted to SUPPORT pending legislation SB 328.**  
**Resolution No.:** N/A  
**Notified Author:** N/A



## GOP senators praise Boxer on highway bill

[Carolyn Lochhead, Chronicle Washington Bureau](#)

Thursday, November 10, 2011

### Washington --

California Sen. [Barbara Boxer](#) won rare praise from Republicans on Wednesday for unanimously passing an overhaul of federal highway programs bill out of her committee.

Boxer, a liberal Democrat who chairs the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, worked hand-in-hand with conservative Oklahoma Republican James Inhofe to consolidate 90 federal highway programs into 30, grant states more flexibility in spending highway money and expand a pilot program to leverage taxpayer money with private investment.

The two-year, \$84 billion bill has no earmarks for pet projects and aims to offset all new spending with trims in other areas of the government. The 18-0 vote was a rare moment in the bitterly partisan climate on Capitol Hill and provides a template for infrastructure investment that has been sought by the Obama administration but rebuffed by Republicans.

The Senate last week defeated President [Obama's](#) proposal for \$50 billion in infrastructure spending.

"I couldn't be more proud today to be chairman of this committee," Boxer said. "No nation can be an economic leader if it can't move people and goods; no nation can thrive if its people are trapped in traffic, losing 4.8 billion hours from work and paying the price for polluted air."

Several independent studies have warned that the U.S. network of roads, bridges, ports and airports, much of it built in the 1950s, is reaching the end of its life span while carrying a population that has roughly doubled and will climb by 100 million more by 2050. The resulting traffic congestion clogs the economy and pollutes the air.

### Earlier efforts

While highway funding is typically popular with both parties, the Boxer bill contrasts with a transportation plan earlier this year by House Republicans that would have slashed

highway funding by more than a third, including an estimated \$1.25 billion cut to California for its roads and bridges.

Caltrans, the state highway department, has estimated that California needs \$74 billion in the coming decades just to repair and maintain its infrastructure.

Boxer failed to produce the six-year bill that many transportation groups say is needed to allow states to do better long-term planning and start big projects. The last long-term bill expired in 2009. House Republicans have promised to introduce a six-year bill this month but have lifted their objections to passing a short-term bill. They have endorsed many of the reforms in the Boxer bill.

Boxer called Inhofe "a tough but fair partner," while Republicans heaped praise on Boxer for finding "very productive" solutions and encouraging compromise.

### **Bike paths contentious**

Boxer said the most difficult area to navigate was bicycle and pedestrian programs, which take up about 1.5 percent of all transportation spending, to build more bike lanes and walkways. Republicans have waged a concerted fight to eliminate the programs, complaining of wasteful spending on transportation museums and landscaping along with bike trails.

The bill continues current funding for bicycle and pedestrian paths but removes all funding for transportation museums. States that don't want bike lanes can spend the money instead on high-occupancy car lanes or other congestion-reducing measures.

Bicycle and pedestrian programs are very popular with Democrats, including Boxer, who said that bike lanes and sidewalks can increase the carrying capacity of roads and bridges while reducing congestion and improving the air.

The American League of Bicyclists estimates that commuting trips by bicycle have increased more than 40 percent since 2000, and that walking and biking now account for 12 percent of all trips in the United States.

Inhofe argued that highway funding should be for highways, and when money was flowing more freely, "walking trails, beautification and museums go in there. ... I have strong feelings about how Oklahoma sees this, and Sen. Boxer has strong feelings how her state sees this. It took us a long time to get together and I think it might work."

The bill also expands a program used successfully by Los Angeles to use federal loans to attract private investment.

## Boehner Proposes Linking Energy Proceeds to Highway Funding

### Speaker Also Leaves Door Open to Revenue in Debt Deal

- By [John Stanton](#)
- Roll Call Staff
- Nov. 4, 2011, 12:02 a.m.



Bill Clark/CQ Roll Call

Speaker [John Boehner](#) on Thursday announced he was moving forward with a new approach to infrastructure spending that links energy production to highway spending.

Back in September, the Ohio Republican had said he would look to reform how Congress funds highway spending programs. On Thursday, he outlined the broad parameters of that new process.

“We’ve been working on such a plan, and our intention is to introduce a bill within the next couple of weeks that I hope can pass the House by the end of the year,” Boehner said.

The proposal would “remove barriers from American energy production and would use revenue from that new production to help pay for initiatives to repair and improve infrastructure around the country,” he said.

The legislation, which is being drafted by a number of committees, would also not include earmarks or other specific line-item spending requirements and would end what Boehner termed “frivolous projects” like funding for baseball parks and garages.

“I’ve never voted for an infrastructure bill, primarily because they were always full of earmarks and what I thought was an awful lot of frivolous spending. ... I think this represents a better way to do that,” Boehner said.

On the other big topic for Congress, the deliberations by the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction, Boehner said he still expects a deal.

—This is hard stuff. We’re talking about things that a Congress or our government has never ever done. Ever,” he said.

On revenues in the deal, Boehner said, —I think raising taxes hurts our economy and hurts the ability to create jobs.” However, he did say, —I think there’s room for revenues. But there clearly is a limit to the revenues that may be available.”

But he bluntly warned Democrats that, —without real reform on the entitlement side, I don’t know how you put any revenues on the table. I made this clear to the president” this summer during the debt talks.

When asked if he felt he was morally bound to honor the deal he made with President Barack Obama and allow automatic cuts, or the sequester, to be imposed if the committee fails, Boehner said, —Me personally? Yes, I would feel bound. It was part of the agreement. And so either we succeed or we’re in the sequester. The sequester is ugly. Why? Because we didn’t want anybody to go there. That’s why we have to succeed.”

Boehner also stressed that if the committee comes to agreement, it must pass both chambers.

—I think it’s important for the Congress to respect the work of the committee,” Boehner said. —If they come to an agreement ... I think it’d be unfair” to not pass the deal, he added.

But on broader tax reforms, Boehner downplayed the chances of the super committee actually addressing the situation.

—I don’t want to prejudge what the super committee will or won’t do, but I think there’s going to be a real effort over the next year to ensure this project is completed successfully,” Boehner said.

Boehner demurred when asked about what lessons he’s learned in his first year as Speaker.

—I don’t think there’s been any surprises,” he said, saying that even with the problems he encountered during the debt deal, —I’ve been through this drama before.”

But he did say that his —biggest regret this year was that the president and I weren’t able to come to an agreement solving our short- and midterm deficit and debt problem.”

On the public’s dim view of Congress since last year’s historic election swept him and Republicans into power, Boehner acknowledged the public has been upset with the bitter fights this year on a continuing resolution and the debt deal.

—I’m frankly not surprised at all,” Boehner said.

As for Democrats’ claims they believe the House is now in play in next year’s election, Boehner dismissed that notion out of hand, saying he is —confident that we’ll maintain the majority.”

[JohnStanton@rollcall.com](mailto:JohnStanton@rollcall.com) | [@bigjohnrc](https://twitter.com/bigjohnrc)



## 5. APPROPRIATIONS:

# Green groups go to bat for federal conservation dollars

Phil Taylor, E&E reporter

Published: Thursday, November 3, 2011

Environmental groups this week ratcheted up calls for Congress to protect conservation programs as it tackles 2012 budget bills and contemplates longer-term cuts to reduce the federal deficit.

At a media event and roundtable this week on Capitol Hill, groups highlighted what they say are small but crucial investments in land, water and wildlife that will pay huge dividends in jobs, recreation revenue and healthier ecosystems.

Protected wetlands and forests not only succor wildlife but also save billions of dollars by helping filter water supplies and prevent floods for thousands of downstream communities, they argued.

Mark Tercek, president of the Nature Conservancy, said conservation spending accounts for roughly 1.26 percent of the federal discretionary budget, which is itself small compared to the nation's mandatory spending.

"Spending on nature and conservation didn't cause the deficit and cuts to nature and conservation can't solve the deficit," Tercek said at an event at the National Press Club.

His group is part of the new 1,000-member coalition America's Voice for Conservation, Recreation and Preservation, which formed following last spring's budget battles that resulted in steep conservation cuts and a policy rider that stripped the president's ability to protect wild lands.

"The federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation and preservation," the group said in a [letter](#) to leaders in Congress.

While much of the groups' focus is on the 2012 budget, members are also lobbying the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to support conservation and renewable energy investments as it seeks \$1.2 trillion in savings over the next decade ([E&E Daily](#), Oct. 19).

"If you're not taking a look at what the supercommittee is doing, you're potentially missing out on what could be a grander deal that affects discretionary funding levels for many years to come," said the Wilderness Society's Alan Rowsome.

Many, if not most, of the conservation programs the groups are pushing enjoy broad bipartisan support from lawmakers including House appropriators who hold the government's purse strings.

The problem, fiscal conservatives say, is that lawmakers can only spend what budget leaders have allocated.

"I personally would like to see more funding for [the Land and Water Conservation Fund]," Rep. Mike Simpson (R-Idaho), chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that funds Interior and the Forest Service, said at a summer markup. "The problem is we just don't have the money."

But with Congress' budget agreement this summer to raise the federal debt ceiling, House appropriators may now have a larger allowance for the next fiscal year.

Here are some of the places conservation groups would spend the money if they had their way:

- Land and Water Conservation Fund -- The 47-year-old program is a top priority for most environmental groups. Funded by offshore oil and gas revenues, LWCF supports the acquisition of high-value lands that consolidate landscapes, improve visitor access and streamline land management. A portion of the money is used to purchase conservation easements from property owners who agree not to develop their lands. Other money helps states improve urban recreational opportunities. The House this year proposed less than \$100 million for the program in 2012, compared to roughly \$350 million in the Senate. Both fall well short of the Obama administration's request of \$900 million, the fund's maximum authorized yearly amount, which has rarely been reached.
- North American Wetlands Conservation Act -- Enacted in 1989, the program is a staple for waterfowl advocates and clean water groups. Each federal dollar spent on NAWCA must be matched by \$1 or more from non-federal sources and is often met by \$2, \$3 or \$4. More than 2,000 NAWCA projects have helped conserve more than 26.5 million acres of habitat across North America. The fund was given \$38 million in 2011, a 20 percent dip from 2010, according to Ducks Unlimited. The House proposal this summer would cut current funding roughly in half for fiscal 2012, while the Senate has proposed \$36 million. Obama requested \$50 million.
- Cooperative Forest Landscape Restoration -- The Forest Service program established by Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.) in 2009 authorizes up to \$40 million annually for landscape-scale forest restoration projects more than 50,000 acres in size. In the program's first year, 10 competitively selected projects reduced forest fuels and wildfire risk on nearly 155,000 acres, created about 1,550 jobs and produced more than 535,000 tons of woody biomass for energy production, Bingaman said. Both the Senate and House have proposed \$30 million for the program in 2012.
- Legacy Roads and Trails -- The Forest Service program funds the removal of decaying, unmanaged and under-maintained roads. Many of the agency's 300,000 miles of roads threaten to cause erosion that can muddy streams, harm endangered salmon and compromise drinking water for downstream users. Critics warn the roads also fragment habitat for elk, grizzlies and other wildlife and argue the program is a job creator. "The same type of people you need to build a road are the people you need to take them out," Rowsome said. Congress in 2010 provided \$90 million for the program -- nearly double the Obama request -- but recently cut that figure in half in the 2011 continuing resolution. The Forest Service is proposing to bundle the program into a larger integrated forest management fund. The Senate and House have proposed \$45 million and \$35 million for road decommissioning, respectively, in fiscal 2012.
- National Landscape Conservation System -- The Bureau of Land Management program is the nation's newest collection of protected public lands and totals some 28 million acres of wilderness, national monuments, conservation areas, wild and scenic rivers and other designated lands. Congress made the program permanent in 2009, and supporters say funding is crucial to complete

management plans, conduct archaeological inventories and protect resources from looting. Obama asked for a \$15 million funding boost in 2012, which would bring the program to \$78 million, according to the Conservation Lands Foundation. The House proposed \$20 million to fund the program's national monuments and conservation areas, half of the Obama proposal. The program has its critics among fiscal conservatives. Rep. Rob Bishop (R-Utah) calls it a poster child for bureaucratic excess and proposed defunding it entirely in February before yanking the bill from the floor.

- National Wildlife Refuge System (operations and maintenance) -- A recent analysis by refuge supporters argued the Fish and Wildlife Service's 150-million-acre system needs at least \$900 million in annual operations and maintenance funding. Funding increased from 2008 to 2010 but was cut back slightly in 2011. The Senate proposed \$483 million for 2012, a slight decrease from current funding. The House proposed \$455 million, a \$47 million cut, which the agency this year warned could force the closure of a quarter of its 550 refuges, Rowsome said. The system's operations and maintenance backlog has steadily grown over the past decade, exceeding \$3.35 billion today. In response, House lawmakers have proposed restricting the agency from purchasing new lands and designating new refuges without congressional approval.
- Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation -- The FWS program helps states protect species and their non-federal habitats. The program is important, supporters say, because half of all endangered or threatened species spend part of their lives on privately owned lands. The program, which requires states to match 25 percent of federal costs, took a severe hit in the House's 2012 proposed budget, which would drop funding from \$60 million to less than \$3 million. The Senate proposed nearly \$48 million, still well short of Obama's \$100 million request.
- State and Tribal Wildlife Grants -- The program helps prevent species from becoming endangered by funding conservation needs including research, surveys, species and habitat management, and monitoring for state wildlife management plans. The House proposed \$22 million next fiscal year, nearly two-thirds below current funding levels. The Senate proposed \$64 million, still shy of the president's \$95 million request. "This program is of immense importance to state fish and wildlife agencies and would have grave consequences to the conservation of at-risk fish and wildlife if it were substantially cut," said the Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies' Teaming With Wildlife director Mark Humpert.
- Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program -- A core component of Obama's Great Outdoors Initiative, Forest Legacy provides matching funds to assist states in conserving private working forests critical to wildlife and recreation. Conservation easements with willing landowners target high-value forests threatened by land conversion. The administration is asking Congress to bump its \$76 million in current funding to \$135 million in 2012. Funding comes from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
- Farm bill conservation title -- Programs include the Wetlands Protection Program, the Grasslands Reserve Program and the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program. Collectively, the conservation title encourages farmers and forest land owners to take steps that reduce soil erosion, improve water quality, mitigate the threat of flood damage and support wildlife, according to the Nature Conservancy, a key supporter of the programs. Funding for the programs was cut significantly during the House's work on the Agriculture appropriations bill in June.



America's Move to Raise a  
Healthier Generation of Kids

## First Lady Michelle Obama Talks Healthy Habits with Toddlers

11/02/2011 06:39 PM EDT



*First Lady Michelle Obama shares a group hug with children at Royal Castle Child Development Center during her visit as part of her Let's Move! initiative in New Orleans, La., Nov. 1, 2011. . (Official White House Photo by Lawrence Jackson)*

First Lady Michelle Obama visited the Royal Castle Child Development Center in New Orleans yesterday, where she led the toddlers in some exercises and read them a

book that is an Obama family favorite.

Mrs. Obama was in New Orleans to highlight the importance of building healthy habits at a very young age, a key component of the [Let's Move Child Care](#) initiative, which is designed to get child care centers to promote healthy eating and exercise habits. After she finished a round of stretching, jumping and marching in place, the First Lady read two books to the children and their parents. First up was "Lunch" by Denise Fleming, about a mouse that eats vegetables and fruit, followed by "Where the Wild Things Are," the children's classic (beloved by the Obamas) by Maurice Sendak.

Royal Castle Child Development Center offers an arts-based health curriculum called Eat Sleep Play that is designed to teach children, parents and caregivers how to eat healthy, get the right amount of sleep and lead an active lifestyle. It is conducted by the Louisiana Children's Museum, which is part of the [Let's Move Museums and Gardens](#) program.

Transforming the way we feed children and teaching them healthy habits from the beginning is the core of [Let's Move Child Care](#), which has a five point checklist ([and quiz](#)) for childcare providers:

- Provide one to two hours of physical activity daily.
- No TV or media screen time for children under age 2. Limit screen time for older children to no more than 30 minutes per week during child care, and ensure children have no more than one to two hours of quality screen time per day overall.
- Serve fruits and vegetables at every meal, eaten family-style when possible and no fried foods.
- Provide access to water throughout the day, and do not serve sugary drinks.
- Support mothers who want to breast-feed by providing mother's milk to infants and welcoming mothers who want to breast-feed their children during the child-care day.



*First Lady Michelle Obama reads "Where the Wild Things Are" to children at the Royal Castle Child Development Center in New Orleans, La., Nov. 1, 2011. (Official White House Photo by Lawrence Jackson)*

## [What's New in Healthy, Green Schools at the U.S. Department of Education](#)

11/03/2011 12:30 PM EDT

Posted by:  
Secretary Arne Duncan, U.S. Department of Education

In September, I opened the [pilot year of the Green Ribbon Schools award](#) to recognize the highest performing green and healthy schools in the nation. High standards of nutrition, fitness, and outdoor time for both students and staff are among the [qualifying criteria](#) for the award.

The award recognizes exemplary achievement in environmental impact, health and education. The [standards and resources](#) that the award relates advance ED and Let's Move! shared aims of fostering health, wellness and productivity; cutting schools' costs, saving jobs; providing a well-rounded education, increasing STEM skills, and ensuring students' college and career preparedness. Among the fitness resources Green Ribbon ties together are the [First Lady's Let's Move!](#) initiative and [The President's Challenge](#). The nutrition standards it incorporates include USDA's school [garden](#) promotion, [Agriculture in the Classroom](#), and [Farm to School initiative](#).

As President Obama and I have said, green schools are critical to schools' fiscal health and our nation's economy. Through the [American Jobs Act](#), schools and community colleges would receive \$30 billion to modernize antiquated buildings and make green improvements that create new jobs, save schools money, and bring them closer to the standards that Green Ribbon Schools recognition award sets. These standards prepare students to participate in the green economy and strengthen the nation's energy security and conserve precious natural resources.

And we know from the First Lady's work that healthy habits, environmental education and green facilities schools are as vital to individual students as they are to their schools and the nation. High standards of nutrition, fitness and facility conditions improve student and staff health, attendance and productivity, and enhance achievement and engagement, particularly in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Green schools support our shared objectives of well-rounded education, healthy students and STEM achievement.

At the Department, we want to encourage states and schools to work toward Green Ribbon Schools' three pillars of reduced environmental impact, improved health and environmental literacy. State education officials can participate by nominating schools to ED. School communities can help out by asking their state education authorities to nominate them and applying according to state procedures. And everyone should remember to call on the many resources available in attaining the

high standards Green Ribbon Schools sets out in environmental impact, health and education. We all have expertise and resources to offer to this important work: Let's Move!, ED, non-profits, businesses, and federal, state and local health, environmental, energy and safety authorities.

We wish you the best in improving the environmental health, impact and education of your school!

**Additional Information:**

In the few weeks since the pilot year announcement, 17 states have already communicated to ED plans to nominate schools. ED encourages chief officers or their designees to *use the following dates to guide their state selection process:*

By November 22<sup>th</sup>: Notify ED of participation

By March 22<sup>nd</sup>: Submit nominees to ED

## Climate change effect on Delta detailed in new study

**By Mike Taugher**  
**Contra Costa Times**

Posted: 11/02/2011 08:54:07 PM PDT

Updated: 11/02/2011 10:21:24 PM PDT

California's water problems and the ecological pressure on the West Coast's largest estuary will intensify in a warming world, according to a first-of-its-kind scientific study.

San Francisco Bay and the Delta will get warmer, saltier and clearer if global warming continues over the next several decades. That will increase the risk of extinction for some kinds of fish and could help unwanted species, including a toxic algae, flourish.

Flooding is likely to be more common upstream and along the coast, and water supplies will be stretched due to a shrinking snowpack, the researchers found.

In the Delta, already seeing a broad ecological decline, the probability of further ecological surprises will increase.

"We're going to enter a new era of environmental conditions," said James Cloern, the study's lead author and a phytoplankton ecologist at the U.S. Geological Survey in Menlo Park.

Cloern said the seven-year study was the most complex research project he's undertaken in 36 years at the USGS. The researchers said their paper appears to be the first multifaceted assessment of how the estuary could respond to climate change.

"Everything that we looked at will change in response to global warming," he said.

The Delta watershed is a source of drinking and irrigation water for 25 million Californians and 2.5 million acres of farmland.

The researchers found, bay and Delta salinity is likely to increase, the Sierra snowpack will shrink and less sediment will flow downstream.

Copyright © 2011 by Bay City News, Inc. republication, re-transmission or reuse without the express written consent of Bay City News, Inc. is prohibited.  
online

## Pension reform group's initiatives may spur Legislature

By Steven Harmon and John Woolfolk

Staff writers

Posted: 11/02/2011 12:58:58 PM PDT  
Updated: 11/02/2011 11:18:54 PM PDT

[Click photo to enlarge](#)



Gov. Jerry Brown discusses his proposal to rollback public employee pension... ( Rich Pedroncelli )

SACRAMENTO -- A pair of pension reform initiatives filed Wednesday could shake up the Capitol landscape and jolt reluctant Democrats and labor leaders into acting on Gov. Jerry Brown's plan to overhaul pensions.

Initially lukewarm if not hostile to Brown's plan, Democrats and public employee unions got a glimpse of the alternative -- measures that would require a lot more sacrifices from government workers than Brown's week-old proposal.

Led by two former officials in Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's administration, Californians for Pension Reform said it filed the two proposals with the attorney general's office but will decide in January which measure to circulate. The group will need 1.3 million signatures to qualify a measure for the November 2012 ballot, and officials said they're prepared to raise the approximately \$3 million needed.

Brown's plan and the proposed initiatives come amid mounting public outrage over soaring pension costs that are gobbling up funds for basic services such as police and fire protection. In San Jose, where city leaders are seeking their own reform measures, rising retirement costs have helped drive a decade of budget deficits.

"If there's a more extreme measure out there, it could compel legislators and unions to come together on a consensus deal," said Ben Tulchin, a Democratic strategist. "I don't think a measure that's funded by wealthy right-wingers would pass in California. But if it's on the ballot, you never know. It's out there, so you've got to address it."

Brown has his own reasons for trying to get ahead of pension reform pushed by outside interests. The once and current governor recalls all too well the Legislature's botched 1978 effort at addressing property tax reform, handing anti-tax advocates the keys to victory in the historic Proposition 13 campaign. Brown had opposed the measure, but after it passed overwhelmingly, he announced he was a "born again" tax reformer.

Asked to comment, the governor's spokesman, Gil Duran, said that Brown "laid out the best and most realistic plan for achieving significant pension reform."

The initiative proposals differ in some key respects from Brown's. The governor called for eventually making public employees pay half the annual cost of their pensions. But the proposed initiatives open the door to billing workers with underfunded pension plans for at least some of the massive unfunded liabilities accumulated from market losses, retroactive benefit increases and flawed cost assumptions.

A state watchdog commission earlier this year reported that 10 of the state's largest pension funds have a combined \$240 billion in unfunded pension debt, or more than \$20,000 for each California household.

The initiatives also include provisions against pension "spiking" for current employees and limiting government contributions to underfunded plans. Spiking is a practice in which workers artificially inflate their compensation at the end of their careers to beef up their pensions. One version would put new hires on a 401(k)-type defined contribution plan similar to those in the private sector.

But backers of the initiatives will have to prove they can fund it before the Legislature takes them seriously, said Rob Stutzman, a Republican strategist who worked with former GOP legislator Roger Niello on a similar measure earlier this year but backed down when they couldn't attract funders.

"It's a tough issue to raise money for," Stutzman said. "We certainly couldn't find those champions willing to commit. It's not just a couple million you need for signatures; you're looking at \$10 million to \$15 million, minimum, to run a campaign at a time when there's a lot of competition for money. It would almost take an ideological funder.

"But no question, if they can get the signatures they'll have leverage and influence over any legislative activity," Stutzman added.

Shortly after plans for the initiatives were announced, Brown's office released a long list of editorials and columns supportive of his plans -- which would make current and future public employees pay at least half the annual cost of their retirement benefits and would put future hires on a "hybrid" plan that combines a modest traditional pension with higher retirement ages and a 401(k)-style tax-deferred retirement savings account. It also raises the retirement age for new workers to 67 for those not in public safety.

Even the backers of the initiatives were impressed with the sweep of the governor's plan. But, they said, it doesn't go far enough, and they doubt the Democratic-controlled Legislature's willingness to adopt the governor's proposals.

"While we would prefer to see a legislative solution to this problem, we know full well that there is little chance of that happening," said Mike Genest, a former state finance director for Schwarzenegger working with the reform group. "We cannot afford to postpone decisive reform while our elected leaders debate half measures."

Public employee groups blasted the group's proposal as a conservative effort to smear government workers and asserted it is illegal. But they seemed more receptive to the governor's proposals than they had been last week. "We will continue to work with the governor and legislature to craft changes in the state's complex pension system rather than have extremist politically motivated ballot box measures like this one," said Dave Low, chairman of Californians for Retirement Security, which represents 1.5 million public employees and retirees.

The Legislature began a joint conference committee on pension reform last month and will hold at least one more hearing to address Brown's proposal, as well as the initiatives, said Alicia Trost, spokeswoman for Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg, D-Sacramento.

- For current employees, the initiatives would cap government contributions to underfunded pension plans at 6 percent of pay for most employees and 9 percent for public safety workers. Employees with underfunded pension plans may be asked to pay some unfunded liabilities.
- The initiatives would prohibit pension "spiking," a practice in which workers artificially inflate their compensation at the end of their careers.
- For new employees, one initiative proposal would cap government retirement contributions at 6 percent for most workers and 9 percent for public safety, limiting them to perhaps a 401(k)-type benefit or annuity.
- The other initiative proposal would provide a "hybrid" benefit similar to the governor's proposal, combining a traditional pension with a 401(k)-type benefit. But it would cap annual pension payments at \$100,000.

## State's park closure criteria murky, Assembly panel told

[mweiser@sacbee.com](mailto:mweiser@sacbee.com)

**PUBLISHED WEDNESDAY, NOV. 02, 2011**

Leaders of the California parks department on Tuesday were unable to explain to lawmakers the full list of criteria they used to pick 70 state parks for closure.

One-fourth of the state's 278 parks are set to be shuttered by next July, a move required by budget cutbacks. The parks agency must trim \$11 million in the current fiscal year, and another \$11 million in the next.

Some of the parks slated for closure by July 1 are encumbered by legal restrictions that could result in lawsuits. Others are defined by the state as "outstanding" resources that require special protection.

Some house a wealth of historical artifacts that must be carefully packed, shipped and stored to protect them from vandals and thieves.

Parks officials said at an Assembly oversight hearing that the closure list was assembled by a dozen park executives who met for three weeks.

They looked at park revenue, visitation, maintenance needs and historical value – criteria approved by the Legislature in Assembly Bill 95 in March.

But they otherwise used largely subjective criteria and used no formal ranking method, said Bill Herms, deputy director of the department.

They kept no records of the process for lawmakers or the public to review, he said.

"There was a great deal of argument – arm wrestling," Herms said. "There was no rubric by which all the different criteria were put into a formula. We had to rely to a very large extent on the experience of our professional staff."

Assembly members expressed alarm, saying they wanted to evaluate why some parks were targeted for closure and others kept off the list. They said they had heard from constituents, concerned that their local parks had been singled out based on some obscure criteria.

"We're the 'show your math' committee," said Roger Dickinson, D-Sacramento, who chairs the Assembly Accountability and Administrative Review Committee and voted for the parks closure bill. "What's of concern here is that the department can't show its math."

Parks slated for closure in the capital region include the Leland Stanford Mansion in downtown Sacramento and Malakoff Diggins near Nevada City. Both are state historic parks with vulnerable artifacts and relatively low visitation.

Another is Brannan Island State Recreation Area, the only full-service state park in the vast Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

How were these factors weighed? The department could not explain.

"The process is beginning to seem downright arbitrary and capricious in the absence of any data you can show us," said Jared Huffman, D-San Rafael, who chairs the Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee. "People gathered in a room and rolled out a list and that's all we get to know."

Anne Malcolm, chief counsel at the parks agency, said the department had only three weeks to prepare the closure list. Staff resources were not available to develop clear ranking criteria, she said.

The agency's intent is to continue modifying the closure list. In all likelihood, Malcolm said, the final number slated for closure will be fewer than 70, and may well include a different mix of parks.

For instance, the National Park Service has agreed to help operate three state parks in Marin County and one in Del Norte County. The department also has received about 20 proposals from nonprofits to operate other parks.

In some cases, "closed" will not mean the public is excluded, only that no services are available.

Malcolm said the department is still evaluating legal problems, such as whether the state agreed to ensure public access when a particular parcel was acquired.

"Some parks have hundreds of deeds. We didn't have time to review them," she said. "We factored them in to the extent we could. But we're looking more closely on a park-by-park basis as we move along."

[© Copyright The Sacramento Bee. All rights reserved.](#)

## PolitiCal

ON POLITICS IN THE GOLDEN STATE

### Two proposed ballot measures aim to scale back public pensions

November 2, 2011 | 10:40 am



Less than a week after Gov. Jerry Brown unveiled his proposal to change the state's employee retirement system, critics of public pensions unveiled two new plans to scale back worker benefits, with hopes of putting one of them on the November 2012 ballot.

**The major obstacle for the group's initiative** plans remains money. It would take upwards of \$2 million to simply qualify a measure for the ballot, and thus far no donor has come forward

to fund either of the pension proposals.

But the initiatives filed Wednesday by California Pension Reform, a group led by former state GOP Chairman Duf Sundheim and former Schwarzenegger finance director Mike Genest, help draw the battle lines for the pension debate for the 2012 legislative year.

#### **FULL COVERAGE: California state pensions**

Brown put down his marker last week, calling for a new mandatory 401(k)-style savings plan for new employees to supplement a scaled-back guaranteed pension. Brown also wants to raise the retirement age for most new workers to receive full benefits from 55 to 67.

**The two potential initiatives filed with the attorney general's office Wednesday go further than Brown's** proposal, tackling benefits for existing workers as well as future hires. One of the proposals would shift most state workers to a 401(k)-style plan almost exclusively. The proposal also places caps on how much **an employer can pay toward a worker's retirement, and asks current workers to pay more of their own** retirement than even Brown is asking.

**Under the governor's pension blueprint, employees would pay at least half of the cost for their own retirement. Labor unions pushed back against Brown's proposal, saying it went too far, and are sure to** oppose the new initiatives. But fear of a stronger pension measure on the November ballot could serve as political leverage for Brown as he tries to push his pension plan through the legislative process.

## Counties launch constitutional amendment to protect realignment funding

November 1, 2011



Local officials embarked today on what is sure to be a long and tough fight to convince voters that funds for Gov. Jerry Brown's realignment plan should be constitutionally protected.

A coalition of law enforcement and local government leaders filed a [ballot measure](#) today with the California Attorney General that, if approved by voters next year, would require the state to provide ongoing funding for the host of public safety and other services now under local control. Under [Brown's realignment plan](#), which took effect Oct. 1, counties are now responsible for incarcerating and supervising

those convicted of nonviolent felonies.

The filing — the first step before supporters can start collecting signatures to get the measure on the Nov. 2012 ballot — doesn't come as a surprise. Local opposition over realignment has focused nearly exclusively in recent months on concerns that the funding could dry up, and Brown [promised a constitutional amendment](#) in September.

According to supporters, the proposed constitutional amendment would do the following:

- Require the state to provide counties and local governments with ongoing funding to pay for the cost of providing services that were recently shifted to local government under realignment.
- Dedicate existing state revenues, not raise taxes.
- Prohibit the Legislature from raiding or redirecting the revenues away from counties and local governments unless the services are shifted back to the state.
- Require that all revenues be subject to annual, independent audits by the state Controller.
- Prohibit the state from passing any new law or regulation that imposes additional costs on local governments associated with realignment, unless the state provides ongoing funding to pay for these services.

The group expects to receive a title and summary for the ballot measure by mid December and said it will begin collecting signatures at that time. But it also said it will "continue to work with the Brown administration and other partners on potential alternative measures to protect local funding."

# THE SACRAMENTO BEE

## News

CA-Politics

### School districts wait to see if state revenue shortfalls trigger more cuts

dlambert@sacbee.com (Diana Lambert)

Posted: 10/31/2011 6:59 AM



School officials are on the edge of their seats.

In six weeks, they should know if they have to cut buses, shorten the school year, ask teachers to take furlough days, raid their reserves or cut programs.

That's when revised revenue projections are expected from the state. If revenues fall short, it could trigger up to \$1.75 billion in cuts that would hit K-12 districts in February.

The state was \$654 million short of its revenue projections at the beginning of October, but school officials aren't sure how much their districts will lose and what exactly they will do if the trigger is pulled.

"It's almost impossible (to know)," said Rhonda Crawford, chief financial officer for Folsom Cordova Unified. "We do the best we can with what we know and what we can anticipate."

Schools could lose 4 percent of their state revenue for student attendance if the trigger is pulled, as well \$248 million in funds for bus transportation. The amount schools would lose depends on how close the state is to its revenue goal.

"The moving target continues to be the biggest challenge," said Gabe Ross, spokesman for Sacramento City Unified.

Meanwhile, Assembly Bill 114, passed in July, makes it difficult for districts to squirrel away money just in case. The bill says school officials must ignore the prospect of the trigger and maintain staffing and program levels at the same funding level as last year.

So most districts scuttled the "worst-case scenario" budgets they had prepared before the state's revised budget was approved and rehired many teachers and restored programs.

Now districts have fewer options, although state legislators have given districts permission to cut the school year by another seven days. Some districts have already cut the school year from the previous minimum of 180 to 175 days.

But cutting days must be negotiated with employee unions and, even if contracts are reopened, it isn't likely negotiations could be completed in two months.

"Because we've already closed our contracts for this school year, it would be difficult to get everyone back at the table," Crawford said.

There are exceptions. San Juan Unified's unions have agreed to take up to five furlough days if the trigger is pulled. And the Sacramento City Teachers Association contract allows both the union and the district opportunities to reopen the contract several times a year, Ross said.

With transportation funding, however, there is little flexibility. Most districts have eliminated all but the most rural routes and federally mandated busing for special needs students.

Ross of Sacramento City Unified said transportation is critical for kids living in urban areas. "We considered cutting transportation last year and luckily we didn't have to," he said. "Our preference would be not to look at it."

Officials from both Folsom Cordova and Natomas unified districts say they won't cut programs this school year, even if the state cuts funding. Folsom Cordova officials said they will rely on one-time federal stimulus dollars and other belt-tightening measures to save programs. Natomas Unified will be able to fall back on a \$5 million cushion, said Walt Hanline, interim superintendent.

And, while district officials stopped short of saying they budgeted conservatively in case the trigger is pulled to comply with the new law, they do say they are analyzing district jobs and programs to find efficiencies.

They are concerned about how the faltering economy, state deferrals of school funds and budget cuts will affect their school districts over the next two years, they say.

Ron Bennet, president of School Services of California, which advises districts on fiscal matters, issued a report warning that economic indicators are pointing toward budget shortfalls for the next few years. He warns school districts to continue to negotiate with unions for concessions, to cut costs and to hold on to reserves.

"To even think we are going to have two more years of even further cuts than we've experienced, it boggles the mind," said Steven Ladd, superintendent of Elk Grove Unified.

Hanline said a trigger for the 2013-14 school year "becomes Armageddon" as teacher agreements sunset and districts run out of federal stimulus money aimed at creating jobs.

In preparation, he has turned to a committee of more than 50 community members and employees who are working on goals and objectives for the district to propose to the school board.

"We are going to make the cuts from the bottom of the priority list," he said.

## Sylvia McLaughlin, Save the Bay founder, fights on

Peter Fimrite, Chronicle Staff Writer

Monday, October 31, 2011

Sylvia McLaughlin sat in the study of her Berkeley hills home - books, maps and documents scattered, as always, on her desk - and gestured out of a large corner window toward the gleaming blue San Francisco Bay.

"It's beautiful," she said, admiring the sailboats, the brilliant sun shining on the water and the Golden Gate Bridge in the distance. "We should save these beautiful places."

The 94-year-old co-founder of the nonprofit group Save the Bay knows a little something about the subject. She has spent a half century fighting to save the bay from the ravages of development, garbage dumping, toxic pollution, sewage and environmental degradation.

Her accomplishments are now on display outside her study window, where people can jog, gaze at birds or exercise their dogs along a giant estuary that was once in danger of becoming a filthy channel amid industrial sites and tract home developments.

McLaughlin will be honored Thursday on the 50th anniversary of the day she and two other East Bay women founded Save the Bay under the then-crazy notion that they might be able to protect San Francisco Bay. McLaughlin will be given a lifetime achievement award and accept the honor on behalf of her now-deceased cohorts, Catherine "Kay" Kerr and Esther Gulick.

"The only reason they did succeed was because they didn't realize that they couldn't be successful," said David Lewis, the executive director of Save the Bay. Lewis was born in 1961, the year McLaughlin, Kerr and Gulick founded the organization. "These women were forces of nature. They just couldn't be denied, and they built a movement involving tens of thousands of people."

McLaughlin grew up in Denver, where she developed a passion for wild landscapes and the outdoors. She eventually made her way to the East Coast, where she received a bachelor's degree in French from Vassar College in 1939.

She married Donald McLaughlin in 1948, and the couple settled in Berkeley. They had two children.

Ugly sights, smells

McLaughlin, who moved into her hillside home in 1955, did not like the view out of the window back then. She saw garbage being dumped on the shoreline, marshlands being filled and raw sewage being piped into the bay. By 1961, a third of the bay had already been filled or diked off, and only 10 percent of the original wetlands remained.

"Cities had their dumps along the shoreline, and you could see dump trucks going down there continuously," McLaughlin said. "I remember seeing garbage burning out there. And people who lived here then remember the smell of sewage. It was not very nice."

At that time, less than 6 miles of shoreline was accessible to the public, and developers were planning to fill in 60 percent of what remained of the bay, including much of the Berkeley shore. The Army Corps of Engineers said the bay would be nothing more than a shipping canal by 2020 if development continued at the same rate.

McLaughlin, Kerr and Gulick, whose husbands were all UC Berkeley administrators or faculty, decided something had to be done. They gathered representatives of every environmental organization they knew about and presented them with the problem. The group concluded that a new organization should be formed to deal with the problem and, with that, McLaughlin said, "they all filed out and wished us luck."

With no one else to carry the banner, the three women formed Save San Francisco Bay Association while sitting around their kitchen tables munching almond cookies and sipping tea. It was the first organization devoted exclusively to protecting San Francisco Bay and one of the first modern grassroots environmental movements in the country.

Raising awareness

McLaughlin, a friendly, engaging woman, handled most of the public speaking.

"I made a point of becoming acquainted with as many people as I could no matter what their beliefs were," McLaughlin said. "I went around to a lot of places and spoke. We brought it to people's attention."

The women were up against powerful development interests and local politicians with tax dollar signs in their eyes, but they didn't back down. McLaughlin, Kerr and Gulick mobilized thousands of local residents to stop a plan to double the size of Berkeley by filling in 2,000 acres of the bay. The women then galvanized support around the Bay Area in an effort to stop similar projects.

McLaughlin said she hauled her children to meetings and organized busloads of activists to lobby politicians in Sacramento. Before long, the women attracted the attention of radio personality Don Sherwood, who rallied people to their cause. Save the Bay soon had members all over California and from other states, McLaughlin said.

In 1965, the state acknowledged that San Francisco Bay belonged to the public. The McAteer-Petris Act, which created the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, placed a moratorium on placing landfill in the bay.

In 1968, Save the Bay and the BCDC challenged a wild scheme led by real estate mogul David Rockefeller to fill more than 10,000 acres along the San Mateo County coast with dirt shaved off of San Bruno Mountain, a 27-mile-long development dubbed "new Manhattan." The fight lasted for a decade, but the proposal finally was defeated.

"I was introduced to David Rockefeller" after the final decision, McLaughlin said, "and he held out his hand and said, 'You win.' "

Save the Bay helped establish the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge, one of the largest urban refuges in the United States. Garbage dumping, sewage discharge, chemical and toxic spillage, and pollution are now all regulated.

Save the Bay is the largest organization dedicated to the protection and restoration of the bay. Some 35,000 people work on cleanup and restoration projects, monitoring development, keeping tabs on politicians and filing lawsuits against projects that they believe might harm the bay's ecosystem.

Success stories

San Francisco Bay is now roughly 40,000 acres larger than it was in 1961. More than half of the bay is ringed with public trails connecting a series of shoreline parks. Save the Bay volunteers are involved in numerous tidal wetland restoration projects, including the reclamation of salt ponds and former hay fields.

McLaughlin, who has served on the boards of virtually every environmental organization in the Bay Area, is still actively involved in efforts to create parks along the east shore. She also opposed the removal of a grove of oak trees in preparation for the construction of a new student athletic training center at UC Berkeley.

"She has consistently defied expectations," Lewis said. "I got a call a few years ago and somebody asked, 'Did you know that Sylvia just climbed up one of the trees in front of Memorial Stadium?' Sure enough, there she was on television with her legs dangling from a branch in the tree."

McLaughlin's 2007 stint as a tree-sitter was unsuccessful. The trees were eventually cut down.

"You win some, you lose some," she said.

E-mail Peter Fimrite at [pfimrite@sfchronicle.com](mailto:pfimrite@sfchronicle.com).

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/10/31/MN741LLP7N.DTL>

This article appeared on page A - 1 of the San Francisco Chronicle

## Oakland Estuary: Funding, settling delay wetland

[Carolyn Jones, Chronicle Staff Writer](#)

Sunday, October 30, 2011

---



Lacy Atkins / The Chronicle

Canada geese fly over Port View Park, which was created by the Port of Oakland when the Navy's operations closed. The adjacent expanse of water is slated to become a 180-acre habitat for fish and birds.

Middle Harbor is a calm, picturesque expanse of water edged by beaches and parks, a quiet oasis amid the incessant shipping traffic along the Oakland Estuary.

The only problem is that it's supposed to be a wetland.

The Port of Oakland promised when it embarked on one of the biggest dredging projects in Bay Area history to fill Middle Harbor with mud, sand and eelgrass seeds to create a 180-acre habitat for fish and birds.

But two years after the dredging ended, Middle Harbor is as watery as ever.

"It's unconscionable," said Save the Bay director David Lewis, who recently complained to the port and two state regulatory agencies about the issue. "The port and the shipping companies got what they wanted, but when it's time to help the bay, nothing gets done. The bay pays the price."

A decade ago, the Port of Oakland began a long-term dredging project to dig out 15 million cubic yards of mud and sand from the estuary to create a 50-foot deep shipping channel. Some of the muck went to wetland restoration projects in the North Bay, some was dumped in the ocean, and 6 million cubic yards of it was pumped into Middle Harbor to eventually help create a tidal marsh, nesting islands for birds and underwater eelgrass meadow.

The muck is still there, in a big pile underwater.

But it won't be there forever, said port spokeswoman Marilyn Sandifur.

The delay is because of hang-ups in federal funding and longer-than-expected time for the mud to settle, she said. The mud needs to settle another 1 1/2 feet before workers can begin carving channels, building islands and planting eelgrass seeds, she said.

"What we've learned is that we could have done a better job communicating the status of the project to the public," she said.

### **Port, regulators blamed**

That's not good enough, Lewis said. The port found the money to dredge the channel, now it should find the money to create the wetlands, he said. If the sediment is taking a long time to settle, the port should expand the wetland or take other steps to make up the harm to the bay that's occurring because of the delay, he said.

The regulating agencies - Bay Conservation and Development Commission and Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board - are equally guilty, he said. They should be monitoring the project and ensuring the port meets its deadlines, he said.

Ultimately, though, you can't hurry mud, said BCDC sediment program manager Brenda Goeden.

"We understand Save the Bay is upset, but except for the delays, the port has met its requirements to date," Goeden said. "We're feeling pretty confident with the work they've done so far."

Middle Harbor is at the mouth of the estuary, offering sweeping views of the bay and San Francisco. It was once part of the Navy supply center, where ships delivered goods for Navy vessels.

### **Attracting wildlife**

In the late 1990s, when the base closed, the Port of Oakland took over and built a pair of parks, Port View and Middle Harbor Shoreline.

The parks don't get much use, but that's likely to change once the birds start moving in. Pelicans, egrets, herons, ducks and terns are expected to frequent the harbor once the eelgrass takes hold, providing habitat for fish and other critters birds like to eat.

Wildlife is starting to trickle in now, Sandifur said.

"It may not be finished, but we're already seeing more birds out there," she said. "It's exciting to see that happening."

E-mail Carolyn Jones at [carolynjones@sfchronicle.com](mailto:carolynjones@sfchronicle.com).

# THE SACRAMENTO BEE

## News

CA-Politics

### California's continued revenue slide could trigger cuts

kyamamura@sacbee.com (Kevin Yamamura)

Posted: 10/14/2011 12:09 AM



California missed the revenue mark again in September by collecting \$301.6 million less than state leaders expected when they approved this year's budget, according to Controller John Chiang.

For the first three months of the fiscal year, from July to September, California has fallen \$705.5 million, or 3.6 percent, behind what state leaders expected by this point.

The gap is roughly equivalent to the July through September share of the \$4 billion revenue spike that Gov. Jerry Brown and Democratic lawmakers used to close the budget in June.

That optimistic projection has drawn skepticism ever since the budget was signed. Brown has defended the assumption by pointing to as much as \$2.5 billion in "trigger" cuts to schools and social services that would occur if that money never materializes.

"September's revenues alone do not guarantee that triggers will be pulled," Chiang said in a statement. "But as the largest revenue month before December, these numbers do not paint a hopeful picture."

School leaders have grown particularly concerned they will face mid-year budget cuts as revenues lag projections.

But officials at the Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst's Office downplay the monthly revenue totals. They say it remains possible that the bulk of the \$4 billion bump will come next spring. They also say that projections have become less reliable on a monthly basis because of recent tax changes.

Forecasters will determine by December whether the state is on a path to receive that money. Jason Sisney, a deputy analyst with the LAO, said he saw positive signs despite the growing revenue shortfall. He said income tax revenues and sales taxes have held firm.

But he also noted that economic news generally has been negative since summer. If economic indicators remain sluggish, it will be difficult for forecasters to assume the state will get that \$4 billion spike.



## Politics and money

OCTOBER 13, 2011 JOHN HOWARD [3 COMMENTS](#)



*"While experts disagree on how much is too much when it comes to debt service, 7.8 percent is high. In fact, it's the highest since 1977."*

The buzz in the Capitol is that the \$11.1 billion borrowing planned for the November 2012 ballot may get pushed back or downsized, in part because of the miserable economy, in part because of the ballot's volatile political mix.

The size and timing of the bond election has been part of the political calculation since lawmakers and then-Gov. Schwarzenegger approved it two years ago. When times are flush, voters are more prone to approve spending for public works projects than when times are tough – and times are tough. In 2010, tight-fisted voters rejected new spending on a number of levels, and even refused to allow an \$18-a-year levy – that's \$1.50 per month — to keep California's state parks open. Now, that's cheap.

State Treasurer Bill Lockyer noted recently that California's debt service accounts for about 7.8 percent of the state's General Fund, its main coffer of personal income, sales, corporation and insurance taxes. That's a lot of dough in an \$80 billion-plus General Fund, and while experts disagree on how much is too much when it comes to debt service, 7.8 percent is high. In fact, it's the highest since 1977 even though the state is borrowing less than before – the disparity here is that the state's revenues went down, driving the debt service proportion up.

Last fiscal year, from July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2011, the debt service level was 7.1 percent. Twenty years ago it stood at 2.36 percent.

Those are not good numbers. In California, General Obligation bonds – voter-approved borrowings – have the full faith of the state behind them and bond holders go to the front of the line and take priority over other state debts. Nobody ever lost money on California's GO bonds, as Lockyer often points out, and bond buyers know it: The state is the nation's largest issuer of municipal debt.

If lawmakers decide to trim the \$11.1 billion bond offering, the big question is what will be cut and what will be left? Cut each project by 25 percent – that's one proposal on the table – or cut entire projects out all together? Politically, this is a tough call, since the fragile agreement that put the bond on the ballot in the first place reflected

compromises between environmentalists, agriculture, Delta protectionists, water districts, reservoir construction advocates and others. If entire projects are removed, the support could dwindle and rewriting a scaled-back plan could prove difficult.

If there were solid indications that the recession was waning – and with it, the parsimonious views of voters – the bond could be pushed back two years. There is precedent for this – a major school bond for example – but it is a gamble, too. Putting it on the November 2014 ballot may give it a better chance of passage — or it may not. Voters are fickle.

Politically, the November 2012 ballot is probably the bond’s best shot. A presidential ballot brings out a higher turnout than off-year or special elections, and a high turnout in California traditionally means more Democrats at the polls, which means more voters likely to approve spending.

But there are other issues on the ballot that could affect passage of a multibillion-dollar bond offering.

One proposal would modify the term limits of lawmakers, allowing them to serve up to 12 years in any one house. State lawmakers used to have unlimited terms of office, but in 1990 angry voters – led by Republicans – approved limiting them to six years in the Assembly and eight years in the Senate. The term modification on the ballot in 2012 may draw large numbers of Republicans to the polls to oppose it – and the Legislature with a 14 percent approval rating is even less popular now than it was in 1990.

If Republicans come to the polls in droves – it’s a presidential election, remember – will they be inclined to oppose the bond issue?

Also on the ballot is a \$1-per-pack tax on cigarettes – and in tight times, new taxes typically aren’t too popular. But will anti-tax sentiment spill over into an anti-borrowing mood?

Another ballot proposal is a constitutional amendment for a —“rainy day fund” for the state budget, a set aside to act as a buffer for the state’s books when revenues dip.

**{Update: Gov. Brown has signed legislation that pushes the “rainy day fund” election to 2014.}**

Just how this proposal will play out as voters decide whether to borrow \$11.1 billion is anybody’s guess, but now we paraphrase Bette Davis in *All About Eve*: Fasten your seat belts. The November 2012 ballot is going to be quite a ride.

**TO:** Board Legislative Committee  
(Chair Ted Radke, Doug Siden, Ayn Wieskamp and  
Alternate Beverly Lane)

**FROM:** Robert E. Doyle, General Manager  
Erich Pfuehler, Government Relations and Legislative Affairs Manager

**SUBJECT:** Board Legislative Committee Meeting  
**WHEN:** Friday, November 18, 2011 12:45 p.m.  
Lunch will be served

**WHERE:** Board Room, Peralta Oaks

---

**Items to be discussed:**

I. STATE LEGISLATION / ISSUES

A. NEW

- a. N / A (Legislature is adjourned)

B. ISSUES

a. **State Parks Hearing**

On November 1<sup>st</sup>, two state Assembly committees held hearings on the impacts of closing state parks and looked at alternatives ways to keep them open. The chairs of the hearing were Chair of the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee Jared Huffman and Chair of the Assembly Accountability and Administrative Review Committee Roger Dickinson. The Committees specifically looked at how the park closure list was developed. To develop the list, state parks staff looked at park, visitation, maintenance needs, and historical value – criteria approved by the Legislature in Assembly Bill 95 in March. At the hearing Deputy Director for State Parks Bill Herms essentially said the closure list criteria were mostly subjective. They kept no records of the process for lawmakers or the public to review. Both Assembly Members Huffman and Dickinson seemed surprised by the lack of process. The hearing may actually have prompted more questions than it answered – particularly with regard to parks which were developed or improved with federal funds and where deed restrictions preempt closures. There were also questions as to whether closure would actually trigger CEQA review and analysis. While there were no specific asks of local government to take on management of state parks at this hearing, it is clear the challenges facing state parks remain and may require outside the of box solutions. There is a possibility the state park issue could get lumped into overall “realignment” discussions and the District should be prepared to proactively make recommendations which could improve the current agreements it has in managing three state parks in Alameda County.

b. **Pension Reform**

On October 27<sup>th</sup>, Governor Jerry Brown announced his plan to reduce pension benefits for public employees across the state. He estimates his public pension reform plan would save the state \$4 billion to \$11 billion over 30 years and \$21 billion to \$56 billion over 60 years. Local government pensions also would have to comply and would save proportionately similar sums. Neither labor unions nor Democrats in the legislature embraced Brown’s proposal, but all sides see the risk of letting the pension issue be addressed at the ballot

box. There are discussions occurring between the California Special Districts Association, League of Cities and labor unions to see if the various sides could come to a general agreement on some level of reform. Below is a good summary of Governor Brown's proposal:

Provisions which would apply to new state and local workers:

- "Hybrid" pensions: New workers' retirement money would come from a blend of Social Security, a small guaranteed pension and a professionally managed 401(k)-type plan. Public safety workers don't participate in Social Security, so the other two components would be larger. Labor expected an optional hybrid, but like everything in Brown's plan, this provision is mandatory.
- Later retirement: Instead of the current age of 50 or 55 (public safety) or 62 (just about everyone else), Brown would set full government retirement at 67. Public safety workers could retire sooner, but the governor didn't offer specifics.
- Three-year averaging: Instead of using employees' highest year of earnings to calculate pension benefits, Brown wants to use an average of the highest three years to keep workers from "spiking" their pensions with short-term promotions or raises.
- Defines "base pay": Unused leave, overtime and other extra income would be excluded from pay calculations for pension purposes.

Provisions which would apply to current and future government employees:

- 50-50 contribution split: Employers and employees would share pension costs equally. Right now most employees pay a smaller share – some local government workers pay nothing.
- "Double dipping" limits: Sets a 960-hour annual cap on the work government retirees can do for a public employer. This aims to curb retirees drawing both a pension check and a paycheck. The state already follows this rule.
- Pensions for criminals: Employees would lose their pensions if they are convicted of a felony that happened on the job, while seeking office or appointment, or if the crime was connected with securing pay or benefits. The idea is inspired by the City of Bell scandal.
- Retroactive pension hikes: Legally, pension reductions can't be applied retroactively. This proposal would do the same for pension hikes.
- Pension "holidays": Employers sometimes skip pension payments when the retirement funds are flush, which made the impact of the real estate bust and 2008 market crash all the more worse for the funds. This provision mandates employers and employees always pay in.
- Axes "airtime:" Currently, state and many local workers can buy years of service time that they don't actually work to increase their pension payouts. This closes the window on "additional retirement service credits," but it is more symbol than substance because few workers can pay the tens of thousands of dollars the credits usually cost.

Other provisions:

- State retiree health: State employees must work 10 years to qualify for the government to pay half of a predetermined sum toward their health care premiums when they retire. At 20 years, the state pays 100 percent. Brown's plan would reset that to 15 years and 25 years of service for new hires only.
- CalPERS board composition: Brown wants to add two gubernatorial appointees to the CalPERS Board of Administration. Brown says two "independent" officials without career ties to the state, but with financial expertise would add "sophistication" to the 13-member board of elected officers, politicians, and department and agency heads.

c. **California Forward Ballot Initiative**

California Forward has day lighted their proposed ballot language for November 2012. Some of their ideas are positive: Shifting to a two-year budget and curbing last-minute legislative amendments by requiring all bills be made available to the public at least three days before final passage. The initiative proposal would also mandate "performance-based budgeting," requiring departments to provide lawmakers with goals, performance measures, target outcomes, and require a funding source is identified for any new program or tax cut expected to cost more than \$25 million.

Of more concern, however, is their effort to establish Community Strategic Action Plans. This process allows a county, by action of the Board of Supervisors, to initiate a Community Strategic Action Plan (CSAP). The county "shall" invite the participation of all other local government entities within the county whose existing functions or services are within the anticipated scope of the CSAP. Local governments may also petition the Board of Supervisors to initiate a CSAP. After an unspecified period of time for the CSAP to be developed, the CSAP would be submitted to the governing bodies of each of the participating local government entities within the county. Participating in the final CSAP requires a majority vote by the governing board of each local governing entity. The CSAP does not apply to any local government entity that does not approve the CSAP (this is essentially the "opt-out" provision). The initiative would allow CSAPs to substitute 'functionally equivalent objectives' in place of state statute or regulation. It would require the legislature to act within 60 days to respond to the CSAP. If they do not respond in 60 days, the "functionally equivalent objective" would be operative. CSAPs need to be evaluated for effectiveness once every four years. The term "local government entity" is defined as a county, city, city and county, and any other local government entity, including school districts, county offices of education, and community college districts." Special districts are not explicitly mentioned, but are probably legally covered by "any other local government entity." The initiative also states nothing is intended to abrogate or supersede any existing authority enjoyed by local government entities, nor to discourage or prohibit local government entities from developing and participating in regional programs and plans designed to improve the delivery and efficiency of government services.

Of particular concern to the District, is the lack of clarity on special districts being explicitly named as a "local government entity" despite significant participation by special districts in the California Forward blueprint process. Past practice has shown that unless special districts are explicitly named in the definition of "local agencies," they have been routinely excluded from eligibility and participation (grant programs come to mind). Under this language, special districts might be accorded an invitation to participate if the County is seeking something from them, but special districts would appear to have no standing to initiate the process, or demand to participate in a CSAP that affects their jurisdictional authority. Additionally, special districts can only "petition" the county for inclusion in a CSAP process. This seems to give the county the opportunity to ignore a special district with a legitimate interest in participating. One can petition all they want, but that doesn't mean they will be included; it doesn't even mean the county will listen to or read their petition. It would have been better if the ballot language clearly stated special districts shall be included upon petition. It is also concerning that a CSAP can modify state statute, on a county's initiative, absent a legislative veto. Does this mean that counties, unilaterally, could say that the current distribution of property tax revenues to local agencies is the "problem" or "impediment" to them meeting their goals? If so, it would seem this provides a means

for Counties (with or without “invited” participating local agencies) to re-structure local property tax distribution, unless the legislature intervenes.

Now the California Forward 501(c)4 “Action Fund” will move the campaign part of this process forward and gather signatures. Once the constitutional amendment language is cleared by the attorney general's office, supporters will have 150 days to collect the 807,615 valid voter signatures needed to qualify for the November 2012 election.

## 2. STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

## 3. FEDERAL LEGISLATION / ISSUES

### A. NEW LEGISLATION

#### a. **H.R. 2513 (Baldwin) and S. 1354 (Hagan): Healthy Media for Youth Act (7/13/2011)**

As we know, children are surrounded by media. From television to movies to social media and new technologies, children are consuming up to 10 hours of recreational media each day. Unfortunately, media doesn't always promote healthy images of girls or boys. Research from the Girl Scouts suggests girls are very influenced by what they see in the media, and that it can have a significant impact on their self-esteem, body image and leadership aspirations. The Healthy Media for Youth Act will:

- Provide competitive grants for organizations, like Girl Scouts, which provide media literacy programming and leadership development to help empower girls and boys.
- Support research to better understand the impact of media on youth development.
- Create a federal task force through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), in coordination with the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Director of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, to review, synthesize, and conduct or support research on the role and impact of depictions of girls and women in the media on the psychological, sexual, physical, and interpersonal development of youth.
- Direct the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to develop voluntary recommendations to help the media industry put forward healthy images of women and girls for the benefit of all youth.

Support for this legislation would be consistent with the District's Healthy Parks, Healthy People initiative.

Staff Recommendation: SUPPORT

### B. ISSUES

#### a. **Transportation Issues**

The Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee recently passed their new draft two-year transportation bill. The bill (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century), S. 1813, would reduce the number of transportation programs from 90 to 30, eliminate earmarks, change the Transportation Enhancement (TE) program, increase Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) federal loan program by \$1 billion annually and speed project environmental reviews. The bill passed the EPW Committee on November 9<sup>th</sup>. The bill does not include language suggested by the District for special districts, but trails remain eligible for funding through the transportation mobility, congestion mitigation and air quality improvement, and the transportation enhancement programs. A significant change is made to the TE program which gives states the option of whether to use the funds.

The Boxer-Inhofe EPW bill represents a fundamental change in the way Federal highway funding is apportioned to states via formula. Ever since the first highway law in 1916, each separate highway program had its own distribution formula. Starting in the 1980s, state equity considerations began to trump the formulas, so certain programs (like the current Equity Bonus program) were added on top of existing formula programs to add money to “donor” states to gain a critical mass of votes in the House and Senate. The Boxer-Inhofe EPW bill repeals all the existing formulas. Instead, each state will be apportioned a percentage of the total funding based on the average amount they received during the FY 2005-2009 SAFETEA-LU period. No state will receive less than 95% of what they contribute in Federal gas tax payments. Once each state has its total formula dollar amount, the Boxer-Inhofe EPW bill first allocates Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) and Metropolitan Planning Programs (MPPs) based on 2009 apportionments. Once CMAQ and MPPs are taken off the top, the remaining funding is distributed amongst the other formula programs as follows: 58 percent for the National Highway Performance Program, 29.3 percent for the Transportation Mobility Program, 7 percent for the Highway Safety Improvement Program, and 5.7 percent for the National Freight Program.

4. **Quagga / Zebra Mussel Discussion** - Operations AGM Jim O’Connor and Legislative Affairs Manager Erich Pfoehler will lead a brief discussion about these invasive species and efforts to minimize their impact on recreational boating.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

6. CORRESPONDENCE AND ARTICLES

- a. “GOP senators praise Boxer on highway bill”, SF Gate, November 10, 2011
- b. “Boehner proposed linking energy proceeds to highway funding”, Roll Call, November 4, 2011
- c. “Green groups go to bat for federal conservation dollars”, Environment & Energy Daily, November 3, 2011
- d. “First Lady Michelle Obama talks healthy habits with toddlers”, Let’s Move, November 2, 2011
- e. “What’s new in healthy, green schools at the U.S. Department of Education, Let’s Move, November 3, 2011
- f. “Climate change effect on Delta detailed in new study”, Contra Costa Times, November 2, 2011
- g. “Pension reform group’s initiatives may spur Legislature”, Contra Costa Times, November 2, 2011
- h. “State’s park closure criteria murky, Assembly panel told”, Sacramento Bee, Nov. 02, 2011
- i. “Two proposed ballot measures aim to scale back public pension”, Los Angeles Times, November 2, 2011
- j. “Counties launch constitutional amendment to protect realignment funding”, SF Gate, November 1, 2011
- k. “School districts wait to see if state revenue shortfalls trigger more cuts”, Sacramento Bee, October 31, 2011
- l. “Sylvia McLaughlin, Save the Bay founder, fights on”, SF Gate, October 31, 2011
- m. “Oakland Estuary: Funding, settling delay wetland”, SF Gate, October 30, 2011
- n. “California’s continued revenue slide could trigger cuts”, Sacramento bee, October 13, 2011
- o. “Politics and Money”, Calwaterwars.com, October 13, 2011