

**SOLANO
City-County Coordinating Council**

MEMBERS

Elizabeth Patterson
Chair
Mayor, City of Benicia

John Vasquez
Vice Chair
*Supervisor, Solano
County, District 4*

Jack Batchelor
Mayor, City of Dixon

Harry Price
Mayor, City of Fairfield

Norman Richardson
Mayor, City of Rio Vista

Pete Sanchez
*Mayor, City of Suisun
City*

Len Augustine
Mayor, City of Vacaville

Osby Davis
Mayor, City of Vallejo

Erin Hannigan
*Supervisor, Solano
County, District 1*

Linda J. Seifert
*Supervisor, Solano
County, District 2*

Jim Sperring
*Supervisor, Solano
County, District 3*

Skip Thomson
*Supervisor, Solano
County, District 5*

SUPPORT STAFF:

Birgitta Corsello
*Solano County
Administrator's Office*

Michelle Heppner
*Solano County
Administrator's Office*

Daryl Halls
*Solano Transportation
Authority*

Jim Lindley
City of Dixon

**AGENDA
May 12, 2016**

Location - Solano County Water Agency, Berryessa Room,
810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 203, Vacaville, CA.

7:00 P.M. Meeting

PURPOSE STATEMENT – City County Coordinating Council

“To discuss, coordinate, and resolve City/County issues including but not necessarily limited to land use, planning, duplication of services/improving efficiencies, as well as other agreed to topics of regional importance, to respond effectively to the actions of other levels of government, including the State and Federal government, to sponsor or support legislation at the State and Federal level that is of regional importance, and to sponsor or support regional activities that further the purpose of the Solano City-County Coordinating Council.”

Time set forth on agenda is an estimate. Items may be heard before or after the times designated.

ITEM

AGENCY/STAFF

I. CALL TO ORDER (7:00 p.m.)

Roll Call

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (7:00 p.m.)

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT (7:10 p.m.)

Pursuant to the Brown Act, each public agency must provide the public with an opportunity to speak on any matter within the subject matter of the jurisdiction of the agency and which is not on the agency's agenda for that meeting. Comments are limited to no more than 5 minutes per speaker. By law, no action may be taken on any item raised during public comment period although informational answers to questions may be given and matter may be referred to staff for placement on future agenda.

This agenda shall be made available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42U.S.C.Sec12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal.Govt.Code Sec.54954.2) Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact Jodene Nolan, 675 Texas Street, Suite 6500, Fairfield CA 94533 (707.784.6108) during regular business hours, at least 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes for January 7, 2016 (Action Item - carried over from March 10, 2016 meeting) Chair Patterson
2. Approval of Minutes for March 10, 2016 (Action Item) Chair Patterson

V. DISCUSSION CALENDAR

1. Legislative Update – Report on Governor's May State Budget Revisions and Measures that have Qualified for the June 2016 Ballot (Oral Report)
(7:10 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.)

Presenters: Michelle Heppner, Solano County, and Paul Yoder, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc.,

2. Accept the role of Policy Advisory Committee for the Travis Air Force Base Joint Land Use Study and establish an Ad-Hoc Committee to advise staff (Action Item – carried over from March 10, 2016 meeting)
(7:30 p.m. – 7:45 p.m.)

Presenters: Jim Leland, Principal Planner, Department of Resource Management, Solano County

3. Receive an update on Moving Solano Forward
(7:45 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.)

Presenters: Sandy Person, President, Solano Economic Development Corporation, Sean Quinn, Project Manager, Dr. Robert Eyler, President, Economic Forensics and Analytics, and Audrey Taylor, President, Chabin Concepts

4. Update on the County’s Regional Parks Exploratory Effort (Informational only, no presentation)

Presenters: Bill Emlen, Director, Department of Resource Management, Solano County

5. Update on Solano State Parks Committee Efforts (Verbal Update)
(8:00 p.m. – 8:15 p.m.)

Presenters: Victor Randall, Management Analyst II, Parks & Community Services, City of Benicia

6. Draft Solano Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Plan
(8:15 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.)

Presenters: Bob Macaulay, Planning Director, Solano Transportation Authority and Drew Hart, Associate Planner, Solano Transportation Authority

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

VII. CCCC CLOSING COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT: The next City-County Coordinating Council meeting is scheduled for August 11, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at the Solano County Water Agency – Berryessa Room, 810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 203, Vacaville, CA.

Future Items for Upcoming Meeting:

- Legislative Update and November Ballot Measures
- Annual Update on Air Quality – (BAAQMD and YSAQMD)
- Moving Solano Forward – Implementation of Diversifying Economic Action (IDEA)

CITY-COUNTY COORDINATING COUNCIL
January 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes

The January 14, 2016 meeting of the Solano City-County Coordinating Council was held in the Berryessa Room at the Solano County Water Agency located at 810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Ste 303, Vacaville, CA 95688.

I. Roll and Call to Order

Members Present

Linda Seifert, Chair	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 2)
Elizabeth Patterson	Mayor, City of Benicia
Jack Batchelor	Mayor, City of Dixon
Harry Price	Mayor, City of Fairfield
Norm Richardson	Mayor, City of Rio Vista
Len Augustine	Mayor, City of Vacaville
Erin Hannigan	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 1)
Jim Sperring	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 3)
John Vasquez	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 4)
Skip Thomson	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 5)

Members Absent

Pete Sanchez	Mayor, City of Suisun City
Osby Davis	Mayor, City of Vallejo

Staff to the City-County Coordinating Council Present:

Michelle Heppner	Legislative Officer, CAO, Solano County
Andrew Boatright	Office Assistant III, CAO, Solano County
Jim Lindley	City Manager, City of Dixon
Daryl Halls	Executive Director, Solano Transportation Authority

Guest Speakers and Other Staff Present

Paul Yoder	Legislative Advocate, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc.
Rochelle Sherlock	Consultant, Senior Coalition of Solano County
Sandy Person	President, Solano EDC
Sean Quinn	Project Manager
Dr. Robert Eyler	President, Economic Forensics and Analytics
Audrey Taylor	President, Chabin Concepts
Jerry Huber	Director, Health & Social Services, Solano County
James Bezek	Senior Management Analyst, CAO, Solano County
Sabine Goerke-Schroeder	District 3 Board Aide

I. Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the City-County Coordinating Council was called to order at 7:00 pm.

II. Approval of Agenda

A motion to approve the Agenda was made by Mayor Richardson and seconded by Mayor Price. Agenda approved by 10-0 vote.

III. Confirmation of the Chair & Vice Chair for 2016

A motion to nominate Mayor Patterson as Chair and Supervisor Vasquez as Vice Chair was made by Supervisor Sperring and seconded by Mayor Batchelor. Confirmation approved by 10-0 vote.

IV. Opportunity for Public Comment

No public comments were received.

V. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of minutes for November 12, 2015

Motion to approve the November 12, 2015 minutes was made by Mayor Batchelor and seconded by Mayor Price. Consent calendar approved by 10-0 vote.

VI. Discussion Calendar

1. Legislative Update – Governor’s FY 2016/17 Proposed State Budget

Paul Yoder, Legislative Advocate with Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. provided an update on the Governor’s FY 2016/17 State Budget proposal released on January 7. He noted that according to the Governor, typically the State budget has been a balanced budget, followed by a deficit and believes the next deficit will occur in the next four years resulting in approximately \$40 billion in debt. He noted the Governor’s plan to prevent a future deficit is to use \$1.6 billion to pay loans from special funds, past liabilities from Proposition 98, and reduce University of California retirement liabilities as well as supplement the rainy day fund with a discretionary \$2 billion increasing the balance to \$8 billion. \$2 billion is proposed to be paid into CalSTRS and \$6 billion into CalPERS.

Mayor Patterson asked if the CalPERS and CalSTRS unfunded liabilities are being treated separately; Mr. Yoder confirmed they are being treated separately.

Mr. Yoder noted that \$3.1 billion in Cap and Trade expenditures is proposed to focus on transportation, pollutants, improving ecosystems, and disadvantaged communities. Mr. Yoder stated the definition of disadvantaged communities may be expanded to include low-income communities due to an increase in Cap and Trade funds.

Supervisor Spering asked if the \$3.1 billion in cap and trade money includes additional funding allocated for the Strategic Growth Council (SGC). Mr. Yoder stated that SGC will receive \$400 million of the \$3.1 billion.

Supervisor Seifert recalled the Governor’s visit to the CSAC Executive Committee noting that he believed he may have difficulty passing the proposed budget because the transportation funding proposals and Managed Care Organization (MCO) tax. Supervisor Seifert noted she believed CSAC did not appear to think it would be problematic and asked Mr. Yoder what the likelihood of the budget being adopted in its current iteration. Mr. Yoder answered that the MCO tax will need to be readopted in the next month according to the Governor and could lead to the transportation tax completed by the year’s end.

2. Proposed 2016 CCCC Legislative Platform Discussion (Action Item)

No discussion.

A motion to approve the November 12, 2015 minutes was made by Supervisor Hannigan and seconded by Mayor Batchelor. The 2016 Legislative Platform was approved by 10-0 vote.

3. Senior Poverty

Rochelle Sherlock, Consultant for the Senior Coalition of Solano County, Barbara Ewing, Chair of the Senior Coalition, and Bob Stalker, Legal Services of Northern California and member of the Senior Coalition made presentation on issues impacting senior in Solano County. Ms. Sherlock kicked off the presentation noting that income must equal or exceed the need/expenses of an individual otherwise they will be in poverty. She noted that senior poverty and poverty in general have interconnected causes and indicators of what lead to poverty. Ms. Sherlock presented a video to highlight four women in Solano County who have lived in poverty to highlight their experiences and issues leading to poverty. The video highlighted several issues including inability to pay for housing, medical co-pays, and social necessities not being met as a result of the lack of family support. Ms. Sherlock noted that 26% of seniors are economically vulnerable. One third of seniors age 65 and older do not have any retirement savings and those that do, have a median income of around \$12,000 which is around half of the cost of basic necessities.

Ms. Sherlock introduced Bob Stalker to present information about housing. Mr. Stalker noted that the Federal Government estimates housing cost makes up about 30 percent of an individual's income; around 50 percent of renters in Solano County are paying more than 30 percent and of the people overpaying, 84 percent of them are low-income residents. This equates to a requirement of 2.5 jobs at minimum wage to afford renting. Mr. Stalker noted several suggestions to increasing affordable housing through different methods of delivery and funding sources. Ms. Sherlock connected the affordable housing issues presented by Mr. Stalker to the costs of long-term medical care for seniors. The income of seniors is overtaken by both the costs of housing and long-term medical care.

Ms. Sherlock introduced Barbara Ewing Chair, Senior Coalition, who identified the interdependent actions that will be required to increase care of seniors and connect seniors to services that currently exist: in order to increase access to services that exist. The network of care needs to be launched in the form of a website, support for seniors in meeting their current needs in the form of a volunteer center which would be staffed and headed by a coordinator. Ms. Sherlock ended her presentation with identifying the CCCC members as the "trusted insiders" in the model she presented in her Power Point and that they, as elected officials have the ability to identify pockets of poverty that exist, employ a consumer based staff, and buy in to this social network model, not unlike the Village model shared at the previous CCCC meetings.

4. Moving Solano Forward Phase 2 Overview

Sean Quinn, Program Manager with Solano EDC, Sandy Person President, Solano EDC, Audrey Taylor President, Chabin Concepts, Dr. Robert Eyerl President, Economic Forensics and Analytics, and James Bezek, Senior Management Analyst with Solano County Administrator's Office collectively provided an update on the Moving Solano Forward project. The overview included a brief description of what each task of the project would hold as it related to each team member. The overall project will reach its conclusion in February 2017 with scheduled deliverables along the way which will be expanded upon in future CCCC meetings. The aim of Phase 2 is to create a web-

based tool through which businesses can view Solano County's premium sites (targeted for certain business, workforce, etc.) to bolster Solano County's economy as well as attractiveness to reside, train, and grow as much as possible. Mr. Quinn described the method by which it is built upon is a tier system for site selection. Tier 1 being ready to present and list on the site tool, Tier 2 needing at least one factor to be site ready which vary greatly (housing, workforce, similar businesses, and many other infrastructure categories), and Tier 3 having no infrastructure and may not have been annexed into the community but are planned to be annexed.

One deliverable or backbone of the web-based tool is in process which includes the site data from the cities and the County, industry cluster data which identifies where certain businesses, workforces, and other infrastructure lay currently which will be used alongside other data to project where those clusters will be in later years. Dr. Eyler stated one method the information gathered for Solano County will be used is to market through a regional comparison of businesses who could thrive in Solano County as a first choice with reasons why those businesses would thrive and concurrently be truthful in describing why Solano County would not be suited for certain businesses. Dr. Eyler reiterated that the usefulness of this tool would be that it identifies only the best site selections and value propositions for the best industry clusters rather than simply being a collection of all sites - the filtering allows for a better, more focused marketing of Solano County's business and workforce brand, regionally.

Ms. Taylor described how the criteria in site selection have been identifying workforce availability, buildings, electric, water, sewer, similar business surroundings, possibility and proximity of training, housing, and many more factors all of which effect whether a site is categorized as Tier 1, 2, or 3. Ms. Supervisor Sperring commented regarding the lack of a ready workforce mentioned in the presentation. Ms. Taylor explained that if the workforce is intended to be local then the programs must be present and fostered by the County/cities earlier and continuously from K-12, at Solano Community College, and beyond with any other skill-based training available. Aligning curriculum with current and projected business or economic clusters will allow for a local workforce rather than an imported one which leads to responsibility of housing and traffic.

VII. Announcements

There were no closing comments.

VIII. CCCC Closing Comments

There were no closing comments.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. The next meeting will be on March 10, 2016 in the Berryessa Room at the Solano County Water Agency located at 810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Ste 203, Vacaville, CA 95688.

CITY-COUNTY COORDINATING COUNCIL
March 10, 2016 Summary Meeting Minutes

The January 14, 2016 meeting of the Solano City-County Coordinating Council was held in the Berryessa Room at the Solano County Water Agency located at 810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Ste. 303, Vacaville, CA 95688.

I. Roll and Call to Order

Members Present

John Vasquez, Vice Chair	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 4)
Tom Campbell, Alternate	City Councilman, City of Benicia
Scott Pederson Alternate	City Councilman, City of Dixon
Harry Price	Mayor, City of Fairfield
Pete Sanchez	Mayor, City of Suisun City
Len Augustine	Mayor, City of Vacaville
Osby Davis	Mayor, City of Vallejo
Skip Thomson	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 5)

Members Absent

Elizabeth Patterson, Chair	Mayor, City of Benicia
Jack Batchelor	Mayor, City of Dixon
Norm Richardson	Mayor, City of Rio Vista
Erin Hannigan	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 1)
Linda Seifert	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 2)
Jim Sperring	Solano County Board of Supervisors (District 3)

Staff to the City-County Coordinating Council Present:

Birgitta Corsello	County Administrator, Solano County
Michelle Heppner	Legislative Officer, CAO, Solano County
Andrew Boatright	Office Assistant III, CAO, Solano County

Guest Speakers and Other Staff Present

Michele Harris	Director, Solano First 5
Connie Harris	Chief Executive Officer, Solano Community Foundation
Rochelle Sherlock	Consultant, Senior Coalition of Solano County
Bill Emlen	Director, Department of Resource Management, Solano County
Jim Leland	Principal Planner, Department of Resource Management, Solano County
Dan Marks	Special Advisor, Management Partners
Bob Macaulay	Director of Planning, Solano Transportation Authority

I. Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the City-County Coordinating Council was called to order at 7:00 pm.

II. Approval of Agenda

A motion to approve the Agenda was made by Mayor Richardson and seconded by Mayor Price. Agenda approved by 10-0 vote.

III. Opportunity For Public Comment

No public comments were received.

IV. Consent Calendar

No quorum present. Approval of Minutes for January 14, 2016 moved to next CCCC meeting May 12, 2016.

V. Discussion Calendar

1. Give Local America

Michele Harris, Director, Solano First 5 introduced Rochelle Sherlock, Consultant, Senior Coalition of Solano County and Connie Harris, Chief Executive Officer, Solano Community Foundation. Ms. Sherlock provided an overview of Give Local Solano, a non-profit organization which aims to enrich lives through art, education, and protecting resources. Ms. Sherlock noted that despite an increased need for charitable giving, Solano County has a low per capita of charitable giving at \$3 per capita. Ms. Sherlock noted that compared to surrounding counties, such as San Francisco County, with \$1,200 per capita, Alameda County, with \$200 per capita, and Marin County, with \$200 per capita the increase in poverty rate in Solano County means the giving is not proportional to the need. Ms. Sherlock also noted that the foundational and individual giving rate has lowered, weakening the non-profit sector since the Recession. Ms. Sherlock noted the Give Local campaign exists nationwide and one organization, "Give Local America", is going to be used as foundation of the nation-wide model to form the structure for "Give Local Solano" which will be used to create philanthropy by increasing awareness, identify funding sources, and provide opportunities for personal giving.

Connie Harris, Chief Executive Officer for the Solano Community Foundation described Give Local Solano as a 24-hour crowd funding event. Give Local America, which is in its third year, has partnered with Give Local Solano to identify and pre-select around 30 local non-profits which will be utilizing their outreach strategies, along with their donor bases, and word of mouth to steer web traffic to a one-day donation event to take place on May 3, 2016. Ms. Harris explained that the participants (non-profits) are representing most of the cities in Solano County with several providing services to Dixon if not based in Dixon. Ms. Harris noted that the number of non-profits, around 30 allows for a manageable network in which donors, both business and individual, can identify and access an array of possible charities for giving at the "Give Local Solano" website, www.givelocalsolano.org.

Rochelle Sherlock called on the CCCC leadership for help in the form of a proclamation declaring May 3rd as the "Big Day of Giving" along with receiving a presentation on philanthropy and individual giving at the various City Council meetings and Supervisor meeting. Ms. Sherlock noted that Samantha Fordyce at Solano Community Foundation will draft proclamations. Ms. Sherlock noted that that the plan to tap into the network of non-profits starts with the event and continues with those organizations, along with Solano County in using the website and brand of Give Local Solano on newsletters, websites, and anywhere the public is able to access information. Mayor Augustine offered to have City staff produce a video. Ms. Sherlock accepted the offer and requested each CCCC member participate in the video messaging.

2. Update on the County's Regional Parks Exploratory Effort

Bill Emlen, Director, Department of Resource Management, Solano County provided an introductory overview of activities taken by Resource Management staff, SRI Consulting and O'Brien Consulting staff, and Board subcommittee members, Supervisor Vasquez and Supervisor Seifert relating to the recent Regional Parks Exploratory Effort since May 2015. Mr. Emlen noted the idea and possibility of establishing a regional parks system made some headway in the early 2000s but had been placed on hold as the economy took a downturn. A new look at the feasibility is now being undertaken. Mr. Emlen noted the consulting firm had interviewed 50 stakeholders, conducted outreach, and conducted a public telephone survey of 500 registered voters and had found that interest in an open, public access, regional parks system remains high, but interest in funding such a project by the public is not high (around 36% in favor of a special tax or similar funding strategy). Mr. Emlen noted the idea for a regional park system with more integration is still being reviewed.

Mr. Emlen noted that a list of identified properties around Solano County, some owned by various cities, Solano Land Trust, and others which total around 14,000 acres of potential parks areas was provided along with the report given to the Board. The goal is to establish a regional parks system around the systems that already exist in the form of city parks. Mr. Emlen noted that currently some park-like attractions that exist within or around the County, such as Lake Solano, Sandy Beach, Lagoon Valley, and Lynch Canyon are on long-term leases with the Bureau of Reclamation and are managed rather than being owned. Mr. Emlen noted that the County funds reflect a model of shared costs and can continue to do so while increasing connections and partnerships with organizations which control some part of the 14,000 acres identified. Birgitta Corsello noted that a regional parks system can be used as a means of branding allowing for advertising at a higher level of inclusion and use of online and shared services.

3. Update on Proposed Travis Air Force Base Joint Land Use Study

There was not a quorum present to ratify the recommendations for the proposed Travis Air Force Base Joint Land Use Study, however with the blessing of the current CCCC members present, the staff presentation continued. It was noted that the agenda item will need to return to the CCCC to be ratified in May 2016.

Jim Leland Principal Planner, Department of Resource Management, Solano County began with an explanation of what has preceded the Joint Land Use Study. Mr. Leland noted that the Travis Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan which focused on the air installation operations had an urgency that did not allow for the Joint Land Use Study to be part of the impact issues investigated during its execution. The Base has identified several issues related to enhancing the Base and its infrastructure, consolidating engineering into a single facility, the leaseback areas at the northeast corner, the overall perimeter of the Base, and Base security. A meeting with a consultant from Matrix Design, Base staff, and invited staff from surrounding cities occurred on January 6, 2016 to tour Travis Air Force Base and discuss the process of the 18 month study. Mr. Leland noted

that it was proposed that during the next project coordination meeting to include SCWA members and that CCCC members would act as the policy oversight as well as form a subcommittee to provide guidance during the times between meetings with Mayors from Vacaville, Fairfield, Suisun, and Supervisors from District 3, and District 5 as the suggested members.

Mayor Augustine commented that Vacaville City Council approved residential status for those using Travis Air Force Base's facility as being based in Vacaville, resulting in lower rates than were previously paid.

Supervisor Vasquez asked when the last time a Joint Land Use Study was conducted. Birgitta Corsello noted that though many studies had been conducted in the past to look at specific interactions such as air installation encroachment effects on air traffic, compatibility of surrounding city activities, wildlife, accident potential zones, runways, some radar interference, wind turbines, solar, habitat creation, the Joint Land Use Study is using some different criteria than other studies have in the past, specifically identified by the Base. Mayor Price also noted that an air quality study was also conducted.

The action was continued to May 12, 2016 CCCC meeting.

4. ABAG/MTC Merger

Dan Marks Special Advisor, Management Partners gave an overview of potential issues surrounding a merger between the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Mr. Marks noted that Supervisor Spering could be used as a resource for any questions set forth in the meeting as the CCCC's representative from MTC's Planning Committee. Mr. Marks stated that Management Partners was hired by ABAG to perform a merger study which he quoted from the Request for Quotation (RFQ) as "an examination of the policy, financial, and legal issues associated with further integration up to and including institutional merger between MTC and ABAG" the length of which would be from January 2016 through June 2016. Management Partners' client is ABAG's Joint Committee and MTC's Planning Committee. Mr. Marks noted that every Metropolitan area in the country is required to have a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to receive Federal funding for transportation; MTC serves as the MPO for the Bay Area. In all other counties in California both agency purposes, land and transportation, are combined, but in Solano County they controlled by ABAG and MTC respectively. ABAG provides information to MTC to forecast and MTC provides financing to do that work.

Mr. Marks noted that a merger was discussed in the past but never happened; a change occurred in the form of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) that requires the use of a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) in all metropolitan areas to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which has not been problematic elsewhere with agencies combined. The Legislature detailed how and what is needed from both ABAG and MTC to create the SCS, but is not providing funding for the SCS. Conflict arose between MTC and ABAG during the time period of 2011 to 2014 regarding responsibilities and process. In 2015, when Plan Bay Area was set to be updated, MTC identified issues with Plan Bay Area's

inefficiencies and proposed to absorb 13 employees from ABAG to perform the work at MTC rather than continuing to finance ABAG to perform the work. ABAG hired Management Partners in January 2016, who introduced their plan and work schedule to solve the conflict. In February, Management Partners looked at 3 other metropolitan areas within California and 3 outside of California and in March will present alternative propositions to MTC's proposal, ranging from changing the SCS process to merging with MTC as well as criteria for measuring and evaluating those options, as well as an economic analysis for ABAG to project if they can survive with the loss of 13 employees and without funding from MTC in the following 5 years. During March and April the options will be presented and evaluated and during April and May a choice will be made of one of the options and preparation for an implementation plan will take place. Outreach has been conducted throughout several counties and technical advisory committees to hear staff concerns regarding the following questions which are posed to the CCCC board now: what is the perception of the Plan Bay Area process; what is the opinion of how regional planning should be going forward?

5. Update on Plan Bay Area

Bob Macaulay Director of Planning, Solano Transportation Authority presented an update on Plan Bay Area, a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mr. Macaulay noted SB 375 was supposed to address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and resultant climate change as an immediate threat to the state and country and requires substantial regional action through a reduction of GHG emissions and creation of affordable housing.

In the first RTP the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) provides funding to Congestion Management Associations (CMA) such as Solano Transportation Authority (STA) to do transportation related projects to address GHG. OBAG 2, the second cycle, covers 5 years from FY 17/18 through FY 22/23 with \$21.6 million from the Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grant, and Transportation Development Act (TDA) in funding which MTC is holding for the RTP, placing Solano County in competition for funding with cities such as San Francisco and San Jose. MTC is allowing for CMAs such as STA to fund safe routes to schools program and regional rideshares program but will no longer provide funding itself. In the prior phase of OBAG, STA received \$1.066 million in TDA planning funds which STA was able to use to facilitate work on the city GHG plans. Federal funding to CMAs require planning activities and as such funds were set aside in OBAG II amounting to \$4.4 million across the 5 years and \$1.5 million for Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) funds for rural roads.

OBAG 2 schedule and RTP schedule are set to be adopted in summer 2017. MTC has adopted most of its guidelines from OBAG 2 and STA is now working at a local level to visit various jurisdictions and advisory committees to determine what the priority should be for transportation. MTC must meet the deadline to include a housing element for the State Planning & Community Development (PCD) requirement and a complete street program to meet MTC's requirements in order to receive OBAG 2 funds.

STA staff plan to have a workshop to present to the STA Board in September 2016 details on the various priorities for transportation programs and have a selection framework decided in a December 2016 meeting.

MTC has laid out a projects assessment through a cost-benefit analysis and set a series of 13 performance targets to determine which CMAs should receive regional funds, 11 of which are voluntarily proposed by MTC; along with SB375s two statutory requirements of GHG emission reduction and adequate housing there has been disagreement at a regional level of what the wording should be regarding policy for displacing existing low-income or other distressed communities' housing by projects funded, in part, by RTP. Mr. Macaulay noted that the question that some policy or an incentive base, such as cities adopting rent-controlled housing, in order to receive funds is cause for some regional concern. One target proposed by MTC is the creation of middle-wage jobs; no funding has been set aside for "goods movement" which can help establish and support middle-wage manufacturing jobs.

VI. Announcements

There were no closing comments.

VII. CCCC Closing Comments

There were no closing comments.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m. The next meeting will be on May 12, 2016 in the Berryessa Room at the Solano County Water Agency located at 810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Ste. 203, Vacaville, CA 95688.

**SOLANO
City County Coordinating Council
Staff Report**

Meeting of. May 12, 2016

**Agency/Staff: Michelle Heppner,
Solano County Administrator's
Office, Paul Yoder, Shaw,
Yoder, Antwih Inc., and Nancy
Hall-Bennett, League of
California Cities**

Agenda Item No: V.1

Title /Subject: Legislative Update

Background: At each CCCC meeting, staff provides a legislative update to keep members informed of activities at the State and Federal level.

Discussion: CCCC staff, the County's legislative advocate, Paul Yoder from Shaw, Yoder, Antwih, Inc., and Nancy Hall-Bennett from the League of California Cities will provide an oral update on the Governor's May Revision to the FY2016/17 State Budget and other legislative issues of concern to the County and the cities.

The following Statewide measures have qualified for the June 7th ballot.

1. Proposition 50 – Members of the Legislature: Suspension (Legislative Constitutional Amendment. SCA 17. (Chapter 127, 2014), Steinberg)
Senate Constitutional Amendment 17 (SCA 17) is a resolution to propose to the people of the State of California and amendment to the Constitution of the State relating to the suspension of the members of the State Legislature requiring a 2/3 vote of the membership of the house to which the member belongs and suspend any rights or privileges of the members office. A 2/3 vote will be required to remove the suspension.

The following Countywide measures on the June 7th ballot:

1. Measure AA – San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority – \$12 Annual Parcel Tax
Measure to levy \$12 parcel tax annually and raising approximately \$25 million annually for twenty years to protect the bay from trash, pollution, and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protection from floods, and increasing public shoreline access.
2. Measure G - Solano County Transportation Improvement Advisory Measure
Advisory measure to that any new funds raised by an increase in the transactions and use tax rate by the Solano County 2016 Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance be spent solely for transportation improvements, including road safety repairs, filling potholes, maintaining local streets and roads, and protecting transportation for seniors and disabled persons.

3. Measure H - Transportation General Sales Tax

The County of Solano has proposed a general transactions and use tax (sales tax) of one-half of one cent per dollar (0.50%) and requires approval by the majority of qualified voters of the entire county voting in the election. The tax would be levied for no more than five years unless extended by the voters. The measure will provide funding for the maintenance and repair of local streets and roads and road safety projects will return to each city and the unincorporated area of the County based on a combination of the following factors: population (40%), total lane miles (40%), and total taxable sales (20%). Each city and the County will spend its share of the revenue for local maintenance and repair of local streets and roads and road safety and may not redirect these funds for any other purposes.

4. Measure J - Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District Bond Authorization

A measure authorizing the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District to issue bonds in the aggregate amount of \$ 249,000,000, bearing interest at rates not exceeding the statutory limit, for the purpose of funding school facilities projects.


Recommendation: Receive a report on legislative matters of concern.

Attachments:

1. Proposition 50 - Members of the Legislature: Suspension
2. Measure AA - San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority – \$12 Annual Parcel Tax
3. Measure G - Solano County Transportation Improvement Advisory Measure
4. Measure H - Transportation General Sales Tax
5. Measure J - Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District Bond Authorization


FILED
in the office of the Secretary of State
of the State of California

AUG 25 2014

By 
Deputy Secretary of State

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 17


Adopted in Senate May 27, 2014


Secretary of the Senate


Adopted in Assembly August 20, 2014


Chief Clerk of the Assembly

Attest:


Secretary of State

This resolution was received by the Secretary of State this
25th day of August, 2014, at 4:15 o'clock P.M.


Deputy Secretary of State

RESOLUTION CHAPTER _____

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 17—A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 5 of Article IV thereof, relating to the Legislature.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SCA 17, Steinberg. Members of the Legislature: suspension.

The California Constitution provides that each house of the Legislature shall judge the qualifications and elections of its Members and may expel a Member by a vote of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the membership of the house. The California Constitution further charges the California Citizens Compensation Commission with the responsibility to establish the annual salary and benefits of all state officers, and provides that the salary of an elected state officer may not be reduced during his or her term of office.

This measure would require that, to suspend a Member of either house of the Legislature, a motion or resolution to that effect shall be adopted by a vote of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the membership of the house, as specified. The measure would prohibit a suspended Member from exercising any of the rights, privileges, duties, or powers of his or her office, or from utilizing any resources of the Legislature, while the suspension is in effect. If the motion or resolution imposing the suspension does not specify the date upon which the suspension ends, this measure would require a vote of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the membership of the house to remove the suspension. The measure also would authorize the salary and benefits of the Member to be forfeited for all or part of the period of the suspension by express provision of the motion or resolution.

Resolved by the Senate, the Assembly concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2013–14 Regular Session commencing on the third day of December 2012, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California that the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:

That Section 5 of Article IV thereof is amended to read:

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Each house of the Legislature shall judge the qualifications and elections of its Members and, by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, may expel a Member.

(2) (A) Each house may suspend a Member by motion or resolution adopted by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring. The motion or resolution shall contain findings and declarations setting forth the basis for the suspension. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, the house may deem the salary and benefits of the Member to be forfeited for all or part of the period of the suspension by express provision of the motion or resolution.

(B) A Member suspended pursuant to this paragraph shall not exercise any of the rights, privileges, duties, or powers of his or her office, or utilize any resources of the Legislature, during the period the suspension is in effect.

(C) The suspension of a Member pursuant to this paragraph shall remain in effect until the date specified in the motion or resolution or, if no date is specified, the date a subsequent motion or resolution terminating the suspension is adopted by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership of the house concurring.

(b) No Member of the Legislature may accept any honorarium. The Legislature shall enact laws that implement this subdivision.

(c) The Legislature shall enact laws that ban or strictly limit the acceptance of a gift by a Member of the Legislature from any source if the acceptance of the gift might create a conflict of interest.

(d) No Member of the Legislature may knowingly accept any compensation for appearing, agreeing to appear, or taking any other action on behalf of another person before any state government board or agency. If a Member knowingly accepts any compensation for appearing, agreeing to appear, or taking any other action on behalf of another person before any local government board or agency, the Member may not, for a period of one year following the acceptance of the compensation, vote upon or make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence an action or decision before the Legislature, other than an action or decision involving a bill described in subdivision (c) of Section 12, which he or she knows,

or has reason to know, would have a direct and significant financial impact on that person and would not impact the public generally or a significant segment of the public in a similar manner. As used in this subdivision, "public generally" includes an industry, trade, or profession. However, a Member may engage in activities involving a board or agency which are strictly on his or her own behalf, appear in the capacity of an attorney before any court or the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, or act as an advocate without compensation or make an inquiry for information on behalf of a person before a board or agency. This subdivision does not prohibit any action of a partnership or firm of which the Member is a member if the Member does not share directly or indirectly in the fee, less any expenses attributable to that fee, resulting from that action.

(e) The Legislature shall enact laws that prohibit a Member of the Legislature whose term of office commences on or after December 3, 1990, from lobbying, for compensation, as governed by the Political Reform Act of 1974, before the Legislature for 12 months after leaving office.

(f) The Legislature shall enact new laws, and strengthen the enforcement of existing laws, prohibiting Members of the Legislature from engaging in activities or having interests which conflict with the proper discharge of their duties and responsibilities. However, the people reserve to themselves the power to implement this requirement pursuant to Article II.



Resolution #13

**CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD
FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY ON JUNE 7, 2016;
REQUESTING SERVICES OF REGISTRAR OF VOTERS;
REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION OF ELECTIONS; AND SPECIFYING
CERTAIN PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSOLIDATION ELECTION**

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 50075 et seq. of the Government Code, cities, counties and districts in California have the authority to impose special taxes pursuant to the provisions of Article XIII-A of the California Constitution, subject to the approval of two-thirds of the votes cast by voters voting upon the proposition;

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (“Authority”), a regional governmental entity, is authorized pursuant to the aforementioned provisions of the Government Code, as well as the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Act (Title 7.25 of the Government Code, commencing with section 66700), to levy a parcel tax, subject to the requisite two-thirds voter approval, in the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma, and the City and County of San Francisco (such nine counties, collectively, the “San Francisco Bay Area”);

WHEREAS, after years of study, the Authority has prepared the San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure (the “Measure”) in order to fund programs that will:

- Reduce trash, pollution and harmful toxins;
- Improve water quality;
- Restore habitat for fish, birds and wildlife;
- Protect communities from floods; and
- Increase shoreline access for public enjoyment and recreation.

WHEREAS, the Authority proposes to levy a special parcel tax of \$12 per year for 20 years on each parcel wholly or partially in the San Francisco Bay Area, subject to two-thirds voter approval, to fund the programs identified in the Measure. Such a levy is anticipated to generate approximately \$25,000,000 a year to fund specific clean water, pollution prevention and habitat restoration projects and other purposes, including, without limitation, the possible payment of debt service on bonds issued by or on behalf of the Authority, all as set forth in the Measure; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code section 66704.05, when the Authority proposes the Measure to levy a parcel tax, the board of supervisors of the counties, including the City and County of San Francisco, (hereafter, all references to “County” include the City and County of San Francisco) in which the parcel tax is proposed, are required to call a special election on the Measure.

Resolution #13

**CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD
FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY ON JUNE 7, 2016; REQUESTING
SERVICES OF REGISTRAR OF VOTERS;
REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION OF ELECTIONS; AND SPECIFYING CERTAIN
PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSOLIDATION ELECTION**

**NOW THEREFORE, THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD HEREBY RESOLVES, DETERMINES AND ORDERS AS
FOLLOWS:**

FIRST: A special election is hereby called within each of the following nine Counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma and the City and County of San Francisco (comprising the entire jurisdiction of said Authority), which election is to be consolidated with the general election to be held on June 7, 2016. As required by Elections Code sections 13247 and 10403, the abbreviated form of the Measure as it shall appear on the ballot is as follows:

San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and
Habitat Restoration Program.

To protect San Francisco Bay for future generations by reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protecting communities from floods, and increasing shoreline public access, shall the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority authorize a parcel tax of \$12 per year, raising approximately \$25 million annually for twenty years with independent citizen oversight, audits, and all funds staying local?

Resolution #13

**CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD
FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY ON JUNE 7, 2016;
REQUESTING SERVICES OF REGISTRAR OF VOTERS;
REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION OF ELECTIONS; AND SPECIFYING
CERTAIN PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSOLIDATION ELECTION**

The Measure shall be voted on within the entire jurisdiction of the Authority, which pursuant to the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Act (Act), comprises the nine Counties enumerated above and referred to in the Act as the San Francisco Bay Area. A 2/3 vote of all votes cast on the measure is required to pass the measure.

SECOND: The Registrar of Voters of each County in the San Francisco Bay Area is requested to give notice of said election in accordance with law and to perform all other acts which are required for the holding and conducting of said election.

THIRD: The Board of Supervisors of each County within the San Francisco Bay Area is hereby requested to order the consolidation of the Authority's special election with the other elections to be held on June 7, 2016, to conduct such election in accordance with the requirements set forth in Elections Code section 10418, and to provide the election precincts, polling places, and voting booths which shall in each County be the same, and that there shall be only one set of election officers in each of said precincts; and to further provide that the question set forth above shall be set forth in each form of ballot to be used at said election. Said Board of Supervisors is further requested to order the Registrar of Voters to: (a) set forth on all sample ballots relating to said consolidation election, to be mailed to the qualified electors of the Authority, the question set forth above and (b) provide absentee voter ballots for said consolidation election for use by qualified electors of said Authority who are entitled thereto, in the manner provided by law.

FOURTH: Pursuant to Government Code section 66704.05, each County within the San Francisco Bay Area shall use the exact ballot question, impartial analysis, and ballot language provided by the Authority. If two or more Counties are required to prepare a translation of ballot materials into a different language, the County that contains the largest population among those Counties that are required to prepare a translation of ballot materials into the same language shall prepare the translation and that translation shall be used by the other Counties, as applicable.

FIFTH: Pursuant to Government Code section 66704.05, the Registrar of Voters of each County within the San Francisco Bay Area shall mutually agree to use the same letter designation for the Measure.

SIXTH: Each Registrar of Voters of each County within the San Francisco Bay Area is hereby authorized and requested to canvass, or cause to be canvassed, as provided by law, the returns of said special election with respect to the total votes cast for and against said question and to certify such canvass of the votes cast to the Governing Board of the Authority.

Resolution #13

**CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD
FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY ON JUNE 7, 2016;
REQUESTING SERVICES OF REGISTRAR OF VOTERS;
REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION OF ELECTIONS; AND SPECIFYING
CERTAIN PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSOLIDATION ELECTION**

SEVENTH: The clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to certify to the due adoption of the resolution and to transmit a copy hereof so certified to each of the Registrar of Voters within the San Francisco Bay Area.

EIGHTH: The attachment to Resolution No. 14 shall comprise the full text of the Measure.

NINTH: The Authority recognizes that each County in the San Francisco Bay Area will incur additional costs because of the consolidation of the election on the Measure with the June 7, 2016 election and agrees to reimburse each County for the "incremental costs" thereof, as defined in Government Code section 66704.05(h). The Chair of the Authority is hereby authorized and directed to expend the necessary funds to pay those costs.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority at its meeting on January 13, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: Governing Board Members

NOES: Governing Board Members

ABSENT: Governing Board Members ___

ABSTAIN: Governing Board Members ___

I, Kelly Malinowski, Clerk of the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Resolution adopted by the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority at its meeting of January 13, 2016, which Resolution is on file in the _____ entity.

Kelly Malinowski
Clerk of the Governing Board



**San Francisco Bay
Restoration Authority**

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2016

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

Resolution #14

**SPECIAL PARCEL TAX BALLOT MEASURE FOR VOTER APPROVAL:
THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY CLEAN WATER, POLLUTION
PREVENTION AND HABITAT RESTORATION MEASURE**

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay (sometimes referred to herein as the “Bay”) is the region’s greatest natural resource and its central feature and contributes significantly to the State’s economic health and vitality. The Bay is a hub of interconnected open-spaces, watersheds, natural habitats, scenic areas, agricultural lands, and regional trails;

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay and its wetlands, waterways and shoreline are a significant part of the State’s coastal resources and a healthy Bay not only enhances the quality of life for all Bay Area residents but is essential to support the state’s human and wildlife populations;

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay must be protected and restored so that current and future generations may use and enjoy it;

WHEREAS, the restoration, preservation, and maintenance of the San Francisco Bay and its wetlands, improvement of Bay water quality, provision of public access to the Bay shoreline, and enhancement of shoreline recreational amenities for the growing population of the San Francisco Bay Area are immediate state and regional priorities;

WHEREAS, wetland restoration in the San Francisco Bay is necessary to address the growing danger that global warming and rises in sea level pose to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and environment of the State. Tidal wetlands can prevent flooding and adapt to rising sea levels;

WHEREAS, the protection and restoration of the San Francisco Bay require efficient and effective use of public funds, leveraging of local funds with State and federal resources, and investment of significant resources over a sustained period for habitat restoration on shoreline parcels, parks, and recreational facilities, and public access to natural areas;

WHEREAS, in 2008, the State established the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (the “Authority”) for the purpose of assisting in the restoration, enhancement, protection and enjoyment of the wetlands and wildlife in the San Francisco Bay and shoreline, including raising funds for programs that would protect and restore the Bay;

WHEREAS, the Authority is a regional governmental entity comprising the nine counties that touch the San Francisco Bay: the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa,

San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma, and the City and County of San Francisco (such nine counties, collectively, the “San Francisco Bay Area”);

WHEREAS, after years of study, the Authority has prepared the San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure (the “Measure”) in order to fund programs that will:

- Reduce trash, pollution and harmful toxins;
- Improve water quality;
- Restore habitat for fish, birds and wildlife;
- Protect communities from floods; and
- Increase shoreline access for public enjoyment and recreation.

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 50075 et seq. of the Government Code, cities, counties and districts in the State have the authority to impose special taxes pursuant to the provisions of Article XIII-A of the California Constitution, subject to the approval of two-thirds of the votes cast by voters voting upon the proposition;

WHEREAS, the Authority is authorized pursuant to the aforementioned provisions of the Government Code, as well as the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Act (Title 7.25 of the Government Code, commencing with section 66700), to levy a parcel tax, subject to the requisite two-thirds voter approval, in the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the Authority proposes to levy a special parcel tax of \$12 per year for 20 years on each parcel wholly or partially in the San Francisco Bay Area, subject to two-thirds voter approval, to fund the programs identified in the Measure. Such a levy is anticipated to generate approximately \$25,000,000 a year to fund specific clean water, pollution prevention and habitat restoration projects and other purposes, including the possible payment of debt service on bonds, all as set forth in the Measure; and

WHEREAS, the proceeds from the parcel tax will be spent only for local projects that directly improve the Bay, and cannot be taken away by the State. The Measure also requires citizen oversight, transparency, independent audits of all money collected and spent, and strict caps on the amount that may be spent on project management and administration.

NOW THEREFORE, THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY GOVERNING BOARD HEREBY RESOLVES, DETERMINES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Approval of Ballot Measure.

Pursuant to Government Code sections 50075 through 50077.5 and the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Act (Title 7.25 of the Government Code, commencing with section 66700 of the Government Code), the Authority hereby adopts the San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure (the “Measure”) and approves the placement of the Measure on the June 7, 2016 election ballot within the San Francisco Bay Area. A full copy of the Measure is attached hereto.

Section 2. Tax Imposed and Rate.

Subject to two-thirds approval of the voters voting on the Measure, a special parcel tax (the "Special Tax") shall be levied in the amount and in accordance with the terms and procedures set forth in the Measure, for a twenty-year year period commencing July 1, 2017 and ending June 30, 2037. The Special Tax shall be levied at an annual rate of twelve dollars (\$12) per parcel of taxable real property (as defined in the Measure) wholly or partially within the San Francisco Bay Area. The proceeds from the Special Tax shall be used solely to support the programs and priorities and other purposes set forth in the Measure, including, without limitation, the payment of debt service on bonds issued by or on behalf of the Authority for the purposes set forth in the Measure.

Section 3. Method of Collection.

Subject to two-thirds approval of the voters voting on the Measure, the Special Tax shall be collected by the Tax Collector of each county, including the City and County of San Francisco (hereafter, all references to "County" include the City and County of San Francisco) within the San Francisco Bay Area in accordance with the terms and procedures set forth in the Measure.

Section 4. Accountability.

The Authority's levy, collection and expenditure of the Special Tax shall be subject to the transparency, independent audit, and accountability measures set forth in the Measure, including requirements that: (a) the proceeds of the Special Tax be used solely for supporting the programs and priorities and other purposes set forth in the Measure; (b) the proceeds of the Special Tax be deposited in a special account; (c) the proceeds of the Special Tax be spent only for projects in the San Francisco Bay Area identified in the Measure and cannot be taken by the State; (d) an independent, annual audit be conducted of all Special Tax proceeds collected and allocated under the Measure; (e) an annual report be prepared showing both the amounts of Special Tax proceeds collected and expended and the status of any project funded pursuant to the Measure; and (f) annual audits and reports be submitted to an Independent Citizen Oversight Committee for review, with its findings to be posted on the Authority's website.

Section 5. Additional Action.

The Chair of the Governing Board of the Authority, or any of his or her designees, is hereby authorized and directed to make any changes to the text of the Measure attached hereto, to the abbreviated form of the Measure, or to the text of this Resolution or Resolution No.13 (calling the special election), as may be convenient or necessary to comply with the intent of this Resolution and Resolution No.13 to place the Measure on the June 7, 2016 ballot, the requirements of elections officials, or the requirements of the law; and to take or authorize any administrative actions necessary to effectuate placing the measure on the ballot and administering the said election, including without limitation, drafting the argument in favor of the measure and fixing the dates on which arguments and rebuttals are due .

Section 6. CEQA.

Pursuant to the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15378(b)(4), adoption of this resolution to place the Measure, a government funding mechanism, on the ballot for voter approval is not a project subject to the requirements of CEQA. Prior to approval of funding of any projects pursuant to the Measure, any necessary environmental review required by CEQA shall be completed.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority at its meeting on January 13, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: Governing Board Members

NOES: Governing Board Members

ABSENT: Governing Board Members _____

ABSTAIN: Governing Board Members _____

Dave Pine
Chair

I, Kelly Malinowski, Clerk of the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Resolution adopted by the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority at its meeting of January 13, 2016, which Resolution is on file in the office of this regional governmental entity.

Kelly Malinowski
Clerk of the Governing Board

Attachment to Resolution 14 of

**Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority**

**Special Parcel Tax Ballot Measure for Voter Approval
The San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and
Habitat Restoration Measure**

**THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY CLEAN WATER,
POLLUTION PREVENTION AND
HABITAT RESTORATION MEASURE**

The people of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority do ordain as follows:

Section 1. Findings and Purpose.

Over the last century, landfill and toxic pollution have had a massive impact on San Francisco Bay (sometimes referred to herein as the "Bay"). It is not too late to reverse this impact and restore the Bay for future generations. To meet that objective, in 2008, state law established the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (the "Authority"), to raise and allocate resources for the restoration, enhancement, protection, and enjoyment of wetlands and wildlife habitats in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline.

The purpose of the San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure (the "Measure") is to protect and restore San Francisco Bay to benefit future generations by reducing trash, pollution, and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds, and wildlife, protecting communities from flood and increasing shoreline public access and recreational areas.

Section 2. Funding of San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Expenditure Plan.

Subject to voter approval, the Authority hereby establishes a special parcel tax (the "Special Tax") the proceeds of which shall be used solely for the purpose of supporting the programs and priorities and other purposes set forth in this Measure. The Special Tax shall be levied at a rate of twelve dollars (\$12) per parcel within the jurisdiction of the Authority, which consists of the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma and the City and County of San Francisco (such nine counties, collectively, the "San Francisco Bay Area"). The Special Tax shall be levied annually for a total of twenty (20) years, commencing July 1, 2017 and ending June 30, 2037.

The Special Tax shall be levied on each parcel of taxable property within the San Francisco Bay Area, and shall be collected by the tax collectors of each county (including the City and County of San Francisco) in the San Francisco Bay Area (the "Tax Collectors") at the same time as, and along with, and will be subject to the same penalties as general, *ad valorem* taxes collected by the Tax Collectors. The Special Tax and any penalty shall bear interest at the same rate as the rate for unpaid *ad valorem* property taxes until paid. Any Special Tax levied shall become a lien upon the properties against which taxes are assessed and collectible as herein provided. The Special Tax shall appear as a separate item on the tax bill.

All property that is otherwise exempt from *ad valorem* property taxes in any year shall also be exempt from the Special Tax in such year. The Authority shall adopt procedures that set forth any clarifications and exemptions to address unique circumstances and any procedure for claimants seeking an exemption, refund, reduction or recomputation of the Special Tax.

Section 3. San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Expenditure Plan.

The revenues from the Special Tax set forth in Section 2 above shall be used solely for the purpose of supporting programs and priorities and purposes set forth in this Measure, including the following:

A. Program Descriptions

Under this Measure, the Authority may fund projects along the Bay shorelines within the Authority's jurisdiction, which consists of the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma and the City and County of San Francisco. The shorelines include the shorelines of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, and most of the Northern Contra Costa County Shoreline to the edge of the Delta Primary Zone. These projects shall advance the following programs:

1. Safe, Clean Water and Pollution Prevention Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to remove pollution, trash and harmful toxins from the Bay in order to provide clean water for fish, birds, wildlife, and people.

- a. Improve water quality by reducing pollution and engaging in restoration activities, protecting public health and making fish and wildlife healthier.
- b. Reduce pollution levels through shoreline cleanup and trash removal from the Bay.
- c. Restore wetlands that provide natural filters and remove pollution from the Bay's water.
- d. Clean and enhance creek outlets where they flow into the Bay.

2. Vital Fish, Bird and Wildlife Habitat Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to significantly improve wildlife habitat that will support and increase vital populations of fish, birds, and other wildlife in and around the Bay.

- a. Enhance the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, shoreline parks and open space preserves, and other protected lands in and around the Bay, providing expanded and improved habitat for fish, birds and mammals.
- b. Protect and restore wetlands and other Bay and shoreline habitats to benefit wildlife, including shorebirds, waterfowl and fish.
- c. Provide for stewardship, maintenance and monitoring of habitat restoration projects in and around the Bay, to ensure their ongoing benefits to wildlife and people.

3. Integrated Flood Protection Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to use natural habitats to protect communities along the Bay's shoreline from the risks of severe coastal flooding caused by storms and high water levels.

- a. Provide nature-based flood protection through wetland and habitat restoration along the Bay's edge and at creek outlets that flow to the Bay.

- b. Build and/or improve flood protection levees that are a necessary part of wetland restoration activities, to protect existing shoreline communities, agriculture, and infrastructure.

4. Shoreline Public Access Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to enhance the quality of life of Bay Area residents, including those with disabilities, through safer and improved public access, as part of and compatible with wildlife habitat restoration projects in and around the Bay.

- a. Construct new, repair existing and/or replace deteriorating public access trails, signs, and related facilities along the shoreline and manage these public access facilities.
- b. Provide interpretive materials and special outreach events about pollution prevention, wildlife habitat, public access, and flood protection, to protect the Bay's health and encourage community engagement.

B. Additional Allocation Criteria and Community Benefits

1. The Authority shall ensure that the Measure's revenue is spent in the most efficient and effective manner, consistent with the public interest and in compliance with existing law. The Authority shall give priority to projects that:
 - a. Have the greatest positive impact on the Bay as a whole, in terms of clean water, wildlife habitat and beneficial use to Bay Area residents.
 - b. Have the greatest long-term impact on the Bay, to benefit future generations.
 - c. Provide for geographic distribution across the region and ensure that there are projects funded in each of the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Area over the life of the Measure.
 - d. Increase impact value by leveraging state and federal resources and public/private partnerships.
 - e. Benefit economically disadvantaged communities.
 - f. Benefit the region's economy, including local workforce development, employment opportunities for Bay Area residents, and nature-based flood protection for critical infrastructure and existing shoreline communities.
 - g. Work with local organizations and businesses to engage youth and young adults and assist them in gaining skills related to natural resource protection.
 - h. Incorporate monitoring, maintenance and stewardship to develop the most efficient and effective strategies for restoration and achievement of intended benefits.
 - i. Meet the selection criteria of the Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program and are consistent with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's coastal management program and with the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture's implementation strategy.
2. The Authority shall ensure that 50% of the total net revenue generated during the 20-year term of the Special Tax is allocated to the four Bay Area regions, defined as the North Bay (Sonoma, Marin, Napa and Solano Counties), East Bay (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), West Bay (City and County of San Francisco and San Mateo County) and South Bay (Santa Clara County) in proportion to each region's share of the Bay Area's population, as determined in the 2010 census, and consistent with the priorities set forth in this section. As a result, each region will receive the following minimum percentage of

total net revenue generated during the 20-year term of the Special Tax: North Bay: 9%, East Bay: 18%, West Bay: 11%, South Bay: 12%. The remaining revenue shall be allocated consistent with all other provisions of this Measure.

3. The Authority shall conduct one or more public meetings annually to gain public input on selection of projects under this Measure. All actions, including decisions about selecting projects for funding, will be made by the Authority in public meetings with advance notice and with meeting materials made available in advance to the public.
4. The Authority may accumulate revenue over multiple years so that sufficient funding is available for larger and long-term projects. All interest income shall be used solely to support programs and priorities set forth in this Measure.
5. No Special Tax proceeds shall be used for campaign advocacy.
6. No more than 5% of the Special Tax proceeds generated in any given fiscal year may be used by the Authority for general government purposes in such fiscal year, including to administer the projects funded under this Measure. Any unused funds may be carried over for use in subsequent fiscal years.
7. The Authority shall have the right, power and authority to pledge Special Tax proceeds to the payment of bonds of the Authority or another public agency (including, but not limited to, a joint powers authority created pursuant to Article 1 of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Section 6500 et seq.)), and use Special Tax proceeds to pay debt service on such bonds and the costs of issuance related thereto.

C. Accountability and Oversight

In order to ensure accountability, transparency and public oversight of funds collected and allocated under this Measure and comply with State law, all of the following shall apply:

1. The specific purpose of the Special Tax shall be to support only programs and priorities and other purposes listed in this Measure. The Special Tax proceeds shall be applied only for specific purposes of this Measure and shall be spent only in accordance with the procedures and limitations set forth in this Measure.
2. A separate account shall be created by the Authority into which all Special Tax proceeds must be deposited. The Authority shall commission an independent annual audit of all revenues deposited in, and all expenditures made from, the separate account and publish annual financial statements.
3. All Special Tax revenue, except as set forth in Section 3.B.6 above, shall be spent on projects for the benefit of the San Francisco Bay Area, and shall not be taken by the State.
4. The Authority shall prepare annual written reports showing (i) the amount of funds collected and expended from Special Tax proceeds and (ii) the status of any projects or programs required or authorized to be funded from the proceeds of the Special Tax, as

identified above. The report shall comply with Government Code section 50075.3, be posted on the Authority's website, and be submitted to the Bay Restoration Advisory Committee, established pursuant to Government Code section 66703.7 (the "Advisory Committee"), for review and comment.

5. The Advisory Committee shall provide advice to the Authority on all aspects of its activities under this Measure to ensure maximum benefit, value, and transparency. Advisory Committee meetings will be announced in advance and will be open to the public. The responsibilities of the Advisory Committee shall include, but shall not be limited to: (a) advising the Authority about implementation of this Measure; and (b) making recommendations regarding expenditure priorities under this Measure.
6. The Authority shall appoint six members of the public to an Independent Citizens Oversight Committee that shall: (a) annually review the Authority's conformance with the Measure; (b) review the Authority's audits and expenditure and financial reports; and (c) publish an annual report of its findings, which shall be posted on the Authority's website. The six members shall include residents of the North Bay, East Bay, West Bay, and South Bay, as defined in Government Code 66703(a), who are experts in water quality, pollution reduction, habitat restoration, flood protection, improvement of public access to the Bay, or financing of these objectives. No person may serve on the Independent Citizens Oversight Committee who (a) is an elected official or government employee, or (b) has had or could have a financial interest in decisions of the Authority as defined by Government Code section 87103 and the Fair Political Practices Commission.

Section 4. Establishment of Appropriation Limit.

Pursuant to Article XIII-B of the California Constitution and section 66704.05(b)(2) of the Government Code, the appropriation limit of the Authority shall be set by the total revenues actually received by the Authority from the proceeds of the Special Tax levied in fiscal year 2017-18, as adjusted each fiscal year thereafter for the estimated change in the cost of living, population and number of parcels on which the Special Tax is levied (such estimate to be determined by the Governing Body of the Authority and be conclusive for all purposes after made). The appropriation limit may be further adjusted by any other changes that may be permitted or required by Article XIII-B of the California Constitution.

Section 5. Amendments and Severability.

A. The Governing Board of the Authority shall be empowered to amend this Measure by majority vote of its members to further the purposes of this Measure, to conform the provisions of this Measure to applicable State law, to modify the methods of levy and collection of the Special Tax, or to assign the duties of public officials under this Measure.

B. If any part of this Measure is held to be invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the remaining portions of this Measure and the voters declare that they would have passed the remainder of this Measure as if such invalid portion were not included.

MEASURE AA – San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention And Habitat Restoration Program

To protect San Francisco Bay for future generations by reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protecting communities from floods, and increasing shoreline public access, shall the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority authorize a parcel tax of \$12 per year, raising approximately \$25 million annually for twenty years with independent citizen oversight, audits, and all funds staying local?

Impartial Analysis of Measure **AA**

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority was created by the State of California to fund projects to protect and restore the San Francisco Bay. The Authority does not receive any dedicated local, state or federal funding to underwrite such shoreline projects

The Authority has placed on the ballot Measure **AA**, which if approved by two-thirds of the voters voting on the Measure, would assess a special parcel tax of \$12 per year on each parcel of taxable real property wholly or partially within its jurisdiction, the San Francisco Bay Area comprising the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma and the City and County of San Francisco. The parcel tax would be assessed for a period of 20 years, from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2037. According to the Measure, the parcel tax would raise approximately \$25 million annually.

According to the Measure, proceeds would be used to fund shoreline projects to protect and restore San Francisco Bay for future generations by (1) reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins; (2) improving water quality; (3) improving habitat for fish, birds and wildlife; (4) protecting communities from floods; and (5) increasing shoreline access for public enjoyment.

Projects would be prioritized based on criteria set forth in the Measure, including but not limited to, their positive impact on the San Francisco Bay as a whole, in terms of clean water, wildlife habitat, beneficial use to the residents, and ensuring projects are funded in each of the San Francisco Bay Area's nine counties. The Measure ensures allocation of 50% of the funds to the North Bay, East Bay, South Bay, and West Bay proportional to their populations, with the remaining 50% allocated to projects within the jurisdiction without regard to location.

Proceeds from the parcel tax would be used solely for the programs set forth in the Measure, would be deposited in a separate account, would be spent exclusively for projects in the nine counties comprising the Authority, and could not be taken by the State, with total administrative expenditures limited to no more than 5% of the Measure's proceeds.

An independent, annual audit would be conducted of all proceeds and expenditures, and an annual report would be published detailing the amounts deposited and expended and the status of projects funded under the Measure.

These annual audits and reports would be submitted to an Independent Citizens' Oversight Committee for review, with the committee's findings posted on the Authority's website.

The parcel tax would appear as a separate item on residents' property tax bills and would be collected by tax collectors at the same time as and in the same manner as other property taxes.

A "yes" vote is a vote to approve a parcel tax of \$12 per parcel on taxable parcels within the San Francisco Bay Area for a period of 20 years to fund San Francisco Bay restoration projects.

A "no" vote is a vote not to approve a parcel tax of \$12 per parcel on taxable parcels within the San Francisco Bay Area for a period of 20 years to fund San Francisco Bay restoration projects.

By: _____
Dennis Bunting
Solano County Counsel

Measure - ADVISORY VOTE ONLY
Solano County Transportation Improvement Advisory Measure

This is not a tax measure. It is Solano County voters' intent that any new funds raised by an increase in the transactions and use tax rate by the Solano County 2016 Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance be spent solely for transportation improvements, including road safety repairs, filling potholes, maintaining local streets and roads, and protecting transportation for seniors and disabled persons. This measure would require that all revenues generated would remain in local communities and that a citizen oversight committee be established to recommend approval of all projects before funds are spent.

100% of the revenues would be allocated for the following purposes:

- Maintenance and Repair of Local Streets and Roads and Road Safety Projects
- Senior/Disabled Mobility
- Oversight and Accountability

Maintenance and Repair of Local Streets and Roads and Road Safety Projects

Funding for the maintenance and repair of local streets and roads and road safety projects will return to each city and the unincorporated area of the County based on a combination of the following factors: population (40%), total lane miles (40%), and total taxable sales (20%).

Each city and the County will spend its share of the revenue for local maintenance and repair of local streets and roads and road safety and may not redirect these funds for any other purposes.

For each fiscal year that the Board of Supervisors appropriates the revenue as described above, the Board will require that local jurisdictions maintain their existing commitment of local funds for that fiscal year for transportation purposes. Each report to the Board will inform the public how each jurisdiction has spent funds in the previous year, how they plan to spend the funds in the forthcoming year, and how they met their maintenance of effort requirement.

Senior/Disabled Mobility

Up to 3% of the revenue would go to senior and disabled persons mobility programs and services developed in coordination with the Solano Transportation Authority, the Solano Paratransit Coordinating Council, and the Solano Senior and People with Disabilities Transportation Advisory Committee.

Oversight and Accountability

Should the Board decide to use the funds as set forth above, the Board will identify administrative policies and procedures to provide public oversight and accountability and to distribute the funds consistent with the goals and objectives of this advisory measure. The Board will appoint an independent citizens oversight committee that will:

- Review revenue projections and financial reports and audits;
- Review each jurisdictions' expenditure plan and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors annually regarding whether the proposed expenditures are consistent with the parameters of this advisory measure;
- Review whether each jurisdiction has adhered to the maintenance of effort requirement by continuing their existing commitment of local funds for streets and roads; and
- Conduct all meetings in accordance with the Brown Act and open to the public.

No more than 1% of new revenue would be used for oversight and administration and up to 3% for senior/disabled mobility, thus reserving a minimum of 96% of the revenue for maintenance and repair of local streets and roads and road safety projects.

Measure G – Solano County Transportation Improvement Advisory Measure

Advisory Vote Only:

"Shall Solano County allocate 100% of proceeds of any new voter approved taxes on the June 2016 ballot to transportation improvements, including road safety repairs, filling potholes, maintaining local streets and roads, and protecting transportation for seniors and disabled persons, keeping revenues in local communities and requiring that a citizen oversight committee approve all projects before funds are spent?"

COUNTY COUNSEL'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE G

Measure **G** is an advisory vote concerning the expenditure of any revenue from the proposed new Solano County 2016 Transactions and Use Tax (Measure H), if the voters approve the measure.

California Election Code section 9603, subdivision (c) governs the purpose and effect of an advisory vote. It states that an advisory vote is "an indication of general voter opinion regarding the ballot proposal. The results of the advisory vote will in no manner be controlling on the sponsoring legislative body."

Measure **G's** purpose is to indicate the general opinion of the County voters whether any new funds raised by an increase in the transactions and use tax rate by Measure H shall be returned to the County's eight public entities to fund transportation improvements, such as maintaining local streets and roads, filling potholes, implementing road safety programs, and protecting transportation for seniors and disabled persons; whether the administrative and oversight expenses incurred shall be limited to no more than 1% of the new revenue; whether addressing senior and disabled issues shall be up to 3% of the new revenues; whether to reserve a minimum of 96% of the new revenue for maintenance and repair of local streets and roads and road safety projects; and whether an appointed independent citizens' oversight committee shall provide public oversight and accountability in the distribution of funds and the implementation of the improvements consistent with the intent expressed in this advisory vote.

The opinion expressed in this advisory vote, while of interest to the Board of Supervisors, is not in any manner legally controlling on the Board of Supervisors' use of any new County revenues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Bunting
Solano County Counsel

[EC § 9160]

ORDINANCE NO. 2016- 1770

AN ORDINANCE ADDING ARTICLE XVII TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE SOLANO COUNTY CODE IMPOSING A GENERAL COUNTYWIDE TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

The people of the County of Solano ordain as follows:

Section 1.

Article XVII is added to Chapter 11 of the Solano County Code to read:

ARTICLE XVII. SOLANO COUNTY 2016 TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX

Section 11- 700 Title.

This ordinance shall be known as the “Solano County 2016 Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance.” This ordinance shall be applicable in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of Solano County (“the “County”).

Section 11- 701 Operative Date.

“Operative date” means the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing more than 110 days after the adoption of this ordinance.

Section 11 – 702 Purpose.

This ordinance is adopted to achieve the following, among other purposes, and directs that its provisions are interpreted to accomplish those purposes:

(a) To impose a retail transactions and use tax in accordance with the provisions of Part 1.6 (commencing with section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and section 7285 of Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, which authorizes the County to adopt this tax ordinance which shall be operative if a majority of the qualified voters voting on the measure vote to approve the imposition of the tax at an election called for that purpose.

(b) To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance that incorporates provisions identical to those of the Sales and Use Tax Law of the State of California insofar as those provisions are consistent with the requirements and limitations contained in Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(c) To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance that imposes a tax and provides a measure for it that the State Board of Equalization can administer and collect in a manner that adapts itself as fully as practicable to, and requires the least possible deviation from, the existing statutory and administrative procedures followed by the State Board of Equalization in administering and collecting the California Sales and Use Taxes.

(d) To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance which can be administered in a manner that shall be, to the greatest degree possible, consistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, minimize the cost of collecting the transactions and use taxes, and at the same time, minimize the burden of record keeping upon persons subject to taxation under the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) To raise the appropriations limit for the County.

Section 11- 703 Contract with State.

Prior to the operative date, the County shall contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of this transactions and use tax ordinance; provided, that if the County has not contracted with the State Board of Equalization prior to the operative date, it shall nevertheless so contract, and in that case the operative date will be the first day of the first calendar quarter following the execution of the contract.

Section 11- 704 Transactions Tax Rate.

For the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail, a tax is imposed upon all retailers in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County at the rate of 1/2 of 1 percent (0.50%) of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail in the territory on and after the operative date of this ordinance.

Section 11- 705 Place of Sale.

For the purposes of this ordinance, all retail sales are consummated at the place of business of the retailer unless the tangible personal property sold is delivered by the retailer or his or her agent to an out-of-state destination or to a common carrier for delivery to an out-of-state destination. The gross receipts from such sales shall include delivery charges, when such charges are subject to the state sales and use tax, regardless of the place to which delivery is made. In the event a retailer has no permanent place of business in the State, or has more than one place of business, the place or places at which the retail sales are consummated shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed and adopted by the State Board of Equalization.

Section 11- 706 Use Tax Rate.

An excise tax is imposed on the storage, use or other consumption in the County of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer on and after the operative date of this ordinance for storage, use or other consumption in the territory at the rate of 1/2 of 1 percent (0.50%) of the sales price of the property. The sales price shall include delivery charges when such charges are subject to state sales or use tax regardless of the place to which delivery is made.

Section 11- 707 Adoption of Provisions of State Law.

Except as otherwise provided in this ordinance and except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, all of the provisions of Part 1 (commencing with section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code are adopted and incorporated by this reference.

Section 11- 708 Limitations on Adoption of State Law and Collection of Use Taxes.

(a) In adopting the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, wherever the State of California is named or referred to as the taxing authority, the name of this County shall be substituted for it. However, the substitution shall not be made when:

(1) The word "State" is used as a part of the title of the State Controller, State Treasurer, State Board of Control, State Board of Equalization, State Treasury, or the Constitution of the State of California.

(2) The result of that substitution would require action to be taken by or against this County or any agency, officer, or employee of it rather than by or against the State Board of Equalization, in performing the functions incident to the administration or operation of this ordinance.

(3) In those sections, including, but not necessarily limited to, sections referring to the exterior boundaries of the State of California, where the substitution would be to:

a. Provide an exemption from this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not otherwise be exempt from this tax while such sales, storage, use or other consumption remain subject to tax by the State under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, or

b. Impose this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not be subject to tax by the State under the provisions of that code.

(4) In sections 6701, 6702 (except in its last sentence), 6711, 6715, 6737, 6797 or 6828 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(b) The word "County" shall be substituted for the word "State" in the phrase "retailer engaged in business in this State" in section 6203 and in the definition of that phrase in section 6203.

Section 11- 709 Permit Not Required.

If a seller's permit has been issued to a retailer under section 6067 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, this ordinance shall not require an additional transactor's permit.

Section 11- 710 Exemptions and Exclusions.

(a) There shall be excluded from the measure of the transactions tax and the use tax the amount of any sales tax or use tax imposed by the State of California or by any city, city and county or county pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sale and Use Tax Law or the amount of any state administered transactions or use tax.

(b) There are exempted from the computation of the amount of transactions tax the gross receipts from:

(1) Sales of tangible personal property, other than fuel or petroleum products, to operators of aircraft to be used or consumed principally outside the County in which the sale is made and directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property under the authority of the laws of California, the United States, or any foreign government.

(2) Sales of property to be used outside the County which is shipped to a point outside the County, pursuant to the contract of sale, by delivery to such point by the retailer or his or her agent, or by delivery by the retailer to a carrier for shipment to a consignee at such point. For the purposes of this subsection, delivery to a point outside the County shall be satisfied:

a. With respect to vehicles (other than commercial vehicles) subject to registration under Chapter 1 (commencing with section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed according to section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, and undocumented vessels registered under Chapter 2 of Division 3.5 (commencing with section 9840) of the Vehicle Code by registration to an out-of-County address and by a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, stating that such address is, in fact, his or her principal place of residence; and

b. With respect to commercial vehicles, by registration to a place of business out-of-County and declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, stating that the vehicle shall be operated from that address.

(3) The sale of tangible personal property if the seller is obligated to furnish the property for a fixed price under a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

(4) A lease of tangible personal property which is a continuing sale of such property, for any period of time for which the lessor is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by the lease prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

(5) For the purposes of subsections (3) and (4) of this subdivision, the sale or lease of tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated under a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

(c) There are exempted from the use tax imposed by this ordinance, the storage, use or other consumption in this County of tangible personal property:

(1) The gross receipts from the sale of which have been subject to a transactions tax under any state administered transactions and use tax ordinance.

(2) Other than fuel or petroleum products purchased by operators of aircraft and used or consumed by such operators directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property for hire or compensation under a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under the laws of California, the United States, or any foreign government. This exemption is in addition to the exemptions provided in sections 6366 and 6366.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(3) If the purchaser is obligated to purchase the property for a fixed price under a contract entered into before the operative date of this ordinance.

(4) If the possession of, or the exercise of any right or power over, the tangible personal property arises under a lease which is a continuing purchase of such property for any period of time for which the lessee is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by a lease before the operative date of this ordinance.

(5) For the purposes of subsections (3) and (4) of this section, storage, use, or other consumption, or possession of, or exercise of any right or power over, tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated under a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

(6) Except as provided for in subsection (7), a retailer engaged in business in the County shall not be required to collect use tax from the purchaser of tangible personal property, unless the retailer ships or delivers the property into the County or participates within the County in making the

sale of the property, including, but not limited to, soliciting or receiving the order, either directly or indirectly, at a place of business of the retailer in the County or through any representative, agent, canvasser, solicitor, subsidiary, or person in the County under the authority of the retailer.

(7) "A retailer engaged in business in the County" shall also include any retailer of the following: vehicles subject to registration under Chapter 1 (commencing with section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed according to section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, or undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with section 9840) of the Vehicle Code. That retailer shall be required to collect use tax from any purchaser who registers or licenses the vehicle, vessel, or aircraft at an address in the County.

(d) Any person subject to use tax under this ordinance may credit against that tax any transactions tax or reimbursement for transactions tax paid to a county imposing, or a retailer liable for a transactions tax under Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code with respect to the sale to the person of the property the storage, use or other consumption of which is subject to the use tax.

Section 11- 711 Amendments.

All amendments subsequent to the effective date of this ordinance to Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to sales and use taxes which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, and all amendments to Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall automatically become a part of this ordinance, provided however, that no such amendment shall operate to affect the rate of tax imposed by this ordinance.

Section 11- 712 Enjoining Collection Forbidden.

No injunction or writ of mandate or other legal or equitable process shall issue in any suit, action or proceeding in any court against the State of California or the County, or against any officer of the State of California or the County, to prevent or enjoin the collection under this ordinance, or Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, of any tax or any amount of tax required to be collected.

Section 11 - 713 Use of the Taxes.

The tax imposed by this ordinance is a general tax within the meaning of article XIII C, section 1(a) of the California Constitution. The revenue generated by this general tax is available for general governmental purposes and shall be paid into the General Fund for use by the County.

Section 11 – 714 Increase of Appropriations Limit.

The appropriations limit of the County shall be increased by the amount of the revenue anticipated to be collected by the County from the transactions and use tax to allow spending of the tax revenue for the period allowed by law.

Section 11 - 715 Independent Citizens' Oversight Committee and Annual Audit.

(a) The Board of Supervisors shall establish a citizens' oversight committee to provide transparency and ensure fiscal accountability. The committee shall review the receipt and expenditures of the revenue from the transactions and use tax, including the County's annual independent audit. The committee's review shall be completed in conjunction with the County's budget process. The committee shall produce an annual oral or written report on its review which shall be considered by the Board of Supervisors at a public meeting. The committee may provide budget recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding expenditures from the transactions and use tax. Any written report shall be a public record. The Board of Supervisors shall adopt a resolution regarding the appointment of the committee members and any additional duties of the committee.

(b) The funds collected from the transactions and use tax ordinance shall be accounted for and tracked by the county auditor-controller in a separate fund to facilitate citizen oversight.

(c) The amount generated by this general purpose revenue source and how it was used shall be included in the annual audit of the County's financial operations by an independent certified public accountant, which the committee shall review.

(d) To preserve the integrity and independence of the oversight process, the committee's responsibilities shall not include decision-making on spending priorities, financing plans or tax rate projections or assumption and the committee shall have no authority to direct, nor shall it direct, County staff or officials.

Section 11- 716 Effective Date.

This ordinance relates to the levying and collecting of the County's transactions and use taxes and shall take effect immediately upon the close of the polls on June 7, 2016, if approved by a majority of the qualified voters of the entire county voting on the measure at the election held that day.

Section 11- 717 Termination Date.

The authority to levy the tax imposed by this ordinance shall expire five (5) years from the operative date, unless extended by the voters in the manner set forth in Revenue and Taxation Code section 7285.

Section 11-718 Compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15378(b)(4), adoption of this ordinance is not a project subject to the requirements of CEQA.

Section 11- 719 Severability.

If any provision of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

Ordinance No. 2016- 1770

Section 2.

This ordinance shall be published once within fifteen (15) days after its passage, in the Fairfield Daily Republic, a newspaper of general circulation in Solano County.

Passed and adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors at its regular meeting on February 9, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES:	SUPERVISORS	<u>Seifert, Spring, Thomson, Vasquez</u> <u>and Chairwoman Hannigan</u>
NOES:	SUPERVISORS	<u>None.</u>
EXCUSED:	SUPERVISORS	<u>None.</u>

ERIN HANNIGAN, Chairwoman
Solano County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
BIRGITTA E. CORSELLO, Clerk
Board of Supervisors

By:
 Jeanette Bellinder, Chief Deputy Clerk

Introduced: February 2, 2016
Adopted: February 9, 2016
Effective: June 7, 2016 [if voter approved]
Operative: October 1, 2016 [if voter approved]

COUNTY COUNSEL'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE H

The County of Solano has proposed a general transactions and use tax (sales tax) of one-half of one cent per dollar (0.50%). The tax would be levied for no more than five years unless extended by the voters.

State law authorizes the County to levy a general sales tax if the ordinance proposing the tax is approved by a two-thirds vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors and the tax is approved by a majority of the qualified voters of the entire county voting in the election. The Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the tax on February 9, 2016. If a majority of the voters in the County who vote on this measure vote "Yes," the measure will pass and the sales tax will be levied.

The estimated annual revenue generated by this general tax, which is listed on the ballot in the Fiscal Impact Statement, would be deposited into the General Fund and would be available for general governmental purposes, including maintaining and repairing local streets and roads, repairing potholes, implementing road safety projects, addressing senior and disabled mobility issues and other essential services. The revenue from the tax would be annually appropriated by the Board of Supervisors for general governmental purposes. This measure does not restrict the use of the tax revenue to any specific purpose.

The tax would be paid in addition to the current sales tax. Like the current sales tax, the tax would be imposed on all retailers in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County for the selling of tangible personal property, subject to certain exemptions and exclusions identified in the measure.

An independent citizens' oversight committee would review the receipt and expenditures of the tax revenue, including the County's annual independent audit, in conjunction with the County's budget process. The committee may make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding expenditures from the tax.

If approved, the tax would take effect immediately on June 7, 2016 and become operative on October 1, 2016. The tax will terminate in five years unless a majority of voters reauthorize the tax at a subsequent election.

Respectfully submitted,

Solano County Counsel
Dennis Bunting

[EC § 9160]

Measure H – Solano County 2016 Transactions and Use Tax

"Shall the people of Solano County enact a one-half percent sales tax for general governmental purposes such as maintenance and repair of local streets and roads, pothole repairs, road safety projects, senior and disabled mobility and other essential services within the seven cities and unincorporated area for 5 years with annual audits made available to the public showing how all revenue was spent the previous year?"

EXHIBIT A

FULL TEXT OF THE MEASURE

Upon the passage of Measure _____, the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District (the “District”) shall be authorized to issue bonds in the aggregate amount of \$ 249,000,000, bearing interest at rates not exceeding the statutory limit, for the purpose of funding the school facilities projects listed below under the heading “School Facilities Projects to Be Funded with Proceeds of Bonds” (the “Bond Project List”).

Background

The Governing Board of the District (the “Board”) is committed to providing a modern learning environment in local schools with safe, secure, upgraded classrooms and science labs which keep pace with 21st Century technologies and learning standards. The Board recognizes the need to modernize facilities so Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District schools can meet the demands of current and future students. Over the last year, the District initiated a long-term planning process and commissioned a facilities master plan detailing all facility’s needs. The development of this plan included input from the community, teachers, staff, parents and students. Said plan is available for review at the District office and incorporated into the Bond Project list by this reference.

Proposition 39 Bond Accountability Measures

At its February 25, 2016, meeting, the Board certified that it evaluated safety, class size reduction, and information technology needs in developing the Bond Project List set forth below. The proceeds of the Bonds shall be used only for the projects identified in the Bond Project List, and not for any other purpose (i.e., teacher and administrative salaries and other school operating expenses).

The District will deposit the proceeds of the bonds in a separate account. The Board is bound to conduct financial and performance audits annually to account for the bond funds and to assure that funds have only been expended on the specific projects authorized. The District shall prepare and deliver an annual report to the Board containing the amount of funds collected and expended as well as the status of school facilities projects authorized to be funded by proceeds of the Bonds.

The Board will appoint a citizen’s oversight committee (the “Committee”) having a minimum seven members and including at least one member active in a business organization representing the business community located within the District, one member active in a senior citizens’ organization, one member active in a bona fide taxpayers’ organization, one member who is the parent or guardian of a child enrolled in the District, and one member who is both a parent or guardian of a child enrolled in the District and active in a parent-teacher organization.

School Facilities Projects to Be Funded with Proceeds of Bonds

The Bond Project List below describes the specific projects the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District proposes to finance with proceeds of the bonds. The District's goals are to provide

equity among district schools so each student has similar facilities and educational opportunities. Listed projects will be completed as needed at a particular school site according to Board-established priorities, and the order in which such projects appear on the Bond Project List is not an indication of priority for funding or completion. The final cost of each project will be determined as plans are finalized, construction bids are awarded, and projects are completed. Certain construction funds expected from non-bond sources, including State grant funds for eligible projects, have not yet been secured. Until all project costs and funding sources are known, the Board cannot determine the amount of bond proceeds available to be spent on each project, nor guarantee that the bonds will provide sufficient funds to allow completion of all listed projects. Completion of some projects may be subject to further government approvals or appropriation by State officials and boards, to local environmental review, and to input from the public. For these reasons, inclusion of a project on the Bond Project List is not a guarantee that the project will be funded or completed. Bond proceeds will be expended to repair, modernize, replace, renovate, expand, construct, acquire, equip, furnish and otherwise improve the classrooms and school facilities of the District's existing schools, new school sites, and other district-owned properties to provide equity among campuses, improved facilities, and student access to instructional technology. Unless otherwise noted, the projects in the Bond Project List are authorized to be completed at each or any of the District's sites, as shall be approved by the Board. Projects listed may or may not apply at every site.

Renovation, Repair and Upgrade Projects to High Schools

- Repair/replace outdated leaky roofs
- Repair/replace existing deteriorating plumbing systems, including drainage, irrigation and sewer systems
- Update infrastructure to improve student access to instructional technology
- Upgrade inadequate electrical systems
- Repair/replace outdated portable classrooms
- Provide new shade/rain structures
- Modernize, renovate, repair, expand and/or upgrade the interior and/or exterior of existing classrooms and school facilities
- Repair and upgrade roofs, ceilings, walls, and floors
- Upgrade, expand, or construct classrooms and labs for career technical education
- Upgrade, expand, construct/provide, repair and/or equip student support facilities including labs, multipurpose rooms, cafeterias, auditoriums, libraries, locker rooms, and other school facilities
- Upgrade outdated restrooms

- Install energy efficient systems including "green" building projects and sustainable building practices to promote energy-efficiency (e.g., windows, solar, lighting, electrical systems panel, HVAC etc.)
- Make health, safety, and security improvements including upgrading, repairing, or expanding drop off and pick up areas, school site parking, walkways, ground, and utilities
- Upgrade physical education fields and athletic facilities for school and community use
- Provide education space for music and the arts
- Federal and State-mandated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility upgrades and as mandated by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) including site access, parking, restrooms, relocation of some existing electrical devices, drinking fountains, playground equipment, etc.

Renovation, Repair and Upgrade Projects to Middle Schools and Schools of Choice

- Repair/replace outdated leaky roofs
- Repair/replace deteriorating plumbing systems, including drainage, irrigation and sewer systems
- Update infrastructure to improve student access to instructional technology
- Repair/replace outdated heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems
- Renovate and upgrade outdated and inadequate school infrastructure including electrical and communication systems
- Upgrade, expand, or construct classrooms and labs for career technical education
- Upgrade, expand, construct/provide, repair and/or equip student support facilities including labs, multipurpose rooms, cafeterias, auditoriums, libraries, locker rooms, gymnasiums, and other school facilities
- Construct science and technology classroom labs
- Modernize, renovate, repair, expand and/or upgrade the interior and/or exterior of existing classrooms and school facilities
- Repair and upgrade roofs, ceilings, walls, and floors
- Provide education space for music and the arts

- Make health, safety, and security improvements including upgrading, repairing, or expanding drop off and pick up areas, school site parking, walkways, ground, and utilities
- Install energy efficient systems including "green" building projects and sustainable building practices to promote energy-efficiency (e.g., windows, solar, lighting, electrical systems panel, heating, air conditioning and ventilation)
- Repair/replace outdated portable classrooms
- Provide new shade/rain structures
- Federal and State-mandated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility upgrades and as mandated by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) including site access, parking, restrooms, relocation of some existing electrical devices, drinking fountains, playground equipment, etc.

Renovation, Repair and Upgrade Projects to Elementary and K-8 Schools

- Repair/replace outdated and leaky roofs
- Repair/replace deteriorating plumbing systems, including drainage, irrigation and sewer systems
- Update infrastructure to improve student access to instructional technology
- Upgrade inadequate electrical systems
- Install, repair, upgrade, or replace safety and security systems for students and staff, including fire alarms, fencing, lighting and security cameras
- Modernize and renovate H. Glenn Richardson Educational Complex and re-open campus to reduce student overcrowding
- Upgrade, expand, construct, repair and/or equip labs, multipurpose rooms, food service facilities, auditoriums, libraries, and other school facilities, including the cafeterias and gymnasiums
- Provide education space for music and the arts
- Install energy efficient systems including "green" building projects and sustainable building practices to promote energy-efficiency (e.g., windows, solar, lighting, electrical systems panel, heating, air conditioning and ventilation)
- Federal and State-mandated Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) safety upgrades including playground areas and playground equipment replacement
- Upgrade and repair play areas, play fields, and nature areas

- Repair, replace and/or upgrade paved surfaces and other grounds to eliminate safety hazards and improve outside instructional areas
- Repair/replace outdated portable classrooms
- Provide new shade/rain structures
- Federal and State-mandated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility upgrades and as mandated by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) including site access, parking, restrooms, relocation of some existing electrical devices, drinking fountains, playground equipment, etc.

District-Wide Projects

- Reduce student overcrowding throughout the District including building new classrooms and/or a new school
- Update infrastructure to improve student access to instructional technology
- Install energy efficient systems including "green" building projects and sustainable building practices to promote energy-efficiency (e.g., windows, solar, lighting, electrical systems panel, HVAC etc.)
- Improve campus safety by upgrading intercom systems, wireless systems, and telecommunications systems
- Address unforeseen conditions revealed by construction/modernization (such as plumbing or gas line breaks, dry rot, seismic, structural, etc.)
- Remove all dry rot and repair damaged caused by dry rot
- Abate and remove hazardous materials identified prior or during construction
- Fire alarm systems upgrades, repair fire safety equipment, and emergency exit lighting improvements
- Repair, replace and/or upgrade paved surfaces and other grounds to eliminate safety hazards and improve outside instructional areas
- Other improvements required to comply with existing building codes, including the Field Act, and access requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act
- Update/construct transportation yard facilities
- Necessary site acquisition and preparation/restoration in connection with new construction, renovation or remodeling, or installation or removal of relocatable classrooms, including ingress and egress, removing, replacing, or installing irrigation, utility lines (such as gas lines, water lines, electrical lines, sewer lines,

and communication lines), trees and landscaping, relocating fire access roads, and acquiring any necessary easements, licenses, or rights of way to the property

- Rental or construction of storage facilities and other space on an interim basis, as needed to accommodate construction materials, equipment, and personnel, and interim classrooms (including relocatables) for students and school functions or other storage for classroom materials displaced during construction
- Acquisition of any of the facilities on the Bond Project List through temporary lease or lease-purchase arrangements, or execute purchase option under leases for any of these authorized facilities
- For any project involving rehabilitation or renovation of a building or the major portion of a building, the District shall be authorized to proceed with new construction instead, if the Board determines that replacement and new construction is more economically practical than rehabilitation and renovation, considering the building's age, condition, expected remaining life, and other relevant factors
- All work necessary and incidental to specific projects described above, including demolition of existing structures

The listed projects will be completed as needed. Each project is assumed to include its share of furniture, equipment, architectural, engineering, and similar planning costs, program/project management, and a customary contingency for unforeseen design and construction costs. In addition to the listed projects stated above, the list also includes the acquisition of a variety of instructional, maintenance and operational equipment, including the reduction or retirement of outstanding lease obligations and interim funding incurred to advance fund projects from the list; installation of signage and fencing; payment of the costs of preparation of all facility planning, facility studies, assessment reviews, facility master plan preparation and updates, environmental studies (including environmental investigation, remediation and monitoring), design and construction documentation, and temporary housing of dislocated District activities caused by construction projects. In addition to the projects listed above, the repair and renovation of each of the existing school facilities may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following: renovation of student and staff restrooms; repair and replacement of heating and ventilation systems; upgrade of facilities for energy efficiencies; repair and replacement of worn-out and leaky roofs, windows, walls, doors and drinking fountains; installation wiring and electrical systems to safely accommodate computers, technology and other electrical devices and needs; upgrades or construction of support facilities, including administrative; physical education/athletic facilities and performing arts buildings and maintenance yards; repair and replacement of fire alarms, emergency communications and security systems; resurfacing or replacing of hard courts, pools, turf and irrigation systems and campus landscaping and play fields; expand parking; install interior and exterior painting and floor covering; demolition; and construction of various forms of storage and support spaces, upgrade classrooms, bleachers, kitchens, repair, upgrade and install interior and exterior lighting systems; replace outdated security fences and security systems. The upgrading of technology infrastructure includes, but is not limited to, servers, switches, routers, telephone systems, network security/firewall, and

wireless technology systems. The allocation of bond proceeds will be affected by the District's receipt of State matching funds and the final costs of each project. In the absence of State matching funds, which the District will aggressively pursue to reduce the District's share of the costs of the projects, the District will not be able to complete some of the projects listed above. The budget for each project is an estimate and may be affected by factors beyond the District's control. Some projects throughout the District, such as gyms, fields and performing arts facilities, may be undertaken as joint use projects in cooperation with other local public or non-profit agencies. The final cost of each project will be determined as plans and construction documents are finalized, construction bids are received, construction contracts are awarded and projects are completed. Based on the final costs of each project, certain of the projects described above may be delayed or may not be completed. Demolition of existing facilities and reconstruction of facilities scheduled for repair and upgrade may occur, if the Board determines that such an approach would be more cost-effective in creating more enhanced and operationally efficient campuses. Necessary site preparation/restoration may occur in connection with new construction, renovation or remodeling, or installation or removal of relocatable classrooms, including ingress and egress, removing, replacing, or installing irrigation, utility lines, trees and landscaping, relocating fire access roads, and acquiring any necessary easements, licenses, or rights of way to the property. Proceeds of the bonds may be used to pay or reimburse the District for the cost of District staff when performing work on or necessary and incidental to bond projects and the costs of issuing the bonds. Bond proceeds shall only be expended for the specific purposes identified herein. The District shall create an account into which proceeds of the bonds shall be deposited and comply with the reporting requirements of Government Code § 53410.

The Bond Project List shall be considered a part of this ballot proposition, and shall be reproduced in any official document required to contain the full statement of the bond proposition.

EXHIBIT B
TAX RATE STATEMENT

An election will be held in the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District (the “District”) on June 7, 2016, to authorize the sale of up to \$ 249,000,000 in bonds of the District to modernize and improve schools within the District. Specifically, bond proceeds shall be utilized for the purposes of financing the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities, including the furnishing, and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities.

If the bonds are authorized and sold, debt service thereon will be payable from the proceeds of tax levies made upon the taxable property in the District. The following information is provided in compliance with sections 9400-9404 of the Elections Code of the State of California. It is anticipated that the District will sell the bonds in four (4) separate series.

1. The best estimate of the tax which would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of the bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is \$0.06 per \$100 (\$60 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2016-17.

2. The best estimate of the tax which would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of the last series of bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is \$0.06 per \$100 (\$60 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2023-24.

3. The best estimate of the highest tax rate which would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is \$0.06 per \$100 (\$60 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.

4. The best estimate of the average tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue during the life of the bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is \$0.06 per \$100 (\$60 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.

5. The best estimate of the total debt service, including principal and interest, that would be required to be repaid if all the bonds are issued and sold is \$ 550,000,000.

Voters should note that the estimated tax rates are based on the *ASSESSED VALUE* of taxable property on the County’s official tax rolls, *not* on the property’s market value. Property owners should consult their own property tax bills to determine their property’s assessed value and any applicable tax exemptions.

Attention of all voters is directed to the fact that the foregoing information is based upon the District’s projections and estimates only, which are not binding upon the District. The actual tax rates, the years in which they will apply, and the total debt service may vary due to variations from these estimates in the timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold and market interest rates at the time of each sale, and actual assessed valuations over the term of repayment of the bonds.

The dates of sale and the amount of bonds sold at any given time will be determined by the District based on the need for construction funds and other factors, including the legal limitations on bonds approved by a 55% vote. The actual interest rates at which the bonds will be sold will depend on the bond market at the time of each sale. Actual future assessed valuation will depend upon the amount and value of taxable property within the District as determined by the County Assessor in the annual assessment and the equalization process.

Dated: February 25, 2016

Kris Corey, Superintendent
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District

MEASURE J – Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District Bond Proposal

“To improve the quality of education, provide safe and modern schools for all students with funding that cannot be taken by the state; upgrade, modernize and construct classrooms, science labs and libraries; improve student access to technology; repair leaky roofs, outdated electrical and plumbing systems; and improve safety, security and access for students with disabilities shall Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District issue \$249,000,000 of bonds at legal rates, including independent citizens’ oversight, audits and no money for administrative salaries?”

BONDS - YES

BONDS - NO

SOLANO
City County Coordinating Council
Staff Report

Meeting of: May 12, 2016

**Agency/Staff: Jim Leland, Principle Planner,
Department of Resource Management,
County of Solano**

Agenda Item No: V.2

Title /Subject: Action Item: Accept the role of Policy Advisory Committee for the Travis AFB Joint Land Use Study and establish an Ad-Hoc Committee to advise the staff, as needed, in between the quarterly meetings of the Council

Background: On March 10, 2016, staff from the County of Solano presented information to the Council (Attachment A) on the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS), now underway for Travis AFB. A JLUS is conducted in partnership with local governmental agencies and other stakeholders in order to:

- Plan compatible civilian uses around local military facilities and to carry out efforts to ensure compatible use,
- Engage the private sector to support compatible use, and
- Partner with the Military Departments as they seek compatible civilian activities consistent with their local missions

The County of Solano was identified as the local partner to sponsor the JLUS and has since engaged Matrix Design to conduct the study.

Discussion: The Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) commenced this winter. The project is in the early data collection phase and is expected to be completed in the Spring/Summer of 2017. A Technical Advisory Committee, consisting of planners from Fairfield, Suisun City, Vacaville and the County participated in a Base tour with Travis personnel and the consultants on March 3, 2016.

The process will culminate with a Final Report which, if successful, will provide a consensus of steps to be taken by individual agencies to address land use and infrastructure issues facing the Base and its surrounding communities.

The JLUS process includes public outreach to the relevant stakeholders and on-going engagement with local officials. An important part of that process is the reliance on a Policy Advisory Committee. We are recommending that the City-County Coordinating Committee, with expanded representation from Travis AFB, agree to serve that purpose, as was done for the update to the Travis Plan update.

In addition, we recommend the formation of an Ad-Hoc Committee to advise the staff, as needed, in between the quarterly meetings of the Council. The Ad-Hoc committee would consist of the Mayors from Fairfield, Suisun City and Vacaville as well as the Supervisors from the 3rd and 5th Districts.

Recommendation: Accept the role of Policy Advisory Committee for the Travis AFB Joint Land Use Study and establish an Ad-Hoc Committee to advise the staff, as needed, in between the quarterly meetings of the Council

**SOLANO
City County Coordinating Committee
Staff Report**

Meeting of: May 12, 2016

Agency/Staff: Sandy Person, President, Solano Economic Development Corporation, Sean Quinn, Project Manager, Dr. Robert Eyler, President, Economic Forensics and Analytics, and Audrey Taylor, President, Chabin Concepts

Agenda Item No: V.3

Title/Subject: Receive update on Moving Solano Forward Phase 2.

Background:

Solano County received a grant from the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) in the amount of \$453,460 to undertake Moving Solano Forward Phase 2. Moving Solano Forward Phase 1 was completed last year.

The County entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Solano EDC to assist in project management of the grant and provide other services. After completing a competitive solicitation process, the County selected Economic Forensics and Analytics (EFA). The EFA team consists of Dr. Robert Eyler of EFA, Audrey Taylor of Chabin Concepts, Don Schjeldahl, DSG Advisors and Debbie Kern of Keyser Marston Associates.

The following is the list of deliverables from Moving Solano Forward Phase 2.

- An economic development corridor strategy, based upon best practices from across the nation that will focus on marketing concepts, recruitment strategies, workforce development and the readiness of key sites that will assist in creating a competitive advantage.
- A set of tools, resources and initiatives that best address the labor, real estate, capital and other needs of identified key target business clusters that can be shared with cities and the County, filling the economic development gaps at the local level and adding value to their efforts.
- With the absence of redevelopment, identifying new public-public and public-private financing structures that can be used to invest infrastructure in key sites to attract economic activity, near and long term.
- Recommendations on potential local, state and federal funding sources that can be used to assist businesses and to fund economic development activities.
- A robust state-of-the-art website that will assist businesses, brokers and site selectors. The web site will be data rich with economic and demographic data, dynamic mapping to showcase unique market locations, all county business parks, mega-sites and specific properties; highlight target industries and clusters. The site will also include resources for businesses. This will create a virtual one-stop clearinghouse.

Discussion: EFA will be providing an update of their work since the January. They will discuss the site visits with each of the cities and the County, visits with businesses in each community and tour of key sites/buildings. They will also present a summary of the results of the Perception Survey. The business clusters from Moving Solano Forward Phase 1 have been refined and they will walk through their rationale for the changes. Finally, they will discuss their work around workforce. Solano EDC staff will discuss the recent Office of Economic Adjustment meeting.

Recommendation:

Receive the presentation on Moving Solano Forward Phase 2

SOLANO
City County Coordinating Council
Memo

Meeting of: May 12, 2016

Agency/Staff: Bill Emlen, Solano County

Agenda Item No: V.4 (Written Update Only, No Presentation)

Title /Subject: Status report on the County's exploratory efforts to establish a regional park system.

Background:

In May 2015 the County initiated exploratory work towards establishment of a regional parks/open space system in Solano County. The Board of Supervisors took action to form a Board subcommittee, consisting of Supervisors Seifert and Vasquez.

With consultant assistance, the County conducted 50 stakeholder interviews and a telephone survey of 519 registered voters attempting to determine the level of general public knowledge of existing regional parks and gauge public support for an integrated regional system of parks and open spaces in Solano County. The consultant team and staff presented the results and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on January 12, 2016, and staff provided an update to the CCCCs on March 10, 2016.

Based on the survey results, the Board approved additional funding and directed County staff to continue further community outreach focusing on the regional management opportunities for regional parks and open space lands in the County. In concert with the outreach efforts, the Board directed staff to move forward with the technical analysis toward the formation of a dependent regional parks and open space district.

Discussion:

Current Status: Since the last CCCCs meeting on March 10, 2016, the County has entered into contract with a consultant to provide technical analysis, recommendations, and an implementation program relating to the formation techniques of a regional park and open space district, including financing and governance. Their work is underway.

County staff has also been in contact with a firm, specializing in public outreach. The focus of the public outreach will be on broadening public awareness of the County's various park and open space opportunities, to solicit input on how to improve them, and to introduce the concept and potential benefits of having regional type parks and open spaces in the County managed as a comprehensive entity.

It is expected that public outreach efforts will be initiated this summer. A status report on the Park District formation options will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors in July or early August.

Recommendation:

Receive a status report on the County's exploratory efforts to establish a regional park system.

Solano State Parks Committee Status Update



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

Solano State Parks Committee

A Multi-Agency Partnership

- Benicia State Recreation Area and Benicia Capitol State Historic Park were both placed on the Parks Closure List in 2007
- Benicia State Recreation Area was closed two days per week in 2011, with an extensive maintenance backlog
- There was talk of boarding up the Capitol State Historic Park



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

Solano State Parks Committee

A Multi-Agency Partnership

- Benicia Mayor called for forming a Committee of cities, county, regional trail groups, and State Parks in summer 2012
- Letter of Understanding developed to guide Committee efforts
- Joint advocacy in support of key legislation and in response to the Parks Forward Report
- Partnerships strengthened with State Parks
- Collaborative projects facilitated by Committee



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Solano State Parks Committee

A Multi-Agency Partnership

- **California State Parks** – District Superintendent Rodriguez and Sector Superintendent Goering
- **Benicia State Parks Association** - Carol Berman and Bob Berman
- **Solano County** - Supervisor Seifert and Park Commissioner Alvarez
- **City of Benicia** - Mayor Patterson (Chair) and Councilmember Strawbridge
- **City of Vallejo** – Councilmember Bob Sampayan



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Solano State Parks Committee

A Multi-Agency Partnership

- **Bay Area Ridge Trail** - Harry Englebright
- **San Francisco Bay Trail** - Maureen Gaffney
- **Legislative** aides representing:
 - Senator Wolk
 - Assemblymember Bonilla
 - Assemblymember Frazier



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Benicia State Recreation Area

- Three Regional Trail Systems, with trailheads in Vallejo and Benicia
- 270 acre tidal marsh
- 2015 visitation exceeded 10,000
- Forrest Deaner Native Plant Botanic Garden



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Regional Trail Partners on the Committee

- San Francisco Bay Trail
- Bay Area Ridge Trail



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

San Francisco Bay Trail

Bay Area Ridge Trail

- Regional Trail Systems that will link the entire 9 county bay shoreline and ridgeline
- Shared Waterfront alignment through the SRA and downtown Benicia
- Bay Trail linkage planned through downtown Vallejo
- Ridge Trail linkage north through the Vallejo-Benicia Open Space Buffer that extends to Blue Rock Springs Park and Benicia Community Park
- Excellent regional trails marketing and promotion



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail

- Bay Trail and Ridge Trail linkage to regional, city, and state parks, watershed lands, and historic downtown districts along the Carquinez Strait
- Benicia State Recreation Area is the key Solano County trailhead for this regional recreation asset



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Vallejo, Solano County, Benicia

AB 1478 Donor Agreement of 2013

- \$10,000 each from Solano County and City of Benicia, \$4,000 from City of Vallejo generated a \$24,000 State match
- Restored everyday operations at the Benicia SRA
- Generated further State reinvestment at the SRA
- Match projects have included new signage and benches



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

City of Vallejo

SRA Trail and Road Repaving

- City of Vallejo provided equipment and staff, State Parks provided maintenance funding to repave the Bay Trail/Ridge Trail and portions of Dillon Point Road in summer 2015



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Benicia State Parks Association

- Membership organization that supports Benicia SRA and Benicia Capitol State Historic Park
- Coordinates weekly volunteer days at Deaner Native Plant Botanic Garden and annual Coastal Clean-up at the SRA
- Weekend Academy with Solano County Juvenile Probation



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

Additional Partner Contributions

- Benicia Tree Foundation volunteer tree plantings
- Bay Area Ridge Trail and REI workday



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

Benicia Capitol State Historic Park

- Operations Agreements between State Parks/ Benicia State Parks Association/City of Benicia
- Historic Structure Report in progress
- 2015 visitation in excess of 8,500



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

Benicia State Parks Association

- Regular interpretive programs and docent led tours at the Fischer-Hanlon House and Capitol
- Hosts Capitol Speakers Series and other special events
- Partnered on new interpretive signage and irrigation upgrades



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Parks Forward Commission

- Blue Ribbon Panel that produced the Parks Forward Report, whose 2014 recommendations included:
 - Create an **interdisciplinary team** focused on transforming State Parks
 - **Modernize** technology and business practices
 - Foster **partnerships**
 - Establish a ‘**California Parks Conservancy**’
 - Support a **network of protected lands**
 - Create **preservation partnerships** to protect and restore historic structures and encourage adaptive reuse where appropriate



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



State Parks Transformation Team

- Internal State Parks team working to implement Parks Forward Recommendations and other internally determined Strategic Goals:
 1. Develop Excellent Management Systems.
 2. Maintain High Quality Operations and Public Service.
 3. Create Meaningful Connections and Relevancy to People.
 4. Protect and Enhance Natural and Cultural Resources.



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016



Solano State Parks Committee Status Update



State Parks Update – May 12, 2016

**SOLANO
City County Coordinating Committee
Staff Report**

Meeting of: May 12, 2016

**Agency/Staff: Andrew Hart, Associate Planner,
Solano Transportation Authority**

Agenda Item No: V.4

Title/Subject: Draft Solano Priority Conservation Area Plan

Background:

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) initially began designating Priority Conservation Areas (PCA) in 2007. PCA's are locally identified areas for conservation which provide important agricultural, natural resource, historical, scenic, cultural, recreational, and/or ecological values and ecosystem functions. To date Solano County has six (6) designated PCA's:

<u>PCA</u>	<u>Sponsor Agency</u>
Vacaville-Fairfield-Solano Greenbelt and Cement Hill	City of Fairfield
Blue Ridge Hills (Vaca Mountains)	Solano County
Western Hills (including part of the Vallejo Lakes Property)	Solano County
Tri City and County Cooperative Planning Area	Solano County
Baytrail and Ridge Trail	ABAG
Suisun Valley	Solano County

In the fall of 2012, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and ABAG created a \$10 million regional PCA Pilot Program with \$5 million specifically dedicated to the 4 North Bay Counties of Marin County, Napa County, Solano County, and Sonoma County. This pilot was developed in response to a request from STA, the County of Solano and the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (now Napa Valley Transportation Authority). The funding was included as part of the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program via Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. In follow up, the North Bay MTC Commissioners and Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Directors met on February 28, 2013 and agreed to distribute \$1.25 million to each North Bay county to fund their PCA priorities.

On March 13, 2013, the STA Board approved \$1.175 million fund allocation for the County of Solano for the Suisun Valley Farm to Market Phase 1 Project. Additionally \$75,000 was approved by the STA Board on September 11, 2013 for the development of a Solano PCA Assessment and Implementation Plan to identify the project opportunities within each PCA as well as identify any potential new PCA projects. To accomplish the work, a consultant was selected and a Stakeholder Committee formed.

Discussion: In April 2014, STA secured the consulting services of PMC, and subsequently held six public meetings with the STA's PCA Stakeholder Committee, including a review of the newly-adopted ABAG policies for the function and designation of PCAs. These new policies include the need to identify designation classification for each PCA (Natural Landscape, Agricultural Land, Regional Recreation, or Urban Greening) and supporting data. Over the course of these meetings, the Committee developed recommended boundaries for the existing PCAs and recommended the addition of four new PCAs. The Suisun Marsh and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta are recognized for their local, regional, and state-wide importance, but the committee decided not to recommend them for PCA designation under ABAG's program due to the extensive protection these areas already receive.

Committee-recommended boundaries of existing PCAs and new PCAs were presented to the planning directors, who recommended the County to carry forward this effort. Solano County staff desired more focused boundaries around the locations of future investment, therefore boundaries were adjusted. Ultimately, the County decided not to apply for any new PCA designations.

The Draft Solano PCA Assessment and Implementation Plan culminates the two-year effort to understand and implement the ABAG guidelines and to identify transportation projects to enhance the open space and agricultural land in Solano County. The most noteworthy section of the Plan is the Next Steps section, which contains two important features: a prioritized list of improvement projects within PCAs, and identification of areas which ought to be considered for future PCA designation.

Once the 4Cs has reviewed the Draft Solano PCA Assessment and Implementation Plan, the Plan is scheduled for consideration by the STA Board in June of this year. The STA Board may release the plan for a public comment period prior to adopting the Plan at its July meeting. Once the Plan is adopted, it will guide the allocation of future PCA funds and other investments which support PCA projects. MTC has indicated its continued support for the PCA program which is demonstrated by the increase of program funds in the approaching OBAG 2 cycle. STA expects to receive \$2.5 million dedicated to PCA projects in Solano County, which will be guided by the priorities outlined in the Solano PCA Assessment and Implementation Plan. Attached is the Introduction and map for the PCA Assessment and Implementation Plan.

Recommendation:

Informational only.

Attachment:

1. Introduction and Map - PCA Assessment and Implementation Plan

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of Priority Conservation Areas (PCA) in Solano County—funded through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program—aligns transportation priorities with Plan Bay Area’s land use and housing goals and in doing so, positions Solano County jurisdictions for future funding.

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) created the PCA Public Advisory Committee (PCA PAC)—a stakeholder-based planning process—to identify project opportunities that enhance the County’s already rich agricultural heritage, recreation options, and open space areas, and to identify potential new areas based on PCA Guidelines established by the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Solano County has a long-standing commitment to land conservation. The importance of agriculture and open space to Solano communities has historic roots and is entrenched in the daily lives of residents and workers. As early as the 1950s, Solano County participated in and spearheaded various efforts to ensure the continued protection and viability of its local environment, natural resources, and farmland. The Solano County General Plan affirms that approximately 70 percent of unincorporated land in the county is agricultural (329,000 acres), and 20 percent is comprised of undeveloped natural resources, such as marsh, watershed, or conservation areas.

The PCA guidelines set forth by ABAG provide an excellent avenue to build on conservation efforts in Solano County. By utilizing conservation analysis framed by ABAG guidelines and funding tools associated with One Bay Area, Solano County can position itself to easily fold new areas into its existing conservation structure.

Note that establishing a PCA does not change the zoning, general plan designation, or other land use controls or voter initiatives applicable to the geographic area encompassed by the PCA. Local jurisdictions retain full control over land use decisions, and the designation of PCAs may open up a variety of funding avenues for improvement and preservation projects in the identified areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The PCA PAC recommended nine areas as appropriate for designation as PCAs. This includes five previously adopted PCAs, plus four new areas which the PCA PAC recommended for adoption. The recommendations are based on conformity with the ABAG PCA guidelines criteria, the significance of the area, and identifiable projects with a high potential for future funding options. Although the PCA PAC recommended four new PCA designations, a land use

authority, like a city or county, must be the nominee. At this time, no land use authority chose to nominate additional PCAs, therefore they will be studied and reconsidered at a future time.

The following is a list of the Priority Conservation Areas and potential projects (detailed descriptions in the section Conclusions and Next Steps) identified by the PCA PAC:

1. Blue Ridge Hills | Adopted July 2008

The Blue Ridge Hills is an established PCA, and is part of the Vaca Mountain range bordered by the cities of Vacaville and Fairfield. It meets designation criteria under the Natural Landscapes and Agricultural Lands categories.

Project: To be determined by forthcoming area specific plan

2. Vacaville-Fairfield-Solano Greenbelt and Cement Hill | Adopted July 2008

The boundaries of this existing PCA were adjusted with the recently adopted Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan. It was established to provide recreational opportunities and act as a community separator and buffer between agricultural and urban areas in Solano County. The Vacaville-Fairfield-Solano Greenbelt and Cement Hill PCA meets designation criteria under the Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Urban Greening (Compact Growth) categories.

Project: None identified at this time

3. Suisun Valley | Adopted December 2013

The Suisun Valley PCA was established in 2013 by Solano County. The PCA boundaries correspond to the adopted Suisun Valley Strategic Plan (2008). Solano County is continuing a history of strong protections for the important agricultural land in Suisun Valley and the important access it requires for economic vitality. Similar recent attempts across the country have been coined “farm-to-market.” For Solano, this is not a new trend, but a continuation of a longstanding practice. The Suisun Valley PCA meets designation criteria under all four categories: Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Urban Greening (Compact Growth).

Project: Farm to Market Project

4. Western Hills | Adopted July 2008

The Western Hills PCA was established in 2007 by Solano County. The current planning effort modified the boundaries of the original PCA to match the boundaries of the Solano County General Plan Western Hills Agricultural Region, and to incorporate a portion of the proposed Bay Ridge Trail located north of Vallejo. The Western Hills region is primarily grazing land due to the steep slopes and soil types in the region. The Western Hills PCA

meets designation criteria under the Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Regional Recreation categories.

Project: Rockville Hills Staging Area and Trail Connections

5. Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Area | Adopted July 2008

The Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Area PCA was established in 2007 by Solano County. This PCA includes the Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Area (Cooperative Planning Area) established in 1994 by the Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Group, now called Solano Open Space. The current planning effort modified the original PCA boundaries to match the boundaries of the Cooperative Planning Area. The Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Area PCA meets designation criteria under the Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Regional Recreation categories.

Project: Lynch Canyon Expansion and Vallejo Swett Trails and Bay Area Ridge Trail Expansion

The following is a list of potential Priority Conservation Areas as identified by the committee for future consideration. Consistent with the above list, potential projects (detailed descriptions in the section Conclusions and Next Steps) are listed which identified by the PCA PAC:

6. Putah Creek | Potential Future Designation

This potential PCA includes rolling farmland, wooded hillsides, and canyons along the Putah Creek watershed. The Putah Creek area is an important agricultural center for the community and contains some of the most valuable agricultural land in the county. The Putah Creek area qualifies for PCA designation under the criteria for Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Regional Recreation categories.

Projects: Putah Creek Road; Stevenson Bridge Improvements

7. Dixon Agricultural Service Area | Potential Future Designation

This proposed PCA covers a portion of the Dixon Ridge Agricultural Region identified in the County General Plan. It includes mostly flat, low-lying farmland used for field crops and several large-scale agricultural processing facilities. The area has multiple businesses that sell goods directly to the market including a produce market and pumpkin patch and corn maze. This area also includes land that supports the larger watershed. The Dixon Agricultural Service Area qualifies for PCA designation under the criteria for Natural Landscapes and Agricultural Lands categories.

Project: Pedrick Road Overcrossing

8. Mare Island | Potential Future Designation

Mare Island is the oldest arsenal in the Pacific, and was closed on April 1, 1996. The Island is now protected under multiple layers of historical and environmental conservation. Over two-thirds of the area is either wetlands or inactive dredge pond, and nine percent has been designated for parks and recreational use. The Mare Island area qualifies for PCA designation under the criteria for Natural Landscapes, Regional Recreation, and Urban Greening categories.

Project: None identified at this time

9. Elmira | Potential Future Designation

Elmira is part of a distinct agricultural area to the south of Dixon and the east of Vacaville. The Elmira area qualifies for PCA designation under the criteria for Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Urban Greening (Compact Growth) categories.

After each focus area and its benefits were identified, PMC prepared summary reports for each proposed PCA, consisting of a description of the area and its location, the criteria benefits it exhibits, and associated maps. The summary reports are presented in **Appendix 1**. These reports are formatted as PCA applications in order to streamline future submittal to ABAG or other grantor agencies.

The projects listed above are profiled in **Appendix 2**. As OBAG funding and funding from other sources becomes available to support these projects, STA will coordinate with lead agencies to use the information collected within this report to support grant applications.

Potential Solano County PCAs

Priority Conservation Area

- 1 - Blue Ridge Hills (Vaca Mountains)
- 2 - Vacaville-Fairfield-Sobano Greenbelt and Cement Hill
- 3 - Suisun Valley
- 4 - Western Hills
- 5 - Tri City and County Cooperative Planning Area

Basemap Layers

- Roadway
- Highway
- Railroad
- Streams and Creeks
- Major Water Features
- Water Trail Facilities
- Existing Destination
- Planned Destination
- Existing Launch
- Planned Launch
- Existing and Proposed Trail Network
- Bay Trail
- Planned Bay Trail
- Other/Ridge Trail
- Planned Other/Ridge Trail

General Plan Land Use Designations

- Natural Resource Designations
- Water Bodies and Courses
- Park and Recreation
- Marsh
- Agricultural Designations
- Watershed
- Agriculture

City Limits

- Sphere of Influence
- Tri-City/County Cooperative Planning Area
- Adjacent Counties

