



Local Agency Formation Commission of Napa County
Subdivision of the State of California

1700 Second Street, Suite 268
Napa, California 94559
Telephone: (707) 259-8645
Facsimile: (707) 251-1053
<http://napa.lafco.ca.gov>

August 1, 2011
Agenda Item No. 7b (Action)

July 25, 2011

TO: Local Agency Formation Commission

FROM: Keene Simonds, Executive Officer

SUBJECT: Report on California Forward

The Commission will receive a report from staff summarizing the initiative efforts undertaken by California Forward to restructure governance relationships and duties throughout the state. The report follows a discussion by the Commission at the June 2011 meeting and is accompanied by a draft comment letter presented for Chair signature.

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) are political subdivisions of the State of California responsible for administering a section of Government Code now known as the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (“CKH”). LAFCOs are located in all 58 counties and are delegated regulatory responsibilities to coordinate the logical formation and development of local governmental agencies and municipal services. Specific regulatory duties include approving or disapproving proposals involving the establishment, expansion, and reorganization of cities and special districts. LAFCOs inform their regulatory duties through a series of planning activities, namely preparing municipal service reviews and sphere of influence updates.

A. Background

California Forward (“CAFWD”) is a non-profit organization formed in 2007 dedicated to restructuring governance relationships and duties throughout the state. Funding for CAFWD is principally drawn from the California Endowment, Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, James Irvine Foundation, and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. CAFWD’s adopted mission is as follows:

“Work with Californians to help create a "smart" government – one that’s small enough to listen, big enough to tackle real problems, smart enough to spend our money wisely in good times and bad, and honest enough to be held accountable for results.”

CAFWD’s advocacy efforts have evolved recently and the organization is now working in the direction of drafting a statewide ballot initiative with the goal of qualifying for the general election in November 2012. Underlying the initiative effort is implementing CAFWD’s “Smart Government Framework Plan” consisting of five tiered proposals aimed at restructuring and improving governance performance. Most significantly on a statewide level, this includes orienting the State’s general fund expenditures to focus on achieving five priority outcomes referred to by CAFWD as the “Big Five”:

Lewis Chilton, Vice Chair
Councilmember, Town of Yountville

Bill Dodd, Chair
County of Napa Supervisor, 4th District

Brian J. Kelly, Commissioner
Representative of the General Public

Joan Bennett, Commissioner
Councilmember, City of American Canyon

Brad Wagenknecht, Commissioner
County of Napa Supervisor, 1st District

Gregory Rodeno, Alternate Commissioner
Representative of the General Public

Juliana Inman, Alternate Commissioner
Councilmember, City of Napa

Mark Luce, Alternate Commissioner
County of Napa Supervisor, 2nd District

Keene Simonds
Executive Officer

- Increase Employment
- Improve Education
- Decrease Poverty
- Reduce Crime
- Improve Health

CAFWD's Smart Government Framework Plan also takes aim at shifting more fiscal authority to local agencies with respect to certain services, such as health and human services. Accomplishing this reform is predicated on CAFWD's five tiered draft proposals identified in short-form as 1) focusing on outcomes, 2) aligning authority with responsibility, 3) adjusting the State role, 4) fostering regional collaboration, and 5) encouraging integration and consolidation.

B. Discussion

It is the fifth and final proposal in CAFWD's Smart Government Framework Plan – encouraging integration and consolidation – that is particularly relevant to the Commission given its potential impact on the role and function of LAFCOs. Markedly, at the time of the Commission's initial review at the June 6, 2011 meeting, the fifth proposal identified two implementing options, both of which would affect, directly and indirectly, LAFCOs. Option "5a" proposed LAFCOs work with their regional councils of government (COGs) in standardizing data collection in municipal service reviews with particular emphasis on exploring consolidation opportunities. Option "5b" proposed the creation of a new independent statewide commission to conduct studies on local governmental services and efficiencies with particular emphasis on exploring consolidation opportunities.

Subsequent to the Commission's June 6th review and discussion, CAFWD updated its Smart Government Framework Plan to significantly amend the fifth proposal addressing integration and consolidation. Options 5a and 5b have been deleted and replaced with a single broad proposal to further empower LAFCOs in fulfilling existing mandates with increased focus on performance measures as part of the municipal service review process. The updated fifth proposal would also make joint-powers authorities (JPAs) subject to LAFCO review as well as direct county offices of education to work with LAFCOs in reviewing the boundaries and organization of local school districts.

C. Analysis

Staff is cautiously encouraged by the changes made by CAFWD as part of its updated Smart Government Framework Plan as it relates to LAFCOs. In particular, as initially provided, the fifth proposal and its Options 5a and 5b appeared problematic – albeit to different degrees – in terms of potentially undermining LAFCOs authority and/or autonomy. The decision to eliminate these options, consequently, is a positive. The updated fifth proposal, conversely, centers on recognizing and expanding LAFCOs' authority with added focus on performance evaluation; an area the Commission has already oriented staff to emphasize in the current round of municipal service reviews.

With regard to specifics tied to the updated fifth proposal, staff believes expanding the scope of LAFCOs' municipal service reviews to include JPAs appears reasonable given these arrangements have increasingly assumed more responsibility in delivering essential municipal services in support of urban development; a trend that will presumably continue within the indefinite future given the constraints on local funding resources. Discretion, however, should be provided to LAFCOs given many JPAs simply serve as financing conduits for public agencies in sharing infrastructure and equipment costs, and therefore would not necessarily merit detailed assessment in a municipal service review. Similarly, notwithstanding the inevitable political angst, directing county offices of education to work with LAFCOs in preparing studies on local schools districts has merit in terms of establishing a formal intertie in addressing the relationship between LAFCO-facilitated growth and development and local school resources.

CAFWD's updated fifth proposal remains subject to additional changes as they begin to finalize an actual initiative proposal for circulation later this year. It is unclear at this time whether CAFWD will propose policy goals or implementation measures as part of its initiative. Regardless, given CAFWD's commitment to bring this item before voters in November 2012, staff believes it would be appropriate as well as beneficial for the Commission to formally comment on these proceedings before they are finalized. Staff, accordingly, has prepared a draft comment letter for Commission consideration expanding on the issues outlined in the preceding paragraphs as well as incorporating general policy comments raised by Commissioners at the June 6th meeting.

Note: The majority of comments raised by the Commission at the June 6th meeting were specific to Options 5a and 5b; options that have now been deleted. As a result, staff fully expects the Commission to amend the draft comment letter as needed given the new proposal language relating to LAFCOs.

D. Alternatives for Commission Action

The following three actions are available for Commission consideration.

Alternative One: Approve by motion authorization for the Chair to sign the attached draft comment letter to CAFWD with or without additional modifications as specified.

Alternative Two: Continue consideration to a future meeting while providing additional direction to staff as needed.

Alternative Three: Take no action.

E. Recommendation

The Committee recommends Alternative One as outlined in the preceding section.

F. Procedures for Consideration

The following procedures are recommended with respect to the Commission's consideration of this item:

- 1) Receive verbal report from staff;
- 2) Invite public comment; and
- 3) Discuss item and consider action on recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

Keene Simonds
Executive Officer

Attachments:

- 1) Draft Comment Letter to CAFWD
- 2) CAFWD's Smart Government Framework Plan



Local Agency Formation Commission of Napa County
 Subdivision of the State of California

1700 Second Street, Suite 268
 Napa, California 94559
 Telephone: (707) 259-8645
 Facsimile: (707) 251-1053
<http://napa.lafco.ca.gov>

August 1, 2011

Mr. James P. Mayer, Executive Director
 California Forward
 1107 9th Street, Suite 650
 Sacramento, California 95814

SUBJECT: California Forward's Smart Government Framework Plan

Mr. Mayer:

The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Napa County has reviewed California Forward's (CAFWD) July 11, 2011 update to its Smart Government Framework Plan and its five tiered proposals to restructure and improve governance performance. Napa LAFCO is particularly interested in the fifth proposal – encouraging integration and consolidation – given its direct impact on the role and function of LAFCOs. Specifically, the fifth proposal seeks to further empower LAFCOs in fulfilling existing mandates with increased focus on performance measures as part of the municipal service review process. The fifth proposal would also make joint-powers authorities (JPAs) subject to LAFCO review as well as empower county offices of education to work with LAFCOs in reviewing the boundaries and organization of local school districts.

Napa LAFCO understands CAFWD is currently working to finalize its Smart Government Framework Plan as part of an actual initiative(s) for circulation later this year in anticipation of qualifying as a ballot initiative for the November 2012 general election. With these preceding factors in mind, Napa LAFCO respectfully offers the following comments as it relates to both the Smart Government Framework Plan and the public policy issues underlying this effort.

- Napa LAFCO agrees with a key premise underlying the Smart Government Framework Plan's fifth proposal to make it easier to reorganize and consolidate local governmental agencies and their services *when appropriate*; the latter emphasis relevant given bigger government does not always lead to better government. Possible solutions meriting review include expanding LAFCOs' authority under Government Code Section 56375 with regard to initiating changes of organization as well as streamlining Revenue and Taxation Code Section 99 to help expedite property tax exchange agreements for jurisdictional changes.

Lewis Chilton, Vice Chair
 Councilmember, Town of Yountville

Joan Bennett, Commissioner
 Councilmember, City of American Canyon

Juliana Inman, Alternate Commissioner
 Councilmember, City of Napa

Bill Dodd, Chair
 County of Napa Supervisor, 4th District

Brad Wagenknecht, Commissioner
 County of Napa Supervisor, 1st District

Mark Luce, Alternate Commissioner
 County of Napa Supervisor, 2nd District

Brian J. Kelly, Commissioner
 Representative of the General Public

Gregory Rodeno, Alternate Commissioner
 Representative of the General Public

Keene Simonds
 Executive Officer

- Expanding LAFCOs' municipal service review process to include JPAs appears reasonable since these arrangements have increasingly assumed more responsibility in delivering essential municipal services in support of urban development; a trend that will presumably continue within the indefinite future given the economy and restraints on local funding resources. However, since many of these arrangements function only to facilitate shared ownership in public facilities and equipment, it would be appropriate to provide LAFCOs discretion in determining which JPAs should be included in the municipal service reviews based on local conditions.
- Similar to the preceding comment, directing county offices of education to work with LAFCOs in preparing studies on local schools districts has merit in terms of establishing a formal intertie in addressing the relationship between LAFCO-facilitated growth and development and local school resources. The extent of LAFCOs participation, though, would need to be carefully defined given the political dynamics existing between communities and their school districts.
- LAFCOs funding is generally dependent on annual apportionments from local agencies; a small amount of cost-recovery is also generated from service charges. Expanding LAFCOs' responsibilities raises the potential for requiring more funding from local agencies at a time many are struggling to remain solvent. CAFWD, accordingly, should explore revenue enhancement opportunities to help ensure any new LAFCO requirements are appropriately funded.

Napa LAFCO appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on CAFWD's Smart Government Framework Plan. Napa LAFCO also appreciates the time and effort expended by your staff in addressing this important public policy issue. Should you have any questions, please contact Napa LAFCO Executive Officer Keene Simonds at your earliest convenience by telephone at (707) 259-8645 or by e-mail at ksimonds@napa.lafco.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Bill Dodd
Chair

cc: William Chiat, Executive Director, CALAFCO
SR Jones, Executive Officer, CALAFCO



Smart Government: Making California Work Again

California may be struggling with a budget crisis and a sluggish economy – but we can fix it. Our state can have a prosperous and environmentally sustainable economy that provides equal opportunities for all, while remaining a frontier for innovation, creativity, discovery, and enterprise.

To get there, governments at the state and local levels must work together to provide cost-effective services and better results. *California Forward* calls this *Smart Government*. It doesn't happen today as much as it should.

California has a nearly \$90 billion budget without a unified vision and strategy for achieving statewide goals. Taxpayers have little sense of how tax dollars are being used, whether public programs are working, and who to hold accountable. The root of this problem lies in the state's fragmented system of government: Most essential services in California are delivered by local governments – counties, cities, school districts, and special districts. But for the last thirty years, the state government has been setting most of the rules around how the money is spent.

This growing gap between local service providers and fiscal authority has only increased the distance between more than 36 million Californians and their government. Until this relationship between the state and local governments is fundamentally reformed, the state's ongoing budget crisis cannot fully be resolved, Californians will not be able to fully

participate in their government, and the state's government cannot function effectively.

In the **Smart Government Framework**, *California Forward* outlines a strategic action plan for solving this problem.

First, the state must be more explicit about its strategy by establishing a clearly-defined set of priorities for public programs. It also must give local governments more flexibility over both programs and revenues to improve results. Counties should have greater authority for human services and community corrections – and they must be encouraged to integrate these services with other local programs and coordinate their efforts with other local governments. In exchange for this increased authority, California's local governments must be more transparent about their progress and more accountable for these programs' results.

The *Smart Government Framework* is built upon a simple idea: The three biggest areas of state government spending in the General Fund – education, health and human services, and public safety – are fundamentally interrelated. Better education leads to better jobs, which leads to a healthier population, less crime, and, ultimately, less pressure on government budgets. Programs addressing these challenges must work together – with a renewed focus on transparency and accountability for results – to achieve safer communities, increased employment, reduced poverty, improved health, and educational success.



Smart Government: Making California Work Again

Introduction	1
A Smart Government Framework:	
1. Focus on Outcomes	3
2. Align Authority and Responsibility	9
3. Adjust the State Role	17
4. Foster Regional Collaboration	20
5. Evaluate Efficiency of Operations	23
Implementing with Accountability	26
Conclusion	27
Appendix	28

Note: *The Smart Government Framework and the draft proposals are a course of action to restructure the state/local relationship to produce better results for taxpayers and people who rely on government services. These ideas are being collaboratively developed with local government practitioners, stakeholders, and experts involved in a Local Government Task Force, a series of Stakeholder Roundtables, and California Forward’s “Speak Up California” civic engagement forums. (See Appendix 4 for details.)*

Each chapter ends with a principle statement defining the Smart Government approach, followed by a detailed draft proposal. These proposals are intended to facilitate discussions regarding governance in California and to reflect the good ideas generated by this statewide conversation. They are not at this point California Forward recommendations, nor are they specific legislative proposals. All five proposals can be found in the Conclusion beginning on pg. 26.

Introduction

The goal of *California Forward* is a state government that works. The California state budget crisis cannot be fully resolved without fundamental reform that restructures the relationship between state and local governments. The following pages outline the essential steps California will need to take to develop a new governance model that promotes a culture of performance and accountability.

This goal is shaped by the “Three Es:” At every level, government should be making simultaneous progress toward achieving:

1. Prosperous **E**conomy
2. Quality **E**nvironment
3. Community **E**quity

Californians need to know what they are getting for their tax dollars and what government is achieving. The three biggest components of state general fund spending – education, health and human services, and public safety – are fundamentally interrelated. Better education leads to better jobs, which leads to a healthier population, less crime, and, ultimately, less pressure on government budgets. Too often, these relationships are obscured by the current state government structure.

This Framework offers a straightforward approach to addressing this problem: It proposes five priority outcomes that serve as leading indicators for the largest state general fund expenditures. The intention is to focus structural and fiscal governance reforms on these Big Five Outcomes, not just to balance the budget or close a shortfall – but to realign public programs at all levels to deliver these results:

BIG FIVE OUTCOMES

- Increased Employment
- Improved Education
- Decreased Poverty
- Decreased Crime
- Improved Health

The current state and local structure is failing on several levels: The state struggles to ensure that statewide interests are met, while also complicating the efforts of local governments to hold down costs and provide effective services.

- Part of the reason for this is organizational: For decades, a plethora of state departments and scores of programs have been aimed at addressing one narrow aspect of complex social and economic issues. This organizational evolution has made it difficult to integrate these efforts.
- At the local level, hundreds of autonomous agencies make it politically difficult to shift priorities, share resources, reduce costs, and collaborate on shared goals.
- Budget volatility and legislative mandates restricting how money can be spent make it difficult for local leaders to integrate efforts to improve long-term results.

“This is not a parlor game. It’s not just an exercise. Across the country, a discussion has started about how we will deliver services in the 21st century. This is the tip of the spear of that discussion.”

- **Ron Loveridge**, Mayor of the City of Riverside

*Testimony at a Stakeholder Roundtable meeting
March 31, 2011*

This Framework is predicated on three principles developed by the Local Government Task Force, a group of current and former city and county officials who helped to conceive this approach to state/local restructuring:

- Public programs should work collaboratively with a focus on shared outcomes. These outcomes should guide policy development, management decisions, and ultimately, accountability, through public reporting of results.
- Fiscal control is essential if local governments are going to be empowered to integrate services, innovate, develop better practices, and achieve economies of scale.
- Regional collaboration can make many services more efficient and effective by allowing local governments to meet large-scale challenges by developing more cohesive service delivery strategies across jurisdictions.

1. Focus on Outcomes

The State of California has a nearly \$90 billion budget without a unified vision and strategy for achieving statewide goals. To improve the performance of public programs, state and local operations must be aligned with measurable outcomes. This will not only allow taxpayers to determine whether these programs are achieving their goals, it also will better serve California’s most vulnerable populations.

A comprehensive restructuring of the roles of state and local government must include a range of new measurement tools that will provide information about public progress – and give governments the ability to identify priorities and assess strategic choices. These tools will be especially important for integrating strategies and services and developing a range of new partnerships – among public agencies and between public entities and the private sector. These tools also will be an essential part of creating a new paradigm that allows citizens to better engage with their government by creating more transparency and accountability.

The state will need to set some basic standards for outcomes for public services – reflecting statewide interests and objectives. But more detailed performance metrics will need to be developed at the regional and community levels. Many states and many regional and community governments in California already have adopted a standard format of overarching statewide Outcomes, targeted Indicators, and ongoing Performance Measures.

- Outcomes:** The state’s long-term goals should be expressed in terms of desired outcomes. These outcomes should be embedded in the state budget and used in reviewing policies and creating strategic plans, along with other decision-making venues, to sharpen priorities and inform trade-offs.
- Indicators of Success:** To determine whether the state is making progress toward its highest priorities, outcomes should be tied to indicators like employment rates, graduation rates, obesity rates, and crime rates. Indicators should inform debates among policymakers and managers on what needs to change in strategies, practices, and personnel to accelerate progress.
- Performance Measures:** To gauge whether state programs and services are producing the desired results, performance measures are needed to measure program effectiveness and efficiency. These performance measures need to be benchmarked against those in other agencies and states to identify opportunities for improvement.

WHAT THIS MIGHT LOOK LIKE: EMPLOYMENT AS AN EXAMPLE

Outcome	Increased Employment
Indicator	State Unemployment Rate
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number – Families Participating in CalWORKs • Ratio – Case Manager/Participant • Number – CalWORKs Participants Obtaining Employment

The Benefits of Integration and Collaboration: Developing outcomes-based programs and integrated services can be a challenge in California today. But even with the many limitations imposed by our current system, some communities have found ways to focus their programs on collaboration and other changes to improve performance. See below for several examples of counties that have integrated the services they provide – in partnership with cities, schools, and special districts – to improve outcomes. (See Appendix 2 for more examples.)

- San Diego County:** In the 10 years since the county began integrating the agencies responsible for public health, mental health, alcohol and drug treatment, and foster care, the restructured programs have generated a total of \$230 million in savings for the county that have been reinvested in performance-based front-line services. Restructuring has helped the county streamline administrative overhead from 21 percent when integration began to less than 12 percent today.
- San Mateo County:** To encourage county agencies to work together to mitigate the health issues of the county's most vulnerable people, San Mateo has pooled the resources of three large agencies – human services, juvenile probation and mental health services. These agencies meet once a week to make joint decisions about shared clients. Over the past 10 years, restructuring has resulted in a 50 percent reduction in the number of children being placed out of home, while also reducing levels of incarceration, homelessness, and hospitalization.
- Alameda County:** Using a Joint Powers Authority, the county has institutionalized an integrated service plan that allows programs from the county, the city of Oakland, and the Oakland Unified School District to work together to keep kids in school, lower Oakland's high school suspension rates, and reduce crime. The program has thrived for over a decade, through six superintendents and four mayors. "When we put our staff into the schools, these kids become our kids," says Dave Kears, special assistant to the county administrator. "It doesn't matter who signs the paychecks. What we discovered was, 'We can't do this by ourselves.'"

"We did this with all of the challenges of silos, and all of the minutiae we have to deal with locally. In spite of all that, we were able to make change happen. Just think of what we could do if we had the flexibility we need."

- **Nick Macchione**, director of the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency

Testimony before the Senate Committee on Governance and Finance, January 26, 2011

Lessons Learned: There is an emerging consensus among members of the Stakeholder Roundtables about how the lessons learned from these local efforts can be applied to statewide restructuring, especially in the three most significant areas of government spending – education, health and human services, and public safety. (Details about the ongoing Stakeholder Roundtable dialogues can be found at CAFWD.org/stakeholders.)

- **Education:** There is support for integration both within education programs and between schools and other programs. These efforts will be vital to improving student performance and addressing goals like closing the achievement gap. This would involve two steps:
 - The school system itself benefits from integration. The state has separate early childhood, K-12, and higher education programs, many of which do not communicate as much as needed, or work together to create a seamless workforce or higher education pipeline.
 - Health, welfare, and public safety programs benefit from links to schools such as in the form of community schools, full-service schools, and joint-use schools.
- **Health and Human Services:** There is support for integration and information-sharing in the areas of juvenile justice, child welfare, child mental health, and behavioral health programs. Improved results in these areas will not only help the most vulnerable Californians – they also have the potential for huge savings across the safety net, including: Reduced Medi-Cal expenses; Reduced incarceration rates; Reduced employee health costs; Increased tax revenues from a more economically productive population.
- **Public Safety:** There is substantial evidence that the most cost-effective public safety strategies in other states involve a continuum of programs aimed at prevention, early intervention, community corrections, incarceration, and offender re-entry. These efforts also require an integration of services: Many community-based programs have demonstrated the potential benefits of this approach, and, in recent years, California policymakers have attempted to move in this direction. The state has not developed a comprehensive approach, however – or effectively implemented small-scale efforts to deploy programs that have cost-effectively reduced crime in other states.

“For restructuring the fiscal relationship between state and local governments, this is the time. We can all agree on that. The stars are aligned, but that’s not a guarantee of anything other than the stars are aligned. We have an opportunity, and we need to take advantage of it.”

- **Senator Lois Wolk**
Chair, Senate Committee on Governance and Finance

Testimony at a Stakeholder Roundtable meeting, March 10, 2011

PRINCIPLE I

California government must be aligned to a clear, unified vision, and restructured to focus decision-making on improving performance, with a renewed emphasis on the clients of public programs. The new structure must systematically encourage decision-makers to change policies, budgets, personnel, and practices to improve results – and the public knowledge of these results is essential to restore accountability to the people.

DRAFT PROPOSAL I – FOCUS ON OUTCOMES

Aligning program outcomes with larger statewide goals should follow a standard cascading format – similar to those already used in other states – of overarching outcomes, targeted indicators, and ongoing performance measures. Putting this into practice will involve four major steps:

1. **Stakeholders:** A widespread stakeholder process involving both state agencies and local governments will be necessary to establish desired program outcomes. This process could include the development of a menu of tangible goals within each outcome (e.g. “All 3rd-graders should be able to read at a 3rd-grade level” or “The state’s dropout rate should be cut in half”) that communities can choose from.
2. **Strategy:** Community stakeholders should be responsible for drafting strategic plans that set local goals, define community strategies, and identify the right partnerships to get the job done. These local strategic plans should include a 4-year implementation timeline to allow for enough time to restructure administrative functions, integrate programs, and enhance the system based on actual practice. These plans should also include sustainability protections, so they can be implemented through multiple administrations.
3. **Transparency and Accountability for results:** As local governments begin to carry out their strategies, local leaders should conduct regular, structured meetings to review and evaluate program performance against these targets.
4. **Flexibility:** The state, meanwhile, should allow local agencies flexibility in how those outcomes are achieved so the development of collaborative services can build on different communities’ strengths. (See Proposals 2 and 3.)

Many states and local governments throughout California have adopted a standard format for refocusing programs on improving results. This includes gauging progress toward a set of overarching statewide Outcomes, targeted Indicators, and ongoing Performance Measures.

Outcomes:

- The state’s long-term goals should be expressed in terms of desired outcomes, with particular emphasis on the Big Five Outcomes – Increased Employment, Improved Education, Decreased Poverty, Decreased Crime, and Improved Health.
- Investments by the state and local government should be evaluated against these outcomes.

Indicators of Success:

- Indicators are the specific measure communities should use to evaluate the progress they are making toward the Big Five Outcomes.
- At least three Indicators of Success in each of these outcome areas should be developed by local governments in consultation with the state within the first year of implementation. The Indicators of Success should be in line with state (and where appropriate, national) objectives and approved by legislators.
- Cities, counties, schools, and special districts should develop a multi-year strategy and an annual action plan for achieving these Indicators of Success, relying where possible on proven and evidence-based practices. The strategies should be presented and discussed in locally appropriate public venues. In many counties, county Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCo) may be the appropriate venue for these presentations. (As described in Proposal 5, LAFCos should expand their existing role and begin collecting standardized data on the quantity, cost, and effectiveness of local governments. Schools should continue to present their performance data to the state – as they do today – but the state’s role should change as described in Proposal 3.)

Performance Measures:

- Performance measures help provide context to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the services delivered. (“What does it cost to achieve this outcome?” “What’s the trend in the service level?”)
- Progress made by cities, counties, schools, and special districts toward achieving these indicators should be included in the LAFCo performance reviews.
- This county performance information should also be published as a report card on the state website and should be used to make programmatic and fiscal decisions at the state and county levels.

POTENTIAL MODELS (see these and more online at CAFWD.org/bestpractices)

- [State of Maryland StateStat](#): Modeled after the CitiStat performance-measurement and management tool that has been successfully implemented in Baltimore, StateStat uses a data-based management approach to make public programs more efficient and accountable by continually evaluating state performance. Key public safety, health, and social services agencies are already involved, from the Department of Juvenile Services to the Department of Housing and Community Development.
- [NYCStat](#): NYCStat is New York City’s one-stop-shop for all essential data, reports, and statistics related to City services. NYCStat provides access to a wide array of performance-related information, including citywide and agency-specific information, 311-related data, and interactive mapping features for selecting performance data and quality-of-life indicators.
- [Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services](#): Building off the nationally recognized STATS models in New York and Maryland, the LA County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) adopted STATS in 2004 as a tool to manage its operations.

After a four-month pilot, the nation's largest administrator of federal welfare programs increased its results dramatically, with the percentage of district offices meeting targeted performance jumping by over 25 percent. Between 2004 and 2008, STATS helped the department improve outcomes across an array of metrics. Its food stamps error rate alone—which once had one of the highest rates in the country at over 20 percent—was brought down to less than 1 percent. This one case of improved performance helped the county avoid federal penalties of \$143 million in only two fiscal years.

- [Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health](#): The LA County Department of Mental Health also launched a STATS effort in 2007 in order to address a range of management challenges, from a lack of clarity about DMH priorities among line managers to a set of inconsistent metrics by which executives were monitoring operations. After adopting a regular, structured meeting to review and evaluate program performance against targets, outcomes improved dramatically: Within two years, the timeliness of billing and collection improved, as did monitoring reductions in homelessness among clients receiving community-based services. DMH was also able to provide more timely access to outpatient care following psychiatric hospitalizations.
- [Minnesota's Drive to Excellence](#): The Drive to Excellence (2005-2010) was a state-government reform initiative that focused on serving citizens better. The overarching objective was to encourage government to act together as an enterprise, rather than independent agencies, on the issues they have in common. Drive to Excellence identified common processes across government that can be improved with common solutions, such as standardized computers or a universal system for managing the state's buildings.
- [Washington State Priorities of Government](#): This budget approach creates a strategic framework for public investment decisions, prioritizing activities that guide the governor's budget proposal to the Legislature – and helping communicate that budget to the public. As part of the Priorities of Government plan, every agency in Washington has been asked to answer eight questions related to whether their activities are essential to state government and whether they are being delivered in the most cost-effective manner.
- [Virginia Performs](#): A performance leadership and accountability system within state government, Virginia Performs aligns specific state agency outcomes with larger statewide goals. Outlining a vision for Virginia's future – including responsible economic growth, an enviable quality of life, good government, and a well-educated citizenry – the state has defined key metrics like obesity in adults, graduation rates, and acres of land preserved to gauge whether it is getting results on its highest priorities.

2. Align Authority and Revenue with Responsibility for Results

To achieve the outcomes described above, local governments will need more authority to integrate services and collaborate with other agencies. The goal of restructuring is not to move all functions from the state to local governments, but to ensure the most appropriate alignment at each level of government of both program operations and fiscal control to get the job done.

For more than 125 years, Californians have thrived with a bottoms-up approach to community governments. With few exceptions, most of the state's local governments were created by groups of people using state statutory procedures to provide services and regulate land-use based on local preferences. This system of locally controlled community government – cities, counties, school districts, community colleges, and special purpose districts – has been a hallmark of California's system of governing. The desire to reinvigorate local governance should build on this tradition, with the state continuing to maintain some responsibility where appropriate.

2011 Realignment: In his 2011-2012 budget, the Governor and the Legislature have taken a substantial step toward greater local control by moving program and fiscal responsibility over a range of public safety and health and human services programs from the state to local governments. These programs include a group of local public safety programs, along with mental health, substance abuse, foster care, child welfare services, and adult protective services. The budget provides local governments with \$5.6 billion to operate these programs with revenue from 1 cent of the state sales tax with a portion of revenues from the Vehicle License Fee.

The 2011 Realignment serves as a cornerstone for the comprehensive restructuring proposal that is outlined in this document. Its strengths include a community focus and its alignment of programmatic responsibility with fiscal authority.

Smart Government Restructuring: Long-term, comprehensive restructuring should take the next step. It should not only encourage communities to integrate services with a focus on improving results, it should also constitutionally guarantee this local revenue – something the Governor's budget does not do. In exchange for this new program and revenue authority, local governments should be required to have a strategy for improving outcomes, be transparent about their progress, and be held accountable for these programs' results. Regional coordinating bodies should also be given the authority they need to develop a region-wide system for addressing infrastructure, environmental, and workforce development issues, as well as crime prevention, law enforcement, and reentry. The state should also expand its effort to evaluate the efficiency of local operations to reduce complexity, reduce costs, and improve performance.

This comprehensive restructuring will require shifting both (1) program authority and (2) fiscal authority to local governments:

I. Program Authority: Improving local outcomes should be the responsibility of communities. Local governments can do this most effectively if they have more control over the way they provide programs. Cities, counties, and special districts should provide primary authority over local public safety, while counties should maintain authority over self-sufficiency, social services, and behavioral health programs.

To achieve positive outcomes, local governments need the following authority: The ability to set priorities within the outcome framework, including which problems, issues, or opportunities are most important; the ability to develop strategies, partnerships, and programs to respond to those priorities; the ability to integrate services to achieve the best outcomes.

To achieve positive outcomes, other barriers need to be identified and removed, including federal requirements that discourage innovation or best practices, as well as limits in the state constitution, statutes, and regulations that increase costs without value or block cost-effective solutions.

Restructuring the state's public service system won't just improve outcomes – it also can cut costs. Studies show that if local governments could bring programs like CalWORKs, public safety, and mental health to the same levels of effectiveness and efficiency as other states, **California could save billions of dollars each year.**

Cities, counties, school districts, and special districts have always enjoyed different degrees of autonomy in California, and some of these distinctions should continue.

2. Fiscal Authority: In addition to program authority, improving the outcomes of communities' public programs will require giving local government more discretion over revenues. A more simple fiscal system also should enable Californians – as advocates, clients, citizens, and taxpayers – to more easily express their desires and hold government accountable.

Principles of a Results-Based Revenue Structure:

Since community governments vary in the types and scale of services they provide, California needs a flexible revenue structure that does not ignore historical choices, while also encouraging new fiscal arrangements that allow local governments to be responsive and accountable to citizens, voters, and taxpayers. The objective is to provide a revenue structure that is flexible enough to meet local needs, while also allowing the state to maintain equity among community governments focusing on improving outcomes.

The following principles support results-based government:

1. Local governments need control of local revenue. Local control has three components:

- The state should avoid interfering in the direction, redirection, or use of local revenue.
- Local governments, working together by consensus within an established process, need authority and incentives to allocate local resources to reflect changing public priorities, and to encourage efficiencies and better outcomes.
- It is critical to service delivery and public accountability that each agency delivering a service maintains control over and responsibility for its funding.
- Within some limits, local taxpayers need appropriate control over the level of taxation.

2. Revenue sources should be matched to the appropriate unit of government.

This match reflects service responsibility and the administrative and economic nature of the tax. This could include reassigning revenue streams to local governments that are given more responsibility. For example, is the property tax more appropriate for municipal services? Are sales and other transaction taxes a more appropriate way to fund county and regional scale services?

3. Revenue sharing agreements between governments should be encouraged.

Fiscal incentives are some of the most effective tools the state can use to encourage service integration. Most of the state’s largest programs are fundamentally interrelated. Revenue sharing agreements can support strategies for integrating services and targeting resources to community and regional priorities and needs. A realigned revenue system should allow for that cooperation, while other state-based revenues should be allocated to reward cooperation. This might involve sharing savings, for example, or revenue pooling at the countywide or regional scale.

THE RIGHT FISCAL INCENTIVES CAN IMPROVE PERFORMANCE – AND SAVE MONEY

In Arizona, counties are rewarded with 40 cents on every dollar the state saves by not having to lock up county-managed probation violators. The counties, in turn, are able to use those funds to strengthen offender supervision and victim services – but they continue to receive those dollars only if crime by probationers falls or holds steady. This tightly drawn fiscal incentive is strongly supported by both counties and voters, as it reduces the number of prisoners and gives local government more flexibility. When successfully implemented, studies show this collaborative approach to corrections reduces prison reentry by as much as 20 percent, while also directly improving the state’s bottom line.

PRINCIPLE 2

Transforming the performance of public programs will require systematic change, not just shifts in responsibilities and resources. The new structure needs to be supported by a restructured fiscal system that constitutionally guarantees control of revenue to the level of government responsible for delivering services. In addition, aligning authority and responsibility with those resources is essential to encourage the integration needed to improve results.

DRAFT PROPOSAL 2 – ALIGN AUTHORITY WITH RESPONSIBILITY

California is too large and diverse for a one-size fits all approach to a new governance model. To effectively meet local needs—and to improve the results of public programs—local governments will need more control over both programs and revenues. To accomplish this, local governments will need a set of authorities in the constitution and statute that allow them to *organize and finance* their responsibilities, while the state continues to play an important role balancing community strategies with statewide interests. This will require the following:

- **Program authority for local governments**
- **Aligning fiscal authority with program responsibility**

PROGRAM AUTHORITY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Improving outcomes should be a primary responsibility of community governments. Local governments can do this most effectively if they have more control over the way programs are administered. Cities, counties, school districts, and special districts currently have a mix of responsibilities for the health, safety, and quality of life of their citizens. To allow governments to focus on improving local program results, the state should grant to local governments the following:

- **Increased authority over local programs:** Cities, counties, and special districts should provide primary authority over local public safety, including fire services. Counties should have authority over self-sufficiency, social services, and behavioral health programs.
- **The ability to set local priorities:** Local governments should be able to set local priorities within the framework of the Big Five Outcomes, including which problems, issues, or opportunities they consider most important.
- **The ability to develop strategies, partnerships, and programs:** Local governments should have more flexibility in how they work toward local priorities.
- **The ability to integrate services:** To achieve the best outcomes, local governments should be encouraged to integrate local services. This should include the ability to share program resources as well as local and state savings that result from local successes.
- **Greater flexibility in contracting:** Local governments should have more flexibility in contracting with non-governmental service providers working toward the Big Five Outcomes.

ALIGNING FISCAL AUTHORITY WITH PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY

Since community governments vary in the types and scale of services they provide, California needs a flexible, *locally-developed* revenue structure. The structure needs to respect historical choices, while also encouraging new fiscal arrangements that allow local governments to be responsive and accountable to citizens, voters, and taxpayers. Simply providing additional taxing power to local governments will not alone move California toward the Big Five Outcomes. What is needed is a strategic plan and resource base that will encourage local governments to integrate their services—and to focus their resources on improving community outcomes.

A first step: California’s 2011-12 budget contains the first step toward moving state-managed services to community governments, particularly county government. As part of its historic realignment plan, the budget creates a new Local Revenue Fund—\$5.6 billion of existing sales tax and VLF revenues—that will support a variety of realigned public safety programs, mental health, substance abuse, foster care, child welfare services, and adult protective services. Within the fund, there are numerous categorical accounts and subaccounts that allocate these funds to the “realigned” programs. There is no general provision for integration of services, however, nor is there any protection for the funds over time.

Two elements should be considered to build upon this realignment plan:

- **Program integration:** Constitutionally protected local strategies should be developed defining program authority and service delivery
- **Protection of local revenue:** Local governments should have the authority to decide how to spend resources to carry out these strategies

Program elements:

Local allocation of responsibility – As part of any of the revenue realignment options outlined below, local governments need a constitutionally protected plan defining how they deliver services. This proposal would allow counties, cities, K-12 schools, community college and special districts to develop a Community Services Strategic Action Plan to perform functions and provide services mandated by state or local law in an integrated manner that will improve results.

- The Community Services Strategic Action Plan would be approved by two-thirds vote of the governing body of each of the participating jurisdictions and would outline the goals of the plan, describe the public services that will be delivered through the plan, and explain why those services can be delivered more effectively and efficiently under the plan than by current state law.
- The plan would include benchmarks and expected outcomes that the participating entities will achieve and a method for regularly reporting outcomes to the public and to the state.
- Through the Action Plans, communities would be able to identify statutes or regulations that are barriers to the effective and efficient delivery of service, and identify an

alternative procedure – provided that the Legislature had not determined the state provision to be a matter of statewide importance.

- Once an Action Plan is adopted by the agencies within the county and accepted by the state, those local governments would have the flexibility provided for in the plan and access to additional authority over resources provided by the revenue elements below.

Revenue elements:

Local governments need the flexibility to decide how to spend resources to carry out these strategies. In order to implement all four elements of revenue realignment outlined below, local governments would be responsible for developing an Action Plan, as described above. These revenue options are intended to serve as fiscal incentives that encourage local governments to define local strategies for improving outcomes, while also increasing transparency and accountability for program results.

Element 1 – Dedicate existing state resources toward integrated services and improving results

- **Element 1A – Building on the Budget:** To build upon the 2011-2012 budget’s realignment plan, a constitutional amendment should protect the revenues in California’s new Local Revenue Fund by setting aside 1 cent of the state sales tax for state realigned services. The amendment would allow these funds—totaling approximately \$5.1 billion—to be comingled at the local level to integrate services.
 - Strategy, transparency, accountability for results: To access these constitutionally guaranteed funds, local governments would be responsible for developing a local Action Plan, as described above.
- **Element 1B – Expanding to Block Grants:** In addition to the revenue allocation described in Element 1A, the state could also provide local governments with block grants to fund programs in the areas of criminal justice or health and children’s services. The purpose of the grants would be to provide local government maximum flexibility in the delivery of services and encourage inter-agency collaboration. Through Joint Powers Authorities, local governments would allocate local and state funds among themselves for the purpose of improving agreed upon outcomes. Participating governments would have broad discretion over service delivery, flexibility in co-mingling program funds, and freedom from state administrative rules.
 - Strategy transparency, accountability for results: In exchange for the new flexibility block grants would provide, local governments would need to expand the scope of their Action Plan, as described above.

Element 2 - Give local governments the authority to manage revenue: Local governments need the authority to develop local agreements for reassigning responsibilities and revenue in ways that improve results and make government understandable to the public. A

new constitutional authority could be created to give local governments the power to allocate and share locally-levied revenues including the sales, use, and property taxes.

Without expanding the size or type of local revenues, this authority could give local governments the power to use existing revenues to break down silos and integrate services. These local agreements would require the approval of each participating local agency.

- Strategy transparency, accountability for results: In exchange for this new authority over local revenue, local governments would need to revise their Action Plan, as described above.

Element 3 – Increase local revenue: To increase the transparency and stability of public services, voters may decide that local governments require

more revenue. To accomplish this, several broad changes to the tax structure could be considered. One example of this might involve providing revenue from a broader sales tax base—about \$5 billion, depending on the services involved—to local governments for community services. These new revenues, allocated on a per-capita basis countywide, would be less volatile than current funding streams because they reflect recent structural changes to the state’s economy.

- Strategy transparency, accountability for results: In order to access any new revenue provided by the state, local governments will need to expand their Action Plan accordingly, as described above.
- **Note:** *California Forward* communicates regularly with groups researching potential new revenue options. But at this time, *California Forward’s* focus is on improving the performance of public programs with existing resources.

Element 4 – Provide a resource base for regional infrastructure and workforce development:

The state currently lacks a system for financing regional infrastructure, environmental, or workforce development activities. To encourage coordination of services on a regional level, a new model would provide fiscal incentives to local governments to develop a region-wide system for addressing infrastructure, environmental, and workforce development issues. Elements of such a system might include all or a portion of each of the following.

The Strategic Growth Council would designate an entity with boundaries matching the regional economy, which would be granted the authority to place a measure on the ballot within the boundaries of the region. Depending on the needs of different regions, these measures might include the following, for example:

WHAT ABOUT PROP 13?

The legal agreements described here would not require changes in the tax rate or the property assessment system established by Proposition 13. In the case of the property tax, they would reassign responsibility for allocating the existing tax from the state to local governments.

- Increase the vehicle license fee up to 1 percent or a regional sales tax up to 1 percent dedicated to an adopted strategic plan for regional infrastructure and workforce development. The regional strategic plan would contain policies, priorities and a process for allocating revenues within the region to create the human resources and infrastructure to attract jobs.

POTENTIAL MODELS (see these and more online at CAFWD.org/bestpractices)

- [SB 678](#): In 2009, to address the problem of repeat offenders accounting for 40 percent of new felony prison admissions, the state Legislature passed SB 678, also known as the *California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act*. Drawing from evidence-based practices in other states, the legislation established a new performance-based funding system to supervise the state's adult felony probationers. This legislation requires interagency collaboration, and provides a financial incentive to locals for achieving outcomes by reallocating state savings to local programs.
- [1991 Realignment](#): In 1991, the state enacted a major change in the state and local government relationship that involved the transfer of some mental health, social services, and health programs from the state to county control. This realignment altered program cost-sharing ratios and provided counties with dedicated tax revenues from the sales tax and vehicle license fee to pay for these changes.

3. Adjust the State Role

There are vast social, economic, and geographic differences in California. State leaders must balance their desire to tell local government how to achieve statewide goals with the need for local leaders to develop and execute strategies that make sense in their communities. While the state may give up uniformity in how services are provided, the potential upside is continuous improvement in outcomes, even if some communities get better faster than others.

The state's role after restructuring would include the following:

- Establishing statewide performance objectives:
 - Defining the state's desired outcomes – that is, establishing what it is the state is trying to achieve – as well as establishing statewide performance and equity standards.
 - Ensuring data are collected and publicly available. Cost, performance and other data are essential tools for state and local officials, as well as the public.
- Tying statewide objectives to performance-based budgeting and management: To be effective, performance data must be tied to state-level decision-making, including the budget decisions that may remain at the state and the management of the new support role.
- Assisting local governments to meet outcomes:
 - **Technical assistance:** serving as a convener of peer-to-peer technical assistance that will allow successful communities to share analyses, best practices, and expertise with other parts of the state. This should involve an annual assessment by state departments of county program outcomes to identify areas in need of support, coordination, and assistance.
 - **Fiscal incentives:** encouraging improvements in strategy and execution.
 - **Performance mechanisms:** encouraging continuous improvement (publishing performance data, for example). This will help refocus local governments on pursuing success instead of avoiding failure.
- Intervening when local governments fail to meet statewide objectives. This might include:
 - State intervention, which should be handled by having another successful local agency – a peer, in other words – help a failed agency restructure or stabilize. Agencies falling short of performance thresholds could receive technical assistance from teams made up of state and peer administrators. They also could be assisted by consortiums of experts like the Fiscal Crisis Assistance and Management Team or the UC Davis Center for Human Services.
 - The state's role would be to set performance standards for when the failed agency could resume full operations.

- Sanctions and/or temporary state takeovers of local administration involving state administrators assuming local powers should be avoided whenever possible and considered a last resort.
- Reconsidering the role of state agencies, given their new roles, to eliminate overlapping functions or pursue state agency consolidation opportunities.

PRINCIPLE 3

In the new structure the state has an essential role of establishing – in collaboration with local agencies – statewide outcomes reflecting statewide goals and values, ensuring that data is available to measure effort and performance, and facilitating learning and best practices to encourage continuous improvement.

DRAFT PROPOSAL 3 – ADJUST THE STATE ROLE

In addition to the draft proposals above, the state needs to restructure legislative and executive activities to provide a new form of leadership focused on driving improved results at the local level. The state also will continue to play a vital role in ensuring minimum standards across the state to maintain equity. It should do this by establishing a set of basic standards that include prohibiting counties from discontinuing obligations to provide services under current law or reducing eligibility for services. Specifically, the state's role will be to:

- Establish the Big Five Outcomes for state programs in collaboration with local communities, and measure indicators of success annually.
- Incentivize collaboration among local programs based on evidence-based practices.
- Provide encouragement and serve as a convener of peer-to-peer technical assistance, so successful local governments can share best practices around achieving better outcomes and improving fiscal management. This also should include performance-based management training.
- Quantify savings to the state based on positive outcomes (e.g. reducing the number of people sent to prison can be directly tied to a reduction in state prison operating costs).
- Allow cities, counties, schools, and special districts to retain local savings.
- Streamline regulations that impede economic development and reduce micromanagement compliance activities that detract from a local focus on outcomes.
- Act as an advocate on behalf of local governments before Congress and federal agencies, to forge a partnership around federal programs and funds.
- Focus state budget-making on improved performance:
 - Performance-based budgeting: The governor and legislators should establish clear goals and performance measures for all programs. At least once a year, as part of the budget process, lawmakers must review programs to determine if they should continue, or how they can be improved.
- When local governments chronically underperform or fail to meet statewide objectives, the state should intervene in the following ways:

- State intervention should involve having another successful local agency help a failed agency restructure or stabilize. Agencies falling short of performance thresholds should receive technical assistance from teams made up of state and peer administrators. These teams could include consortiums of experts like the Fiscal Crisis Assistance and Management Team or the UC Davis Center for Human Services.
- The state's role would be to set performance standards for when the failed agency could resume full operations.
- Sanctions and/or temporary state takeovers of local administration should be avoided whenever possible and considered a last resort.

POTENTIAL MODELS (see these and more online at CAFWD.org/bestpractices)

- [Washington State Priorities of Government](#): This zero-based budget approach creates a strategic framework for public investment decisions, prioritizing activities that guide the governor's budget proposal to the Legislature – and helping communicate that budget to the public. As part of the Priorities of Government plan, every agency in Washington has been asked to answer eight questions related to whether their activities are essential to state government and whether they are being delivered in the most cost-effective manner.
- [Council on Virginia's Future](#): The Council on Virginia's Future was established in 2003 to develop a vision and long-term goals for Virginia's future. It also was tasked with developing a performance leadership and accountability system for state government that aligns with and supports achieving the vision.
- [The Commission for a New Georgia](#): The Commission for A New Georgia was established in 2003 by Governor Sonny Perdue to launch a management turnaround that would make Georgia the best-managed state in America.
- [The Prime Minister's Delivery Unit](#): The Prime Minister's Delivery Unit was established in June 2001 by former British Prime Minister Tony Blair to monitor progress on and strengthen the British Government's capacity to deliver its key priorities across education, health, crime and transport.
- [Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration \(SAMHSA\)](#): SAMHSA is a federal program that allocates funding to the states for substance abuse services and requires recipient agencies to document performance and report information as a condition of receiving funding.

4. Foster Regional Collaboration

Many of the challenges facing California's communities – workforce development, land-use, and environmental issues, in particular – can be most effectively handled not just by one or two counties, but by local agencies working collaboratively across the state's economic regions. Local governments including K-12 schools and community colleges should be given incentives that encourage communities to work together with the private sector to create the workforce and infrastructure needed to bolster the state's regional economies. The state should not add another layer of bureaucracy, but rather provide the right fiscal and regulatory incentives to encourage public agencies and private entities to coordinate their efforts and integrate activities. This will help local entities find innovative ways to achieve the Big Five Outcomes.

Examples of regional solutions and their benefits often involve land-use and transportation:

- **Metropolitan Planning Organizations**, for example, were created in the 1960s to coordinate distribution of state and federal transportation funds. They serve as venues for representatives of local government and state transportation authorities to come together to make long-term transportation plans for different regions. Over the years, these groups have often proved to be effective collaborative models – taking into account available funds, the region's integrated goals, and the needs of the region's residents.
- **The California Inter-regional Blueprint** is an example of a plan to link statewide transportation goals and regional transportation and land-use goals to produce a unified transportation/land use strategy.

One barrier to regional partnerships is the disconnect between regional entities and the state's core fiscal system. As a result, many regional activities rely on the goodwill of cities and counties to coordinate their efforts.

Local strategies for infrastructure investments and workforce connectivity are already coordinated by existing regional agencies and structures that can be linked to outcomes-based plans for schools, cities, counties, and special districts. These include:

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- Regional economic development initiatives
- Joint Powers Authorities, such as Councils of Government
- Multi-county special districts (the East Bay Regional Parks District, for example, or the Bay Area Rapid Transit Authority)

PRINCIPLE 4

The new structure needs to provide regulatory, fiscal and other incentives to encourage cooperation among local governments in partnership with the private sector to efficiently and effectively meet regional needs. This strategic alliance should align public efforts with regional economic activity and match the scale of effort to the magnitude of regional challenges.

DRAFT PROPOSAL 4 – FOSTER REGIONAL COLLABORATION

To encourage cooperation among local governments to efficiently and effectively meet regional challenges that cross city and county lines, the state constitution should be amended to allow cities, counties, schools, community colleges, and special districts in a region to create regional convening and coordinating bodies devoted to improving workforce development. These entities should be designed locally under a uniform statewide set of statutory authorities that would give them the power to provide regulatory, fiscal, and other incentives to encourage cooperation among local governments to meet regional needs. This should include a particular focus on developing a robust pipeline between the educational system and the workforce needs of the regional economy.

The Strategic Growth Council would be responsible for designating an entity with boundaries matching the regional economy. Depending on the needs and resources of different regions of the state, this new regional authority could be granted to an existing regional entity like a Council of Government, an existing convening body like a state university, or, where appropriate, another grassroots regional collaborative entity.

No matter where this authority is vested, in order to promote progress towards the Big Five Outcomes, these regional bodies should include members from all of the governmental entities in a region. This includes cities, counties, schools, community colleges, and special districts.

A few examples of how different regions might use this new authority:

- **COGs:** The state's current regional system of voluntary Councils of Governments is institutionally inadequate to the task of fostering regional collaboration because COGs only include cities and counties and because most COGs are focused exclusively on regional transportation, housing, and environmental planning issues. Regions could choose to make a constitutional change to extend the Joint Powers Authority of their COG to make it more representative by including schools, community colleges, and special districts. This authority would also allow them to develop incentives to encourage development of a robust workforce pipeline.
- **State Universities:** Some regions could choose to invest this new authority in their local state university, instead of their COG, and use the university as a regional convener. A state university public policy institute, for example, could be responsible for

bringing local governments and the private sector together on a regular basis to address regional issues.

- **Other Regional Entities:** Some regions could opt to build their regional education and workforce using existing collaborative entities. In the Central Valley, for example, this might include the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley, a public-private partnership established by Gov. Schwarzenegger in 2005 that includes the eight counties of the San Joaquin Valley. The Partnership continues today to bring together representatives from state agencies, each COG in the region, and members of the private sector to focus on improving the region's economic vitality and quality of life.

POTENTIAL MODELS (see these and more online at CAFWD.org/bestpractices)

- [Senate Bill 375 \(Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008\)](#): SB 375 directs the Air Resources Board to set regional targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Aligning these regional plans is intended to help California achieve GHG reduction goals for cars and light trucks under AB 32, the state's landmark climate change legislation.
- [Strategic Growth Council grants](#): The Strategic Growth Council manages and awards grants and loans to support the planning and development of sustainable communities. These grants aim to coordinate the activities of state agencies to improve air and water quality, protect natural resources and agriculture lands, increase the availability of affordable housing, improve infrastructure systems, promote public health, and assist state and local entities in the planning of sustainable communities.
- [California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley](#): The California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley is an unprecedented public-private partnership sharply focused on improving the region's economic vitality and quality of life for the 3.9 million residents who call the San Joaquin Valley home. The Partnership is addressing the challenges of the region by implementing measurable actions on six major initiatives to help the San Joaquin Valley emerge as California's 21st Century Opportunity.
- [California Stewardship Network](#): The California Stewardship Network is composed of 11 diverse regions across California who came together to develop regional solutions to the state's most pressing economic, environmental, and community challenges.
- [California Regional Economies Project](#): Through a regional perspective, the California Regional Economies Project improves understanding of how the economy is changing, where changes are concentrated, and what catalysts and conditions are causing those changes. In addition, the project assesses how change in one region affects other regions and the state as a whole.
- Several outcomes-focused, reported metrics might be used regionally:
 - [California Regional Progress Report](#) (California Strategic Growth Council)
 - [Re-Imagining California, A Sustainable Future for the Golden State](#) (Women's Environmental Leadership League "WELL" Network)

5. Evaluate Efficiency of Operations

For most of the last sixty years, as California has grown, the number of cities has also grown, often as a way to ensure local control. Since the 1990s, this growth in the number of local governments has begun to level off, while the number of special districts has actually declined. Even while this small-scale consolidation has been occurring, the state has not yet grappled with the challenges of how to organize local governments' myriad municipal functions – or how to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of how community services are delivered. From a local perspective, most existing political boundaries may appear justifiable, though opportunities do exist to review – and improve upon – the delivery of local services.

This process should build on the work of the *Commission on Local Governance in the 21st Century*, a commission led by former Speaker of the Assembly Robert Hertzberg. The Commission issued a report in 2000 recommending revisions to the laws that govern city, county, and special district boundary changes.

Even after many of these recommendations were enacted, an abundance of governmental entities remain in California. The state has nearly 60 counties, hundreds of cities, and thousands of school districts and special districts. These local governments provide a wide range of services, usually to meet specific local needs, and should have their functions and efficiencies continually assessed.

Options for encouraging political and functional reorganization:

- More authority could be given to local governments to initiate proceedings for functional and or organizational consolidation of agencies through their LAFCo, provided that all entities involved ultimately agree on the reorganization.
- Reduce thresholds/barriers to functional reorganization.
- More authority could be given to Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs), countywide groups that ensure the orderly formation of local government agencies in every California county.
- Public release of data and analysis, including cost and performance comparisons. The state could provide fiscal incentives, including one-time matches for documented cost savings.

Functional integration:

- Smaller units of government could be given technical assistance for sharing administrative, maintenance, technology, and other functions, while still being able to maintain political autonomy and accountability.

PRINCIPLE 5

Government should be organized in a way that most cost-effectively improves results. Local agencies need the incentives and the analysis to make organizational or functional consolidations to reduce costs and improve service.

DRAFT PROPOSAL 5 – EVALUATE EFFICIENCY OF OPERATIONS

More authority should be given to Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCo), countywide groups that ensure the orderly formation of local government agencies in every California county. LAFCos should be authorized to expand their current practice of collecting information about how municipal services in each county are organized—and should begin to analyze how local governments are *performing*, as well.

In addition to their current work, this would require LAFCos to conduct analyses of every government agency in the county and region and present standardized data on their quantity, cost, and effectiveness. This should include public release of data and analysis, including cost and performance comparisons. It could also include fiscal incentives from the state, including one-time matches for documented cost savings.

- This LAFCo review process should take advantage of existing LAFCo municipal service reviews, comprehensive studies designed to better inform regional bodies, local agencies, and the community about the provision of municipal services. These reviews should also be extended to include Joint Powers Authorities, which are not currently reviewed by LAFCos or any other county body.
- LAFCo reviews should also include regional analyses identifying the number of jurisdictions in each region, their boundaries, the role of each agency in the jurisdiction, these agencies' goals and results, and any opportunities for consolidation or collaboration. This process should be coordinated with the newly-empowered regional workforce development entities discussed in Proposal 4.
- Because LAFCo reviews do not currently include schools, County Offices of Education, working in collaboration with LAFCos as needed, should be authorized to conduct their own “service review” studies of county school district boundaries and size.

POTENTIAL MODELS (see these and more online at CAFWD.org/bestpractices)

- [Orange County LAFCo Shared Services Program](#): With local governments in Orange County struggling to balance rising costs and reduced revenues, the Orange County LAFCo developed a program in 2011 to help agencies share services. The Shared Services Working Group identified a wide array of potential opportunities, including: fleet maintenance, human resources, water quality monitoring, IT support, landscape maintenance, construction administration, meter reading, rodent control, and tree trimming, among others. Based on direction from the LAFCo and workgroup, LAFCo staff developed a web-based tool that matches agencies seeking services with agencies

offering services—an “eHarmony,” of sorts, for municipal service agencies. The end result is a no-cost, user-friendly resource for local agencies in Orange County interested in sharing services to be matched with agencies that have excess capacity.

- [A New NY: A Blueprint to Reform Government](#): In 2008, The New N.Y. Government Reorganization and Citizen Empowerment Act was enacted into law to reduce New York's 10,521 overlapping governments. In his 2011 State of the State speech, Gov. Andrew Cuomo proposed a set of grants at up to \$100,000 each for local communities to conduct dissolution and consolidation studies.
- [San Mateo Regional Fire Services](#): This memo estimates that the cost of fire protection in San Mateo County could be reduced by nearly \$17 million if five cities and the county jointly contracted with a single entity rather than using five separate fire departments.
- [Sacramento City-County Functional Consolidation](#): A 2010 report identified annual savings upward of \$5 million if the City of Sacramento leveraged functional consolidation opportunities with the County of Sacramento. The following savings would be achieved if the city and county consolidated: emergency dispatch communication (\$2.2 million); major crimes investigation (\$750,000); police property and evidence management (\$290,000); police special teams units (\$840,000); police air support (\$200,000-\$500,000); and, animal care services (\$308,000).
- [California School District Unification](#): In 1964, to encourage voters to form unified school districts, AB 145 (Unruh) stipulated that the funding level for qualified unified school districts be increased by \$15 per ADA. In addition to increasing support for unified school districts, for each elementary school district that voted in favor of unification, even if the whole proposition failed, the funding level of that district would be increased by \$15 per ADA.

Implementing with Accountability

Most of the benefits from a restructured governance model will come from smartly implementing the new structure to develop evidence-based strategies and deploy proven programs that focus services on better outcomes, involve residents in local decision-making, and ultimately make government more accountable and transparent.

While much of the initial thinking regarding restructuring rightly focuses on what the new structure will look like, even more attention will ultimately need to be put into implementation. To make restructuring a success, residents will need to be more heavily involved in the decisions that will change the manner in which they interact with their government. Given the range of potential service and funding options, the early stages of implementation will consist of mostly local choices – monitored by the state – including setting priorities, identifying community assets and partners, evolving programs to incorporate best practices, and critiquing results to provide for continuous improvement.

Leaders at the state and local level will need to adjust to their new roles and responsibility, and work to incorporate a culture of results and accountability. State and local officials will need to work more collaboratively to anticipate problems and proactively respond to resolve conflicts and seize opportunities for reinforcing the new culture. And it will provide an opportunity for legislators – as policymakers – to develop their own mechanism for jointly monitoring progress and assertively changing statutes or regulations that impede progress.

All of these considerations will best be acted upon with greater involvement from community level leaders – in the public and private sectors – who are championing improvements at the community level. Today's governance system makes it difficult for Californians to hold their public officials accountable. Only through a more coherent and simplified structure – one that the public helps implement – will citizens have a genuine opportunity to be engaged with government.

Conclusion

California's state and local governments must work better together for everyone. If Californians can come together to restructure the relationships between state and local governments, the state will see immediate benefits, from better outcomes to increased civic engagement. The experience of other states indicates that in five to seven years, a streamlined governance system also will lead to substantial fiscal savings and renewed private investment.

Continuous improvement in the performance of education and social programs will allow the state to shift resources from prisons back to universities. Reductions in the growth of safety net programs – along with increasing confidence in the performance of public programs – will also allow businesses to pay higher wages, while still remaining competitive. Growing middle-income jobs will reduce demand for public services and increase tax revenue.

Restructuring California's government, in other words, can be the beginning of a virtuous cycle – improved education, more workforce participation, better health outcomes, and less crime – that can lead to the best possible outcome: A government that achieves positive social gains in a financially sustainable way.

Appendix 1 – Models for Revenue Reallocation

In developing ideas for a new local revenue model, *California Forward* considered several different forms of state assistance to help local governments meet underlying statewide goals for improved outcomes. Three models, in particular, continue to inform *California Forward*'s revenue proposals.

The first is the *compact* model that is a formal bilateral agreement between the state and local governments that would outline roles, responsibilities and financing. The second is a fee-for-service model in which local governments could contract with the state to provide a service or vice versa. The third is a block grant model that simply sets up one or more broadly crafted grants to support locally defined services directed at improving outcomes for a targeted group such as children.

I. The Compact Model: A compact is an agreement formally entered into between the state and one or more local governments in which one or more of the governments transfers responsibility for the delivery of services to another under terms and conditions that include the resources needed to carry out the tasks. The governments responsible for the service would have broad discretion as to the manner of delivering the service subject to the accomplishment of mutually agreed-upon outcomes. The compact could be dissolved for cause or at the end of the term. The following two examples illustrate how the system might work.

- **Criminal Justice:**

- Outcome target: Reduction in recidivism.
- Model: The state and county agree that the county will house, supervise and provide rehabilitative services to offenders convicted of certain crimes (previously incarcerated in state prison). Judges will have broad discretion in sentencing and supervising offenders identified in the compact. The county will have broad discretion in using Medi-Cal, behavioral health and employment and training funds to house and provide rehabilitative services to offenders identified in the compact. State savings in per offender costs will be transferred to the court to fund the program.

- **Health/Human Services:**

- Outcome target: Reduction in number of children living in poverty, improved health status, and improved independent living conditions for seniors
- Model: The state and county agree that the county will be financially responsible for all TANF, Foster Care, IHSS, Medi-Cal Long-term Care, Behavioral Health and Child Support clients. The county will have broad discretion in establishing eligibility, applying sanctions and operating these programs. All federal funds received for these programs will be transferred to the county. All state funds appropriated for these programs will be transferred to the county. (The transfer

of state funds to the county could be partially offset if the state assumes 100 percent responsibility of all medically indigent adults.) Financial incentives would be available to counties and school districts that work together to improve health and educational outcomes for children. Under this model it may be possible to eliminate the state Department of Child Support and Department of Aging.

2. Pay-for-Service Model: The state will provide state aid to local governments to provide specific services at a minimum level of performance. The increased aid will be on a fee-for-service basis for designated services. The state would designate the performance outcomes and fees per client. County participation would be voluntary. Participating counties would have broad discretion over service delivery, flexibility in co-mingling program funds and freedom from state oversight and administrative rules.

- **Criminal Justice:**

- Outcome target: Reduction in recidivism.
- Model: The state identifies prisoners housed in state facilities that would be housed at the county level. The county would be reimbursed for all state prisoners transferred to the county and all county prisoners not sentenced to state facilities. The county would receive a fee per offender that would be sufficient to cover the cost of housing, supervision and rehabilitative services. Counties would be relieved of complying with state Board of Corrections standards. Counties that exceed the target reduction would receive an incentive payment from the state that could be used for any county purpose.

- **Health/Human Services:**

- Outcome target: Reduction in number of children living in poverty, improved health status, and improved independent living conditions for seniors.
- Model: The state identifies those clients in programs with blended state/local funding (e.g., TANF, Foster Care, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Long-term Care, Behavioral Health and Child Support) for which improved outcomes are desired. The county would receive a fee per client with improved outcomes in identified areas. Counties that exceed the targets for improvements would receive an incentive payment from the state that could be used for any county purpose.

3. Block Grant Model – Children First: The state could provide local governments with block grants in the areas of criminal justice, or health and children’s services. The purpose of the grants would be to provide local government maximum flexibility in the delivery of services and encourage inter-county and regional collaboration. Participating governments would have to pledge 5 percent of their general funds that would be matched by the state. Through joint powers authorities, local governments would allocate local and state funds among themselves for the purpose of improving agreed upon outcomes. Participating governments would have

broad discretion over service delivery, flexibility in co-mingling program funds and freedom from state oversight and administrative rules.

- **Criminal Justice:** Counties, cities and schools would provide services that would reduce crime, improve school attendance, and increase graduation rates.
- **Children:** Counties, cities, and schools would provide services that would reduce the number of children living in poverty, improve education outcomes, and increase the number foster children successfully transitioning to adulthood.
- **Health:** Counties, cities, and schools would provide services that would improve the health status of the community.

Appendix 2 – Examples of Successful Service Integration

Developing outcomes-based programs and integrated services can be a challenge in California today, but there are many examples of communities that are finding ways to improve outcomes within the constraints of the current governance system. Many of the lessons learned from these local efforts can be applied to statewide restructuring.

Counties – Even with the many limitations imposed by our current system, some counties have found ways to encourage their programs to focus on performance and collaboration. See below for just a few examples of counties that have integrated their own services – or partnered with cities, schools, and special districts – to improve outcomes.

- **San Diego County** – In the ten years since the county began integrating the agencies responsible for public health, mental health, alcohol and drug treatment, and foster care, the restructured programs have generated a total of \$230 million in savings for the county that have been reinvested in performance-based front-line services. Restructuring has helped the county streamline administrative costs, as well: Overhead for these agencies was 21 percent of their budgets when integration began; today it is less than 12 percent.
- **San Mateo County** – To encourage county agencies to work together to mitigate the health issues of the county’s most vulnerable groups, San Mateo has pooled the available resources of three large agencies – human services, juvenile probation, and mental health services. These newly integrated groups meet once a week to make joint decisions about what they now acknowledge are their shared clients. Over the past ten years, restructuring has resulted in a 50 percent reduction in the number of children being placed out of home, while also reducing levels of incarceration, homelessness, and hospitalization.
- **Santa Clara County** – The county’s new Center for Leadership and Transformation was created in 2010 to deploy elements of the Toyota management system – world-renowned for its elimination of waste – on the challenge of tying local government programs to performance. The teams’ early forays into restructuring have identified millions of dollars in savings in programs ranging from county IT systems to its hiring practices.
- **Contra Costa County** – The county’s Service Integration Teams bring together workers from public assistance, employment services, child welfare, probation, alcohol and drug abuse treatment, mental health, and public health into a single collaborative service delivery model.
- **Los Angeles County** – In the 1990s, the county adopted a multi-department set of “Principles of Family Support Practice,” after a study found that a substantial number of children and families were receiving services from more than one county department – and more than 1.3 million children alone were relying on services

provided by county government. These ‘Principles’ have encouraged health programs and social services to integrate their work, and have helped prevent many children and families from falling through cracks in the safety net.

Cities, Schools, and Special Districts – Many cities, schools, and special districts also have found ways to encourage public programs to integrate their services and collaborate to improve outcomes. Just a few examples:

- **City of Millbrae and City of San Bruno** – Originally designed as a pilot program to cut costs, these two cities have formalized their practice of sharing fire services under a single command staff in the past several years. The two fire departments share truck company services, emergency medical services, and even firefighter training – making more personnel available to respond to emergencies, and saving both cities hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. The cities also have recently started sharing police services, as well.
- **Oakland Unified School District** – Using the Joint Powers Authority, Alameda County, the City of Oakland, and the Oakland Unified School District have institutionalized an integrated service plan that allows programs from the county, the city, and the schools to work together to keep kids in school, lower Oakland’s high school suspension rates, and reduce crime. For the past 12 years, this initiative has brought together over 65 governmental agencies, community service providers, early childhood centers, and philanthropic organizations – which together design and fund programs for poor and vulnerable families. “When we put our staff into the schools, these kids become our kids,” says Dave Kears, special assistant to the county administrator. “It doesn’t matter who signs the paychecks. What we discovered was, ‘We can’t do this by ourselves.’”
- **Conejo Recreation and Park District** – “If voters could reimagine government, it might look a lot like special districts – where people can create just the type of service they want,” Jim Friedl, the general manager of the Conejo Recreation and Park District said recently. Created by a group of Central Coast communities to provide recreation opportunities and conserve the recreational resources of the surrounding area, the Conejo Recreation and Park District is a model of how special districts can integrate their services with nearby governments: Conejo has a JPA with the city of Thousand Oaks and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to manage conservation projects, while also collaborating with the local school district in a facility-sharing agreement and jointly funding a youth outreach program – including some after-school programs that schools themselves might have offered in the past.

Appendix 3 – Key Elements of Successful Service Integration Initiatives

Following the February and March Stakeholder Roundtable meetings, *California Forward* Leadership Council member Sunne Wright McPeak summarized the following as some key elements of successful service integration initiatives:

- 1. Leadership:** Leadership is essential. It takes a different kind of leadership that articulates the vision and values for the initiative and that inspires, supports, and drives the team to achieve the intended outcomes and results.
- 2. Partnership:** There must be a true partnership with a sense of ownership and sincere commitment by all partners to the mission of the initiative. This kind of partnership goes beyond agency coordination – it involves collaboration to integrate resources for better results. The partnership needs to have an explicit organizational structure with the roles and responsibilities of all partners clearly delineated in written agreements, often legal documents.
- 3. Responsibility and Accountability:** All partners must be individually and collectively responsible and accountable for outcomes and results. This element needs to be data driven and reinforced with regular reports to partners and stakeholders about outcomes.
- 4. Integrated Resources:** Partners combine and integrate their resources (personnel, funding and facilities) to focus on outcomes and results, usually providing improved services to the target populations. The integration of resources often requires greater flexibility from funding and regulatory agencies.
- 5. Customer-Focused Service Model:** Partners focus on results for the customer – the clients or target population—to break through conventional silos and cut across existing systems. The service model evolves from an imperative to focus on results with a common sense approach to the most direct deployment of resources to achieve efficiency, transparency, and accountability.
- 6. Regulatory Relief:** A customer-focused service model often requires relief from unnecessary and nonproductive process regulations in return for greater accountability for results. Regulatory agencies from other levels of government (such as the state and federal government) need to shift their role to being a partner in success instead of a monitor for failure, and to provide technical assistance, including information about best practices.
- 7. Sustained Focus and Funding:** Sufficient and sustained funding is essential to overcome the inertia of the existing system. Initial seed funding that serves as a catalyst to jump-start the

development of a new service model is often pivotal. Further, there must be a commitment to stable funding for a reasonable period of time to produce observable change and measurable results.

8. Incentives for Performance: Incentives, including financial rewards for partner organizations and employees, have a very positive impact on motivating partners to drive expeditiously to results.

9. Continuous Collaboration and Improvement: The partnership establishes a disciplined practice with a set timetable to review progress and determine course corrections. There is a process for continuous improvement and encourages ongoing collaboration.

10. Rooted Culture and Institutionalization Practices: The leadership and partners reinforce the culture of collaboration to outcomes and results with efficiency, transparency and accountability. This is accomplished with training, reorganization and rewards for improved practices and results.

Appendix 4 – The Origins of the Framework

After meeting with leaders around the state about the causes of the state’s current dysfunction, the same themes emerged again and again: The current governance system is broken, it lacks focus on outcomes, it fails to align authority with responsibility, and it is too complex. To improve California’s government, it has become increasingly clear the state needs to restructure.

The Local Government Task Force: In the fall of 2010, *California Forward* convened a workgroup of local government leaders to begin developing a set of detailed options for how to improve results by restructuring the relationship between state and local government. A group of current and former city and county officials on what became known as the Local Government Task Force developed three principles that have served as the foundation of *California Forward*’s approach to state/local restructuring. These principles also served as the guide for the initial draft of the *Smart Government Framework*:

- Public programs should work collaboratively with a focus on shared outcomes. These outcomes should guide policy development, management decisions, and ultimately, accountability, through public reporting of results.
- Fiscal control is essential if local governments are going to be empowered to integrate services, innovate, develop better practices, and achieve economies of scale.
- Regional collaboration can make many services more efficient and effective by allowing local governments to meet large-scale challenges by developing more cohesive service delivery strategies across jurisdictions.

Stakeholder Roundtables: After the initial work of the Local Government Task Force, *California Forward* spent the winter of 2011 hosting a series of Stakeholder Roundtables in Sacramento to refine its proposals. In a series of five collaborative meetings moderated by *California Forward*’s Sunne Wright McPeak, a committed group of stakeholders and experts in education, local government, health and human services, economic development, and labor provided detailed feedback on the Framework. They also offered suggestions for improving its five draft proposals for restructuring. After each meeting, the Framework was revised and refined to incorporate stakeholders’ suggestions.

Throughout these meetings, stakeholders encouraged *California Forward* to continue its work without becoming bogged down by the state’s ongoing budget negotiations. “This is not a parlor game. It’s not just an exercise,” Mayor Ron Loveridge of Riverside said at one meeting. “Across the country, a discussion has started about how we will deliver services in the 21st century. This is the tip of the spear of that discussion.”

Speak Up California: At the same time the Stakeholder Roundtable meetings were being held in Sacramento, *California Forward* was also leading a statewide conversation project called “Speak Up California” focusing on the challenges of restructuring. In more than 60 meetings across California through the winter and spring of 2011, groups of civic leaders, business leaders, non-profit advocates, elected officials, and other interested citizens came together to discuss how to reform California’s government. The input from these meetings – which has included a range of specific suggestions for how *California Forward*’s approach could be refined – also helped shaped the Framework and its five draft proposals.

Regional Stakeholder Roundtable Meetings: After completing the Sacramento-based Stakeholder Roundtable discussions and statewide “Speak Up” dialogues, *California Forward* convened a series of Regional Stakeholder Roundtables to get more detailed feedback on the *Smart Government* Framework from stakeholders across the state. A total of ten Regional Stakeholder meetings were held in San Diego, Los Angeles, the Inland Empire, the Central Valley, and the Bay Area. Local elected officials and leaders from business, labor, government and the nonprofit sector provided detailed feedback on what works in the *Smart Government* proposals, as well as what’s missing. This input was also incorporated into the Framework.

Participants: A complete list of the members of the Local Government Task Force as well as the participants in the Sacramento and Regional Stakeholder Roundtables can be found in the pages that follow. Following the list of names is a collection of quotes and statements from participants about the importance of restructuring.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TASK FORCE

Christina Altmayer, *President, Altmayer Consulting Inc.*

Dion Aroner, *Partner, Aroner, Jewell and Ellis (AJE) Partners*

Toby Ewing, *Consultant, Senate Committee on Governance and Finance*

Jean Hurst, *Legislative Representative, California State Association of Counties*

Jennifer Ito, *Project Manager, USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity*

David Kears, *Special Assistant to the County Administrator, Alameda County*

Patricia Leary, *Assistant County Administrator, Yolo County*

Dave Leshner, *Associate Director, Governmental Affairs, Public Policy Institute of California*

Ron Loveridge, *Mayor, City of Riverside*

Dan McCorquodale, *former California State Senator*

Mary McMillan, *Deputy County Manager, County of San Mateo*

Jim Morris, *Chief of Staff to the Mayor, City of San Bernardino*

Susan Muranishi, *County Administrator, Alameda County*

Isabelle Mussard, *Safe Passages/Youth Ventures JPA*

Anu Natarajan, *Councilmember, City of Fremont*

Mike Nevin, *Executive Director, Service League of San Mateo County; former Mayor, Daly City; and, former Supervisor, San Mateo County*
 Manuel Pastor, *Professor, University of Southern California*
 Richard Robinson, *CEO, Stanislaus County*
 Michael Ruane, *Executive Director, First 5 Orange County*
 Charlene Silva, *former Health Director, County of San Mateo*
 Jeffrey Smith, *County Executive, Santa Clara County*
 Dan Wall, *former Chief Legislative Advocate, County of Los Angeles*
 Ray Watson, *Supervisor, Kern County*

SACRAMENTO STAKEHOLDER ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS

Individually Provided Information and Consultation, but did not attend meetings

Justin Adams, *Consultant, Chang and Adams Consulting*
 Ryan Alsop, *Assistant Administrative Officer, Los Angeles County*
 Christina Altmayer, *President, Altmayer Consulting Inc.*
 Jesus Andrade, *Field and Campaign Organizer, National Council of La Raza*
 Dion Aroner, *Partner, Aroner, Jewell and Ellis (AJE) Partners*
 Glenn Backes, *Policy Consultant, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights*
 Steve Barrow, *Policy Director, California State Rural Health Association*
 Joaquin Beltran, *Public Affairs Coordinator, Long Beach Regional Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Network*
 Andrew Berthelsen, *Legislative Aide, Office of Assemblymember Rich Gordon*
 Linda Best, *Executive Director, Contra Costa Council*
 Diana Boyer, *Senior Policy Analyst, County Welfare Directors Association of California*
 Ashley Bradley, *Communications Specialist, Smith Moore and Associates*
 Jesse Brown, *CEO, Merced County Association of Governments*
 Vanessa Cajina, *Legislative Advocate, Western Center on Law and Poverty*
 Pat Callan, *National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education*
 Matthew Cate, *Secretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*
 Roseanne Chamberlain, *Executive Officer, Amador Local Agency Formation Commission*
 Andrew Chang, *Managing Director, Chang and Adams Consulting*
 Cindy Chavez, *Executive Director, Working Partnerships USA*
 Scott Chavez, *Fiscal Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus*
 Bill Chiat, *Executive Director, California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions*
 Michael Coleman, *Fiscal Policy Advisor, CaliforniaCityFinance.com*
 Linda Collins, *Executive Director, Career Ladders Project*
 Phillip Crandall, *Director, Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services*
 Tammy Cronin, *Strategic Growth Council*
 Sen. Mark DeSaulnier, *Member, Senate Committee on Governance and Finance*
 Asm. Roger Dickinson, *Chair, Assembly Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review*

Diana Dooley, *Secretary, California Health and Human Services Agency*
Sharon Scott Dow, *Director of Governmental Relations, The Advancement Project*
Kevin Eckery, *President, Eckery Associates*
Ryan Eisberg, *Fiscal Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus*
Kirk Everett, *Vice President of Government Relations and Tax Policy, Silicon Valley Leadership Group*
Toby Ewing, *Consultant, Senate Committee on Governance and Finance*
Heather Fargo, *Executive Policy Officer, Strategic Growth Council*
Stephanie Farland, *Senior Research and Policy Consultant, California School Boards Association*
Alan Fernandes, *Chief Legislative Representative, Los Angeles County*
Jim Fox, *former District Attorney, San Mateo County*
Jean Fraser, *Chief, San Mateo County Health System*
Jeffery Freitas, *Legislative Representative, California Federation of Teachers*
Jim Friedl, *General Manager, Conejo Recreation and Park District*
William Fujioka, *Chief Executive Officer, Los Angeles County*
Linda Galliher, *Vice President, Education and Healthcare, Bay Area Council*
Sherri Gauger, *Executive Director, Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission*
Sandra Giarde, *Executive Director, California Association for the Education of Young Children*
John Gioia, *Supervisor, Contra Costa County*
Asm. Rich Gordon, *Member, Assembly Committee on Local Government*
Scott Graves, *Senior Policy Analyst, California Budget Project*
Charlotte Hague, *President, California County Planning Commissioners Association*
Barbara Halsey, *Executive Director, California Workforce Association*
Sen. Loni Hancock, *Chair, Senate Committee on Public Safety*
Joan Hancock, *Board Member, Contractors' State License Board*
Mike Hanson, *Superintendent, Fresno Unified School District*
Hans Hemann, *Chief of Staff, Office of Senator Loni Hancock*
Iris Herrera, *Legislative Advocate, California Special Districts Association*
Bill Higgins, *Executive Director, California Councils of Government*
Scott Hill, *Vice President of Education Policy, School Innovations and Advocacy*
Janet Hogan, *Executive Director, First 5 Tulare County*
Sen. Bob Huff, *Vice-Chair, Senate Committee on Governance and Finance*
Hasan Ikhtrata, *Executive Director, Southern California Association of Governments*
Jennifer Ito, *Project Manager, USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity*
Khydeeja Alam Javid, *Legislative Advocate, Advancement Project*
Kathy Jett, *former Undersecretary of Programs, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; and, former Director, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs*
Mike Kasperzak, *1st Vice President, League of California Cities; and, Vice Mayor, Mountain View*
David Kears, *Special Assistant to the County Administrator, Alameda County*
Trish Kelly, *Principal, Applied Development Economics*
Darby Kernan, *Assistant Secretary of Legislation, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Ken Larsen, *Public Policy Director, California Association of Nonprofits*
Ted Lempert, *President, Children Now*
Dave Leshner, *Associate Director, Governmental Affairs, Public Policy Institute of California*
Carol Liu, *Chair, Senate Human Services Committee*
Debbie Look, *Director of Legislation, California State PTA*
Susan Lovenburg, *Trustee, Davis Joint Unified School District* [Susan Lovenburg became a paid consultant to CA Fwd in late March. She participated as a Stakeholder Roundtable member prior to becoming a consultant.]
Ron Loveridge, *Mayor, City of Riverside*
Stephen Lucas, *Executive Officer, Butte Local Agency Formation Commission*
James MacDonald, *Legislative Analyst, California Special Districts Association*
Randy Margo, *former Assistant County Administrator, County of Yuba*
Corey Marshall, *Good Government Policy Director, SPUR*
David Maxwell-Jolly, *Undersecretary, California Health and Human Services Agency*
Tom Mays, *Assistant to the Director, Secondary, Career, and Adult Learning Division, California Department of Education*
Kevin McCarty, *Vice Mayor, City of Sacramento*
Neil McCormick, *Executive Director, California Special Districts Association*
Stuart McCullough, *Executive Director, Youth Homes, Inc.*
Thomas McGeorge, *Family and Children Services, Human Services Agency of San Francisco*
Mike McGowan, *Supervisor, Yolo County*
Frank Mecca, *Executive Director, County Welfare Directors Association of California*
Helyne Meshar, *Principal Consultant, Helyne Meshar & Associates*
Richard Miller, *District Superintendent, Riverside Unified School District*
Rick Miller, *Executive Director, California Office to Reform Education*
Dean Mischynski, *Adjunct Fellow, Public Policy Institute of California*
Rita Mize, *Director, State Policy and Research, Community College League of California*
Cynthia Murray, *President and CEO, North Bay Leadership Council*
Barbara Needell, *Principal Investigator, Child Welfare Performance Indicators Project*
Geoffrey Neill, *Legislative Analyst, California State Association of Counties*
Mike Nevin, *Executive Director, Service League of San Mateo County; former Mayor, Daly City; and, former Supervisor, San Mateo County*
Adam Nguyen, *Family and Children Services, Human Services Agency of San Francisco*
Samuel Odell-Smith, *Planning Company Associates*
Tony Olivera, *former Supervisor, Kings County*
Marianne O'Malley, *Director, General Government, Legislative Analyst's Office*
Kyle Packham, *Legislative Director, California Special Districts Association*
Jennifer Peck, *Executive Director, Partnership for Children and Youth; and, Policy Advisor and Director of Superintendent Tom Torlakson's Transition Advisory Team*
Alicia Perez, *Intergovernmental and Public Relations Officer, Safe Passages/Youth Ventures JPA*

Bev Perry, *former Mayor, City of Brea; and, former President, Southern California Association of Governments*

Pete Peterson, *Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadershipⁱ*

Erich Pfuehler, *Legislative Administrative Manager, East Bay Regional Park District*

Larry Powell, *Superintendent, Fresno County Office of Education*

Ernie Powell, *Senior Manager of Advocacy, American Association of Retired Persons - California*

Thomas Powers, *former Chief Deputy, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs*

Alison Ramey, *Senior Policy Advocate, California Primary Care Association*

Ezra Rapport, *Executive Director, Association of Bay Area Governments*

David Rattray, *Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerceⁱ*

Jaime Regalado, *Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairsⁱ*

Matt Rexroad, *Supervisor, Yolo County; and, Partner, Meridian Pacific, Inc.*

Michael Richard, *Associate State Director of Advocacy - Capitol Action Team, AARP*

Marjorie Rist, *Chief Probation Officer, Yolo County Probation Department*

Jennifer Rodriguez, *Staff Attorney, Youth Law Center*

Phil Rosentrater, *External Affairs Director, Western Municipal Water District*

Jean Ross, *Founding Executive Director, California Budget Project*

Trudy Schafer, *Director of Program, League of Women Voters CA*

Wayne Schell, *President and CEO, California Association for Local Economic Development*

Dianne Segura, *CEO, Segue Enterprises*

Rusty Selix, *Executive Director, California Mental Health Association; former Executive Director, CalCOG*

Nancy Shulock, *Executive Director, Institute for Higher Education and Leadership Policy, California State University, Sacramento*

Elizabeth Siggins, *Chief Deputy Secretary, Adult Programs, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Michele Siqueiros, *Executive Director, Campaign for College Opportunity*

Angelica Solis, *Alliance for a Better Communityⁱ*

Jai Sookprasert, *Assistant Director, Governmental Relations, California School Employees Association*

David Spaur, *President & CEO, Merced County Economic Development Corporation*

Nancy Spradling, *Executive Director, California School Nurses Association*

Kris Stadelman, *Director, NOVA Workforce Services, City of Sunnyvale*

Dwight Stenbakken, *Deputy Executive Director, League of California Cities*

Connie Stewart, *Executive Director, California Center for Rural Policy, Humboldt State University*

Louise Taylor, *former Superintendent, Monvoria Unified School District*

Kristin Tillquist, *Chief of Staff, Mayor Ron Loveridge, City of Riverside*

Thomas Timar, *Faculty Director, Center for Applied Policy in Education at UC Davis*

Christopher Tooker, *Chair, Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission*

Jeff Vaca, *Interim Executive Director, CA School Boards Associationⁱ*

Richard Van Horn, *President and CEO, Mental Health America of Los Angeles*

Bruce Wagstaff, *Administrator, Countywide Services Agency, County of Sacramento*

Dan Wall, *former Chief Legislative Advocate, County of Los Angeles*
 David Warren, *former Lobbyist, Taxpayers for Improving Public Safety; and, Prison Chaplain*
 Rob Wassmer, *Director, Dept. of Public Policy and Administration, California State University Sacramento*
 Roger White, *Research Analyst, SEIU Local 1000*
 Loretta Whitson, *Executive Director, California Association of School Counselors*
 Amber Wiley, *Legislative Advocate, Association of California Health Care Districts*
 Bill Wilson, *School Board Member, Fremont Union High School District*
 Jim Wiltshire, *Deputy Director, California State Association of Counties*
 Sen. Lois Wolk, *Chair, Senate Committee on Governance and Finance*
 Tim Youmans, *Managing Principal, Economic and Planning Systems*

REGIONAL ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS (BY REGION)

BAY AREA

Lou Andrade, *Board Member, Hayward Area Recreation and Park District*
 Helen Benjamin, *Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College District*
 David Boesch, *County Manager, San Mateo County*
 Joe Brooks, *Vice President for Civic Engagement, Policy Link*
 Amy Brown, *Acting City Administrator, City and County of San Francisco*
 Ron Brown, *Executive Director, Save Mount Diablo*
 Gloria Bruce, *Deputy Director, East Bay Housing Organization*
 Liz Callahan, *Former Executive Director, The CBO Center*
 Candace Capogrossi
 Patricia Chiapellone, *Executive Director, Alum Rock Counseling Center*
 Judy Chirco, *Former City Councilmember, City of San Jose*
 Leon Churchill, *City Manager, City of Tracy*
 Peter Cohen, *Policy Director, East Bay Housing Organization*
 Linda Craig, *Public Member, League of Women Voters - California*
 Aimee Durfee, *Public Policy Director, United Way of the Bay Area*
 Samina Faheem Sundas, *Founding Executive Director, American Muslim Voice Foundation*
 Greg Foell, *Administrator, Orangevale Recreation & Park District*
 Brendon Freeman, *Analyst, Napa County LAFCo*
 Jason Fried, *Senior Program Officer, San Francisco County LAFCo*
 Iris Gallagher, *LAFCo Commissioner, San Mateo County LAFCo*
 Patricia Gardner, *Executive Director, Silicon Valley Council for Nonprofits*
 Daren Garshelis, *Counsel, Alliance for Justice*
 Robert Gay, *District Manager, San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District*
 Marvin Goodman, *Rabbi*
 Kara Gross, *Vice President, Joint Venture Silicon Valley*

Joe Head, *President & CEO, Summerhill Homes*
Sarah Henry, *Program Officer, Next 10*
Al Hom, *Program Manager, Alameda County Vector Control Services District*
Kate Howard, *Policy and Finance Analyst, Mayor's Office of Policy and Finance City and County of San Francisco*
Michael Hunt, *Director of Scheduling, City and County of San Francisco*
Jacqueline Jacobberger, *President, League of Women Voters - North and Central San Mateo*
Susan Jeong, *United Way of the Bay Area*
Joanna Jones, *Grassroots Leadership Network of Marin*
Sharon Judkins, *Chief Administrative Officer, Santa Clara Valley Water District*
Rebecca Kaplan, *Councilmember, City of Oakland*
Nancy Kirschner-Rodriguez, *Manager of External Affairs, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency*
Kim Klein, *Consultant, CompassPoint Nonprofit Services*
Linda Koelling, *Vice Mayor, City of Foster City*
Christine Koltermann, *Governing Board Member, Santa Clara Unified School District*
Phil Lawson, *Director of Interfaith Programs, East Bay Housing Organization*
David Lee, *Director, Chinese American Voter Education Committee*
Ted Lempert, *President, Children Now*
Tim Leong, *Director Communications and Community Relations, Contra Costa Community College District*
Steve Lew, *Senior Project Director, CompassPoint Nonprofit Services*
Frank Lopez, *Social Equity Caucus Coordinator, Urban Habitat*
Shauna Lorance, *General Manager, San Juan Water District*
Daniel Macallair, *Executive Director, Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice*
Allison Magee, *Deputy Director, City and County of San Francisco*
Lisa Maldonado, *Executive Director, North Bay Labor Council*
Corey Marshall, *Good Government Policy Director, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association*
Hannah McFaull, *League of Women Voters - California*
Michelle McIntyre, *Analyst, Solano County LAFCo*
Kate McKenna, *Executive Officer, Monterey County LAFCo*
Mary McMillan, *Deputy County Manager, San Mateo County*
Nayantara Mehta, *Senior Counsel, Alliance for Justice*
JoAnn Melgar, *Staff Assistant to Board of Supervisors, Napa County*
Ross Mirkarimi, *Supervisor - Dist 5, City and County of San Francisco*
Karen Mitchoff, *Supervisor - District IV, Contra Costa County*
Mariana Moore, *Director Human Services, Alliance of Contra Costa*
Jeff Moore, *President, NAACP - San Jose Chapter*
Paul Morris, *Mayor, City of San Pablo*
Kevin Mullin, *Mayor, City of South San Francisco*

Paul Murphy, *Santa Clara County*
Rich Napier, *Executive Director, City/County Association of Government of San Mateo County*
Sherry Novick, *Executive Director, First 5 California*
Richard Olsen, *Director, Moraga-Orinda Fire District*
Jason Overman, *Director of Communications, City of Oakland*
Neelima Palacherla, *Executive Officer, Santa Clara County LAFCo*
Mona Palacios, *Executive Officer, Alameda County LAFCo*
Cindy Paredes Banville, *Director of Administrative Services, Mission Oaks Recreation and Parks District*
Chindi Peavey, *Laboratory Director, San Mateo County Vector Control District*
Luella Penserga, *Policy Director, Alameda Health Consortium*
Erich Pfuehler, *Legislative Affairs Manager, East Bay Regional Park District*
Dawn Phillips, *Program Director, Causa Justa: Just Cause*
Jessica Pitt, *Initiative Officer, The San Francisco Foundation*
Martha Poyatos, *Executive Officer, San Mateo County LAFCo*
Michael Pritchard, *Executive Director, Pathway Society, Inc.*
Arun Ramanathan, *Executive Director, Education Trust - West*
Randy Rentschler, *Director, Legislation and Public Affairs, Metropolitan Transportation Commission*
Michael Roe, *District Manager, Mt. View Sanitary District*
John Rusmisl, *District Manager, Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District*
Anne Ryan, *CompassPoint Nonprofit Services*
Libby Schaaf, *Councilmember, City of Oakland*
William Schulte, *Board Chair, Sustainable San Mateo*
Nima Shahidinia, *Silicon Valley Council for Nonprofits*
Rita Shue, *General Manager Hayward Area Recreation and Park District*
William Sifferman, *Chief Probation Officer, City and County of San Francisco*
Keene Simonds, *Executive Officer, Napa County LAFCo*
Sandra Stewart, *Co-chair, Political Advocacy Committee, Green Chamber of Commerce*
Ed Tewes, *City Manager, City of Morgan Hill*
Lou Ann Texeira, *Executive Officer, Contra Costa County LAFCo*
Cheryl Togami, *Management Analyst, Santa Clara Valley Water District*
Bob Uyeki, *Y & H Soda Foundation*
Jennifer Waggoner, *Director/Incoming President, League of Women Voters - California*
Debby Walker, *District Administrator, Mission Oaks Recreation and Parks District*

CENTRAL VALLEY

Amber Adams, *Engineering Manager, Quad Knopf*
Lee Ayers, *Board Member, Fresno Business Council*
Jill Barnier, *Program Manager, Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency*
Suzanne Bertz-Rosa, *Board Member, Fresno Business Council*
Paul Betancourt

Michael Caldwell, *Chair, California State University, Fresno*
Leslie Caviglia, *Deputy, City Manager City of Visalia*
Vic Corkins, *Operations Coordinator, Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency*
Vincent Correll, *Owner of Valley Oak Executive Suites, Fresno Business Council*
Vernon Crowder
Glenda Dwyer, *Hanford/Kings County Coordinator, Central Valley Tea Party*
Carole Farris, *Small Business Owner*
Manuel Ferreira, *Board Chairman, Orange Cove Fire District*
George Finney, *Retired EO/LAFCo consultant, Tulare County LAFCo*
Jeff Fly, *CEO, Turning Point of Central California, Inc.*
Melissa Garza, *Regional Planner, Fresno Council of Governments*
Benjamin Giuliani, *Executive Officer, Tulare County LAFCo*
Ken Grey, *Mayor, City of Selma*
Amy Guerra, *Attorney*
John Harris, *Harris Farms*
LeRoy Hendrix, *Interim Fire Chief, Orange Cove Fire District*
Pauline Hershey-Gambino
Allen Ishida, *County Supervisor, District 1, Tulare County*
Scott Jones, *Undersheriff, Fresno County*
Yezdyar Kaoosji, *YSK Consulting*
Blake Konczal, *CEO, Fresno County*
Matt Leedy, *Fresno County*
Mark Lewis, *City Administrator, City of Chowchilla*
Mitizi Lowe, *California State University, Fresno*
Kurt Madden
John Minkler
Joshua Mitchell, *Mayor, City of Sanger*
Larry Mullen, *Activist, Green Party*
Deb Nankivell, *CEO, Fresno Business Council*
Regina Peters, *Redistricting Task Force Member, Fresno County*
Larry Powell, *Superintendent, Fresno County*
Pat Ricchiuti, *President, P-R Farms*
Alan Rudominer, *Owner of Creative Vision Consulting*
Janet Ryan, *Western Regional Director, Concord Coalition*
Nia Sibley, *Field Representative, Office of Assemblymember Henry T. Perea, 31st District*
Kenneth Sonksen, *General Manager, Sanger-Del Rey Cemetery District*
Matilda Soria
Brian Trevarrow, *Kings River Conservation District*
Michael Turnipseed, *Executive Director Kern County Taxpayers Association*
Riley Walter, *Attorney, Walter Wilhelm Law Group*
John Welty, *President, California State University, Fresno*

Robert Wenzinger, *Reverend Monsignor*
Georgeanne White, *Mayor's Chief of Staff, City of Fresno*
Jeff Witte, *Executive Officer, Fresno County LAFCo*
Robert Woolley, *City Manager, City of Clovis*

LOS ANGELES

Angela Adams, *Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles*
Jacob Aguilar, *Assistant Director, Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services*
Joy Atkinson, *Program Administrator, Los Angeles African American Women's Public Policy Institute*
Luis Ayala, *Vice Mayor, City of Alhambra*
Kenneth Bayless, *General Manager, Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District*
Jacqui Cannon-Jones, *Management consultant, New U Consultants*
Ed Castaneda, *Assistant General Manager, Orchard Dale Water District*
Tom Coleman
Ruben Duran, *Partner, Meyers Nave*
Carolyn Emery, *Assistant Executive Officer, Orange County LAFCo*
Carolyn Fowler, *Chief Operating Officer, The Smiley Group, Inc.*
Elaine Freeman, *Board Member, Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District*
Katie Gagnon, *Director of Public Policy, San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership*
Mark Grajeda, *General Manager, Pico Water District*
Kristine Guerrero, *Regional Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities*
Ron Hasson, *President, NAACP - Beverly Hills/Hollywood*
Kirk Howie, *Assistant General Manager, Three Valleys Metropolitan Water District*
Denise Hunter, *CFO, FAME Assistance Corporation*
Heather Hutt, *Office of Assemblymember Isadore III Hall, 52nd District*
Jennifer Ito, *Project Manager, University of Southern California*
Betsy Johnson, *Co-President, National Womens' Political Caucus - Los Angeles Westside*
Mariko Kahn, *President, Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council*
Francisco Leal, *Leal Trejo*
Maribel Louie, *Economic Development, Analyst City of West Hollywood*
Cecil Murray, *Professor of Religion, University of Southern California*
Zarui Neksalyan, *Assistant Director, Policy and Programs, Los Angeles Business Council*
Felton Newell
Nina Nolcox, *RN, PHN*
Hilary Norton, *Executive Director, Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic*
Laura Olhasso, *Councilmember, City of La Canada Flintridge*
Torie Osborn, *California Alliance*
Lisa Power
Jennifer Quan, *Regional Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities*
Andre Quintero, *Mayor, City of El Monte*
Robyn Ritter Simon, *Former President, National Womens' Political Caucus - Los Angeles Westside*

Joe Rivera, *Governing Board Member, El Rancho School District*
 David Roberts, *Associate Director, Local Government Relations University of Southern California*
 Peter Rodriguez
 Nathan Sessoms, *Director, Brotherhood Crusade*
 Stephen Simon, *Aids Coordinator, City of Los Angeles*
 Jerilyn Stapleton, *Project Director, Jewish Labor Committee*
 Elena Stern, *Vice President of External Affairs, Para Los Ninos*
 Daniel Tabor, *Principal, Higher Ground Enterprises*
 Tony Tartaglia, *Member - Board Of Trustees, Glendale Community College*
 Joylene Wagner, *Glendale Unified School District*
 Diane Wallace
 Mawusi Watson, *Executive Assistant to the City Manager, City of Inglewood*
 Steve West, *General Manager, San Gabriel Valley MVCD*
 Anne Williams, *Central City Association*
 Ben Wong, *Director of Local Public Affairs, Southern California Edison*

INLAND EMPIRE

Jerry Almendarez, *Superintendent, Colton Joint Unified School District*
 Mary Armstrong, *Field Representative, Office of Senator Gloria Negrete McLeod, 32th District*
 Shima Azarafza, *Student*
 Rick Bishop, *Western Riverside County of Governments*
 Christina Bivona-Tellez, *Regional Vice President, Hospital Association of Southern California*
 Gregory Bradbard, *President and CEO, Inland Empire United Way*
 Jonathan Buffong, *Community Liaison, Office of Prevention and Early Intervention, San Bernardino County*
 Elena Carrasco, *Director of Development, American Association of University Women of Antelope Valley*
 Chris Catren, *Lieutenant, City of Redlands*
 Beata Chami, *Student*
 Stephani Congdon
 Olivia Crowley-Sancrant, *Administrative Assistant, Inland Empire Economic Partnership*
 Jalonni Diggs, *Student*
 Christina Duran, *Vice Chair, Friends Across the Lines*
 Bryant Fairley, *Associate Director of Community-University Partnerships, California State University, San Bernardino*
 Max Freund, *LF Leadership*
 Sheila Futch, *Senior District Representative, Office of Assemblymember Wilmer Amina Carter, 62nd District*
 Stanley Futch
 Paul Granillo, *President/CEO, Inland Empire Economic Partnership*
 Dorothy Grant, *Westside Action Group (WAG)*

Don Griggs, *Westside Action Group (WAG)*
Margaret Hill, *Assistant Superintendent, San Bernardino County*
Janel Huff, *Project Manager, Riverside County Southern California Edison*
John Husing, *Economics and Politics Inc*
Shonda Hutton, *Director, Time For Change Foundation*
Ratibu Jacocks, *Treasurer, Westside Action Group (WAG)*
Malik Joyner
Theresa Keller, *Staff Analyst, San Bernardino Employment and Training Agency*
Tigist Keneni, *Student*
Michelle Lamb
John Longville, *Trustee, San Bernardino Community College District*
Andres Luna, *Principal, Rialto Unified School District*
Bronica Martindale, *President, California Gardens Neighborhood Cluster Association*
Samuel Martinez, *LAFCo Analyst, San Bernardino County LAFCo*
Kevin J. McCarthy, *President, Chief Executive Officer, United Way of the Inland Valleys*
Ricky McClure
Jacob Mejia, *Public Affairs, Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians*
Cari Mendez, *Senior Vice President, Investor Relations Inland Empire Economic Partnership*
Jim Morris, *Mayor's Chief of Staff, City of San Bernardino*
Enrique Murillo, *Executive Director, California State University, San Bernardino*
Francisco Navarro, *Director, We Are Communities*
Beth Olhasso, *Water Resources Analyst, Inland Empire Utilities Agency*
Mandy Parkes, *District Manager, Inland Empire Resource Conservation District*
Kent Paxton, *Assistant to the Mayor, City of San Bernardino*
Judy Perry, *Assistant Director Public Health Nursing Field Services, Riverside County*
Kathleen Rollings-McDonald, *Executive Officer, San Bernardino County LAFCo*
Cynthia Rubio, *Student*
Kaitlyn Sarawatai, *Student*
Jeff Sceranka, *President, Enterprise Funding Corporation*
Christy Schroeder
La Donna Sewell
Pete Serbantes
Ali Shuns, *Student*
Lisha Smith, *Deputy Chief of Staff, San Bernardino County*
Shelli Stockton, *Industry Manager Inland Action, Inc.*
Sheri Stuart, *Springboard*
Michael Tuerpe, *Analyst, San Bernardino County LAFCo*
Fabian Villenas, *Principal Management Analyst, City of Rancho Cucamonga*
Stephanie Vondersaar, *Economic Development Manager, City of Ontario*
Dina Walker, *Executive Director, BLU Educational Foundation*
Joseph Williams, *Executive Director, Youth Action Project*

Tom Willman, *Manager, Digital Production Services Riverside County*

SAN DIEGO

Alfredo Aguirre, *Director, San Diego County*

Paul Bushee, *General Manager, Leucadia Wastewater District*

Kathleen Coates Hedberg, *Board Member, Helix Water District*

Robert Coleman, *Executive Director, Second Chance*

Joyce Crosthwaite, *Executive Officer, Orange County LAFCo*

Whitney De Agostini

Vi Dupre, *Administrator, Fallbrook Healthcare District*

Steve Escoboza, *Hospital Association of San Diego and Imperial Counties*

Jill Esterbrooks, *Communications Director, City of San Diego*

Dale Fleming, *San Diego County*

Tim Geiser, *Board President, Deer Spring Fire District*

Philip Hanger, *San Diego County*

Judy Hanson, *Director, Leucadia Wastewater District*

Brett Hodgkiss, *Administrative Services Manager, Vista Irrigation District*

Sharon Jones, *School Board Member, San Diego County*

Nancy Lytle, *Vice President, Southeastern Economic Development Corporation*

Nick Macchione, *Director, San Diego County Health & Human Services*

Margarette Morgan, *President, Vista Fire Protection District*

Marcy Morrison, *Careers With Wings*

Judy Ritter, *Mayor, City of Vista*

Mark Robak, *Board Member, Otay Water District*

Caroline Smith, *San Diego County*

Don Stump, *North County Lifeline*

Don Wells

Christopher Yanov, *Founder & President Reality Changers*

Nick Yphantides, *San Diego County*

STAKEHOLDERS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RESTRUCTURING

At the beginning of the first Stakeholder Roundtable meeting in Sacramento, participants provided a range of deeply insightful comments about the need for change when they were asked to complete the following sentence on a notecard:

“It is important to fix the relationship between state and local governments because...”

- “State and local governments are currently competing with each other over scarce resources, rather than cooperating with each other to stretch them.” – **Justin Adams**, *Chang & Adams Consulting*
- “It’s essential to create the environment for local communities to develop innovative strategies to improve outcomes for all Californians. Until we improve that relationship, we don’t create an environment in which innovative solutions can come forward.” – **Christina Altmayer**, *Altmayer Consulting*
- “The stability and sustainability of our rural health safety net and the economies of rural California demand it. To ensure the 5 million people living in rural communities have healthy communities. The health care safety net system, even with workforce shortages, makes up 11 percent of the rural workforce in the state – and rural communities make up 85 percent of the landmass in the state. That’s why we have to do this right: We need to restore public trust in government and its role in our private lives.” – **Steve Barrow**, *California State Rural Health Association*
- “Because of all the problems that have been mentioned, people have lost trust in state and local government. Because of that, they’re beginning to lose trust in the promise of California.” – **Andrew Berthelsen**, *Assemblymember Rich Gordon’s Office*
- “The current relationship doesn’t provide cost effective or efficient delivery of services to the public.” – **Linda Best**, *Contra Costa Council*
- “We need accountability and parity to ensure a sustainable future.” – **Vanessa Cajina**, *Western Center on Law and Poverty*
- “Effective delivery of public services is contingent upon fixing this relationship. When I say ‘effective,’ I mean cost-effective,’ as well as emphasizing performance and service quality. Government needs to be more process-oriented.” – **Andrew Chang**, *Chang & Adams Consulting*

- “People don’t believe in investing their common wealth anymore for the common good – both because of lack of trust and because most Californians don’t understand the difference between state and local government. People want California to work, and our economy will not thrive until government functions.” – **Cindy Chavez**, *Working Partnership USA*
- “California’s business climate will benefit, protecting businesses and jobs, and make them more competitive with other states.” – **Kirk Everett**, *Silicon Valley Leadership Group*
- “To clearly define and delineate the proper roles and functions of government at all levels, [restructuring must provide]: Greater efficiency/accountability/service delivery; protection of taxpayer dollars; avoidance of the current deficit cycle and the traditional boom and bust cycles of California’s budget.” – **Ryan Eisberg**, *Senate Republican Caucus*
- “The broad range of services needed to educate the whole state depends on a positive and functional relationship between schools, cities, counties, and the state.”
– **Stephanie Farland**, *California School Boards Association*
- “The existing system is dysfunctional and the public is not being well served.”
– **Jim Fox**, *former District Attorney, San Mateo County*
- “The state/local relationship must be restructured to align responsibility and funding, clarify accountability, enable transparency, simplify and enhance citizen involvement in democracy, and provide for efficiency and return on investment assessment.”
– **Linda Galliher**, *Bay Area Council*
- “It’s totally broke and tinkering hasn’t worked. All of the previous efforts at realignment have been tinkering. We need to acknowledge it needs to be totally fixed.”
– **John Gioia**, *Contra Costa County*
- “I was the California Budget Project analyst who had to read and explain Prop 22 on the November 2010 ballot. We can’t afford any more ballot-box solutions that impose additional dysfunction and increase the complexity of policymaking in California. If you don’t fix this, you end up with more of the same.” – **Scott Graves**, *California Budget Project*
- “State and local government must learn how to partner with each other for the purpose of saving money and to keep the trust of the public that we serve.” – **Joan Hancock**, *Contractors State License Board*

- “It will improve service-delivery for all Californians.” – **Iris Herrera**, *California Special Districts Association*
- “We need to renew the public and private infrastructure to restore the golden state to its former glory.” – **Bill Higgins**, *California Councils of Government*
- “We must fix this relationship because we have lost the public’s trust. Our system is broken and fiscally broke, and we must salvage the quality of life of California.”
– **Kathy Jett**, *former Undersecretary of Programs, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; and, former Director, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs*
- “We can achieve far more working together than apart, regardless of the revenues available.” – **Dave Kears**, *Alameda County*
- “Education and Health & Human Services for children are not adequately funded or effectively and efficiently provided. We need to figure out a way to get services to kids where they are – at schools and learning centers.” – **Ted Lempert**, *Children Now*
- “We need to improve the quality of services we provide to Californians.”
– **Susan Lovenburg**, *Davis Joint Unified School District and Saving California Communities*
- “We can’t sustain the needed level of investment in education or other government services without rethinking the way government works. Taxpayers need to see results to continue supporting investments in these services.” – **Debbie Look**, *California State PTA*
- “There is much distrust by the public regarding the ability of state and local governments to address the state’s problems. Moreover, the financial ability to provide operational and capital programs as currently constituted is unsustainable.”
– **Randy Margo**, *retired Assistant County Administrator, Yuba County; adjunct professor, Golden Gate University*
- “Our future depends on it. We need to enable local governing bodies to develop innovative and cost-effective plans and transform state government into more of a leader and less of a bureaucratic impediment.” – **Tom Mays**, *California Department of Education*
- “Our communities are only as strong as their weakest link. We need to find that weakest link and fix it to make it strong. Secondly, because we will be remembered for how we treat each other.” – **Helyne Meshar**, *Helyne Meshar & Associates*

- “In the 21st century, the role of government has become more primary than in the past, and we need to make sure it’s functioning at the level it needs to be to meet the needs of the people.” – **Cynthia Murray**, *North Bay Leadership Council*
- “If we don’t fix this, we can’t be successful. Our citizens want us to do it. Once and for all, we either rise together, or sink alone.” – **Bev Perry**, *City of Brea; former president, Southern California Council of Governments*
- “A positive relationship only makes common sense, and it’s expected by the represented. It’s far more costly not to cooperate.” – **Larry Powell**, *Fresno County Office of Education*
- “To make California a great state again, where our citizens are provided effective services with a transparent governance framework.” – **Tom Powers**, *former Chief Deputy, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs*
- “California’s future depends on successful reform. I’d echo the need to be more cost-effective, more transparent, and to have more public trust with voters.”
– **Alison Ramey**, *California Primary Care Association*
- “Older Californians depend on the social safety net at the state and local levels.”
– **Michael Richard**, *AARP*
- “The mission of government requires that government be responsible to the people – efficient, effective, and equitable at all levels. In times of tight budgets, funding and responsibilities must be allocated in a logical, effective way to ensure the trust of people in government.” – **Trudy Schafer**, *League of Women Voters*
- “My 85-year old father deserves to live with dignity in retirement after a lifetime of service in the public and private sector. And my 7-year-old and 2-year-old deserve a great public school system for their education.” – **Jai Sookprasert**, *California School Employees Association*
- “We have to fix it because we’re wasting focus, energy, and creativity trying to solve problems alone that we all share.” – **Kris Stadelman**, *NOVA Workforce Services, City of Sunnyvale*
- “We need to develop agencies that both encourage and facilitate local-level innovation, to allow us to collectively become more competitive in a global marketplace.”
– **Kristin Tilquist**, *chief of staff, Mayor Ron Loveridge of Riverside*

- “California’s infrastructure has collapsed and before any progress can be accomplished, the schools, roads, public safety public health must be restored to an operational basis. For three generations, we deferred taking care of things, and we can’t defer anymore.” – **David Warren**, *prison chaplain; retired lobbyist, Taxpayers for Improving Public Safety*
- “The restoration of citizens’ trust in public governance in California depends on it. Since Prop 13 and the *Serrano v. Priest* decisions, and the resulting institutions created to respond to them, a growing separation has arisen between citizens and their knowledge, interest, support, and trust of state and local government. Reforms being proposed by CA Forward can change this.” – **Rob Wassmer**, *California State University, Sacramento*
- “California has been a beacon of worldwide leadership in providing opportunity to all. We need to continue that leadership by fixing a dysfunctional system that’s denying those opportunities.” – **Tim Youmans**, *Economic and Planning Systems*



California Forward's mission is to work with Californians to help create a “smart” government – one that’s small enough to listen, big enough to tackle real problems, smart enough to spend our money wisely in good times and bad, and honest enough to be held accountable for results.

Tell us what you think:
fwd@CAFWD.org

CAFWD.ORG

Sacramento

1107 9th Street, Suite 650
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: 916-491-0022
Fax: 916-491-0001

San Francisco

300 Montgomery Street, Suite 638
San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: 415-362-9650
Fax: 415-362-9656

Los Angeles

448 South Hill Street, Suite 1018
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Phone: 213-488-9054
Fax: 213-488-9377