

**Comparison of Proposition 218 Campaigns**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Contra Costa Clean Water Program</b>	<b>City of Palo Alto</b>	<b>City of San Clemente</b>
<b>Campaign Name</b>	Community Clean Water Initiative	Stormwater Management Fee	Clean Ocean Program Fee
<b>Implementation Mechanism</b>	Contra Costa Clean Water Program	City of Palo Alto Storm Drain Program	City of San Clemente Urban Runoff Management Plan
<b>First Year on Ballot</b>	2012 (40% approval) – ballot measure failed	2000 (37% approval) – ballot measure failed	2002 (57% approval)
<b>Subsequent Approvals</b>	No additional ballot measures attempted	2005 (58% approval) 2017 (64% approval)	2007 (75% approval) 2013 (53% approval)
<b>Utility Fee Calculations</b>	Determined by parcel's expected runoff contribution based on estimate of impervious area	Based on Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) defined as 2,500 square feet of impervious area typical of Palo Alto single-family residential property	Determined by parcel's expected runoff contribution based on estimate of impervious area
<b>Annual Rate</b>	\$12 – \$22 single family residential fee (rate varies based on watershed)	\$163.80 single family residential fee (includes \$89.76 ERU base fee plus \$74.04 project and infrastructure fee)	\$74.76 single family residential fee (public street)
<b>Provision for Rate Increase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed fee can only be increased in accordance with the Consumer Price Index, or two percent, whichever is less</li> <li>Fee period not to exceed 10 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project and infrastructure portion of the annual fee will sunset in 15 years unless renewed by another vote</li> <li>The amount of the annual increase is limited to the increase in the rate of local inflation or 6 percent, whichever is less</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, the fee is fixed for the duration of the ballot measure</li> <li>Fee period will end in 2020</li> </ul>
<b>Primary Program Functions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet State and Federal water quality requirements</li> <li>Pollution prevention</li> <li>Trash reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet State and Federal water quality requirements</li> <li>Protect local water quality</li> <li>Preventing flooding</li> <li>Reduce runoff flows to prevent creek bank erosion</li> <li>Creation of policies to increase rainfall infiltration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet State and Federal water quality requirements</li> <li>Protect local water quality</li> <li>Protect public health and safety of beachgoers, swimmers, and surfers</li> <li>Enhance “beach town” aesthetics and tourism</li> </ul>

<b>Program Elements funded by Proposed Fee</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treat polluted stormwater and dry weather runoff</li> <li>• Prevent pollution from entering local waterways, the Delta, and the Bay</li> <li>• Prevent flooding</li> <li>• Protect sources of clean drinking water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storm drain system construction projects</li> <li>• Green storm water infrastructure projects</li> <li>• Commercial and residential rebate programs</li> <li>• Floodplain management programs</li> <li>• Debris and litter reduction</li> <li>• Public and residential Integrated Pest Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Runoff treatment projects</li> <li>• Pollution Prevention Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ street sweeping; catch basin inspection and cleaning</li> <li>○ water quality testing; commercial</li> <li>○ industrial, and construction inspections</li> <li>○ spill cleanups and storm drain maintenance</li> <li>○ enforcement of anti-pollution ordinances</li> <li>○ public outreach and education</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder Input</b>	None described	11-member Storm Drain Blue Ribbon Committee	City of San Clemente Coastal Advisory Committee
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>	None described	City Council will appoint an Oversight Committee to ensure that the money raised from the Stormwater Management Fee is spent in accordance with the ballot measure language	None described
<b>Factors Influencing Voter Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative press coverage</li> <li>• Public insufficiently informed about Proposition 218 process and property-related fees</li> <li>• The ballot pamphlet and mailer did not contain an impartial analysis of the initiative, nor arguments for and against the funding measure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community-based funding proposal</li> <li>• Sunset provision</li> <li>• Cap on annual increases</li> <li>• Establishment of independent oversight committee</li> <li>• Vocal support by City Council members</li> <li>• Clear, informative ballot materials</li> <li>• Positive press coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of stakeholder group</li> <li>• Strong support from Surfrider Foundation</li> <li>• Strong support from community members</li> <li>• Little opposition to Program fee</li> </ul>
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCCWP relied upon voter education only; no advocacy efforts were made</li> </ul>	With respect to Year 2000 ballot measure failure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of sunset clause</li> <li>• Potential for uncontrolled inflationary fee increases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City adopted an Urban Water Management Plan that included capital projects</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of recognizable projects failed to win support</li> <li>• Member agencies (cities) wavered in their support</li> <li>• Impact of negative press was unanticipated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of provision for independent public oversight</li> <li>• Low support from City Council</li> <li>• Negative press coverage</li> <li>• Organized opposition to ballot measure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean water goals resonated with community as quality-of-life issues</li> <li>• Surfrider Foundation supported measure and campaigned for it</li> <li>• Opinion polling helped identify community priorities</li> </ul>
<b>External Links</b>	[ Insert 1 and 2 below ]	[ link to 3 below ]	[ Insert 4 below ]

1 <https://www.mercurynews.com/2012/05/07/contra-costa-water-fee-defeated/>

2 <http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/fwg/1019CCC2012CleanWaterFunding.pdf>

3 San Clemente - Clean Ocean Fee FAQ Revised\_Oct2013

4 <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/news/displaynews.asp?NewsID=3679>