



California Policy Issues Annual

THE YEAR IN REVIEW



A Publication of
The Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairs
California State University, Los Angeles

EDITORS

Ali Modarres

Jaime Regalado

COVER DESIGN AND FORMAT

Richard (Rüsty) Navarrette

CALIFORNIA POLICY ISSUES ANNUAL (ISSN 1533-1725) (ISBN 1-878644-30-0) is published annually as a journal of the Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairs, California State University, Los Angeles, 5151 State University Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90032-8261. Copies of single issues, \$15. Orders of five or more, \$12 each. Please contact The Pat Brown Institute to place orders. pbi@cslanet.calstatela.edu

Publication date: December 2007

© 2007 The Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairs

CALIFORNIA POLICY ISSUES ANNUAL

THE YEAR IN REVIEW

This report was based on the

14th Annual California Policy Issues Conference
(Convened November 2006)

2006 California Agenda Lecture Series

2006 Roundtable Policy Papers

and

2006 Policy Issue Briefs

VOLUME 8

The Public Policy Education Program is supported by a grant from

the James Irvine foundation
Expanding Opportunity for the People of California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

14th Annual California Policy Issues Conference Summary	1
<i>Jennifer Kitson</i>	

2006 California Agenda Lecture Series — Summaries

The State of Education in Los Angeles	9
Can Transit-Oriented Development be Successful in California?	10
Poverty, Inequality, and Justice: A Vanishing Middle Class in Southern California	10
Immigration, Social Exclusion, and Urban Governance in Europe	11
Developing the California Health Care Workforce of Tomorrow	11
California's Infrastructure and the Future of the Golden State.....	13
The Future of Community Development.....	13
The State of the City.....	14

2006 Roundtable Policy Papers

Whither Housing in California?	17
<i>Jan Breidenbach</i>	
Reforming the Campaign Money System, California Style.....	23
<i>Susan Lerner</i>	
Methamphetamines: The Number One Public Safety Issue in California.....	29
<i>Alex J. Norman</i>	
Improving Race Relations: What Have We Learned in the Past 15 Years?.....	35
<i>Stewart Kwoh</i>	

2006 Policy Issue Briefs

Reconceptualizing Educational Reform Through Mayoral Takeover.....	41
<i>Jennifer Kitson</i>	
Facing the Transportation Question.....	49
<i>Ali Modarres</i>	
<i>Jennifer Kitson</i>	
Toward an Immigration Policy Debate	59
<i>Ali Modarres</i>	
<i>Jennifer Kitson</i>	
Preschool After Proposition 82: Should Spatial Targeting Be the Natural Next Step?.....	69
<i>Jennifer Kitson</i>	
Beyond Infrastructure: California's Social and Natural Environments.....	73
<i>Jennifer Kitson</i>	
Biographies	79

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The 2006 California Agenda Public Policy Lecture Series, The 14th Annual California Policy Issues Conference, and this 2007 edition of California Policy Issues Annual (CPIA), was made possible by the generous support of our hosts and sponsors.

The primary goal of our lecture series and annual statewide policy conference is to bring together leaders and experts from across the sectors to discuss, dialogue and debate leading public policy issues impacting California and its urban and suburban communities. Our chief goal in publishing the CPIA, which contains various policy papers, applied scholarly manuscripts and expert presentations made throughout the year, is to have it serve as an expanded policy tool for state, regional and local legislators; public and private agencies; community leaders and policy centers.

The generosity and vision of our sponsors allow us to realize these goals while also exemplifying the public, private and community collaborations that were so central and vital to the broad theme of the 2006 California Agenda, Conference and this 2007 edition of CPIA: *The Year In Review*.

On behalf of the Pat Brown Institute and the many public policy, community and higher education readers of this journal, we would like to take this opportunity to thank and acknowledge the following sponsors: *The James Irvine Foundation, AT&T, Southern California Edison, Sony Pictures Entertainment, Wells Fargo, California Federation of Teachers, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #47, Kaiser Permanente, State Building & Construction Trades Council of California, Center for California Studies, Center for Governmental Studies, and GCG Rose & Kindel.*

We are deeply appreciative.

Jaime A. Regalado, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Ali Modarres, Ph.D.
Associate Director

14TH ANNUAL CALIFORNIA POLICY ISSUES CONFERENCE

November 14, 2006

Elections 2006: Implications for Civic Engagement and Infrastructure Development in California

The legacy of former Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown was revisited in multiple ways at the Pat Brown Institute's 14th Annual California Policy Issues Conference, titled "Implications for Civic Engagement and Infrastructure Development in California." Over the past year, as the media covered the pending infrastructure legislation, references to Governor Brown's legendary investments in transportation, water, and education were constant. But equally important, explained Dr. Regalado, is that we are revisiting the Pat Brown era through infrastructure investment that was achieved, in part, because of a newfound bipartisan spirit. This intricate combination of political leadership, bipartisan effort, media coverage, and voter participation that resulted in a \$42 billion investment in the future of California is a commendable achievement. Held one week after the 2006 election, the conference was designed to serve as a timely forum to explore this intersection of politics, policy, and infrastructure investment in California.

Decision 2006: Civic Engagement and Social Infrastructure

The morning keynote speaker, Ms. Elise Buik from the United Way of Greater Los Angeles, set the tone for the conference in her presentation, "Decision 2006: Civic Engagement and Social Infrastructure." Ms. Buik argued that along with the newly passed physical infrastructure bonds, renewed investment in civic infrastructure must follow. Efforts should be coordinated to develop the social and physical infrastructure, she argued, to best address California's poor national ranking in such areas as academic achievement, access to health insurance, and income disparity. Ms. Buik said that a "sense of shared fate and shared public will to change these circumstances" is necessary, especially within the changing demographic context of California. "Building a strong civic infrastructure will look different than in the past," she said. With an aging population and a sizeable young population, adequate education is necessary to fill the great demand for the next generation of skilled workers in California. Additional challenges to our social infrastructure, she added, include voter apathy, low voter turnout, increasing NIMBYism, and decline in volunteering.

Alongside Ms. Buik's recommendations to develop the human capital and social infrastructure of California was her acknowledgement that "creating the social fabric will not be easy. . . . Only when the three big players"—public, private, and nonprofit—"are equal partners

at the table to address these problems can we hope to build the social infrastructure to match the physical infrastructure." Once at the table, she said, these sectors need to address issues of resources and funding, coordination between sectors to link training institutions to employers, and public policy development. Ms. Buik explained how, in an effort to put these recommendations into practice, the United Way is taking steps to improve quality-of-life issues in the region through public policy advocacy and educational and economic development. Because "Los Angeles is a bellwether for California and the rest of the United States, we need to get it right."

California Has Spoken! What's Next?

The opening plenary panel, moderated by Ms. Bobbi Murray from the *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, posed this question: "California Has Spoken! What's Next?" Mr. Allan Hoffenblum, from the political consulting firm of Hoffenblum & Associates, opened the panel by commenting on the current "democratic tsunami" and its implications for California. He pointed out that the electorate made very different decisions at the state and national levels; voters took out their anger at Bush nationally, while at the state level, California wanted a centrist and reelected Governor Schwarzenegger. Mr. Tom Chorneau from the *San Francisco Chronicle* concurred, adding that the Governor's centrist approach gave voters the feeling that "Sacramento was working for once." Additionally, the Governor was able to take advantage of multiple issues falling into place. Whether or not these bipartisan efforts will continue in light of a budget deficit remains to be seen.

The panelists also identified some of the political "curveballs" that may keep the upcoming year interesting. Mr. Timothy A. Hodson of the Center for California Studies pointed to the large freshman class in the California Assembly. According to Mr. Hodson, one half of the Democratic Caucus and one third of the Republican Caucus will be in their first term. Both the green legislature and leadership politics, said Mr. Hodson, will make for a complicated year in 2007. As for the state level, Ms. Laura Mecoy from the *Sacramento Bee* foresaw potential political fireworks between Governor Schwarzenegger and Attorney General Jerry Brown. Because they have "egos the size of the Sierras" and great capacity for change, she questioned their ability to see eye to eye.

The Governor's ability to bring diverse groups of stakeholders from different sectors together to solve problems was viewed by Dr. Robert Ross from the California Endowment as a great asset for the state. As a self-labeled optimist who worked with the Governor's administration on a statewide obesity summit, Dr. Ross predicted that Governor Schwarzenegger's political clout and consensus-building skills will have tremendous implications for health care reform in California. Due to budget constraints, however, several on the panel expect to see the Governor present a modest health care proposal that will tackle the issue in stages.

Framing the Outcome: The Role of Media in Politics

Moderator Dr. Scott Bowman of California State University, Los Angeles, set the stage for the panel titled “Framing the Outcome: The Role of Media in Politics” by reviewing the recent changes in the media landscape. On the one hand, said Dr. Bowman, the diversity of viewpoints has been reduced by media conglomeration; on the other hand, there has been an increase in “bottom-up news” in the form of Internet news sites and blogs. He described that the challenge for political campaigns is to navigate within both of those realms.

Adding to the media dilemma is the fact that most people still receive their election information from local TV stations, reported Dr. Kim Nalder from California State University, Sacramento. Because of this, said Dr. Nalder, viewers receive very limited information that is largely based on paid advertising. The preliminary findings from her study on the recent election indicate that there were five times as many political ads covered on the local news stations as political stories. The media’s lack of real political information, in addition to the increasing complexity of the initiatives, said Dr. Nalder, allows for the meanings of elections to be swayed by flawed media narratives.

Based on her experience working on the Proposition 87 Clean Energy Campaign, Ms. Yvette Martinez Bracamonte, from Progressive Strategy Partners, described the enormous challenge of getting mainstream TV stations to meaningfully cover their complex initiatives. The media’s desire for a sexy—as opposed to substantive—story, said Ms. Bracamonte, does not lend itself to adequately informed voters and creates a bias toward campaigns with deep coffers that can afford paid advertising. Mr. Parke Skelton from SG&A Campaigns described the TV stations as having an inherent conflict of interest: “The less they cover your story—the more you have to buy air time.” The rising cost of paid advertising makes it increasingly difficult for many candidates, but the dramatic increase in rates during the week before the election is cost-prohibitive for most downticket races. Blogs, the other election media source, described Mr. Skelton, are not a comparable alternative to real journalism, because the bloggers often lack investigative and analytic training and frequently obtain their information from mainstream media sources. Further, he said, the content and ideological background of most blogs remains unclear, leaving room for undisclosed bias.

In addition to inadequate election coverage, said Mr. Tracy Westen from the Center for Governmental Studies, negative media are actually contributing to voter apathy. Negative media are fueling what he referred to as a Downward Death Spiral, “a process in which each participant is forced to behave on short-term interests that ultimately lead to the collapse of the system.” Negative ads, said Mr. Westen, carry two messages that create fear, uncertainty, and doubt in the electorate: “(1) my opponent is a jerk, and (2) all politicians are jerks.” These ads create suspicion of all candidates and propositions, he said, leading to low voter turnout, which is undermining the integrity of the entire system. Because ads are

less likely to be negative when the candidate appears in them, Dr. Westen recommended that incentives be offered to candidates who appear in their own ads.

Pockets and Party Lines: The Politics of Public Expenditures

Mr. Robert Stern, from the Center for Governmental Studies, moderator for the panel titled “Pockets and Party Lines: The Politics of Public Expenditures,” posed a series of questions to the panelists regarding the passing of measures 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, and Proposition 84. He asked participants to consider why these measures had passed. For example, was it because more money was spent in favor of them than against? Because of bipartisanship in Sacramento? Because voters wanted to invest in their future? Because voters did not realize these bonds would cost twice as much to pay back after 10 years? Because we have a “credit card” society that is comfortable with “paying later”?

“The triumph of centrism,” argued Dr. Tom Hogen-Esch from California State University, Northridge, can largely explain the passing of the infrastructure bond package. In his talk, titled “Looking Backward: The Progressive Centrism and the Politics of California’s Infrastructure,” he argued that both voters and the Governor were visited by the ghosts of past Governors, such as Hiram Johnson, Earl Warren, and Pat Brown. The people believe that government still has a responsibility to invest in California’s economy, he said, as evidenced by the upward trajectory of per capita state and local expenditures since the 1970s. “We the voters get it,” argued Dr. Hogen-Esch. “We know it’s time to invest in the infrastructure.” What remains to be seen and what future infrastructure investment will be contingent upon, he concluded, is how successfully the infrastructure investment is implemented.

Though they are a “profoundly remarkable investment,” said Mr. Timothy L. Coyle from the California Building Industry Association, the recent infrastructure bonds are only the tip of the \$150 billion iceberg needed to completely repair and update California’s infrastructure. Mr. Coyle concurred that the implementation of the bonds is critical, because without voter trust, politicians in Sacramento will be unable to make the long-term investments truly needed. This sentiment was echoed by Mr. George Skelton from the *Los Angeles Times*, who argued that state leaders will have to prove they can spend the initial infrastructure money wisely before they ask for any more. “In many ways, people in this state are living in a state of denial,” he said, because they don’t want to raise taxes or restructure the state tax system.

On a different note, Mr. David Sickler from the Los Angeles Department of Public Works Commission argued that the infrastructure bonds were knowingly passed by voters who want a better quality of life, including quality housing and transportation options. The passing of Proposition 1A was significant, described Mr. Sickler, because voters were angry that \$2.5 billion had been siphoned away from transportation funding due to loopholes in Prop-

osition 42. Voters wanted to secure transportation funding and prepare our transportation system for continued population growth. These bonds were so successful, said Mr. Darry A. Sragow from the law firm Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal, LLP, because the campaign talked about fulfilling specific, critical needs (e.g., secure transportation funding). Additionally, said Mr. Sragow, to get a bond passed, the campaign must overcome the voters' inherent distrust of government. In this case, centrism and hope triumphed. He commended the Governor, legislature, and voters for doing the right thing.

Advancing the Pat Brown Legacy: Bipartisanship and the Spirit of 2006

As testament to the collaboration of the past year, the luncheon keynote presentation was shared between Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and Senate President Pro Tempore Don Perata. Ms. Kathleen Brown from Goldman, Sachs & Co. welcomed the Governor on behalf of the entire Brown family, praising the bipartisan teamwork that has brought a renewed interest in infrastructure. Though she has introduced many governors in her lifetime, said Ms. Brown lightheartedly, none of them has been Republican before today. The Governor, said Ms. Brown, "wears a Democratic suit quite nicely."

Honorable Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor of the State of California

Referring to Pat Brown as "one of the greatest architects" of the Golden State, Governor Schwarzenegger proclaimed that the legacy of Governor Brown will be continued through the recent investment of \$42 billion into California's infrastructure. Citing visionary leaders such as Earl Warren, Goodwin Knight, and Pat Brown as inspiration for his strategic growth plan, Governor Schwarzenegger said that he was "determined that California would get back its shine and its status as the most wonderful place in the world, that it could be once again the Golden State."

Based on the Los Angeles Times exit poll—which said that two thirds of Californian's think we are going in the right direction—he argued that as a state we are already on our way. He gave credit to the voters for choosing "greatness and opportunity" on Election Day and thanked Senator Perata for his collaboration and bipartisan efforts on the infrastructure bond package. "The reason for this new sense of optimism," said Governor Schwarzenegger, "is very simple; for the first time in years, people are seeing the tangible results from state government, results that make their lives better." The Governor cited evidence of the last year's productivity and cooperation in Sacramento—the creation of 650,000 new jobs, a reduced deficit, an upgraded credit rating, an on-time budget with funding for education and art, and bipartisan efforts to protect the environment and fight global warming. He also discussed his recent foreign trade missions as a long-term strategy to increase employment and revenue in California.

Though the accomplishments over the past year have been great, many challenges lie ahead, said the Governor. "We should not rest on our laurels." The Governor proceeded to announce his 2007 policy agenda, unveiling for the first time his intent to reform health care access. Other issues of top priority on the Governor's agenda included increasing educational accountability, creating youth career paths, reducing overcrowding in prisons, and forming competitive legislative districts. Additionally, he added, we need to finish what we started with the budget and infrastructure improvements. The tasks for the upcoming year will be tackled like those of 2006, "in a bipartisan way with cooperation and with respect." He said he is filled with "hope and optimism" and very proud of the legislators of both parties.

Governor Schwarzenegger attributed the infrastructure bonds' success and his reelection to simply doing what the public wants—"to concentrate less on politics and more on policy and governing." In California, he said, we have seen results, and "we have laid out a bright vision for the future." People from all walks of life have seen that "there is more that unites us than that tears us apart, that we are all in this together. . . . And now," said the Governor, "we are going to continue building. We are going to do exactly what Pat Brown did: build, build, build."

Honorable Don Perata, California Senate President Pro Tempore

Introduced as one of the most "profound visionary leaders our state has ever known" by Mr. Keith Weaver of Sony Pictures Entertainment, the Senate President Pro Tempore, Don Perata, quickly launched into a behind-the-scenes tale of how the bipartisan efforts enabled the creation of the infrastructure bond package. Senator Perata recalled the memorable jet ride on the Governor's G-5, during which the Governor referred to the Senator's initial \$7.9 billion infrastructure bond jokingly as "that Mickey Mouse bond of yours." The Governor, said Senator Perata, was completely right—California's infrastructure is in need of much greater investment than \$7.9 billion can provide. The key to the successful infrastructure package, said the Senator, was the Governor's ability to communicate his vision and then relinquish control of a project he created. The Senator described the negotiating stage in-between. After "a lot of Zinfandel," said the Senator candidly, Republicans (who wanted dams) and Democrats (who wanted parks) were able to get "stuff worked out."

The credit for "the single greatest investment ever made in the state," proclaimed Senator Perata, goes to the people of California. The public's faith in government, he said, will be validated by the visible landscape of construction throughout the state. Additionally, he continued, this investment will be the "lifeblood of the state" for the next 10 years. Investment in California's infrastructure is critical because "we are in a dead, flat-out race with Mexico to bring goods to the state." We have to attract private investment, said the Senator, so that we can "leverage each dollar a voter invested in California" in an effort to revive the

middle class and raise the overall quality of life. His own commitment, said Senator Perata, is the same as the Governor's—"We are not going to let California down."

Final Thoughts and Policy Considerations: Interactions with Dan Walters

Mr. Dan Walters from the *Sacramento Bee* concluded the conference with a political analysis intended to be "a little more realistic about the prospects for California." The dilemma, he began, is that California's diversity, complexity, and competing value systems make it a difficult state to govern. The American system of government, he argued, was not intended for this context. Created by white, male landowners, the system was based on two assumptions: (1) the diffusion of power, and (2) a core worldview and value system. Because the system is based on checks and balances as a way to diffuse power, some sort of consensus is necessary for anything to happen. Though appropriate at the time it was created, said Mr. Walters, within California's current context, this system appears to lack the social cohesion necessary to govern effectively.

Mr. Walters identified three "megatrends" that will impede effective governance in California: the change from an industrial to postindustrial economy, increasing population growth primarily through immigration, and the increasing complexity of government bureaucracy. As a result of these trends, "politicians must deal with two parallel universes," such as the aging affluent homeowners, on the one hand, and the young, ethnically diverse population with children, on the other. He questioned whether, without a unifying factor, there can be consensus on anything in California—the infrastructure bonds included. That is, the only agreement so far was to borrow more money.

The passing of the infrastructure bonds, argued Mr. Walters, occurred when multiple interests aligned, not out of true bipartisanship efforts. Good governance will require the creation of real consensus in California. If Arnold Schwarzenegger, with all of his unique attributes, cannot generate consensus and govern effectively, said Mr. Walters, who can? If Arnold Schwarzenegger fails, he said, "is it California's destiny to erode into hostile tribes and enclaves?" Voters today, concluded Mr. Walters, are "testing whether this unique system devised over 200 years ago can function effectively in the complexity and diversity of California."

2006 CALIFORNIA AGENDA LECTURE SERIES SUMMARIES

‘The State of Education in Los Angeles’

Moderator: Rick Orlov, *Los Angeles Daily News*

Panel: Hon. Marlene Canter, LAUSD Board of Education; Dr. Julie Mendoza, UC College Prep Initiative; Mr. David Cunningham, Presidents’ Joint Commission on LAUSD Governance; Mr. Joel Jordan, United Teachers of Los Angeles; Mr. Thomas Saenz, Counsel to Los Angeles City Mayor
January 26, 2006

The Pat Brown Institute’s first California Agenda Public Policy Lecture of the New Year aimed to facilitate a dialogue on one of the most pressing issues facing Angelenos today— “The State of Education in Los Angeles.” In addition to the recent publications citing dismal academic scores and high dropout rates, there has been much publicity over Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa’s ambitions to take over the school district. The distinguished panel, moderated by Rick Orlov of the *Los Angeles Daily News*, set out to respond to these and other issues facing the Los Angeles Unified District (LAUSD).

Marlene Canter, president of the LAUSD Board of Education, summarized progress made by the district, including an increasing academic performance index (API) score, the implementation of full-day kindergarten in 70% of the schools, and the massive construction efforts underway to build 180 new schools (of which 55 have been built). District deficiencies, however, were also raised by David Cunningham, of the President’s Joint Commission on LAUSD Governance, who expressed concern over mediocre academic achievement scores, school safety, and lack of safe passage at the end of school. Additional apprehension was expressed by the panel over high dropout rates, achievement gaps between subgroups, failure to pass the exit exam, and overcrowding. Room for improvement within the LAUSD remains, agreed the panel, but debate ensued as to the best way to go about achieving educational reform.

David Cunningham posed the pressing question of the day: To what degree, if any, does educational governance structure—specifically, mayoral control—correlate to academic performance. Joel Jordan, from the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) argued that educational reform needs to come from a “bottom-up” model rather than “top-down” governance restructuring. His vision of academic reform included increased local school control, collaboration among teachers, parents, and administrators, reduced class size, and heightened emphasis on students’ curriculum needs. Dr. Julie Mendoza, who is with the UC College Prep Initiative, argued that the increased accountability touted by mayoral take-over proponents cannot be realized in the absence of a shared definition of accountability.

She advocated a top-down/bottom-up educational reform agenda incorporating a shared vision and terminology to describe educational goals and accountability agreed upon by both community stakeholders and public officials. An inclusive approach is necessary, she emphasized, because ultimately, educational reform is a basic civil rights issue.

Though in agreement on a collaborative “top/bottom” effort, Thomas Saenz, counsel to the Los Angeles Mayor, stressed the critical need for better coordination of city and district services to address the collective responsibility of education in the County. He attributed insufficient academic progress to flaws in the governance system which, he argued, can be mitigated through mayoral oversight. Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa’s governance reform plans, he announced, were to be presented during the next 2–3 months. Concern was raised from the audience regarding the degree to which educational reform programs, those originating at the top or bottom, would be implemented fairly and equitably in terms of access, quality, funding, and accountability.

‘Can Transit-Oriented Development Be Successful in California?’

Dr. Elizabeth Deakin, Director, UC Transportation Center

February 22, 2006

Research findings presented by Dr. Elizabeth Deakin, Director of the UC Transportation Center, illuminated the complexity, and often ambiguous results, of many transit-oriented developments (TOD). High-density development within walking distance of a transit stop, explained Dr. Deakin, is necessary but not sufficient to achieve all the benefits normally attributed to TOD, including reduced auto-use, increased transit ridership, and improved quality-of-life factors. In addition to dense, mixed, and well-designed land use, successful TOD requires favorable public support, public policy, public investment, and good transit. Though community investment and development can result, most TOD does not occur at a large enough scale to justify costly transit infrastructure. Transit-oriented development alone, she concluded, is unlikely to address the majority of transportation problems facing California today.

‘Poverty, Inequality, and Justice: A Vanishing Middle Class in Southern California’

Dr. Daniel Flaming, President, Economic Roundtable

March 22, 2006

Past and present economic trends in Southern California were presented by the president of the Economic Roundtable, Dr. Daniel Flaming, as contributing forces shaping the region’s distribution of poverty, income, and employment. One lesser-known result of Southern Cal-

ifornia's economic restructuring, described Dr. Flaming, has been the rise of the informal economy. The loss of well-paying blue-collar jobs and a rise in low-wage service employment, he argued, has shrunk the middle class and driven many to the informal sector out of economic desperation. To our long-term detriment, growth in the informal sector is actually driving the region's economy, he continued, resulting in lost tax revenue and predatory working conditions. Because recent immigrants are disproportionately represented within the informal sector, said Dr. Flaming, their children's economic future remains uncertain. He concluded with several policy recommendations aimed to increase the region's economic opportunities in an effort to minimize the demand for informal employment.

'Immigration, Social Exclusion, and Urban Governance in Europe'

Dr. Ali Madanipour, University of Newcastle, England

April 17, 2006

Dr. Ali Madanipour, from the University of Newcastle, England, summarized recent immigration trends in Europe in an effort to give a context to the emerging social, economic, cultural, and geographic exclusion experienced by immigrants in the European Union. Dr. Madanipour reviewed the demographic and economic forces contributing to an increased demand for imported labor and the resulting challenges faced by these nations. Efforts to mitigate immigrant exclusion through strategic governance were reviewed by Dr. Madanipour and included the European Union's Social Exclusion Agenda and the Eurocities Project. Successful elements of the integration agendas included coordination among different levels of government, the involvement of multiple agencies, leadership by city authorities, and the participation of excluded groups. Drawing on the commonalities between the European and American experience, Dr. Ali Modarres, the Associate Director of the Pat Brown Institute, concluded the lecture by discussing the parallel causes of social and economic exclusion among immigrants within the United States and the need for an integrative policy response. Finally, Drs. Madanipour and Modarres led a discussion on the issue of immigrant inclusion and, within the framework of recent immigration events, those of particular relevance to California.

'Developing the California Health Care Workforce of Tomorrow'

Mr. Gary L. Yates, President and CEO of The California Wellness Foundation

May 24, 2006

In his lecture titled "Developing the California Health Care Workforce of Tomorrow," president and chief executive officer of The California Wellness Foundation Mr. Gary L. Yates called attention to the ways in which philanthropic foundations can help mitigate the imminent health care crisis facing California. Mr. Yates began by highlighting the key de-

mographic realities poised to dramatically influence California's health care system. The growth, aging, and increasing ethnic diversity of California's population, he argued, necessitate a more "culturally competent" workforce. The under-representation of minorities in the health care workforce limits access to medical services for patients in need of a multi-lingual, culturally sensitive staff. Mr. Yates underscored this workforce disparity with a singular example: Latino's comprise 32% of California's population but make up only 4% of the state's physicians and registered nurses. The promotion of diversity in health professions is not only The California Wellness Foundation's first funding priority but also the "major challenge of our time."

Mr. Yates enumerated three ways that foundations such as The California Wellness Foundation can respond to California's impending health care crisis: through grant making, by the facilitation of timely discussions and forums, and by supporting public policy. He described The California Wellness Foundation's unique responsive grant-making program as a successful, efficient way to get funding to the people most in need. The program accepts 1–2 page grant proposals at any time and upon review, within three months, funding either will be denied or a full proposal will be requested. In an effort to reduce bureaucratic expenditures, grant recipients receive the full amount upon signing the contract. Mr. Yates said the trust required by the responsive grant-making program has eliminated the abuse of funds and enabled nonprofits to spend money where it is truly needed, not on paperwork. Since 2002, the responsive grant-making program has awarded more than 100 grants for over \$15 million to organizations that directly assist underrepresented minorities to participate in the health-related professions (e.g., pipeline organizations, retention programs, loan repayment programs).

Additionally, The California Wellness Foundation has convened people to promote diversity in the health care workforce through an annual conference on the issue and through the Champions of Health Professions Diversity Award of \$25,000 given annually to three people who have significantly furthered diversity in the health care industry. Finally, Mr. Yates highlighted The California Wellness Foundation's most recent \$1 million public education campaign to inform policy makers and the general public about the need to increase diversity within California's health care workforce. Two key components of the campaign include the dissemination of a report on the state of diversity in the health care workforce and the creation of a Web site that will provide comprehensive information about health careers in California. Mr. Yates expressed great hope that if the marketing of the Web site is done correctly, it will increase access to career resources for ethnic minorities in California, a first step toward a diverse health care workforce. With a growing population and many educational opportunities, there should be no reason to go outside of California to acquire skilled health labor. What we need, concluded Mr. Yates, is a "homegrown California workforce."

‘California’s Infrastructure and the Future of the Golden State’

Ms. Sunne Wright McPeak, California Secretary Business, Transportation and Housing

June 21, 2006

California Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, Ms. Sunne Wright McPeak, delivered a talk on “California’s Infrastructure and the Future of the Golden State,” which called attention to the growing needs of an increasing population and economy. Citing the “golden age of building” under the watch of visionary leaders Goodwin Knight, Pat and Jerry Brown, the Secretary highlighted our current opportunity to invest in the California of tomorrow. If we are going to have a world-class economy in the future, she added, we need a world-class infrastructure. Future generations will benefit from our foresight, she argued, much like we have from past infrastructure investments. She concluded by stating that the current gubernatorial administration has reduced the economic deficit, seen a growth in jobs and a reduction in unemployment, overhauled workers compensation, and increased the state’s revenue under its “reform and rebuild” plan. Over the past 5 years, voters have approved 60 bond measures, which the Secretary sees as an indication that the public is willing to invest in the future. We must “push the envelope of greatness for the California dream. This is our time to do it right and do it well.”

‘The Future of Community Development’

Ms. Angela Glover Blackwell, CEO PolicyLink

September 20, 2006

“Equitable development,” the mission of PolicyLink, explained Ms. Angela Glover Blackwell, is a process in which the question “Who benefits?” is repeatedly asked in an effort to achieve social and economic equity. She argued that because the legacy of institutionalized racism, largely inscribed in geography, is so influential in determining life opportunities (e.g., access to wealth building, transportation, quality education, etc.), community development strategies need to achieve equity, not just equality. Equitable development seeks to simultaneously address the interconnected quality-of-life issues surrounding community development. Jobs, housing, transportation, and social services, said Ms. Blackwell, must be coordinated in an effort to connect “people and place issues together.” Moreover, equitable development mandates that all stakeholders are actively involved at every stage and level of the planning and implementation process. These strategies are incorporated into PolicyLink’s new focus on infrastructure, described by Ms. Blackwell as “the next frontier for community development.”

‘The State of the City’

Moderator: Pilar Marrero, La Opinion

Panel: Dr. Daniel Flaming, Economic Roundtable; Dr. Jorja Leap, University of California, Los Angeles; Dr. Fernando Guerra, Center for the Study of Los Angeles

December 6, 2006

Citing both the possibilities and disparities of life in Los Angeles, Ms. Pilar Marrero from La Opinion invited the panel to share its assessment of the City over the past year regarding to economic development, public safety, and politics.

Economic Development

Dr. Daniel Flaming, president of the Economic Roundtable, summarized the state of economic development in Los Angeles as “a city coming of age.” Cities, much like people, said Dr. Flaming, have come of age when they “are able to make decisions that shape their own future.” A healthy economy in Los Angeles is contingent upon the City’s ability to achieve a balanced income distribution as well as sustainable housing and labor markets. Of primary concern, he emphasized, is that Los Angeles is becoming increasingly dependent on an informal economy that lacks the oversight of formal government protection and regulation. Though the formal economy and net wealth of the region are increasing due to the informal economy, many workers are caught in a predatory labor market without government oversight. Too many people in Los Angeles are living precariously on the edge as a result of insecure employment and the lack of affordable housing. Though the City has approved recent programs that will address some social equity issues, said Dr. Flaming, initiatives that provide long-term social equity strategies are still needed, including (1) industrial growth strategy, (2) inclusionary zoning, (3) citywide minimum wage, and (4) enforcement of labor laws to curb the informal economy.

Public Safety

Dr. Jorja Leap, Professor of Social Welfare at UCLA, identified the number-one public safety issue facing Los Angeles: gangs and youth violence. “The City of Los Angeles,” said Dr. Leap, “is at a crossroads—probably the most serious crossroads regarding gangs in 50 years.” We have seen a 40% decrease in crime overall and a reduction in gang-related crime in Los Angeles, but the percentage of homicides that are gang-related has increased. Though gang-suppression activities have been successful, they are only one of the tools needed to reduce gang and youth violence. A number of intervention and prevention programs are already in place, she said, including those that are operated by the city, schools, religious institutions, and nonprofit organizations—but they all have different strategies. “The state of the City,” said Dr. Leap, “in relation to gangs is passionate, fragmented, and uncoordinated.” She argued for gang intervention and prevention programs to be coordinated, evaluated, and more accountable. Though it will require “tremendous political,

economic, and cultural will to go in a new direction," the structure for addressing gang and youth violence needs to be changed.

Politics

Los Angeles is where people come to see pluralistic urban politics unfold, commented Dr. Fernando Guerra, Director of the Center for the Study of Los Angeles. The state of politics in Los Angeles is that we are the center of urban reform, labor reform, ethnic politics, media in politics, money in politics, religion in politics, immigrant politics, and more. In addition to being one of the most democratically incorporated cities, according to Dr. Guerra, Los Angeles also has increasing ethnic representation in positions of power. The findings of a recent study on Leadership in Los Angeles, conducted by the Center for the Study of Los Angeles, indicate that the political structure or pyramid in Los Angeles is very "open," allowing for the participation of individuals from diverse ethnic, cultural, social, and political groups. For example, said Dr. Guerra, in 2003, of the top-100 leadership positions in Los Angeles from 10 different sectors (i.e. politics, business, community, etc.), there were 37 Latinos, 22 Jews, 14 African Americans, and 4 Asians. He described the state of politics in Los Angeles as "vibrant," based on this diversity and the large number of participants.

2006 ROUNDTABLE POLICY PAPERS

Whither Housing in California?

Jan Breidenbach

August 2006

We all know there is a housing crisis in California. A few statistics will remind us:

- California's homeownership rate is the second lowest in the nation (59%) and is 10 percentage points behind the national average. In June 2006, the median cost of a home was \$575,800. To qualify to purchase such a home, a household must earn at least \$127,950. At the same time, the median income for a family of four in the state is \$54,140. Only 14% of the state's residents can afford it (CAR, 2006).
- While the median home price has skyrocketed, the number of sales has recently been decreasing, down by 26% from June 2005. So far, the decrease in home sales has not translated into a price reduction, but it remains to be seen if this occurs later in the year (CAR, 2006).
- Forty-one percent of all Californians rent—and face the greatest affordability challenges. Quarterly figures released by RealFacts (2006) indicate that, for example, rents rose 9.1% in the last quarter alone in San Jose and 6.8% in LA-Orange County.
- California is second only to Massachusetts in the hourly wage needed to afford a two-bedroom apartment at fair market rent (FMR). A California, extremely low-income family earning \$16,242 or 30% of the state median income (and just over minimum wage) can afford rent \$406 per month, but the average statewide FMR is \$1,014 (HCD, 2006).
- According to the California Budget Project (2004), 25% of all renters pay over half their income for rent, and 35% of all renters pay over a third of their income for housing.
- California has over 300,000 people living in our streets, almost one third of them in Los Angeles County (Housing California, 2006).
- California has not built housing to keep up with demand, particularly for multifamily use. Multifamily units accounted for only 25% of all new units in the 1990s, a drop of almost 70% from the decade before. Since 2000, the number has increased slightly to 28% of all new units built (CA HCD, 2006).

What makes the housing crisis seem so intractable, and what policy options are facing us that could ameliorate this tragedy?

Systemic Problems With Housing in California

California's housing problems were not always a crisis. A series of shifts in the state's economy and demographics, along with the unintended consequences of state and federal policy, contributed to today's morass.

Two major economic shifts fueled the fire of our housing crisis. First, in the 1980s and early 1990s, California's economy moved from a manufacturing base to a service base. Higher-paid, "middle-class" jobs in aerospace and defense left and were replaced by lower-paid ones in various service industries. These were often filled by the large influx of immigrants, primarily from Central America but also from Southeast Asia—many of whom were fleeing war or its aftermath. With less income, these newer residents had a harder time buying into the housing market, remaining renters for decades (Haddad, 2006). Second, a combination of the dot-com bust and low interest rates led to much higher speculative investment in real estate, pushing prices to new heights beyond what the normal market would offer.

During the same general time period, several policy shifts depressed housing production. First, in 1986, Congress passed tax legislation that removed the depreciation benefit from rental housing, causing many apartment owners to leave the sector for other investment opportunities. Second, over these same years, the impact of Proposition 13 slowly eroded the state coffers, causing the state legislature in 1992 to shift property taxes from local jurisdictions to the state and providing sales tax instead. This, in turn, has led to the "fiscalization of land use," a process by which municipalities site retail establishments instead of housing production to fund local services. The third policy shift was the closing of state hospitals and mental institutions with the promise of community-based care that never materialized—creating a new, and large, class of homeless individuals that could in no way afford housing.

What's a State to Do?

The question California leaders must address is whether to rise to the occasion and tackle the difficult problem of where and how to house our residents or ignore the issue and leave our crisis to future generations. The question is not simple, however, since it brings into conflict two deeply entrenched—and contradictory—American value systems. First of these is our entrenched view that individualism and competition give the "winner" the right to the spoils of their victory, i.e., their property; this country has long resisted any community restraints on private landholding. The second is our American communitarianism, a sense of community-building that evolved separately. We believe that our individual welfare is connected to that of our neighbor; we relish barn raisings and respond without

hesitation to help those in trouble. Clearly, the push-pull between these two values creates political—and policy—conflicts.

If we can work through these overriding conflicts, what policies might we propose and implement to move us beyond our immediate housing crisis? Policy analysts and researchers provide us with a short list of primary goals for state and local housing policy (Katz & Turner, 2003; Davis, 2006). Our to-do list includes the following:

- Given that the housing market is clearly closed to a large number of our residents, we must increase the supply of nonmarket, nonspeculative housing.
- Where the market has produced incredible wealth, we must redistribute some of this wealth toward housing for those shut out of the market.
- Where we have existing low-income housing, we must preserve and protect it.

Our next question is how to turn these goals into workable policies. A list of options follows.

- **Increasing the supply of nonmarket housing.**
 - The immediate option is to pass Proposition 1-C. Proposition 1-C is one of four infrastructure bonds on the November 2006 ballot. Substantial funds were provided by the voters in 2002 for the production of housing—both rental and homeownership—throughout the State. These funds are virtually depleted and Proposition 1-C would supplement them for at least 3–4 more years.
 - The longer-term solution is a state trust fund. California is one of only 15 states without an operational trust fund. Even with the constraints of Proposition 13, California leadership must push for and support a stream of revenue for such a fund. The source should be spread as widely as possible to produce the least amount of individual payment and yet provide the largest amount of revenue (PolicyLink, 2005).
 - Local housing bonds. Cities and counties should pass housing bonds with a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote, thus allowing a majority of the residents to determine at least part of their own housing future.
- **Redistributing the wealth generated from hot housing markets.** We can redistribute some of the wealth generated by the housing boom through funding the state trust fund. But we can do more at the local level.
 - Put real consequences into the housing element law. Given the fiscal constraints imposed by Proposition 13 and subsequent legislation, local governments often loathe to encourage and site housing production. Only the state can see that this occurs both through incentives to local jurisdictions that do build housing and significant consequences to those that don't. Improving the housing element law and

Conclusion

As noted, we in California—indeed the nation—have a long history of conflicting values that we deeply subscribe to and support. These include both a strong belief in the right of private property ownership with little government intervention as well as the conviction that we are a common people who have built a society that values compassion and interdependence. These two belief systems sometimes conflict, but determining the level of government intervention in the housing market is one place where the conflict is front and center. No one policy completely reconciles these systems, and each policy initiative will lean more toward one or the other. However, given the potential of the housing crisis' long-term impact on residents, infrastructure, and—indeed—our whole economy, finding a way to implement communitarian values may be a necessity if we want to maintain our capitalist viability.

References

- California Association of Realtors (CAR). (2006, July 25). "CAR Reports Median Price of a Home in California at \$575,000 in June, Up 6.2 Percent From Year Ago; Sales Decrease 26.3 Percent." <http://www.car.org/index.php?id=MzYOMzy=>
- California Budget Project. (2004). "Locked Out: California's Affordable Housing Crisis." <http://www.cpb.org/2004/lockedout2004.pdf>
- California Department of Housing and Community Development (CA HCD). (2006, February 15). "California's Deepening Housing Crisis." <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hc021506.pdf>
- Davis, John Emmeus. (2006). "Between Devolution and the Deep Blue Sea: What's a City or State to Do?" In Rachel Bratt, Michael Stone, & Chester Hartman (Eds.), *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda* (pp. 364-398). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Haddad, Annette. (2006, July 20). "Rent Increases in State Outpace Much of the West," *Los Angeles Times*, July 20, 2006.
- Housing California. (2006, Winter). "The Great Rain." http://www.housingca.org/PDFs131_Winter_2006
- Katz, Bruce, & Turner, Margery Austin. (2003). *Rethinking Affordable Housing Strategies: An Action Agenda for Local and Regional Leaders*. Washington, DC: Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy, Brookings Institution/Urban Institute.
- Krueckeberg, Donald A. (1999). "The Grapes of Rent: A History of Renting in a Country of Owners." *Housing Policy Debate*, 10(1), 9-30.
- PolicyLink. (2005). *Expanding Opportunity: New Resources to Meet California's Housing Needs*. Berkeley, CA.

Reforming the Campaign Money System, California Style

Susan Lerner

September 2006

California's political system has reached unprecedented heights of special interest influence, seriously alienating California voters. Politics in California has become an insider game, with special interest lobbyists and well-heeled campaign donors pouring huge amounts of money into political campaigns. A few facts help illuminate the problem:

- The 2004 California elections cost more than \$521 million, according to the Institute on Money in State Politics, which tracks campaign contributions to state candidates, party committees, and ballot measures.
- As has been widely reported, close to \$350 million was spent in relation to last year's Special Election.
- In the June 2006 Democratic primary for Governor, the two principal candidates and a host of independent committees spent upwards of \$80 million.
- Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, who campaigned to recall Governor Gray Davis with a promise to get special interest money out of politics, has already collected more than \$102 million in his 2 1/2 years as governor, according to the Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights, a consumer watchdog group.
- The *Los Angeles Times* reports that more than \$330 million has been raised by all state races as of Tuesday, September 18. With just under 7 weeks of fund-raising time left before the November 7 election, 2006 is shaping up to be another record-breaking year for campaign fund-raising in California.
- Interest groups gave at least \$3.5 million, in contributions of \$1,000 or more, directly to candidates for Senate and Assembly seats in the first 29 days of August. On one day before the end of the legislative session, there were 33 fund-raisers held in Sacramento.
- The financial services and real estate industries contributed \$15.6 million in 2004. In contrast, advocates for the environment gave just \$127,000 and organizations representing racial and ethnic minorities gave \$18,600.
- Of the top 10 largest political contributions from 2001 to 2005, which ranged in size from \$8 million (from the California Teachers Association) to \$14.25 million (from Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America), 7 were from drug companies or PhARMA.

What motivates donors to make such large contributions? It is difficult not to conclude that these contributions are good investments, that special interest money does indeed influence public policy. There are too many instances like the following:

- The financial services and lending industry gave over \$70,000 in donations this year to legislators who sit on committees regulating that industry. A bill that would regulate predatory lending practices preying on service personnel with stop-gap loans at interest rates of over 400% died in committee.
- Health insurers have spent \$3.7 million in campaign contributions in California since 2005, \$765,000 of that to Gov. Schwarzenegger. The Governor just vetoed a bill that would provide universal health care coverage for all Californians and that is opposed by the insurance companies.
- This past spring, AT&T hosted a golf fundraiser at Pebble Beach, sponsored by Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez, which raised \$1.7 million for the California Democratic Party. Shortly after, the Speaker delivered a landslide vote for AT&T's pay-tv deregulation legislation.

The corrosive nature of this escalating political money race is becoming increasingly clear to the California public. A poll conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) last November found 64% of likely voters believe that campaign contributions had a negative effect on the public policy decisions being made in Sacramento. A September 2005 survey by the PPIC found that 92% of California voters thought that special interests control the initiative process. It is little wonder that voter participation in elections in California has fallen precipitously, reaching a low of 20% in the June 2006 primary.

Given these facts, a clear consensus has developed on both sides of the aisle and among people from all ideological backgrounds that California's campaign financing system is broken. Different solutions have been tried, with limited success. It is time for a truly innovative approach: Clean Money full public funding of elections.

Failed Solutions

California's voters have long favored regulation of campaign contributions. In 1974, California voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 9, which established the Fair Political Practices Act. The Act established disclosure requirements for campaign contributions and expenditures by candidates and ballot measure committees, set ethics rules regarding financial conflicts of interest for elected officials, and set disclosure requirements and regulations for lobbyists and their activities. There are those who argue that expanding and strengthening disclosure requirements is the only way in which campaign financing should be regulated.

While transparency and the full disclosure of political contributions is essential to the proper functioning of our democratic system, reliance on disclosure alone to counteract the effects of run-away campaign dollars has not only failed to alleviate or solve the problem but it has also had severe unintended consequences.

We now have a system in which full disclosure leads to the overwhelming desire to vote for “none of the above.” Increasingly, press coverage emphasizes only campaign contributions and not policy. Full disclosure of ever-increasing levels of campaign contributions has had the unintended consequence of breeding cynicism and voter apathy.

In the end, if disclosure is all we have, it merely serves to illustrate how bad every candidate can be and discourages and depresses voter turnout.

An additional approach has been to lower contribution limits. The goal of such lower limits is to make money a less important ingredient in election campaigns. California voters also have passed various propositions limiting campaign contributions.

But very low limits at the state level have not survived legal challenge. Prop 208, which set contribution limits of from \$100 to \$500 (depending on the position) for candidates who refuse voluntary spending limits, passed in 1996 by a margin of 61% to 39%. These limits never took effect, as they were struck down by the courts. Subsequently, California voters adopted Prop 34 in 2000, which set relatively high contribution limits of \$3300 for legislative races and \$22,300 for governor. . As the cost of campaigning in California has risen, candidates are forced to spend ever-increasing amounts of time raising money and less time working on legislation or social policy issues. Thus, the goal of lessening the importance of money in political campaigns has not been served by imposing lower contribution limits. The problem has been exacerbated by term limits.

Clean Money: A Practical and Innovative Solution

Clean Money full public funding of elections is steadily gaining popularity. Arizona, Maine, and Connecticut all have laws establishing full public funding of all statewide and legislative races. New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Vermont all have laws establishing Clean Money public funding for some races or offices, and the cities of Portland, Oregon, and Albuquerque, New Mexico, have also adopted Clean Money for their municipal elections.

To qualify for public funding, candidates are required to

- Reject private fundraising and agree to limit spending to the amount provided by the public
- Demonstrate broad-based support by gathering a set number of signatures and \$5 donations
- Participate in at least one primary and two general election debates.

Experience with Clean Money in Arizona and Maine indicates that the system is effective in changing elections for the better, accomplishing its goals of leveling the playing field, increasing the number of competitive races, opening the ballot to candidates from diverse backgrounds, and helping combat voter apathy.

A recent Associated Press (Lawrence, 2006) article reported that

A 2005 study by three University of Wisconsin political scientists concluded that public financing can significantly increase the number of candidates running for office and therefore the choices available to voters. . . .

A study released this year by the nonpartisan Institute on Money in State Politics found that Arizona's public financing system, adopted by voters in 1998, had narrowed the funding gap between challengers and incumbents and drawn an increasing number of participants.

Fifty-five percent of Arizona candidates accepted public financing in 2004, up from 25 percent in 2000, according to the study. This year, 62 percent are running on public financing, says Eric Ehst, executive director of the Clean Elections Institute, a nonprofit group that defends the Arizona law.

Election statistics collected by the Arizona Clean Elections Institute indicate that the number of women and minority candidates increased with public funding. Further, voter turnout has increased by 20% in Arizona since the adoption of Clean Money. Polls also show that the Clean Elections system in Arizona is popular, with 85% of those familiar with the system saying that it is very or somewhat important to Arizona voters.

In Maine, more than 80% of the Legislature is elected with Clean Money, while in Arizona, 10 out of 11 statewide offices, including governor, are held by Cleanly elected officials.

This November, California voters will have an opportunity to bring Clean Money full public funding of election campaigns to California by passing Prop 89. Prop 89 establishes a full public funding voluntary alternative to the conventional fund-raising race. It also contains strict contribution limits for conventionally funded candidates, as well as tough disclosure and enforcement requirements. Based on the Clean Money laws working today in Arizona and Maine, but adjusted for California's election realities, Prop 89, if adopted, would significantly change the way California politics is conducted.

Conclusion

The campaign financing situation in California cannot be allowed to continue as it is. Voters, elected officials, and commentators all agree that the current system is broken. Traditional forms of campaign finance reform have not prevented the dominance of a pay-to-play atmosphere in Sacramento, which threatens the very fiber of our democracy. It is time for California to adopt Clean Money full public funding of elections and put the voters, not big money contributors, back in control of elections and public policy.

Methamphetamines: The Number One Public Safety Issue in California

Alex J. Norman, D.S.W.

October 2006

Introduction

When one views the landscape of important public safety issues in the State, it is difficult to determine where to begin. Is it homeland security, with its threats of acts of terrorism? Is it disaster preparedness, with the threats of earthquakes, fires and floods? Or is it the familiar area of crime, with threats of violence, drug trafficking, and thefts of identity or property? As I pondered where to begin, I thought of the answer that Willie Sutton, the famous bank robber, gave when asked why he robbed banks. "Because that's where the money is." So I deduced that if I were to uncover clues as to the important public safety issues in California, I would have to start with the budget because that's where the money is allocated.

In January 2006, the Governor submitted a budget to the Legislature that proposed to spend the following over the next 2 years:

- Eight million dollars for Sexual Assault Felony Teams (SAFE) because sexual predators represent one of the greatest threats to safety and security of the citizens of California;
- Nine million eight hundred thousand dollars to add six new Gang Suppression Enforcement Teams (GSET) to the one team already in place because gang-related homicides result in 800 deaths at a cost of \$1.4 billion annually;
- Six million dollars to create three new teams to augment the three existing California Methamphetamine Strategy Programs (CALMS) because meth, as it is called on the street, is the leading drug-related, law enforcement problem facing California; and

One million three hundred thousand dollars to increase Special Crimes Unit investigations and prosecutions of individuals and businesses involved in complex financial and identity theft crimes (e-budget/CA).

In May of 2006 the budget was revised to propose an additional \$142.2 million for public safety programs of which \$20 million was to intensify and strengthen the California Multi-jurisdictional Methamphetamine Enforcement Team Program (CAL-MMET) for a regional approach to the eradication of meth in California. The balance of the funds were for Vertical Prosecution Block Grants (\$8.2 million) to follow heinous cases through the judicial process, competitive grants for the Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Program (\$50 million),

the Citizens Options for Public Safety (COPS) (\$21.3 million), the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) (\$21.3 and \$19.5 million) to offset costs for training local sheriff' deputies and probation officers who work in jails and juvenile halls (e-budget/CA/revised).

Thus, it would seem that from a budgetary standpoint, methamphetamine would rate as the number one concern in enhancing public safety in California. Indeed, based on a series of surveys in 2005 and 2006, sponsored by the National Association of Counties (NACo) and conducted by the Research Institute of Washington, D.C., meth has become the new "bathtub gin" in America. Responding to the surveys were 500 sheriffs in counties across 44 states, many of whom reported that meth was their number one drug-related problem (eight Western States reported meth as the number one drug problem while none of six Eastern States did). Meth is a public safety hazard not only addicting hapless users but also, because of the volatile mixture of chemicals used in its manufacture, it causes death and injury. It is produced in vacant buildings, hotel bathrooms, apartment buildings, and business locations, causing explosions and fires that injure or kill innocent victims whose only misfortune is to be in an adjacent room or building.

The Criminal Effects of Methamphetamine on Communities

The criminal effects of methamphetamines stem from the horrifying, multifaceted results of the manufacture, distribution, and use of the drug and will require more than one solution, involving the coordination of police, fire, and health entities.

A summary of the telephone survey revealed the following:

- More counties (48%) reported that meth was the primary drug problem—more than cocaine (22%), marijuana (22%), and heroin (3%) combined;
- Ninety percent of counties had some kind of precursor legislation in effect. Forty-six percent of sheriffs reported that the number of meth lab busts was down because of precursor legislation in their jurisdictions;
- Fifty-five percent of law enforcement officials reported an increase in robberies or burglaries in the last year, and 48% reported an increase in domestic violence;
- Sixty-three percent of counties reported an increase in workloads in the last year, and 73% reported that they were paying more overtime;
- Forty-eight percent of counties reported that up to 1 of 5 inmates was incarcerated because of meth-related crimes. Seventeen percent reported that 1 of 2 inmates was incarcerated because of meth-related crimes; and

- Eighty-five percent reported out-of-state importation, and 71% reported importation from Mexico (NACo, 2006).

It is interesting that 46% of the counties reported a decrease in meth lab seizures and that only 12% reported an increase. These are promising findings to say the least. However while on the face of it the survey suggests that the precursor legislation has limited the ability to purchase pseudoephedrine, an ingredient in many of the over-the-counter cold medicines and a main ingredient needed for the manufacturing of meth, it does not address the problem of addiction and consequently has not reduced the use of meth in most jurisdictions. At the same time that certain meth lab busts have occurred, robberies and burglaries were up in 55% of the counties, causing public safety staff workloads to rocket sky high and meth-related arrests to increase in 63% of the locales.

Methamphetamine Production and Distribution in California

The City Council of Long Beach referred the matter of “how the City could fight the increasing problem of methamphetamine use and related crime” to the public Safety Advisory Commission (PSAC) on September 14, 2005. During the year that followed, the PSAC conducted public hearings and heard presentations from members of the public at large, law enforcement officials, health and human services personnel, and persons in rehabilitation processes. On August 15, 2006, the Council unanimously adopted the PSAC report and a report from a consortium of health agencies on recommendations on how to address problems related to the production, distribution, and use of methamphetamines in Long Beach. The Commission’s recommendations included restricting over-the-counter drugs containing ephedrine and pseudoephedrine; assessing the effectiveness of addiction programs; monitoring the effects of Proposition 36; and exploring innovative measures law enforcement can use. The health organizations advocated a social marketing campaign focused on the drug and more support groups for parents, students, and meth users (PSAC, 2006).

According to law enforcement officials in Los Angeles County and Long Beach, Mexican drug-trafficking organizations (DTOs) are the primary distributors of methamphetamines in California, enlisting local street gangs and Asian criminal groups who convert the powdered form to a crystallized form known as “ice,” which is sold for up to \$30,000 per pound. DTOs have shifted their production of meth superlabs to Mexico and Riverside/San Bernardino Counties to reduce the risk of discovery. It is anticipated that California will remain one of the most active drug smuggling and production areas for meth due to the close proximity of the state’s major air, land, and sea ports of entry to Mexico. The response of current legislation has been that of a law enforcement and suppression approach.

Treatment Approaches

Proposition 36, an alternative sentencing law that provides funding for substance abuse, has not had enough of a history to determine the effectiveness with persons who are addicted to meth. Health officials at Los Angeles County and Long Beach Departments of Health indicate that there are more methamphetamine-related emergency room visits than for any other drug. Treatment capacities as reported by Health Directors are that

- Fifty-seven percent of treatment facilities lack funding;
- Thirty-seven percent report insufficient capacity for treatment;
- Thirty-three percent do not have sufficiently trained staff; and
- Thirty-seven percent report that different protocols are required for meth.

There are basically four approaches to the treatment and rehabilitation of meth users and proponents of each claim a measure of success. However, research on the effectiveness of treatment approaches is scant or based on too few cases to be reliable as to results in progress. Briefly, the approaches are as follows:

- Moral—The person is bad if they make a bad choice in the use of drugs;
- Disease—The person is powerless over the disease and must be cured;
- Behavioral—The person has the power to change based on the way he or she thinks;
- Holistic—The person is competent to help if given the right education, tools, and support (building on the good points of the other models).

A much more promising approach is present in the Methamphetamine Treatment Project (MTP), a multisite initiative to study the treatment of meth dependence using a new, comprehensive protocol developed jointly by the MATRIX Institute of Addictions and UCLA's Integrated Substance Abuse Program (ISAP). Its goal is to see how this protocol can be transferred to the community drug system.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Methamphetamine, a drug that is largely popular in the Western States, is moving across the country from west to east, and it is both dangerous and hazardous. While the suppression approach of law enforcement coupled with precursor legislation has resulted in fewer production labs and curbed the sale of over-the-counter drugs, the use of meth and meth-related burglaries, robberies, and arrests has all increased. Beyond these realities, due to the longer-lasting effects of meth compared with cocaine, it is anticipated that meth use will continue to surpass cocaine as the preferred illegal drug for hard drug users. Complicating matters even more is the fact that the drug trafficking organizations controlling the United States meth trade have shifted their production to superlabs in Mexico and outlying rural

areas of California, making discovery and prosecution more difficult. Obviously, we cannot arrest ourselves out of the meth problem.

Public Safety groups and health officials report that they are unable to determine the effectiveness of treatment and rehabilitation programs in the community due to their limited history, incomplete records, and lack of established program performance measurements (PSAC, 2006). Based on these conclusions, the State of California should pursue legislation within a comprehensive framework that includes the following:

- Prevention and Education with a focus on funding clinical and community research projects that provide factual data on the production, distribution, and use of methamphetamines;
- Continued Enforcement and Containment of methamphetamine production and distribution on a Western-Regional basis and not just at the State level;
- Vastly increased funding of Treatment and Rehabilitation programs and projects to determine best practices for providing comprehensive services to persons suffering from methamphetamine addiction; and
- Exploring the feasibility of collaborating with State, County, and Municipal elected officials on the possibility of standardized legislation that will restrict and monitor the sales of over-the-counter drugs containing ephedrine or pseudoephedrine.

References

AB275 (Revises definition to include manufacturing of illegal controlled substance).

AB1078 (Would enact the "Methamphetamine Contaminated Property Cleanup Act of 2005" and define terms).

Corrections and Law Enforcement, Enhancing Public Safety in California (e-budget/CA). (2006). <http://ebudget.ca.gov/BudgetSummary/CLE/8866335.html>.

Corrections and Law Enforcement, Enhancing Public Safety in California (e-budget/CA/revised). (2006). <http://ebudget.ca.gov/Revised/BudgetSummary/CLE/8875373.html>.

H.R. 313 (To provide grants to states to combat meth abuse).

H.R. 2335 (To amend the Public Health Service Act, to provide for demonstration projects for the purpose of providing comprehensive services with respect to the problems of chil-

dren who have been removed from environments in which methamphetamine is unlawfully manufactured, distributed, or disbursed).

Methamphetamine Treatment Project. (2006). <http://methamphetamine.org/>.

National Association of Counties (NACo). (2006). "The Meth Epidemic in America: The Criminal Effect of Meth on Communities.

NARCONON. (2006). <http://www.stopmethaddiction.com>.

Public Safety Advisory Commission of Long Beach (PSAC). (2006). "Report Regarding the Problems Associated With Methamphetamine Use in Long Beach and Related Crime."

S.103 (Combat Meth Act of 2005, A bill to respond to the illegal production, distribution and use of methamphetamine in the United States, and for other purposes).

"Tried 12 Step?" (2006). <http://www.ClearHavenCenter.com>.

Improving Race Relations: What Have We Learned in the Past 15 Years?

Stewart Kwoh

November 2006

Do we ever learn from the past in shaping our future? Do we even know our past? I was reminded recently of an incident in Los Angeles in 1871. It was a horrific hate crime, but an event that is not known by very many in Los Angeles. Judge Michael Stern wrote in the *Los Angeles Superior Court Judicial Magazine* court records of the 1871 prosecution in *People v. Ah Lun*, and other accounts of the late October events in Chinatown that year,

illustrate the vulnerability of its inhabitants to extreme racial violence. The Chinatown of the era was located where the El Pueblo de Los Angeles State Historic Park stands today. A quarrel between Yo Hing and Sam Yuen on Oct. 23, 1871, caused the two to be arrested. They bailed out the next day, but their dispute continued when they returned to Chinatown. Hearing gunshots in that area, a police officer went to investigate and stem the feud. A private citizen came to his aid, but was shot and killed in the ensuing confusion.

The record goes on to state,

An angry mob of whites stormed Chinatown with a vengeance. They chased and cornered a number of Chinese in an adobe building and then besieged the structure from the roof and all sides.

The pistol-happy vigilantes shot indiscriminately into the adobe, gunned down a Chinese man who attempted to flee, and torched the premises. The building was stormed and Chinese men were dragged out and hanged. By the time the violence ended, 19 Chinese had been murdered (including two young boys). Although there were some arrests of members of the white mob, few stood trial or served much jail time.

Accounts of the October massacre identify two motivations for the mob action beyond the immediate retribution for the killing of the bystander at the outset of the melee: intense racial hatred of Chinese and common crime. The criminal perpetrators shot and beat innocent people, cut the hands off victims to steal rings, ransacked and stole from the Chinese stores at will, and burned and pillaged property. Most of them got away without penalty for their crimes.

October 24, 1871, is still remembered as the worst instance of racial violence in the Chinese American community of Los Angeles.

How many in Los Angeles know of this event? There are so many important events that shed light on race relations in our past. Yet, our schools, leaders, media, and institutions often choose not to highlight them. Of course, positive events should be highlighted, but those

that reveal our hatreds, the failures of our system of justice, and the consequences of ignoring racial tensions have an important role, too. That role is learning. Learning lessons can be so helpful in preventing future violence that they simply cannot be ignored.

When I posed the question of improving race relations from what we've learned over the past 15 years, that was a somewhat arbitrary number. However, I do believe that it is instructive to see what has transpired in race relations since the 1992 Los Angeles riots.

One of the prominent developments in racial demography has been the continued diversification of our population. The U.S. Census Bureau shows that the 2005 California population included 15,828,690 (44%) whites; 12,722,962 (35%) Latinos; 4,868,438 (13%) Asians; 2,690,805 (7%) African Americans; 696,633 (2%) American Indians; and 256,917 (1%) Pacific Islanders. Clearly, we live in a state without a racial majority group.

The demographic shifts in Los Angeles County are dramatic in that Latinos now outnumber whites. The census population estimates for 2004 included 4,624,713 (47%) Latinos; 3,072,021 (31%) whites; 1,374,156 (14%) Asians; 1,032,227 (10%) African Americans; 153,539 (2%) American Indians; and 54,331 (1%) Pacific Islanders.

These population shifts will continue. By 2025, it is estimated that California will have a population of 21,232,000 (43%) Latinos; 16,626,000 (34%) whites; 9,078,000 (18%) Asians; 3,426,000 (7%) African Americans; and 393,000 (1%) American Indians.

Another development over the past 15 years has been the response of government to the issue of race relations. I was President of the Los Angeles City Human Relations Commission in 1988-89. At the time, the Commission had only one administrative staff member. Our Commission members launched a 2-year campaign that eventually added one professional, our executive director, to the staff. Yes, we had doubled the number of members, but that was the picture of the staff when the 1992 riots occurred. It would take 2 more years after the riots to significantly increase the staff.

Today, the Los Angeles City Human Relations Commission and the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission have staffs of 16 and 23, respectively. They both have vital roles that they play in education, school programs, prevention and response to hate crimes and tensions, and coalition building with community organizations, businesses, and the media. The California Attorney General has pushed state agencies to monitor hate crimes and has consistently reported on trends. The U.S. Community Relations Service has staff with significant experience.

We have also seen the development of new trends, both locally and nationally, that have affected race relations. For example, we see that while general crime rates have fallen, gang

and racialized gang violence has increased. We see that the national debate on immigration has been accompanied by both more immigrant organizing and scapegoating. Acts of hate and discrimination against immigrants are on the rise. Post 9/11/01, one of the unfortunate responses was the wave of hate crimes against Arab Americans, Americans from South Asia, and people identified as Muslims. Finally, we have seen that the gap between the wealthy and the poor continues to grow. Los Angeles has dropout rates hovering around 50% for African American and Latino youth. The county is the homeless capital of the country with over 90,000 homeless people. The middle class is shrinking as jobs have less security and benefits while housing and health costs have risen astronomically.

Sadly, old trends persist because African Americans are the most targeted racial group for hate-motivated violence. Attacks against gays and lesbians have also increased. Hate crimes trended down a year after 9/11/01, but in 2004, attacks in the state against African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans jumped up again. Numbers go up and down, yet we are constantly reminded that too many hate crimes occur in our state and county.

What recommendations can I give to improve our race relations? First, government at all levels should continue to increase resources for human relations agencies and to speak out against hate incidents. The City of Los Angeles should continue bolstering its staff so that it can play a greater role in bringing mediation and other solutions to middle schools. The County of Los Angeles needs to strengthen the efforts of its Human Relations Commission to foster partnerships with community organizations that reduce hate crimes and assist victims.

The Mayor of Los Angeles, Antonio Villaraigosa, spoke eloquently at last year's commemoration of the death of Joseph Santos Iletto, a Filipino American U.S. postal carrier, who was gunned down by a white supremacist in 1999. Public officials must continue to speak out against hate and for tolerance and understanding.

Our systems of law enforcement and criminal justice need to continually be monitored to ensure fairness and connection with communities. The appointment of John Mack, the former leader of the Los Angeles Urban League, to head the Los Angeles Police Commission was an important step to ensure community oversight of the Los Angeles Police Department.

Our public and private schools can do much more to increase understanding and knowledge about our diverse population. By providing inclusive instruction for young people—from diverse history lessons to access to different languages—these institutions can make a tremendous contribution to improved race relations. This learning fosters educational achievement and should not be seen as a diversion from reading and math.

Second, the private sector, including nonprofit organizations, businesses, unions, and churches, must step up in their role to provide education, training, and joint action on race relations. Unfortunately, groups such as the NCCJ (National Conference for Communities and Justice) have closed their Los Angeles office. The Multicultural Collaborative, which played an important role after the 1992 riots in bringing groups together and suggesting the strengthening of the human relations infrastructure (like the commissions) is in the process of dissolving. Yet, it is now that community-based organizations need to support activities for improving human relations and developing coalitions to advance equality for all of our children and residents. This is perhaps the most important recommendation of this time period.

The nonprofit sector has an important role in training and skills building so that community residents have the tools to cross boundaries of race and other differences. This is the primary way that communication, conflict resolution, coalition building, and understanding can be strengthened. In a publication and study by the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, entitled "Crossing Boundaries: An Exploration of Effective Leadership Development in Communities," we found that the significant programs in Los Angeles today are able to reach only 850 residents and students each year. Their capacity would have to be significantly increased to reach the thousands and tens of thousands who desperately need such training.

Programs are necessary, but so are actions that speak to improving race relations. Unite Here has an initiative that encourages the hiring of more African Americans in the hotel industry to counter what advocates say is a preferential hiring of immigrants. The Beverly Hilton recently signed a 3-year contract, which includes a provision to hire more African Americans. In Orange County, the Asian Pacific American Legal Center and 10 other Asian American and Vietnamese organizations and leaders denounced the action of a Vietnamese American Congressional candidate for a campaign of intimidation against Latino voters.

Third, networks of leaders and residents need to come together to discuss tough issues and to find common ground. The segregation of our residential living patterns calls for proactive measures to communicate, meet, dialogue, and work across different boundaries. The potential of neighborhood councils, groups such as the Civic Alliance, and other informal networks is an essential tool in our quest for unity.

Finally, intense public action is needed to expand opportunities for our residents and to lessen the disparities that plague communities. We need action on employment, education, public safety, and so on. Wherever possible, coalitions across racial lines should come together. For example, the Los Angeles Urban League, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the Asian Pacific American Legal Center agreed last year on a 5-year project to jointly develop youth and parent leadership and to work with parent organiza-

tions across the county to build an independent parents' network. This effort will strive to improve educational outcomes for all students.

Improving race relations is a science. There is no reliable road map, especially for California, but we can learn from the past to secure a brighter future for our residents and our children. I welcome the opportunity to coalesce and will work with you to do just that.

2006 POLICY ISSUE BRIEFS

Reconceptualizing Educational Reform Through Mayoral Takeover

Jennifer Kitson

January 2006

Background

The debate over the “mayor-centric” approach to education governance has been escalating as U.S. cities struggle with declining test scores and rising dropout rates. The most severe form of “mayoral takeover” involves a transition in the formal structure of governance in which decision-making power is transferred away from the elected school board to the mayor. This mayoral takeover approach has been implemented in varying degrees in a number of cities and can range from increased involvement to total control of the school board, fiscal affairs, and educational programs. Proponents argue mayoral involvement is necessary to increase accountability and stimulate change in a failing system. Opponents of this institutional restructuring argue that mayoral control threatens the democratic process and undermines the ability of the education system to operate without political interference.

Historically, public school governance in the United States has fluctuated between centralized and decentralized approaches, often based on the social and political events of the time. The current global economy and resulting competition among nations has made certain skill sets of the workforce mandatory. In an effort to ensure future human capital, many agencies that have previously had minimal involvement in the politics of education, such as the state or the city, are feeling pressures to intervene. Though there are multiple ways in which mayors can influence the educational system, mayoral takeovers have been a recent structural attempt to expedite educational reform.

Of the 25 largest school districts in the United States, only a handful has adopted the appointed or corporate-style school boards that are tantamount to the “takeover” approach. Due to the high-profile nature of these cities, such as Chicago, Boston, Baltimore, Detroit, Cleveland, and New York City, there is a perceived mayoral takeover trend. Other cities, such as Washington, D.C., and Oakland, have incorporated moderate levels of mayoral influence involving a hybrid, half-elected, half-appointed board. Still other cities, such as West Sacramento, Sacramento, and historically Los Angeles, have used low levels of mayoral influence by simply endorsing school board candidates and providing campaign financing.

The Debate

Whose interests are being served and what motivations are propelling administrative change are questions central to the mayoral takeover debate. Is mayoral control driven by public frustration with a failing system of governance in which poor academic performance, financial mismanagement, and violence are testimony? Is mayoral control a top-down agenda driven by state legislatures and intended to undermine ethnic minority power in the nation's largest school districts? Have term limits forced politicians to jump on the political bandwagon in an effort to uphold allegiance to those political figures who are influential in their upward mobility?

Proponents proclaim improved accountability within the educational system as one of the primary benefits of mayoral control of the school district. Given that the mayor already holds ultimate responsibility for the well-being of the city's citizens, mayoral oversight of education is a logical next step. Additionally, proponents argue that mayoral-appointed boards can transfer the energy once spent on running for office to the real issues influencing student performance, thereby increasing efficiency and effectiveness while minimizing internal board politics. Many point to the improved test scores in cities that have undergone appointed school boards as evidence of their ability to focus on the needs of the students. Finally, given current and predicted fiscal constraints, securing resources for education will increasingly require political competition among various public sectors. As some believe, this can best be done using the mayoral approach.

Opponents of mayoral takeovers argue that appointed boards redistribute power away from minority parents to the citywide mayoral electorate that comprises a whiter and more affluent population. This issue of democratic representation is a primary concern for those opposing the mayoral approach, especially the effect that an appointed board could have on growing ethnic minority populations. Opponents dispute the benefits of appointed school boards, citing continued internal politics and budget problems, reduced diversity of the board's members, and decreased community representation. Furthermore, the transition to an appointed board affects the opportunity structure and career path for prospective public officials. Ultimately, mayoral control comes with few guarantees, and the possibility that education may not be prioritized or properly funded is still a concern.

SB 767 and the State of California Education

Prior to the introduction of Senate Bill 767 in August 2005, Californians were able to watch the mayoral takeover debate from the sidelines. This proposed legislation permits the transfer of governing power in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) from the elected school board to a mayoral-appointed board upon a state of "educational failure." SB 767 introduced by Senate Majority Leader Gloria Romero (D East Los Angeles), identifies the

school district as an educational failure if the following conditions are not met: a base score at or above 675 on the California Academic Performance Index (API), Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) for 2 years in a row, or a 4-year dropout rate below 20%.

The argument behind SB 767 is the dire need for drastic and immediate educational reform in the LAUSD. Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa of Los Angeles recently returned to his education commitment with the mention of an upcoming agenda to address school safety, access to health insurance, and issues of governance. Though considerable evidence indicates a “state of educational failure” in the District according to these indicators, the methods of measurement are still contested and there is no consensus that shifting to an appointed school board is the solution.

Educational Status of California’s Ten Largest School Districts

Unified School District	Enrollment	Percentage Minority*	Largest E/R Group	CPI Graduation Rate	AYP 2004/2005	API 2005
Los Angeles	741,367	91	Latino	45.3	N/N	649
San Diego City	134,709	74.2	Latino	63.8	Y/N	726
Long Beach	96,319	83.1	Latino	69.1	Y/N	713
Fresno	80,760	83.4	Latino	56.9	N/N	643
Santa Ana	61,693	96.4	Latino	72.5	N/N	656
San Francisco	57,144	87.3	Asian/PI	70.9	Y/N	746
San Bernardino	59,105	84.7	Latino	50.6	N/N	629
Oakland	49,214	92.7	Black	47.8	N/N	635
Sacramento City	51,420	76.5	Latino	52.6	N/Y	700
San Juan	50,089	30.1	White	93.9	Y/Y	752
California	6,322,190	67	Latino	71.3	Y/N	709

* Excludes Non-Hispanic Whites and the multiple/no response category

AYP: Adequate Yearly Progress; API: Academic Performance Index; CPI: Cumulative Promotion Index; E/R Ethnic/Racial
Sources: California Department of Education <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>; CPI data, Harvard Civil Rights Project
<http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/dropouts/March 23 California Final Report.pdf>

With an overall graduation rate of 71%, California falls slightly above the national average, but much disparity exists among and within districts. For example, graduation rates for California vary considerably when compared by race and ethnicity, with only 60% of Latinos, 57% of African Americans, and 52% of Native Americans graduating. The implications are magnified in Los Angeles, where only 39.7% of its fastest growing population, Latinos, are completing high school. The future of LAUSD deserves much attention because, as the largest district in California and the second largest in the nation, it may very well serve as a harbinger of educational governance change for the entire state (see Table 1).

Trends

Each city that has undergone a mayoral takeover has had a unique experience based on the diverse contexts under which these events have occurred. The varied circumstances of each city include differing educational histories, economies, political cultures, demographic compositions, and city-state relations. One certainty to be derived from cities that have undergone a mayoral takeover it is that there is no specific pattern or model to be followed. This being said, there are universal implications of mayoral takeovers, especially for primary stakeholders, and lessons to be learned from those who have undergone this structural change in an effort to inspire educational reform.

Uncertain Educational Impacts

The success, failure, or mediocrity of mayoral-controlled school districts is based in large part by the political skills and educational astuteness of the mayor. As a result of increased mayoral control over the schools, the educational system fluctuates with changes in mayoral styles and priorities. The role of the chief educational officer hired by the mayor is also paramount to educational policy under this structure. Though there are examples of exceptional mayoral leadership in education, there is also the potential to actually delay or damage the system. Moreover, mayoral accountability does not inherently eliminate the often criticized political patronage system of hiring within the school districts.

The context and degree of support by which schools become mayor controlled matter. Cities that have experienced conflict surrounding a mayoral takeover have actually seen negative impacts on the schools and they face an uncertain future by this shift in governance. In most of the mayoral takeover cities, including Baltimore, Chicago, and Detroit, race has played a divisive role because shifts in governance tend to result in power redistribution among racial and ethnic groups.

The public school system, one of the first government agencies to intensively hire minorities, is still a major source of employment for minority populations in central cities. The tendency for mayor-centric school districts to minimize expenditures, sometimes through harsh bargaining over union contracts and privatizing certain school operations, creates fear of job loss and wage cuts in these communities. Also of importance is the symbolic meaning associated with the role of minorities, especially African Americans, in the public school system. Given that some of the first civil rights battles were won in the education arena, many minorities oppose mayoral takeover because it threatens this legacy.

In addition to a changing racial and ethnic composition in the United States, the shifting age structure of the population is influencing educational representation in mayoral takeovers. The act of appointing a school board redistributes power away from those who vote

in school board elections, a smaller segment of the population, who has a stake in education, to the citywide electorate majority. The larger electorate is often dominated by the aging American population (in 2011, the first of the baby boomers will turn age 65), which is generally whiter, wealthier, and more politically active than the average central-city parent. The future of elementary education becomes tenuous as these baby boomers may have little incentive to fund the education of an increasingly minority- and immigrant-comprised population.

Appointed school boards have not inherently experienced reduced diversity, and in some cases, increased representation of ethnic minorities has occurred. However, appointed boards show a predisposition for reduced socioeconomic representation. Because appointed boards tend to comprise predominately academic and business professionals, they do not reflect the income levels and types of employment of the previously elected boards.

Shifting Political Influence

Many authors on the subject have pointed out that the structural changes of mayoral control do not take the politics out of education, but instead they favor different actors. Access to educational politics shifts to those interest groups with greater financial resources to contribute to the mayoral campaign rather than to interests of the board members. The business community stands to benefit the most from such changes. Given that politics influence policy, the changing access to politics in this educational structure favors the interests of the new actors in education over the old.

In cities where mayors have taken over the school district, much influence has been exerted by already existing historical and political forces and constituencies. For example, Chicago's mayor hired leadership with a business style reflecting the strong presence of the business community, whereas in Boston, the business community emphasized the quality of education and a superintendent with extensive educational experience was chosen.

The political power of teachers' unions also has the potential to be weakened by mayoral control and, in an era of teacher shortages, the impact of reduced teacher security and bargaining tools could negatively affect the educational system as a whole. Given that the mayor's educational policy needs to be implemented at the local level, without the support of teachers, school district employees, and parents, these efforts would be severely limited.

Because central-city school districts have an extensive network of interconnected interests, top-down or externally driven reform can face surprisingly obstinate opposition. Successful implementation of mayoral programs and school reform has occurred by involving broad, multifaceted stakeholder coalitions. Additionally, the severity of mayoral influence has not

been found to directly correlate to educational success, and forced structural change runs the risk of damaging the very sociopolitical networks necessary for educational reform.

Final Thought

California's per pupil spending went from \$600 above the national average in the mid-1970s to \$600 below the national average in the last 15 years. Propositions 13 and 98 have limited school expenditures, while the population and demand for educational services have grown. Without adequate funding, significant educational gains cannot be made by either an appointed or an elected board.

Policy Options for California Education

Changing the governing structure through mayoral takeovers is not an end-all solution to educational ailments. Nevertheless, the Pat Brown Institute recognizes that a change in accountability within the educational system also needs to take place. The following policy options are derived from successful educational reform trends and may be considered independently or collectively:

(1) Implement an independent audit of the school district.

In an effort to address the deficiencies in the educational system while simultaneously fostering the most successful mechanisms, a through examination of the school district is suggested. An external assessment can identify systemic weaknesses and formulate a strategic agenda for school reform, thus ensuring prudent, nonpolitical use of the city's resources. This process engenders transparency and accountability and, in the case structural change is deemed necessary, public support will more likely follow.

(2) Adopt the small schools model.

This broad-based educational reform movement seeks to improve academic performance through (1) smaller schools, (2) higher scholastic standards, (3) a redirection of revenues toward teachers, (4) increased local control, (5) greater parent participation, and (6) extended after school and weekend programs. Positive steps can be taken to bring about local participation by aligning school districts with neighborhood councils, thereby prioritizing education within existing local governance structures.

(3) Adopt a combined elected-appointed school board.

Due to the broad constituency required for educational reform, mayors may better serve as contributors, employing their leadership abilities to collaborate rather than control. The

mayor's responsibility of forming a governing coalition as the chief executive of a school district can be facilitated through cooperation with other city departments and centralized authority. If done using a collaborative approach, the mayor has the opportunity to unite different stakeholders.

Facing the Transportation Question

Ali Modarres

Jennifer Kitson

March 2006

The infamous auto dependency of the Southern California region and the resulting economic and social costs were underscored in the 2005 State of the Region report produced by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Of the nation's nine largest metropolitan areas, Southern California had the third highest vehicle ownership (93%) and the third lowest share of workers using transit to commute to work (4.5%), while ranking last in average payroll and per capita income. Costs resulting from congestion totaled almost \$12 billion in 2003, significantly higher than for any other metropolitan region. Undeniably, Southern California (particularly Los Angeles and Orange Counties) continues to be ranked as the metropolitan region with the most congestion and worst air pollution in the nation.

Southern California's transportation woes are directly related to its urban form, which celebrates auto-dependency and increases decentralization of housing and employment. Added to this unsustainable approach to urban design has been the cost of creating and maintaining a reasonably operational infrastructure. Given the added knowledge about the age and the near capacity operational status of current roads and bridges, transportation planning—which includes all aspects of efficient movement of goods and people by air, water, rail, and roads—becomes a formidable task in California. The projected population growth over the next few decades can only worsen the current conditions if nothing is done to improve our transportation system.

The future of California and its economy largely depends on our willingness to improve the infrastructure and pay close attention to urban transportation, because it relates to issues of equity and efficiency in access to affordable housing, health care, and education. Transportation is the bloodline of our cities and the quality of life they offer. Not investing time and money to resolve our transportation challenges will surely worsen current conditions and diminish the ability to solve our many problems. Maintaining California's position as the fifth largest economy in the world is unimaginable if traffic worsens, roads and bridges fall apart, and our working class population spends hours reaching jobs on buses that cannot connect employees and employers in an equitable manner. As the successful campaign of Bus Riders Union revealed, we cannot engage in a transportation planning process that remains at best blinded to class divisions, or at worst aggravates them, by assigning buses to the working class and rail to the middle class. In addition to the technical challenges facing us, we need to be aware that transportation as a medium of connectivity can become either an instrument of equity or separation. We can only hope that California is working toward the former and not the latter.

The purpose of this policy brief is to reinvigorate our discussions on transportation planning and move closer to understanding the formidable task ahead. Knowing that a comprehensive presentation is outside the scope of a policy brief, we have selected a number of topics that can be a good start for ongoing conversations on this topic.

Consider This...

The goals of transportation planning can be reduced either to capacity building (i.e., planning the supply-side) or to managing and maximizing the performance of the transportation system (i.e., managing the demand-side). For urban transportation, the latter includes efforts to reduce the number of trips and traveled miles, as well as increasing the flow of traffic. Over the last few decades, we have gradually become aware that while investment in infrastructure is necessary, only demand management will yield the best results in enhancing our overall transportation experience while protecting our investments in the transportation network.

Despite much research in the last several decades on the advantages of demand-side strategies, however, few regions have fully implemented comprehensive programs and policies using such a planning framework. This was partially caused by putting all eggs in the proverbial basket of Travel Reduction Ordinances (TROs), which focused on travel to work habits of employees at major employment sites. Given that only a small portion of the working population was employed at such sites and that a small percentage of this population shifted from driving alone to other modes of transportation, the net result was an undetectable reduction in trips within the larger metropolitan areas (as was the case for Regulation XV in Southern California). Though TROs faded away, the ideas behind transportation demand management and transportation control measures were never fully abandoned. After all, decades of research does suggest that we cannot simply expand highway lanes to accommodate a growing number of automobiles. The smarter, more sustainable, approach continues to be a strategy to reduce the number of cars and miles traveled on our freeways. This does not suggest that we do not keep an eye on capacity building. It simply means that a focus on demand management could reduce our growing congestion, improve our environment, and address social equity in a more reasonable and less costly manner.

In this policy brief, we do not plan to address supply-side issues and discuss how many more miles of roads we need to build. Instead, we want to resurrect some of the ideas behind sustainable transportation planning. As indicated, we won't be able to list all possible ideas or even present the entirety of discussions within a single topic. Instead, we have envisioned this policy brief as the starting point for another round of discussions, while the Mayor of Los Angeles and the Governor offer their visions for a better transportation system, from both supply and demand sides. Here, we will review the current state of thinking on several pertinent planning issues in urban transportation, which we believe is of special relevance to the region.

Minding Sustainability

The changing geography of cities, from highly centralized to multiple centers and subcenters, has created an arduous task for transportation planners. The various ways transportation affects the quality-of-life or “livability” of a city is increasingly a priority for planners, developers, and communities alike. In an effort to improve the long-term economic, social, and environmental viability of transportation in places such as Los Angeles, researchers point to three necessary areas of demand-side planning: higher attention to the interconnection of land use and transportation, improvements in public transportation, and innovative transportation-demand management techniques.

The Land Use/Transportation Connection

Even as the relative cost of transportation has declined and access to it, especially freeway access in the suburbs, has increased, most would agree that urban structure is inextricably linked to transportation. In connection with urban structure, two interrelated issues are hotly debated: job-housing balance and spatial mismatch. These two phenomena developed out of the decentralization process experienced by many cities across the United States. Though many forces contributed to this process, several major events are noteworthy, including the suburbanization of housing after WWII, freeway construction, and more recently, the dispersal of employment in pursuit of specialized workforces, agglomeration advantages, and low property values.

Unfortunately, the dispersal of employment has not adequately aligned with the corresponding labor supply due to fluctuations in the economy and labor force. Job-housing imbalances can be detected by lengthy commute patterns and long distances between employment centers and employees. The exact nature of the job-housing balance varies depending on a range of characteristics that influence job-housing preference, including, but not limited to, occupation, income, gender, ethnicity, and the presence of multiple income earners. Additionally, growth in California’s employment opportunities has outpaced housing construction, thereby further exacerbating the job-housing balance.

The second structural issue points to the effects of decentralization on minorities in the United States who have remained largely isolated in central cities as a result of inequitable housing opportunities. The concentration of low-income minority residents in the central city, and the suburbanization of employment, especially low-wage job centers, has created what is known as a “spatial mismatch.” The lack of access to jobs, rather than the lack of available jobs, is often cited as a dominant force barring ethnic groups from upward socioeconomic mobility. Research also indicates that the limited transportation options available to low-income minority populations restrict their employment opportunities, especially to higher paying jobs in the suburbs.

Research conducted by the Pat Brown Institute identified several communities experiencing a job-housing imbalance in Los Angeles County, including South Los Angeles, the western San Gabriel Valley, and the northern and southern areas of the San Fernando Valley. Neighborhoods within these geographies appear to have a larger employed resident population than people working in them. Furthermore, they are also affected by proportionally low levels of public transit service. For the region as a whole, transit accessibility was found to be highest along the east-west corridor that parallels Interstate 10, and it was lowest for connections requiring north-south mobility. Moreover, low-income communities throughout the county have disproportionately lower levels of access to bus services. Spatial mismatch is evident in the overall job-housing balance for the region and by the insufficient transit needed to connect employees to their workplaces.

Fundamentally, the disconnect between land use and transportation planning has led to the appearance of an imbalance in job-housing or the creation of spatial mismatch conditions. Without creating comprehensive planning links among urban development, land use, and transportation, we will continue to engage in remedial activities that will be costly and less effective. For more than three decades, researchers have pointed to this necessary link and have attempted to focus on trip generation rates of various types of land use in order to avoid unnecessary and unplanned traffic congestion. Based on this research, development goals should be tested against extra trips generated, impact on roads (which are paid for by the public and not the private-sector developers), and overall quality of life. Development for the sake of development, where maximizing return on investment is the primary goal, will result in imposing unacceptable costs for the society and bringing our traffic to a mere crawl. Sustainable development, which considers mobility and equity as an integral part of economy and quality of life, will obviously engage in strategic decisions that incorporate transportation planning and infrastructure in every aspect of land use and development decision making. Facing a large borrowing against the future to invest in a much needed expansion and maintenance of the infrastructure, Californians would be well-served to demand principles of smart growth and sustainability while spending this money. Otherwise, any expansion in capacity will soon be met by haphazard development that is at best inequitable and at worst a misuse of public dollars for private gains.

Example of Transportation/Land Use Connection

A frequently cited example of successful land-use/transportation integration is Portland, Oregon, best known for its integrated vision incorporating transportation, housing, employment, and land use. In the 1970s, Portland turned down a new freeway proposal, opting instead for a light-rail system, transit priority measures, urban growth boundaries, and mixed-use and higher-density land-use solutions. Portland's long-term success is attributed to the coordination and involvement of regional agencies and public and private stakeholders. As a result of this inclusive planning approach, Portland's downtown has experienced

numerous benefits, including outstanding light-rail ridership levels, a large increase in jobs with no increase in car commuting to the central area, an improved local economy, diverse housing options, and spillover pedestrian-friendly development in the suburbs.

Reinvesting in Public Transportation

Researchers argue that the familiar congestion-related problems found in cities such as Los Angeles (costly gas prices, lengthy commutes, lack of parking, and poor air quality) can be mediated through a more balanced, multimodal transportation system. This perspective calls for an integrated transportation system, where multiple types of transportation are supported, including walking, bicycling, buses, and rail, not just autos. Given the auto-designed urban structure and heavy auto subsidization, achieving a balanced transportation system requires policies and programs that offer transit incentives and auto disincentives. It is worth revisiting some of the benefits of well-designed mass transit, especially those applicable to cities with multiple centers, such as Los Angeles.

To begin, transit is agreed to have two crucial features. The first role of transit, as a public system, is to provide a social service to most of the population, unlike private auto ownership. Therefore, in large cities especially, transit is considered a basic service critical to those without access to cars. Transit comprises fixed rail, best employed in places with high-population densities and employment or recreation centers, and buses, desirable in regions with low-housing density and dispersed economic and social activities. Transit's role as a basic service is particularly critical for low-income adults, who depend more heavily on public transportation, specifically buses, than other groups.

For both men and women, the number of trips and the distance traveled increases with income level, reflecting the mobility inequity present in different modes of urban transportation and access to them. Furthermore, welfare recipients and other low-income groups face specific challenges associated with transportation because they engage in frequent job searches to multiple and dispersed locations. Women's transportation needs are also a topic of much interest due to their increasing participation in the workforce, yet disproportionate share of household responsibilities. Entry-level service jobs also often require traveling to work during nonpeak hours or on weekends when public transit frequency is minimal or nonexistent. Moreover, because the majority of new jobs are being created in the suburbs, central city residents often face a challenging "reverse commute," using a transportation infrastructure designed for the traditional suburb to city journey.

Improved transit solutions are often seen as the best way to mediate several of the aforementioned, and often interconnected, urban structural dilemmas, including the job-housing imbalance, spatial mismatch, and reverse commuting. Given the challenges associated with the long-term relocation of either specific work forces or employment centers,

transit—buses in particular—are viewed by researchers as a means of economic development capable of reducing social inequities. The Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) Route 422, a laudable example, operates on a reverse commute schedule to connect low-wage service jobs to unskilled workers who have limited mobility options.

The second major feature of public transit—efficiency—is evident in transit's ability to move larger volumes of people, use less space, and impart fewer negative side effects than the auto. Illuminated in case studies worldwide, economically, socially, and environmentally healthy cities necessitate diverse transportation options. Successful multimodal transportation systems all include an extensive transit component. Though fixed rail plays an important role in a multimodal city, the needs of decentralized cities such as Los Angeles can often be better met through rapid bus systems that offer flexible routes, catering to shifting employment, housing, and recreational needs.

Even in the bastion of auto dependency, Southern California's transit network has been increasingly used and applauded. The Los Angeles County Metro system, including buses and rail, experienced increased ridership within the last year. Important to consider, especially as new transit services are planned, is the goal of connecting people to their actual destinations. Given that trips to work account for only 14.8% of all trips made, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation, access to transit that connects people to shopping and recreational activities is critical for transit to capture additional trips. Though the built environments in cities such as Los Angeles have evolved to their present day multicentered complexities, fixed transit networks continue to use the central business district as their focal destination, even though the majority of employment opportunities are decentralized. Future transit investment, many argue, needs to create a network connecting people to employment, recreational, and shopping centers as opposed to the long-favored radial system useless to the majority of transit riders.

Example of Reinvesting in Public Transportation

Boulder, Colorado, is well-known for its multimodal, integrated regional approach to transportation that is jointly referred to as the "Hop, Skip, and Jump" system. Coordinated land use, shifting budget priorities, and transportation demand management (TDM) strategies (including many auto disincentives) have provided a suitable context for interconnected regional transit. Pedestrian-friendly development, bicycle trails, buses suitable to carry bicycles, and buses connecting to rail all contribute to a diversified transit system. The "Hop, Skip, and Jump" system connects people to local recreational and shopping destinations through medium-size, high-frequency buses (Hop), to employment centers on large, high-frequency buses (Skip), and to communities and suburbs outside Boulder through an additional set of buses (Jump, Leap, Bound). Research shows the collective transportation demand management efforts in Boulder have shifted 42% of former car users who were traveling to downtown to other transportation types.

Transportation Demand Management

Transportation demand management (TDM) is the umbrella under which a host of programs and policies are included that aim to reduce both the number and distance of trips taken. Though often implemented individually, transportation demand measures work best when they are combined and supported by multiple stakeholders, including neighborhoods, businesses, developers, and transportation planners. Efforts to increase transit use, while deterring auto use, through well-planned land use has been associated with positive social, economic, and mobility outcomes. Furthermore, planning initiatives that incorporate transportation demand measures emphasize increased accessibility, not just mobility.

Because studies show people are inclined to use transit only if it provides mobility advantages over auto travel, many transportation demand measures involve taking away perceived affordability of cars. The automobile has a long history of subsidization in the United States through highway construction, free parking, and few environmental degradation “fees.” Disincentives often involve attaching the “true cost” to various auto-related activities, such as eliminating free parking, increasing gas taxes, congestion pricing, implementing road usage fees, and parking limits. Reduced auto dependency is almost always contingent upon a combination of transit incentives and auto disincentives.

While “smart growth” may be seen as a development approach, it incorporates many demand management techniques that could benefit decentralized cities such as Los Angeles. The basic premise behind smart growth initiatives is that through coordinated land-use and transportation efforts, existing and future development can be more sustainable than the ubiquitous low-density, auto-dependant “sprawl.” Smart growth seeks to combat the high economic, social, and environmental costs associated with decentralized land use through limited freeway building, increased light rail, and land use that reduces auto dependency. One of the most advocated smart growth strategies, transit-oriented development (TOD), unites land use and transportation through mixed use, medium to high-density land use designed to be a short walk from a major transit stop.

The lengthy list of associated benefits increasingly being cited makes transit-oriented development an attractive approach for multiple stakeholders. Recent studies show that when measures of urban structure (city shape, job-housing balance, road density, etc.) and transit supply are taken together, they have a significant effect on travel demand with the ability to reduce the annual miles driven and car ownership rates. Businesses participating in TOD have been found to benefit from increased revenues, untapped markets, enhanced employee productivity, the attraction of qualified workers, higher property value, and more. Cities, it is argued, become more livable, enjoying reduced congestion and increased access to basic services. New developments can cost tax payers double that of higher density, in-fill projects, thereby conserving resources for infrastructure investment. Through the use

of pedestrian-friendly design, residents can reap the well-documented, health-associated benefits of increased exercise by walking to nearby services and transit.

Critics argue that transit-oriented development and smart growth have narrow application, produce inconclusive results, often forget to include affordable housing, and require difficult-to-achieve regional planning. Yet, others argue that smart growth policies can redirect growth while incorporating the needs of multiple stakeholders. For example, recent regional reports produced by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the University of Southern California (USC) advocate the adoption of a long-term, coordinated smart growth agenda for Southern California. The Mobility 21 Smart Growth partnership, comprising public and private Los Angeles County stakeholders, is working toward this goal and has already identified several locations ideally suited for transit-oriented development.

Reflecting on remarks of Dr. Elizabeth Deakin, at a recent public policy lecture of the Pat Brown Institute, it is important to be realistic about TODs. These developments can be successful if they are designed correctly; however, they should not be viewed as strategies to increase transit ridership significantly. For that to occur, hundreds of TODs and thousands of housing units would have to be built.

Examples of Effective Approaches

Regions that have successfully implemented transit-oriented development have usually found ways to remove obstacles to smart growth—primarily through the revision of outdated land-use zoning and policies. Through a package of legislation, the state of Maryland made one of the earliest attempts to remove barriers to smart growth by shifting incentives away from sprawling land use to those communities with existing infrastructure. One of the most important and most successful pieces of legislation redirected state development subsidies to designated “priority funding areas” (PFA)—places with existing infrastructure, such as the central city or inner suburbs. Recent research has found priority funding areas to be an effective way of influencing the location of new development.

Advocacy for TODs has faced issues of equity, since a large number of these developments are not affordable for the working-class population. In other words, in some circles, TODs are viewed as middle-class solutions, excluding the needs of low income and transit-dependent population (people who already ride buses). However, not all TODs are built to be middle-class communities. One of the often-cited best practices comes from Chicago: The Lake and Pulaski Project. This project is not only “green” and “smart” but also an example of how issues of equity and empowerment can be (and should be) incorporated into designing and constructing TODs. Through community involvement and multisector support, this project focused on its goals of transportation and land use integration, as well as smart growth principles and various environmental considerations (such as the use of recycled

material and “green” design). An important characteristic of this project was its unique participatory approach and special attention to existing community assets. The result is a TOD that successfully integrates community development, environmental advocacy, transportation and land-use planning, and quality of life issues into a single project.

Toward an Immigration Policy Debate

Ali Modarres

Jennifer Kitson

June 2006

Introduction

Proposed immigration reform in the United States has engendered debates between, and within, traditional political and sociodemographic groupings. The complexity and importance of the issue is understandable, considering that immigrants comprise 1 in 9 U.S. residents, 1 in 7 U.S. workers, and 1 in 2 new U.S. workers, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The intensity of the immigration debate is magnified in places where immigrants comprise a high percentage of the population or where immigrant populations are growing. With a foreign-born population of 9.5 million in 2004, California cannot ignore close to a quarter of its resident population and has much at stake in the current federal immigration legislation debates.

Recent policy discussions have focused primarily on who should be admitted to the United States, but largely absent from the immigration debate is a discussion on the degree to which new policy will integrate those who are admitted. As we grapple with immigration policy that will define the size, shape, and composition of the U.S. population, it is critical to consider provisions to incorporate our newest members into the social, cultural, and economic institutions of our nation. Present efforts to integrate immigrants are limited, ad hoc, and without integration among agencies or regions. As many have pointed out, the paradox of U.S. immigration policy is the rigid, bureaucratic system of entry but laissez-faire integration efforts after admittance.

Contrary to media portrayal, the immigration experiences of California and the United States are not exceptional but rather a reflection of the current global migration trends. Due to California's inability to address immigration independent of federal policy, and because U.S. immigration is interconnected to global migration patterns, true immigration reform must consider several supranational migration trends. This policy brief links the pertinent immigration trends at different geographic scales in an effort to propose policy recommendations relevant to the great immigrant state, California.

Immigration Status: Permanent or Temporary?

An ambivalent, or rather contentious, component of the current immigration policy debates deals with the American collective will to view the needed labor as either "permanent" or "temporary." From a procedural perspective, however, the popular distinction between these two categories is not accurate. Under its current immigration policies, the United

States admits foreign nationals under two categories: permanent (immigrants) and temporary (nonimmigrants). Note, however, that the temporary/nonimmigrant category applies to those who are largely unable to work in this country. Temporary work permits are, in fact, reserved primarily for those whose skills are needed in the United States and who are given specific preference and visas.

A better understanding of the current social, economic, and humanitarian goals of the U.S. immigration policies emerge from reviewing how admitted immigrants are classified. Overall, a significant majority of immigrants are admitted under three major “permanent” immigration categories: family reunification, employment sponsorship, and humanitarian protection. Interestingly, the nonimmigrant system, so far as the social, economic, and political considerations are concerned, is designed to meet many of the same goals as the permanent categories but instead facilitates the temporary stay of people in the United States for a variety of activities.

There are, however, over seventy classes of nonimmigrant admissions, including tourists, students, business visitors, specialty occupational workers, seasonal nonagricultural workers, religious workers, and others. Due to the heavy backlogs, rigid limitations, and large bureaucracy of the permanent immigrant system, temporary visas are increasingly used for economic and political purposes in an effort to expedite the arrival of foreign nationals. Businesses, in particular, are bypassing the permanent system in favor of the quicker, more reliable temporary system to bring workers into the United States.

The temporary nature of nonimmigrant visas is often dubious as many are assigned for mid-to long-term stays and, increasingly, visas without certain restrictions (e.g., dual intent) are being used as a transitory method of gaining legal permanent residence. As a result, many argue that these two separate systems of entry to the United States are inadequate and do not reflect the actual immigration demands and uses of the systems. As guest-worker proposals are being devised, it is worth considering the existing “temporary-to-permanent” system already in use. According to the Migration Policy Institute, the permanent system admits a large number of immigrants who have learned to navigate the social, economic, and political institutions of the United States while on temporary visas.

Immigration Legislation

One issue has overshadowed all others within the recently proposed immigration legislation—the fate of 11 to 12 million undocumented immigrants already in the United States. Several dominant pieces of proposed legislation aimed to address the sizeable undocumented population mirror the three dominant policy perspectives on the issue: remove undocumented immigrants, allow undocumented immigrants to work temporarily, or give undocumented immigrants the option of obtaining permanent status. Like most of the issues

surrounding immigration, the public is split on the different types of guest-worker plans.

According to a recent survey conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center (March 30, 2006), 27% of the public favor policy that removes undocumented immigrants from the United States, 32% opt for a temporary guest-worker program, and 32% want a guest-worker program that allows for the transition to permanent resident status. Though various policy options have been debated over the last few months, a few of the recent proposals are worth discussing—in that they reveal recent thinking and intentions toward a comprehensive immigration policy reform.

- ✘ A bill passed by the House last December, which aims to halt illegal immigration through punitive measures, is the most stringent “go home” policy currently under review. H.R. 4437, the “Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005” would criminalize undocumented immigrants and those who assist them, authorize state police to enforce federal immigration laws, and build a 700-mile security fence along the U.S./Mexico border. Proponents of this bill are facing much public outcry and opposition from a number of groups, especially those that provide social services, such as the Catholic Church.
- ✘ Truly temporary by design, the “Cornyn-Kyl” bill (S. 1438) introduced by Senators Cornyn (R-TX) and Kyl (R-AZ) proposes a guest-worker program that requires undocumented immigrants already in the United States to voluntarily leave the country and reenter legally. This bill would limit the length of time temporary workers may remain and impose monetary fines for any unauthorized immigrants who do not vacate the United States within 5 years. Another strictly temporary guest-worker bill, introduced by Senator Feinstein (D-CA) would aim to create a legalized agricultural workforce only. The program, which would end after 5 years, would offer 1.5 million “blue cards” to agricultural workers, who would be required to work a minimum of 100, but no more than 150, days a year.
- ✘ The most “permanent” of the guest-worker bills is the “McCain- Kennedy” bill (S. 1033 and H.R. 2330), introduced by Senators McCain (R-AZ) and Kennedy (D-MA). The bill is best known for including a temporary worker program and a path to legalization for unauthorized immigrants already in the United States. The bill would allow undocumented immigrants to gain nonimmigrant status (while still in the U.S.) after paying a fee, a \$1000 fine, submitting fingerprints, and passing criminal and background checks.
- ✘ Most recently, the Senate Judiciary Committee presented a “compromise” proposal that includes a temporary guest-worker program and creates three different categories of unauthorized immigrants with varying opportunities to obtain permanent

status. Under this bill, unauthorized immigrants who have lived and worked in the United States for more than 5 years and meet a number of requirements (fees, fines, etc.) can obtain resident status. Those who have been in the U.S. 2–5 years would (a) be issued temporary work visas, (b) be required to exit the United States and reenter, (c) have to meet additional requirements, and (d) eventually obtain permanent status. The third category of unauthorized immigrants is for the most recent arrivals (those who have resided in the U.S. less than 2 years) and would require them to return to their country of origin and apply for the temporary guest-worker program.

Immigration Trends

Global Migration

Recent research has identified several noteworthy migration trends that break from historical assumptions of migrants as a result of several global imbalances. First, current global demographic and economic disparities are driving the movement of people from places with a population surplus and employment shortage to those with an aging population and growing low-skill service sector. As a result of job-worker imbalances, the global movement of people is directed from developing to more developed countries.

Though our demand for workers is driven by demographic forces, employment recruitment has created most of the global flows of migration, the United States being no exception. The foundation for much of today's migration flow from Mexico to the United States can be attributed to the Bracero Program, which brought over 4.5 million Mexican agricultural workers to the United States between 1942 and 1964. Though an imperfect and problematic system, the Bracero Program illustrates the paradox of U.S. immigration policy: We continue to have a labor demand, but we are at odds about how to best balance it.

Second, the final break from past global trends and common perception is the higher rates of immigration being experienced by the highly skilled. Scarce professional and technical employment opportunity has forced many educated, middle-class residents in developing countries to seek jobs in wealthier countries. Labor recruitment in the United States has also been directed toward the other end of the income spectrum, as in the case of the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act passed by Congress in 1998. Due to pressures from the high-tech and other specialized industries, the Act was designed to increase the number of highly skilled employees by creating the H1-B visa. Among companies hiring highly skilled foreign-born temporary workers, California firms rank among the top.

Another global migration trend of increasing apprehension for both migration-sending and migration-receiving countries is the extensive unauthorized and inhumane trafficking of people. According to the U.S. Department of State, an estimated 600,000 to 800,000 men, women, and children are trafficked across international borders each year. The strong correlation between migration, especially unauthorized flows, and human trafficking is of much concern for countries advocating the preservation of human rights. The more vulnerable a migrant is, due to a lack of legal status or language and cultural barriers, the more susceptible he or she is to becoming a victim of human enslavement and exploitation. Additionally, profits from human trafficking (an estimated \$9.5 million annually, according to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation) will fund organized crime, including drug trafficking, human smuggling, money laundering, and more.

As globalizing forces continue to further facilitate the mobility of capital, demand for increased labor mobility (i.e., international labor migration) will continue to grow. This will, in turn, make intergovernmental cooperation (between sending and receiving countries) a political and economic necessity in the twenty-first century. Whether they are intended to halt unauthorized migration, recruit employees, increase security, or fight human trafficking, bilateral migration agreements are critical. Additionally, cooperation with international migration organizations is advisable in an effort to formulate, standardize, and regulate the safety and conditions of global migration. An important fact to consider is that the U.S. immigration policies, currently being crafted, will affect many generations of immigrants and the natives alike.

To facilitate a rational and humanitarian debate on immigration, we offer the following brief summary of national and regional immigration patterns. Given the multidimensionality of immigration, we strongly believe that economic, social, political, and cultural issues have to be equally evaluated before any supportive or punitive policies are adopted. Without a doubt, immigration is not entirely a one-sided phenomenon that begins and ends with individual immigrants. Forces that bring about current immigration patterns have to be fully considered and included in any progressive policy that attempts to “manage” the current conditions.

National Immigration

Recently, much comparison has been drawn between past periods of U.S. immigration and our present experience. As immigration levels rise, public debate over nationalism, identity, and economic stability increase, and corresponding immigration policy is formulated. The earliest immigration to the United States was defined by Western and Northern Europeans followed by Eastern and Southern Europeans. The highly restrictive 1924 Immigration Act halted large-scale immigration to the United States until the enactment of the 1965 Immigration Act. The new era of immigration, defined by people from Latin America and

Asia, resulted in part from the 1965 Act, which removed the racially-biased national quota system and created the family reunification category, as well as considered other economic and political factors. Today's immigrants comprise people from the following world regions: Latin America (53.3%), Asia (25%), Europe (13.7%), and other regions (8%). The Census Bureau (2003) estimates the foreign-born population to make up about 12% of the U.S. population with 33.5 million people.

According to research conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center (March 7, 2006), unauthorized migrants are estimated at 30% of the foreign-born population in the United States, totaling between 11.5 and 12 million. A recent report published by the Center sheds light on the most current demographic and economic characteristics about this difficult-to-enumerate population. Within the unauthorized population, 49% are adult males, 35% are adult females, and 16% are children. In 2005, there were 6.6 million families in which either the head of the household or the spouse was unauthorized (totaling 14.6 million people). The majority of unauthorized immigrants are from Mexico (56%) and other Latin American countries (22%), followed by Asia (13%), Europe, and Canada (6%), and 3% are from other world regions. The unauthorized population accounted for 4.9% of the civilian labor force in 2005 and was found to be concentrated in several occupational categories, including farming (24%), cleaning (17%), construction (14%), and food preparation (12%).

California's Immigration

According to the Department of Finance, in 2004 California was estimated to have 9.5 million foreign-born residents out of a total population of 36.6 million (26% of the population); and of those, an estimated 2.4 million were unauthorized. The majority of the foreign born in California are from Latin America (54.8%, with 44.3% from Mexico alone), Asia (32.9%), Europe (7.9%), and other world regions (4.5%). Within the state, immigrants are concentrated in several regions: 36.2% of the population in Los Angeles County is foreign born (3.4 million people) as are 27.4% of the San Francisco Bay Area, and the remaining immigrants are distributed primarily in the Southern Counties (23.3%), Coastal Counties (20.7%), Central Counties (19.8%), and the Sacramento Metropolitan region (14.5%).

The economic effects of immigration on California are complex and difficult to untangle, but most research concludes that U.S. residents experience positive net gains as a result of immigration. The benefits of immigration, however, are not necessarily distributed equally for multiple reasons. Because most taxes paid by immigrants go to the federal government, but most services required are provided by state and municipal governments, states such as California, with sizeable immigrant populations, bear a disproportionate cost. Yet, the demographics of the foreign born, who are on average younger, have more children, and earn lower wages than the native population, indicate that services such as education may be costly at the moment, but in the near future the benefits associated with education will

pay off. The short-term costs associated with immigration in California could be considered a long-term investment if managed properly. Over the next 30 years, immigrants and their children will account for almost all of the workforce growth in California. If immigrants remain in California, the state's population will be younger than the national average, which could result in a competitive advantage if combined with adequate education levels.

Though immigrants make significant contributions to California's labor supply, inadequate integration has resulted in great economic disparity. Levels of education and other social factors, such as English-speaking ability, affect the earnings and occupational access of the foreign born. As a result, immigrant groups with lower educational attainment, especially Latinos and to a lesser degree Asians, are concentrated in lower-wage occupations and, thereby, face barriers to future economic advancement. With adequate educational and employment opportunity, however, the children of immigrants generally are found to be proportionately represented in all occupational categories. This underscores the need for educational and integrative efforts to ensure the success of California's future generations and prevent the formation of a permanent underclass.

Unfortunately, research indicates that the rate of economic assimilation for immigrants has slowed over time and that racial barriers still exist. Recent findings by the Economic Roundtable indicate that the informal sector of California's economy is growing, largely due to immigrants who are disproportionately represented in "under-the-table" jobs. Born out of economic desperation, informal economies jeopardize the safety of workers and short-change governments of tax revenue. As we move forward with immigration policy, we need to ensure that the American dream can be realized by recent immigrants, not just those of the past. Additionally, regardless of the length of stay of an immigrant, whether temporary or permanent, a basic quality of life should be available while they are here.

Access to social services is one component of integration that has been systematically reduced for immigrants of all types, further contributing to economic disparity. The passing of costs associated with immigration to the state level, popular perception, and California's Proposition 187 have all fueled federal legislation designed to limit immigrants' access to social welfare services (including Aid to Dependent Families With Children (AFDC), food stamps, Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare). Both the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 severely restricted welfare benefits, for both illegal and legal immigrants. Research, however, indicates that most immigrant groups (excluding refugee groups) are generally less likely to use social welfare services than the native born population. When services are limited for immigrant parents, access to services for their citizen children are usually restricted as well.

Policy Considerations

Before engaging in any policy debate, it is necessary to establish some ground rules. As a country with a long history of immigration and priding itself in doing so, we need to uphold basic human rights standards for all migrants in our country, regardless of their type—permanent, temporary, or unauthorized. This means that in formulating any future immigration policies, we remind ourselves consistently that we are dealing with fellow human beings and their basic universal human rights needs to be respected. All immigrants, including the undocumented, are protected under general international human rights law, which ensures that all people are protected from inhumane treatment or punishment, not subjected to torture or held in slavery, and given due process in the criminal justice system. Given the vulnerability of recently arrived immigrants, especially the undocumented, these basic rights are frequently jeopardized and violations go unreported. Immigration policy needs to emphasize these rights by incorporating preventative education and committing to international treaties regarding the human rights of migrants.

It is after putting such an umbrella policy in place that we can occupy a moral ground from which we can take into account national policies regarding who should or should not come. Immigration policies, however, should fully incorporate a consideration of the conditions that attract and promote immigration. For example, without appropriate living-wage standards, some business may feel that recruiting cheaper foreign labor is to their benefit. This means that full economic consideration of “immigration conditions” need to be incorporated into future policies. From our perspective, we offer the following eight steps for adopting progressive immigration policies:

1. Give full consideration to the protection of the human rights of all immigrants.
2. Develop a political atmosphere that allows for bilateral immigration policies (which allows us to work with immigrants’ countries of origin, prevent human trafficking, and deter exploitive labor abuses).
3. Separate immigration policies from those that focus on undocumented and unauthorized immigration.
4. When designing punitive measures for unauthorized immigrants, equally penalize labor practices that attract this category of migrant population and the human traffickers and agents who facilitate this process.
5. Adopt living-wage standards across all industries, but focus initial effort in adjusting wages in industries with highest level of attraction for the unauthorized immigrants (e.g., agriculture, food and entertainment, and garment industry).

6. View immigration as a process and attempt to adopt seamless policies that affect every phase. Given the history of the American laissez-faire system of government, it is important to consider integration issues within immigration policies. This includes an assurance that the costs of integration and services are not passed to states and specific localities. In other words, costs and benefits of immigration should be assessed with a full attention to the geography of immigration.
7. Include an integration agenda that provides an opportunity for economic and social mobility for all immigrants.
8. Consider basic quality of life issues for all immigrants, regardless of their length of stay or status.

Note on Terminology

The term foreign born is used to refer to anyone who is not a U.S. citizen at birth and includes the following: naturalized U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents (immigrants), temporary migrants (nonimmigrants, e.g., students), humanitarian migrants (e.g., refugees), and people who live in the United States without documentation (undocumented migrants). Undocumented or unauthorized immigrants are residents in the United States without U.S. citizenship, legal permanent resident status, or legal temporary status. The greatest percentage of undocumented immigrants usually originates either through overstaying their visas or by entering the United States without documentation, while a small percentage is in an intermediate state of temporary status.

Preschool After Proposition 82: Should Spatial Targeting Be the Natural Next Step?

Jennifer Kitson

September 2006

On June 6, California voters rejected the universal preschool program agenda laid out by Proposition 82. In the aftermath of months of fierce debate and volumes of reports, the importance of preschool remains clear. Increased preschool quality and access could help narrow the achievement gap between economic and ethnic groups and have long-term social and economic benefits for California as a whole. How to strategically deploy preschool programs and funding to achieve the maximum benefits appears to be the next step.

California's sizeable and complex economic and demographic landscape may necessitate a preschool agenda specifically tailored to our unique cultural geography. In this policy brief, we propose the use of spatial targeting as a way to connect scarce public resources to the geographic locations where access is limited, need is great, and the benefits gained will be greatest. This policy brief highlights some of the reasons spatial targeting is an appropriate next step for the California preschool agenda. Rather than just targeting specific segments of the population (e.g., low income families), spatial targeting would identify the places with highest need based on a series of characteristics about the population (e.g., low-income English language learners, low academic achievement) and the place (e.g., long waiting lists, lack of preschool centers or slots).

Who is in greatest need of preschool?

National studies have repeatedly reported the increased benefits experienced by low-income children from center-based preschool compared with only moderate gains for middle-class children. However, recent studies specific to California, such as one by the University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute (2004), have shown that socioeconomic status and language background largely explain the variation among children's achievement levels in kindergarten. Researchers found these factors to be the primary reason Latino children in California enter kindergarten 2 months behind their white peers in terms of math and reading skills. Furthermore, this gap is almost nonexistent when Latino children have the same socioeconomic and language background as white children.

Additionally, a recent Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE, September 2004) study found that children from all socioeconomic backgrounds in California experienced benefits from participating in center-based preschool programs. Much of these broad-based gains may be linked to the sizeable Latino population in California, which spans across different income brackets. In the PACE study, almost half of the middle-class segment of the sample comprised Latino households where children may be more likely to benefit from

early English literacy preparation. In 2000, Latino children comprised 47% of children under age 5 in California, according to First 5 California. Research pertaining to California repeatedly underscores the need to improve preschool access for Latino children if the achievement gap is to be narrowed and statewide academic levels improved.

Who has least access to preschool?

Currently, approximately two thirds (64%) of California's 4-year-olds attend a preschool center, while the remaining third are cared for by nonrelatives (14%) or relatives (25%), according to PACE (September 2004). PACE research illuminates how access to preschool centers in California varies greatly by income and ethnicity. Their findings indicate that approximately 49% of low-income children attended preschool (23% through Head Start, 26% through other center-based programs) in the year prior to kindergarten, while over 80% of upper-middle class children attended center-based programs. Preschool participation (as the primary care arrangement) by ethnicity in California follows national trends, whereby African American children have relatively high participation rates (59%), as do white children (58%), compared with Asian American (47%) and Latino children (37%).

A major barrier to preschool access is the ineligibility of many families for subsidized programs due to incomes that are above the official poverty level but still moderate by California standards. According to Preschool California, a family of four in 2005 was eligible for free or subsidized state preschool if it earned less than \$39,000 a year. The federally funded Head Start program eligibility is even lower, requiring a family of four to earn less than \$19,350 a year. Numerous studies show that middle-income families are priced out of the preschool market, thereby facing low preschool participation levels on par with the lowest income segment of the population.

The distribution of preschool centers has also been shown to have an uneven geography. Low preschool capacity exists in counties with low adult education levels as well as those with low to middle incomes, according to a recent PACE study (July 2002). The highest supply of preschool enrollment slots available was found in the San Francisco Bay Area and rural areas in the northern part of the state, and the lowest availability was in the Central Valley and Southern California (Los Angeles to San Diego).

Where is preschool demand the greatest?

Another way to determine where preschool expenditure should occur is to identify communities with the greatest preschool demand. A survey conducted by Fight Crime: Invest in Kids (2005) found 76% of California's publicly-funded preschools had a waiting list. Shifting demographic trends in California can also help locate the places with greatest preschool demand. The identification of cities with a declining preschool demand (e.g., aging of the baby boomer population) and those with a predicted increase (e.g., large Latino

population) may help direct future preschool demand.

How can spatial targeting narrow the preschool achievement gap in California?

Present efforts to target populations with greatest preschool need or benefit potential fall short by considering only the lowest levels of household income. Spatial targeting is conducive to the complex demographic, linguistic, and socioeconomic landscape of California, efficiently linking resources to communities where greatest gains will be experienced. One PACE study (January 2003) employed spatial targeting to identify communities in Los Angeles County that had low-performing schools, low preschool supply, and pent-up demand. When used independently, each indicator (e.g., Academic Performance Indicator API, percentage of children in poverty, etc.) resulted in the identification of different communities facing different types of preschool need. But when used in multiple layers, the indicators presented a stark geography of the communities facing compounded barriers to preschool access and educational achievement. Additional research is needed to compare the merits of different social, economic, academic, and demographic indicators to best prioritize where preschool funding will accrue the greatest gains.

The long-term vision behind Proposition 82 should not be forgotten, but current efforts to improve the quality of and access to preschool must address the complex geography of educational disparity in California through an expanded, targeted approach. By broadening the targeting efforts to identify those communities with multiple layers of need and demand (e.g., low adult education levels, English language learners, middle income, Latino, few preschool slots), greater access can be achieved with limited resources.

Beyond Infrastructure: California's Social and Natural Environments

Jennifer Kitson

March 2007

Governor Schwarzenegger's fight against global warming has drawn enormous attention to an environmental cause largely abandoned by the federal government. Beginning with his Executive Order, issued June 1, 2005, which set greenhouse gas emission reduction targets in California, the Governor's promise to "make California No.1 in the fight against global warming" is becoming a reality. In July 2006, he signed an agreement with British Prime Minister Tony Blair to collaborate on new technology research and market-based mechanisms in an effort to control climate change. Most recently, in September 2006, the Governor signed Assembly Bill 32 (AB

32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, introduced by Assembly Speaker Fabian Nuñez and Assemblymember Fran Pavley. This pioneering legislation incorporates regulatory and market mechanisms that will reduce California's greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent by 2020.

Governor Schwarzenegger's effort to reduce greenhouse gases is a noble attempt to preserve our environmental heritage in California, while bringing our state into accord with the global community's environmental standards. If successful, Governor Schwarzenegger can add the Global Warming Solutions Act to his growing legacy for California. Largely responsible for spearheading the infrastructure bond package approved in November, the Governor's bipartisan spirit and strong leadership skills appear inexhaustible. As we begin to reinvest and rebuild California's physical infrastructure, the possibility exists, under Governor Schwarzenegger's leadership, to unfold an agenda that is truly sustainable—environmentally, socially, and economically.

Frequently omitted from the recent public discourse on infrastructure are the reasons why infrastructure investment in California came to an abrupt halt in the 1970s. In addition to multiple economic and political factors in the late 1960s, environmental concerns and regulations brought an end to the infrastructure building era led by Pat Brown. Our waning collective memory may partly explain the current lack of public dialogue on new ways to prevent the environmental degradation and excessive growth associated with massive construction endeavors. Another likely barrier to genuine public discussion is the immense political will (and leadership) necessary to prioritize sustainability amid demand for economic growth.

Even now, all eyes are still focused on the Governor's promise of 750,000 new jobs over the next 10 years—not the environmental implications of the \$42 billion in infrastructure bonds or if these jobs will pay living wages. Though California is desperately in need of

infrastructure repair and expansion, as evidenced by the findings of numerous reports and studies, it would be a tragedy if these improvements came at great expense to the social and natural environments. At the Pat Brown Institute's 2006 Annual California Policy Issues Conference, titled "Elections 2006: Implications for Civic Engagement and Infrastructure Development in California," Ms. Elise Buik from the United Way of Greater Los Angeles delivered the morning keynote presentation, which advocated for the deployment of the physical infrastructure bond package to coincide with reinvestment in the social infrastructure. Without adequate educational and skill training opportunities, she argued, the California Dream cannot be realized for millions of Californians. This first round of infrastructure investment in California has the potential to go beyond building new structures while it builds new green industries and career opportunities. This policy brief outlines some of the ways in which social and environmental goals could be incorporated into infrastructure investment in California.

Building Our Future: Social Capital

Due to new advances in technology since the Pat Brown era, infrastructure building, economic expansion, and environmental conservation do not have to be mutually exclusive. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and the Workforce Investment Board recently commissioned an investigation into the City's capacity to expand its "green" industry and technology sectors. The final report produced by the Economic Roundtable (January 2006), titled "Jobs in L.A.'s Green Technology Sector," inventoried Los Angeles' existing green goods and services and identified those industries with potential for growth and job creation. The report argued that expansion of green industry in Los Angeles has great benefits for the City's overall economy, including numerous employment opportunities with living wages, expanded educational and vocational career paths, economic "ripple effects," and more. Many of the green industries identified in the report as having great growth potential could also contribute to the rebuilding of California's infrastructure: water and sewage systems, construction, nondurable manufacturing (petroleum product recycling, cleaning compound manufacturing), durable manufacturing (HVAC and electrical equipment), durable goods wholesale, professional services (legal services, architecture, and engineering), and waste collection, remediation, and management.

The green industry occupations studied in Los Angeles by the Economic Roundtable have a number of desirable characteristics that can build social capital while they simultaneously contribute to building the physical infrastructure. The report found that several of the green industry construction occupations (accounting for 25 percent of the jobs in green technology industries) have considerable wage increase opportunities between the typical entry-level and overall occupational average. Additionally, a cluster of green technology occupations was found to pay living wages and have low skill requirements. The report also concluded that the green technology occupations in Los Angeles require diverse and

distinct skill sets, creating a multitude of employment opportunities. Finally, the ethnic distribution of Los Angeles residents in green technology occupations was found to parallel that of the overall labor force. The expansion of the green industry presents considerable opportunity to connect skill training and educational opportunities to careers in a growing industry with significant career advancement. By interconnecting the infrastructure bond package to the expansion of the green industry in California, investment will be made in both the physical and social infrastructure of our State while simultaneously reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Green Infrastructure

As different agencies move forward with the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act, an opportunity exists to explore ways the infrastructure bond deployment can bring the State closer to the designated emissions cap of the new law.

Recent legislation signed by Governor Schwarzenegger (in addition to the campaign against global warming) demonstrates his ability to intertwine both economic growth and environmental preservation, including the Hydrogen Highway, the Million Solar Roofs Plan, and investment in innovative technological research. His recent announcement that he will propose nearly \$95 million in the state budget for the creation of the Governor's Research and Innovation Initiative, which includes funding for solar technologies and alternative fuels, exemplifies this commitment to make California a global leader in both these capacities.

If some of these new technologies (e.g., solar, alternative fuels) were designed with infrastructure investment needs in mind, they might provide an immediate contribution to greenhouse gas reduction while also protecting communities in close proximity to the building of new roads, homes, levees, and schools. Issues of environmental justice are of critical concern because many communities may face worsening environmental conditions during the infrastructure repair and rebuilding. Those communities who are already disproportionately affected by industrial pollution in California may need to bear additional burdens when increased manufacturing is needed for construction efforts. In the same way that the California Global Warming Solutions Act mandates the formation of a Global Warming Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, the infrastructure bond spending should also proceed with the consideration of a similar advisory group.

In addition to greenhouse gas reduction, the repair and improvement to California's physical infrastructure provides the opportunity for the encouragement of new environmentally benign methods and technologies, such as deconstruction techniques; waste reduction, reuse, and recycling; sustainable building materials; and sustainable water management. Governor Schwarzenegger has already led this effort through Executive Order S-20-04, also known as the "Green Building Initiative." By adhering to the U.S. Green Building Council's

(USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards, the Executive Order and accompanying Green Building Action Plan mandate that state-owned buildings reduce energy use by 20 percent by 2015 (from a 2003 baseline).

By adopting the nationally recognized LEED standards for all new and renovated state-owned buildings, the Governor has prioritized sustainable building design, construction, and operation. Governor Schwarzenegger has also publicly praised organizations, such as the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), for leadership in greenhouse gas reduction. Caltrans was a recent recipient of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) innovation award for the agency's use of waste products in construction. The Los Angeles Community College District, also an EPA award recipient and exemplar of green planning, has integrated the LEED standards into their modernization project and master plan. The District's comprehensive adoption of these sustainable design and building principles and the size of the project have boosted the entire green building industry in California, including the demand for LEED-accredited professionals. Government sponsored competitions and incentives, such as awards and public recognition, can be expanded and directed toward the public and private sectors responsible for building our housing, roads, levees, and schools.

Concluding Remarks

Governor Schwarzenegger has made bold strides to preserve and improve the State's natural environment. We commend his efforts to date and suggest some policy recommendations to ensure that California's infrastructure is built in ways that are environmentally and socially sustainable. As the infrastructure bond package is deployed, it should accomplish the following:

- Integrate the California Global Warming Solutions Act
 - ✎ Prioritize California-based green technology and construction companies for government contracts
 - ✎ Research the predicted greenhouse gas pollution that infrastructure rebuilding will incur over the next 10 years
 - ✎ Extend government incentives to use LEED standards to private industry
- Build social capital
 - ✎ Promote educational and skill-training opportunities within the green technology and building industries
 - ✎ Link training and education institutions to the green industry sector
- Ensure environmental justice/equity
 - ✎ Form an Environmental Justice Advisory Committee to advise the deployment of the infrastructure bond package
 - ✎ Ensure that input on social justice issues is obtained from local communities af-

ected by infrastructure building

As attention to the previous items increases, and for the first time, it may be possible under the Governor's leadership for California to rebuild, improve, and expand our infrastructure—sustainably.

BIOGRAPHIES

(collected at the time of lecture and/or report)

ANGELA GOLVER BLACKWELL is founder and chief executive officer of PolicyLink, a national nonprofit research, communications, capacity-building, and advocacy organization. PolicyLink is committed to Lifting Up What Works®, with a mission of advancing a new generation of policies to achieve economic and social equity, based on the wisdom, voice, and experience of local leaders who are shaping successful solutions to national problems. Blackwell founded PolicyLink after serving as senior vice president for The Rockefeller Foundation for three-and-a-half years. In 1987 she founded the Urban Strategies Council in Oakland, California, and received national recognition for pioneering a community building approach to social change through in-depth understanding of local conditions, community-driven systems reform, and an insistence on accountability. For a decade, beginning in 1977, Blackwell served as a partner with Public Advocates, a nationally known public interest law firm representing the underrepresented.

JAN BREIDENBACH was Executive Director of the Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH) from 1991 to 2006. Ms. Breidenbach founded *Housing LA*, a citywide campaign calling for establishment of a Housing Trust Fund in Los Angeles. In 2002 founded Building Allies, a project that educates and organizes school districts and community development corporations to engage in joint development of housing and schools. Prior to joining SCANPH, Ms. Breidenbach was the founding executive director of a women's economic development organization. She worked as an organizer for SEIU and was a community organizer around housing and health care issues. Ms. Breidenbach is presently an Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Policy, Planning and Development Department at USC. She writes and speaks on housing and community development and is a Contributing Editor to Shelterforce, a national journal of housing and community development. She is a Senior Fellow at the School of Public Affairs at UCLA and was a James Johnson Fellow of the Fannie Mae Foundation in 2003.

E. RICHARD BROWN is Professor, Department of Health Services and Department of Community Health Sciences at UCLA School of Public Health. Dr. Brown is also Director of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, which he founded in 1994. Dr. Brown's research and publications cover a broad range of issues and policies affecting the access of disadvantaged populations to health care. His research focuses on health insurance coverage, the lack of coverage, and the effects on access of public policies and economic and market conditions. His work addresses disparities in health care and health status experienced by Latinos and other racial and ethnic groups, immigrants, the uninsured, and the economically disadvantaged. He is the principal investigator of the California Health

Interview Survey (CHIS), one of the nation's largest ongoing health surveys. Dr. Brown has been extensively involved in the analysis and development of public policies, with particular emphasis on health care reform, advising several key politicians, including former U.S. Senator Bob Kerrey, then-Governor Bill Clinton, the late U.S. Senator Paul Wellstone, and former U.S. Senator Bill Bradley.

MARLENE CANTER was overwhelmingly elected to the Los Angeles City Board of Education in June 2001 and again in March of 2005. On July 5th, 2005 she was elected Board President by her peers. Ms. Canter began her career in education as a special education teacher at Alta Loma Elementary School. She went on to co-found and serve as the co-CEO of Canter & Associates, now Laureate Education, Inc. The company became one of the world's leading teacher-training organizations and trained more than one million K-12 teachers worldwide. It developed an extensive catalogue of professional development programs, distance learning graduate courseware and resource materials for teachers, administrators, and parents. Ms. Canter sits on the Board of Directors for her alma mater, Pacific Oaks College and is an advisor to the Children's Partnership. Ms. Canter also has served on the Boards of Directors for the Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation and the Kehillath Israel Synagogue of Pacific Palisades.

DAVID S. CUNNINGHAM III, an African American redevelopment and land use attorney, was appointed to the Los Angeles Police Commission by Mayor James Hahn in August of 2001. He was elected President of the Commission in 2003, after being elected Vice President in 2002. The son of former City Councilman David S. Cunningham, Jr., he has been a resident of the City of Los Angeles for most of his life. Commissioner Cunningham's appointment to the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners is the culmination of two decades of distinguished service as a lawyer and public servant. Committed to bettering the Los Angeles community through his legal work and involvement with policy-making boards, Commissioner Cunningham's credentials include a background of professional accomplishment, community advocacy and academic achievement.

ELIZABETH DEAKIN is Professor of City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley and Co-Chair of UC Berkeley's interdisciplinary Global Metropolitan Studies Initiative. She also serves as Director of the statewide University of California Transportation Center, which is jointly funded by both the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). She earned her undergraduate and master's degrees at MIT in Political Science and Civil Engineering-Transportation Systems and her J.D. at Boston College Law School.

DANIEL FLAMING has been president of the Economic Roundtable since 1991, when the Board of Supervisors unanimously endorsed converting the Roundtable into an independent research organization. Under his leadership the Roundtable has built a reputation for

reliable, innovative research that is operationally relevant for the public sector. Dan has led more than 40 major research projects at the Roundtable that have illuminated critical changes in the regional economy and documented conditions of the working poor. Dan received his Ph.D. in Urban Studies from USC, his Masters Degree in Urban Planning from UCLA, and his Bachelors Degree in Philosophy from Pomona College. Dan has extensive practical experience in community social and economic analysis and urban social policy. He worked for Los Angeles County for over 20 years, beginning in delinquency prevention programs, then managing housing and community development programs, and concluding his county career directing job training and economic research programs.

FERNANDO J. GUERRA has been the Director of the Center for the Study of Los Angeles since 1996. Dr. Guerra is also an associate professor at LMU in the departments of Chicano studies and political science. Guerra has authored numerous publications that focus on politics and ethnicity issues in California including, "Latino Politics in California: The Necessary Conditions for Success," "Minority Electoral Representation Patterns During the Pat Brown Years," and "Theory, Reality, and Perpetual Potential: Latinos in the 1992 California Elections." Guerra's community service has included membership on the Los Angeles Transportation Commission and the Los Angeles Rent Adjustment Commission. Guerra received his B.A. in political science and international relations from USC and earned his doctorate in political science from the University of Michigan.

JOEL JORDAN, Director of Special Projects for UTLA; coordinating school sites, organizing outreach to community organizations, Governmental Relations, and school reform efforts. Joel is a recently retired high school Social Studies teacher with 30 years experience, the last 24 years in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Joel served within United Teachers Los Angeles (UTLA) as Chapter Chair, Co-Chair, Representative of the House of Representatives and a Delegate to the California Teachers Association (CTA) State Council.

JENNIFER KITSON is a PhD student in Geography at Arizona State University with research interests in urban and social geography. She received her Masters in Geography from California State University, Los Angeles and was a Research Associate at the Edmund G. Pat Brown Institute of Public Affairs from 2005 to 2007.

STEWART KWOH is the President and executive Director of the Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California (APALC) the largest and most diverse legal assistance and civil rights organization targeting Asian Pacific Americans in the United States. He is also Vice-Chair of the Board of Directors for the Asian American Justice Center, the country's first national Pan Asian civil rights organization. Mr. Kwoh has served as steering committee member for the Coalition for Humane Immigration Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA) and President of the UCLA Asian Pacific Alumni Association, and Chaired the Board of Directors for The California Endowment. He is currently a trustee of the Methodist Ur-

ban Foundation, California Consumer Protection Foundation, The California Endowment and The California Wellness Foundation, The Tang Family Foundation, and The Fannie Mae Foundation. He is a current board member for the United Way of Greater Los Angeles and the Pat Brown Institute.

JORJA LEAP has been a member of the faculty of the UCLA Department of Social Welfare since 1992. She currently teaches in the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Science. Dr. Leap has also served as a lecturer and consultant in the private and public sectors, including work with the County Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Mental Health, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the Los Angeles Police Department. As a recognized expert in crisis intervention and trauma response, she has worked internationally in violent and post-war settings, focusing on issues of change, conflict, attachment and loss.

SUSAN LERNER is the Executive Director of the California Clean Money Campaign. Ms. Lerner has been an activist for more than 25 years. She is a member of the Steering Committee of the Commonwealth Club's Voices of Reform Project and formerly served on the Board of Trustees of the California State Summer School for the Arts. Before joining the California Clean Money Campaign as its executive director, she founded and chaired the Committee for Judicial Independence, a grassroots organization dedicated to educating and activating Americans to the importance of an independent federal judiciary. Ms. Lerner spearheads the Justice for All Project, a California statewide coalition of organizations working to educate members and lobby elected representatives on federal judicial nominations. She is the former executive director of the California Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League-South. For almost 20 years, Lerner was a trial lawyer in Los Angeles specializing in complex commercial litigation and intellectual property.

ALI MADANIPOUR, M.Arch., Ph.D., has studied, practiced and taught architecture and town planning, winning design awards, conducting research, and publishing widely. His research focuses on urban design and development, European urban governance, and social exclusion. He is currently working with academic and municipal partners throughout Europe on these issues in several projects funded by the European Commission. Recent books include *Public and Private Spaces of City* (2003); *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity and Social Milieux* (co-ed, 2002); and *The Governance of Place: Space and planning processes* (co-ed, 2001).

PILAR MARRERO is the senior political writer and columnist for La Opinión Newspaper. In her career of 19 years since moving to Los Angeles from her native Venezuela, she has covered almost every beat as a reporter, including City Hall, Immigration and Politics. She often works as a commentator on radio and TV and is an instructor of journalism courses at UCLA Extension.

SUNNE WRIGHT McPEAK is the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger appointed her to the cabinet-level post in November 2003. Ms. McPeak was formerly President and CEO of the Bay Area Council. During her tenure at the Bay Area Council, Ms. McPeak established and led major regional initiatives that addressed policy challenges involving transportation housing, sustainable economic development, water policy, telecommunications infrastructure, and education and workforce preparation. Prior to joining the Bay Area Council in November of 1996, Ms. McPeak served for three years as President and CEO of the Bay Area Economic Forum, Ms. McPeak was a member of the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors for more than 15 years. As a supervisor, she was a leader on California water policy and an early advocate for promoting regional solutions to Bay Area policy Challenges.

JULIE MENDOZA is the Director of Research and Evaluation for the University of California College Prep (UCCP) Initiative. UCCP provides online college preparatory courses to high school students so that they may achieve competitive eligibility for admission to the University of California and other top universities. UCCP also provides online content, test prep, and academic support to students and teachers. Dr. Mendoza also works as an education consultant and policy advisor to a wide-range of business, government, school, and community leaders in California. She is a Special Advisor to the Marin County Education Fund and the Boyle Heights Learning Collaborative in East Los Angeles. She serves as a member of Mayor Villaraigosa's Council of Education Advisors and the Chair of the Healthy Kids Subcommittee. In October 2005, Mayor Villaraigosa appointed her to the Board of Library Commissioners for the term ending in 2009. Dr. Mendoza earned a B.A. in Communications Studies and M.A. in Urban Planning from UCLA, and an Ed.M. and Ed.D. in Administration, Planning, and Social Policy from Harvard Graduate School of Education.

ALI MODARRES is associate director of the Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairs and professor with the Department of Geography and Urban Analysis at California State University, Los Angeles. Dr. Modarres is editor of California Politics & Policy and California Politics Issues Annual, book review editor for Cities, and is on the editorial board for the Journal of Urban Affairs. He recently co-authored City and Environment, and specializes in urban geography. His primary research and publication interests are community development and planning, and is published in the areas of immigration, race and ethnicity, poverty, transportation planning, and environmental equity.

ALEX NORMAN is Professor Emeritus of Social Welfare from UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research where he was Chair of Planning and Administration. He is currently an independent organization/transformation consultant specializing in strategic/futures planning, conflict management, community development, and managing multicultural environments. His roster of clients includes the City of Long Beach, Southern California Metropolitan Water District, Kaiser Permanente, and Los Angeles County Departments

of Children & Family Services, Probation, and Chief Administrative Office. In addition, he is currently involved in several research projects, including *“Community Policing in Los Angeles: A Study of Organizational and Community Response to Change in the Los Angeles Police Department”* (1995-2000) and *“Police/Community Consultative Process in England: London and Bristol as Comparative Case Studies”* (1996--). A facilitator with the Pat Brown Institute’s Community Policing program for the past four years, Dr. Norman brings extensive expertise in coalition building, collaboratives, and community development.

RICK ORLOV is a political reporter and columnist for the Los Angeles Daily News. He has extensive experience in covering federal, state and local races and is based at Los Angeles City Hall where he primarily reports on municipal government. Orlov has covered Los Angeles area events for more than 30 years and has won numerous local awards, including Journalist of the Year by the Society of Professional Journalists. He is a graduate of California State University, Northridge, in political science.

THOMAS A. SAENZ became Counsel to the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles in August 2005, where he serves as a member of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa’s executive team and provides legal advice to the mayor. At the end of July 2005, Tom left the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), a national organization dedicated to securing and promoting the civil rights of Latinos in the United States, where he served as Vice President of Litigation. As Vice President, Tom oversaw MALDEF’s efforts nationwide to pursue civil rights litigation in the areas of education, employment, political access, immigrants’ rights, and public resource equity. Tom joined MALDEF as a staff attorney in 1993; he became Los Angeles Regional Counsel in 1996, National Senior Counsel in 2000, and Vice President of Litigation in 2001. For eight years, Tom has taught “Civil Rights Litigation” in the spring semester as an adjunct lecturer at the U.S.C. Law School. Tom also currently serves on the Los Angeles County Board of Education, and he previously served on the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations.

GARY YATES is president and chief executive officer of the California Wellness Foundation and serves as a member of the Foundation’s board of directors. He is also assistant clinical professor of pediatrics at the University of Southern California School of Medicine, and is a licensed marriage and family therapist. Yates joined the Foundation staff in 1992 after more than 20 years of experience in health and social service organizations. Immediately prior to his association with The California Wellness Foundation, he was associate director of the division of adolescent medicine at Children’s Hospital Los Angeles. Yates received his undergraduate degree in Government from American University in Washington, D.C., and his master’s degree in counseling psychology from the University of Northern Colorado. His primary area of interest and expertise is adolescent health, about which he has written and spoken extensively. Yates is actively involved in the leadership of numerous philanthropic, civic and community organizations and currently serves on the boards of the Foundation Consortium and Independent Sector. In recognition of his civic leadership and work in the field of health and human services, Yates has received numerous official commendations.



*For information about the Pat Brown Institute,
please call, write or visit our website:*

The Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairs

California State University, Los Angeles

5151 State University Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90032-8261

Telephone: **(323) 343-3770**, Fax: **(323) 343-3774**

Website: **<http://www.patbrowninstitute.org>**