AGENDA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SONOMA COUNTY
575 ADMINISTRATION DRIVE, ROOM 102A
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403

TUESDAY APRIL 5, 2016 8:30 A.M.
(There will be NO regular afternoon session.)

**PLEASE NOTE THAT PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA WILL BE HEARD AT 11:30 A.M.**

Susan Gorin  First District
David Rabbitt  Second District
Shirlee Zane  Third District
James Gore  Fourth District
Efren Carrillo  Fifth District
Veronica A. Ferguson  County Administrator
Bruce Goldstein  County Counsel

This is a simultaneous meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County, the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Water Agency, the Board of Commissioners of the Community Development Commission, the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, the Board of Directors of the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District, the Sonoma County Public Finance Authority, and as the governing board of all special districts having business on the agenda to be heard this date. Each of the foregoing entities is a separate and distinct legal entity.

The Board welcomes you to attend its meetings which are regularly scheduled each Tuesday at 8:30 a.m. Your interest is encouraged and appreciated.

AGENDAS AND MATERIALS: Agendas and most supporting materials are available on the Board’s website at http://www.sonoma-county.org/board/. Due to legal, copyright, privacy or policy considerations, not all materials are posted online. Materials that are not posted are available for public inspection between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100A, Santa Rosa, CA.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Board after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Board of Supervisors office at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100A, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours.

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability which requires an accommodation, an alternative format, or requires another person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (707) 565-2241 or bos@sonoma-county.org as soon as possible to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

Public Transit Access to the County Administration Center:
Sonoma County Transit: Rt. 20, 30, 44, 48, 60, 62
Santa Rosa CityBus: Rt. 14
Golden Gate Transit: Rt. 80
For transit information call (707) 576-RIDE or 1-800-345-RIDE or visit http://www.sctransit.com/

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR
The Consent Calendar includes routine financial and administrative actions that are usually approved by a single majority vote. There will be no discussion on these items prior to voting on the motion unless Board Members or the public request specific items be discussed and/or removed from the Consent Calendar.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Any member of the public desiring to address the Board on a matter on the agenda: Please walk to the podium and after receiving recognition from the Chair, please state your name and make your comments. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit your comments to the subject under discussion. Each person is usually granted 3 minutes to speak; time limitations are at the discretion of the Chair. While members of the public are welcome to address the Board, under the Brown Act, Board members may not deliberate or take action on items not on the agenda.
8:30 A.M. CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
(Items may be added or withdrawn from the agenda consistent with State law)

II. CONSENT CALENDAR
(Items 1 through 11)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
(Commissioners: Gorin, Rabbitt, Zane, Gore, Carrillo)

1. Approve and Authorize the Executive Director to execute an agreement for auditing services with Smith, Marion & Company for $35,525 for services from May 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016, and to execute subsequent amendments to the agreement to extend the term for one additional one-year period upon satisfactory fulfillment of its obligation under the original agreement.

PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

2. Adopt a Resolution and Conditions of Approval for a Lot Line Adjustment between three parcels subject to Land Conservation Act Contracts for 245.53 +/- acres located at 7606 and 7610 Valley Ford Road, Petaluma; APN’s 022-050-011 and 022-050-009 for Dennis Maas; LLA13-0035. (Second District)

3. Adopt a Resolution and Conditions of Approval for a Lot Line Adjustment between two Administrative Certificate of Compliance (ACC) parcels subject to a Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Contract for property located at 1002 Chileno Valley Road, Petaluma; APN 020-010-010 by Patricia and Robin Klaus; PLP15-0046. (Second District)

PROBATION

4. Authorize the Chief Probation Officer to execute an agreement with the University of Cincinnati Corrections Research Institute (UCRI) for specialized evidence-based practices training, coaching and consultation for the period of April 5, 2016 through June 30, 2019 for a total amount not-to-exceed $250,000 with two one-year renewal options.

SHERIFF’S OFFICE

5. Authorize the Sheriff to execute the 2016 Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Program (DCE/SP) Letter of Agreement and any Amendments that do not substantially alter the scope of the Agreement with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). The Sheriff’s Office will receive a minimum of $40,000 to be used for marijuana suppression and eradication activities for the period of January 1, 2016 to September 30, 2016.
TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS

6. Authorize the Chair to execute an agreement with SCS Engineers to design and install a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (“SCADA”) to automate the monitoring and management of the leachate collection systems at the County’s Annapolis, Guerneville, Roblar, and Sonoma legacy landfill sites in the amount of $175,108 and to provide five years of ongoing support in the amount of $14,029 per year with a term of April 5, 2016 through June 30, 2021 for a total contract amount of $245,253. (First, Second, and Fifth Districts)

7. Approve and Authorize the Chair to execute an agreement with Already Set Up, Inc. in the amount of $92,995 with a term ending December 31, 2019 for website design, hosting, maintenance and AdWord marketing for the Charles M. Schulz – Sonoma County Airport.

APPOINTMENTS
(Item 8)

8. Approve the appointment of Richard Savel and the re-appointment of George Johnston to serve as Commissioners on the Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission. (Countywide)

PRESENTATIONS/GOLD RESOLUTIONS
(Items 9 through 11)

PRESENTATIONS AT THE BOARD MEETING

9. Adopt a Gold Resolution recognizing AmeriCorps and Senior Corps volunteers and proclaiming April 5, 2016 as County Day of Recognition for National Service. (Countywide)

10. Adopt a Gold Resolution honoring the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Programs at Sonoma Developmental Center as part of the Day of Recognition for National Service April 5, 2016. (First District)

PRESENTATIONS AT A DIFFERENT DATE

11. Adopt a Gold Resolution proclaiming April 27, 2016 as Sonoma County World Hunger Awareness Day. (First District)
III. **REGULAR CALENDAR**  
(Items 12 through 15)

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR/ AUDITOR CONTROLLER-TREASURER TAX COLLECTOR**

12. Interview and Appoint Donna Dunk as Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector effective April 5, 2016 through January 1, 2019 to complete the unexpired term of David Sundstrom.

**HEALTH SERVICES/HUMAN SERVICES**

13. Aging Together Sonoma County Update, Request to Join the World Health Organization’s Age-Friendly City and Community Network, and Funding Request –  
   (A) Accept an update from the Aging Together Sonoma County initiative.  
   (B) Approve the submission of an application to join the World Health Organization’s Age-Friendly City and Community Network.  
   (C) Allocate $10,000 in General Funds for Fiscal Year 2015-16, and $50,000 per year for a four-year period effective Fiscal Year 2016-17 to support the initiative. Matching federal funds will be used to increase the total funding amount.

**HEALTH SERVICES**

14. Universal Preschool Study Session -  
   (A) Review the American Institutes for Research *Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County* report.  
   (B) Receive an informational report reviewing recommended strategies and options to achieving universal quality preschool in Sonoma County.

**PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

15. Permit and Resource Management Department: Review and possible action on the following:  
   Acts and Determinations of Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Adjustments  
   Acts and Determinations of Project Review and Advisory Committee  
   Acts and Determinations of Design Review Committee  
   Acts and Determinations of Landmarks Commission  
   Administrative Determinations of the Director of Permit and Resource Management  
   (All materials related to these actions and determinations can be reviewed at: http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/b-c/index.htm)  

IV. **BOARD MEMBER REPORTS ON ASSIGNED BOARDS, COUNCILS, COMMISSIONS OR OTHER ATTENDED MEETINGS**

V. **PRESENTATIONS/GOLD RESOLUTIONS**  
(Items 9 through 10, approved on the Consent Calendar)
16. **11:30 A.M. - PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA BUT WITHIN THE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD**

(Comments are restricted to matters within the Board’s jurisdiction. The Board will hear public comments at this time for up to thirty minutes. Please be brief and limit your comments to three minutes. Any additional public comments will be heard at the conclusion of the meeting. While members of the public are welcome to address the Board, under the Brown Act, Board members may not deliberate or take action on items not on the agenda.)

17. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS**

VI. **CLOSED SESSION CALENDAR**

(Items 18 through 22)

18. The Board of Supervisors will consider the following in closed session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation – Settlement Negotiations - Steve La Blue and Peggy Dickinson, 1147 B Street, Fulton, CA - (Code Enforcement). (Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)).

19. The Board of Directors of the Russian River County Sanitation District will consider the following in closed session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Pending Litigation; Significant Exposure to Litigation – Regional Water Quality Control Board Administrative Civil Liability Complaint, California River Watch Citizen Suit 60 Day Notice Letter of Intention to File Suit, for Alleged Violations of the Clean Water Act, Russian River County Sanitation District. (Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2)).

20. The Board of Supervisors will consider the following in closed session: Public Employment Performance Evaluation - Director of Child Support Services. (Government Code Section 54957(b)(1)).

21. The Board of Supervisors will consider the following in closed session: Public Employee Appointment: Chief Probation Officer. (Government Code Section 54957).

22. The Board of Supervisors, the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Water Agency, the Board of Commissioners of the Community Development Commission, the Board of Directors of the Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, the Board of the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District, the Board of the Occidental County Sanitation District, the Board of the Russian River County Sanitation District, the Board of the South Park County Sanitation District, and the Board of the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District will consider the following in closed session: Conference with Labor Negotiator, Agency Negotiators: Christina Cramer/Carol Allen/Kelly Tuffo, Liebert, Cassidy & Whitmore/Richard Bolanos, Liebert, Cassidy & Whitmore. Employee organization: All. Unrepresented employees: All, including retired employees. (Government Code Section 54957.6).
RECONVENE FROM CLOSED SESSION

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

ADJOURNMENTS

NOTE: The next regular meeting will be held on April 12, 2016.

Upcoming Hearings (All dates are tentative until each agenda is finalized.)

April 12th (PM) - Appeal of the Board of Zoning Adjustments’ approval of a Coastal Permit and a Use Permit for a large residential community care facility; PLP14-0056.
April 19th (AM) - Housing Authority Public Housing Agency Annual Plan.
April 26th (PM) - Appeal of the Board of Zoning Adjustments’ approval of a Use Permit for modifications to an approved winery and tasting room; UPE14-0057.
May 10th (PM) - Timber Cove Trail Easement Irrevocable Offer of Dedication Vacation; SUR14-0058.
May 17th (PM) – Sewer and Drainage Review Fee Hearing.
May 24th (PM) - Accept comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Belden Barns farmstead and Winery Project; PLP12-0016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of Sonoma</th>
<th>Agenda Item Summary Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575 Administration Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA 95403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To:** Board of Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Board Agenda Date:</strong></th>
<th>April 5, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote Requirement:</strong></td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Department or Agency Name(s):</strong></th>
<th>Sonoma County Community Development Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Staff Name and Phone Number:</strong></th>
<th>Dawn Chandler, 565-7512</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisory District(s):</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title:</strong></th>
<th>Agreement for Auditing Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommended Actions:**

Approve and authorize the Executive Director of the Sonoma County Community Development Commission to execute a professional services agreement for auditing services with Smith, Marion & Company for $35,525 for services from May 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016, and to execute subsequent amendments to the Agreement to extend the term for one additional one-year period upon satisfactory fulfillment of its obligation under the original Agreement.

**Executive Summary:**

Approval of this agenda item will authorize execution of a Professional Services Agreement for independent financial auditor services for the Sonoma County Community Development Commission (CDC) for FY 2015-16, with one possible one-year extension for FY 16-17.

As required by federal regulations contained in 2 CFR Part 200, *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards*, the CDC must obtain an independent, single audit due to its expenditure of more than $750,000 in federal funds annually. The CDC utilizes the services of an independent firm of certified public accountants to audit its financial statements each fiscal year.

The firm of Smith, Marion & Co has conducted the CDC’s annual single audit for FY 2012-13 through FY 2014-15. They were selected pursuant to a Request for Proposal (RFP) process through which ten firms provided quotes for services. An interdepartmental review panel consisting of staff from CDC, Auditor-Controller, Human Services Department, and Water Agency reviewed ranked the proposals, giving Smith, Marion & Co the highest score. This firm has extensive experience in auditing Housing Authorities and demonstrated experience with various federal funding streams that are used by the CDC. Their proposal also, uniquely, spoke to the issue of financial reporting for the CDC as a component unit of...
local government. The firm provided six Housing Authorities as references and staff from these Housing Authorities had unqualified high praise for the firm.

Pursuant to the CDC’s Procurement Policy, Section VIII, “If, in the decision of the Commission, the provider of an ongoing service is providing the service in a satisfactory manner, the Commission may extend or renew the term of the contract with the same service provider without soliciting additional service proposals”. Given the satisfactory work performance to date, staff requests your Board’s authority to enter into a new agreement with Smith, Marion and Co for one year to conduct the FY 2015-16 audit for an amount not to exceed $35,525, and to extend the Agreement for one additional year for an amount not to exceed $39,000 if performance continues to be satisfactory. After this additional two-year period, the CDC intends to issue a new RFP to solicit proposals for audit services for FY 2017-18, as it is prudent to issue an RFP for audit services after five years.

Prior Board Actions:

4/23/2013: Board authorized auditing agreement with Smith, Marion & Company for FY 2012-13, with extensions permitted for two additional one-year periods upon satisfactory performance under the original Agreement.

8/9/2011: Board authorized auditing agreement with Wallace Rowe & Associates for FY 2010-11, with extensions permitted for two additional one-year periods upon satisfactory performance under the original Agreement.

7/8/2008: Board authorized auditing agreement with Wallace Rowe & Associates to provide auditing services from FY 2007-08 through FY 2009-10.

Strategic Plan Alignment
Goal 2: Economic and Environmental Stewardship

Contracting with Smith, Marion & Company would contribute toward the County's strategic goal of Economic and Environmental Stewardship by employing outside audit services to ensure that the CDC is minimizing risk and protecting its economic resources.

Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$ 35,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Req'd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 35,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 35,525</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td>$ 35,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

Funds for the CDC’s annual audit are included in the approved budget for fiscal year 2015-16. $39,000 will be included in the 16-17 budget to cover costs associated with an extension.
### Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**

**Attachments:**

- Agreement for Professional Services

**Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:**
This agreement ("Agreement"), dated as of March 14, 2016 ("Effective Date"), is by and between the Sonoma County Community Development Commission, a public body corporate and politic (hereinafter “CDC”), and Smith Marion & Company, LLP (hereinafter "Consultant").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Consultant represents that it is a duly qualified firm of certified public accountants, experienced in the preparation and interpretation of audit reports, standard auditing practices, legislated auditing requirements for governmental and public entities, and related services; and

WHEREAS, in the judgment of the CDC, it is necessary and desirable to employ the services of Consultant for auditing the CDC’s financial statements and other related services as set forth in this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Scope of Services.

1.1 Consultant's Specified Services. Consultant shall perform the services described in Exhibit “A,” attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (hereinafter "Scope of Work"), and within the times or by the dates as provided for in Exhibit “A” and pursuant to Article 7 Prosecution of Work. In the event of a conflict between the body of this Agreement and Exhibit “A”, the provisions in the body of this Agreement shall control.

1.2 Cooperation With CDC. Consultant shall cooperate with the CDC, the CDC’s Management, the County of Sonoma Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector’s office, independent public accountancy or audit firms under contract with the County of Sonoma, and CDC staff in the performance of all work hereunder. The Consultant shall also cooperate and respond to reasonable inquiries of successor auditors to include allowing successor auditors to review working papers related to matters of continuing accounting significance.

1.3 Performance Standard. Consultant shall perform all work hereunder in a manner consistent with the level of competency and standard of care normally observed by a person practicing in Consultant's profession. If CDC determines that any of Consultant's work is not in accordance with such level of competency and standard of care, CDC, in its sole discretion, shall have the right to do any or all of the following: (a) require Consultant to meet with CDC to review the quality of the work and resolve matters of concern; (b) require Consultant to repeat the work at no additional charge until it is satisfactory; (c) terminate this Agreement pursuant to the provisions of Article 4; or (d) pursue any and all other remedies at law or in equity.
1.4  Assigned Personnel.

   a. Consultant shall assign only competent personnel to perform work hereunder. In the event that at any time the CDC, in its sole discretion, desires the removal of any person or persons assigned by Consultant to perform work hereunder, Consultant shall remove such person or persons immediately upon receiving written notice from CDC.

   b. Any and all persons identified in this Agreement or any exhibit hereto as the project manager, project team, or other professional performing work hereunder are deemed by the CDC to be key personnel whose services were a material inducement to the CDC to enter into this Agreement, and without whose services the CDC would not have entered into this Agreement. Consultant shall not remove, replace, substitute, or otherwise change any key personnel without the prior written consent of the CDC. Chad Porter is designated as “key personnel” under this Agreement.

   c. In the event that any of Consultant’s personnel assigned to perform services under this Agreement become unavailable due to resignation, sickness, or other factors outside of Consultant’s control, Consultant shall be responsible for timely provision of adequately qualified replacements.

2.  Payment.

   For the audit of Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2016, Consultant shall be paid in three installments after satisfactory completion of a commensurate amount of the scope of services, the total of which will not exceed $35,525 regardless of the number of hours or length of time necessary for Consultant to complete the services. Consultant shall not be entitled to any additional payment for any expenses incurred in completion of the services. Upon completion of the work, Consultant shall submit it’s bill[s] for payment in a form approved by CDC. The bill[s] shall identify the services completed and the amount charged.

   A breakdown of costs used to derive the total amount, including but not limited to hourly rates, estimated travel expenses and other applicable rates, is specified in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

3.  Term of Agreement.

   The term of this Agreement shall be from May 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016, unless terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 below.

   The terms of this agreement can be extend upon Consultant’s agreement in accordance with Exhibit “A,” and at the discretion of the CDC’s Executive Director.

4.  Termination.

   4.1 Termination Without Cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, at any time and without cause, the CDC shall have the right, in its sole discretion, to terminate this Agreement by giving five (5) days written notice to Consultant.

   4.2 Termination for Cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, should Consultant fail to perform any of its obligations hereunder, within the time and in the manner herein provided, or otherwise violate any of the terms of this Agreement, the CDC may immediately terminate this Agreement by giving Consultant written notice of such termination, stating the reason for termination.
4.3 **Delivery of Work Product and Final Payment Upon Termination.**

In the event of termination, Consultant, within 14 days following the date of termination, shall deliver to the CDC all materials and work product subject to Section 9.9 and shall submit to the CDC an invoice showing the services performed, hours worked, and copies of receipts for reimbursable expenses up to the date of termination.

4.4 **Payment Upon Termination.** Upon termination of this Agreement by the CDC, Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment for all services satisfactorily rendered and expenses incurred hereunder, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total payment specified in the Agreement as the services satisfactorily rendered hereunder by Consultant bear to the total services otherwise required to be performed for such total payment; provided, however, that if the CDC terminates the Agreement for cause pursuant to Section 4.2, the CDC shall deduct from such amount the amount of damage, if any, sustained by CDC by virtue of the breach of the Agreement by Consultant.

4.5 **Authority to Terminate.** The CDC’s Executive Director has the authority to terminate this Agreement on behalf of the CDC.

5. **Indemnification.** Consultant agrees to accept all responsibility for loss or damage to any person or entity, including the CDC, and to indemnify, hold harmless, and release the CDC, its officers, agents, and employees, from and against any actions, claims, damages, liabilities, disabilities, or expenses, that may be asserted by any person or entity, including Consultant, that arise out of, pertain to, or relate to Consultant’s performance or obligations under this Agreement. Consultant agrees to provide a complete defense for any claim or action brought against the CDC based upon a claim relating to Consultant’s performance or obligations under this Agreement. Consultant’s obligations under this Section 5 apply whether or not there is concurrent negligence on the CDC’s part, but to the extent required by law, excluding liability due to the CDC’s conduct. The CDC shall have the right to select its legal counsel at Consultant’s expense, subject to Consultant’s approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld. This indemnification obligation is not limited in any way by any limitation on the amount or type of damages or compensation payable to or for Consultant or its agents under workers' compensation acts, disability benefits acts, or other employee benefit acts.

6. **Insurance.** With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain insurance as described in Exhibit B, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

7. **Prosecution of Work.**

7.1 **Authority to Proceed; Force Majeure.** The execution of this Agreement shall constitute Consultant's authority to proceed immediately with the performance of this Agreement. Performance of the services hereunder shall be completed within the time required herein, provided, however, that if the performance is delayed by earthquake, flood, high water, or other Act of God or by strike, lockout, or similar labor disturbances, the time for Consultant's performance of this Agreement shall be extended by a number of days equal to the number of days Consultant has been delayed.

8. **Extra or Changed Work.** Extra or changed work or other changes to the Agreement may be authorized only by written amendment to this Agreement, signed by both parties. Minor changes, which do not increase the amount paid under the Agreement, and which do not significantly change the scope of work or significantly lengthen time schedules may be executed by the Executive Director in a form approved by County Counsel. The CDC must authorize all other extra or changed work. Failure of
Consultant to secure such written authorization for extra or changed work shall constitute a waiver of any and all right to adjustment in the Agreement price or Agreement time due to such unauthorized work and thereafter Consultant shall be entitled to no compensation whatsoever for the performance of such work. Consultant further expressly waives any and all right or remedy by way of restitution and quantum meruit for any and all extra work performed without such express and prior written authorization of the CDC.


9.1 Standard of Care. CDC has relied upon the professional ability and training of Consultant as a material inducement to enter into this Agreement. Consultant hereby agrees that all its work shall be conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards issued by American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Governmental Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards set forth in 2 CFR Part 200. The audits and the reports will meet the requirements of 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart F, the State Controller’s Office guidelines §33080-33080.7, as well as the requirements of other applicable federal, state and local laws, it being understood that acceptance of Consultant’s work by CDC shall not operate as a waiver or release.

9.2 Status of Consultant. The parties intend that Consultant, in performing the services specified herein, shall act as an independent contractor and shall control the work and the manner in which it is performed. Consultant is not to be considered an agent or employee of the CDC and is not entitled to participate in any pension plan, worker’s compensation plan, insurance, bonus, or similar benefits the CDC provides its employees. In the event the CDC exercises its right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 4, above, Consultant expressly agrees that it shall have no recourse or right of appeal under rules, regulations, ordinances, or laws applicable to employees.

9.3 Taxes. Consultant agrees to file federal and state tax returns and pay all applicable taxes on amounts paid pursuant to this Agreement and shall be solely liable and responsible to pay such taxes and other obligations, including, but not limited to, state and federal income and FICA taxes. Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold the CDC harmless from any liability which it may incur to the United States or to the State of California as a consequence of Consultant's failure to pay, when due, all such taxes and obligations. In case the CDC is audited for compliance regarding any withholding or other applicable taxes, Consultant agrees to furnish the CDC with proof of payment of taxes on these earnings.

9.4 Records Maintenance. Consultant shall keep and maintain full and complete documentation and accounting records concerning all services performed that are compensable under this Agreement and shall make such documents and records available to the CDC for inspection at any reasonable time. Consultant shall maintain such records for a period of four (4) years following completion of work hereunder.

9.5 Conflict of Interest. Consultant covenants that it presently has no interest and that it will not acquire any interest, direct or indirect, that represents a financial conflict of interest under state law or that would otherwise conflict in any manner or degree with the performance of its services hereunder. Consultant further covenants that in the performance of this Agreement no person having any such interests shall be employed. In addition, if requested to do so by the CDC, Consultant shall complete and file and shall require any other person doing work under this Agreement to complete and
file a "Statement of Economic Interest" with the CDC disclosing Consultant's or such other person's financial interests.

9.6 Nondiscrimination. Consultant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations in regard to nondiscrimination in employment because of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, marital status, age, medical condition, pregnancy, disability, sexual orientation or other prohibited basis, including without limitation, the County’s Non-Discrimination Policy. All nondiscrimination rules or regulations required by law to be included in this Agreement are incorporated herein by this reference.

9.7 AIDS Discrimination. Consultant agrees to comply with the provisions of Chapter 19, Article II, of the Sonoma County Code prohibiting discrimination in housing, employment, and services because of AIDS or HIV infection during the term of this Agreement and any extensions of the term.

9.8 Assignment Of Rights. Consultant assigns to CDC all rights throughout the world in perpetuity in the nature of copyright, trademark, patent, right to ideas, in and to all versions of the plans and specifications, if any, now or later prepared by Consultant in connection with this Agreement. Consultant agrees to take such actions as are necessary to protect the rights assigned to CDC in this Agreement, and to refrain from taking any action which would impair those rights. Consultant's responsibilities under this provision include, but are not limited to, placing proper notice of copyright on all versions of the plans and specifications as CDC may direct, and refraining from disclosing any versions of the plans and specifications to any third party without first obtaining written permission of CDC. Consultant shall not use or permit another to use the plans and specifications in connection with this or any other project without first obtaining written permission of CDC.

9.9 Ownership And Disclosure Of Work Product. All reports, original drawings, graphics, plans, studies, and other data or documents ("documents"), in whatever form or format, assembled or prepared by Consultant or Consultant’s subcontractors, consultants, and other agents in connection with this Agreement shall be the property of the CDC with the exception of original auditor workpapers. The CDC shall be entitled to immediate possession of such documents upon completion of the work pursuant to this Agreement. Upon expiration or termination of this Agreement, Consultant shall promptly deliver to the CDC all such documents, which have not already been provided to the CDC in such form or format, as the CDC deems appropriate. Such documents shall be and will remain the property of the CDC without restriction or limitation. Consultant may retain copies of the above-described documents but agrees not to disclose or discuss any information gathered, discovered, or generated in any way through this Agreement without the express written permission of the CDC.

10. Demand for Assurance. Each party to this Agreement undertakes the obligation that the other's expectation of receiving due performance will not be impaired. When reasonable grounds for insecurity arise with respect to the performance of either party, the other may in writing demand adequate assurance of due performance and until such assurance is received may, if commercially reasonable, suspend any performance for which the agreed return has not been received. "Commercially reasonable" includes not only the conduct of a party with respect to performance under this Agreement, but also conduct with respect to other agreements with parties to this Agreement or others. After receipt of a justified demand, failure to provide within a reasonable time, but not exceeding thirty (30) days, such assurance of due performance as is adequate under the circumstances of the particular case is a repudiation of this Agreement. Acceptance of any improper delivery, service, or payment does not prejudice the aggrieved party's right to demand adequate assurance of future performance. Nothing in this Article 10 limits the CDC’s right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 4.
11. **Assignment and Delegation.** Neither party hereto shall assign, delegate, sublet, or transfer any interest in or duty under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no such transfer shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

12. **Method and Place of Giving Notice, Submitting Bills and Making Payments.** All notices, bills, and payments shall be made in writing and shall be given by personal delivery or by U.S. Mail or courier service. Notices, bills, and payments shall be addressed as follows:

   **TO: CDC:**
   Sonoma County Community Development CDC
   Attn: Executive Director
   1440 Guerneville Road
   Santa Rosa, CA 95403-4107

   **TO: CONSULTANT:**
   Smith Marion & Company, LLP
   22365 Barton Road
   Grand Terrace, CA 92313

When a notice, bill or payment is given by a generally recognized overnight courier service, the notice, bill or payment shall be deemed received on the next business day. When a copy of a notice, bill or payment is sent by facsimile or email, the notice, bill or payment shall be deemed received upon transmission as long as (1) the original copy of the notice, bill or payment is promptly deposited in the U.S. mail and postmarked on the date of the facsimile or email (for a payment, on or before the due date), (2) the sender has a written confirmation of the facsimile transmission or email, and (3) the facsimile or email is transmitted before 5 p.m. (recipient’s time). In all other instances, notices, bills, and payments shall be effective upon receipt by the recipient. Changes may be made in the names and addresses of the person to whom notices are to be given by giving notice pursuant to this paragraph.

13. **Miscellaneous Provisions.**

   13.1 **No Waiver of Breach.** The waiver by the CDC of any breach of any term or promise contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver of such term or provision or any subsequent breach of the same or any other term or promise contained in this Agreement.

   13.2 **Construction.** To the fullest extent allowed by law, the provisions of this Agreement shall be construed and given effect in a manner that avoids any violation of statute, ordinance, regulation, or law. The parties covenant and agree that in the event that any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remainder of the provisions hereof shall remain in full force and effect and shall in no way be affected, impaired, or invalidated thereby. Consultant and the CDC acknowledge that they have each contributed to the making of this Agreement and that, in the event of a dispute over the interpretation of this Agreement, the language of the Agreement will not be construed against one party in favor of the other. Consultant and the CDC acknowledge that they have each had an adequate opportunity to consult with counsel in the negotiation and preparation of this Agreement.

   13.3 **Consent.** Wherever in this Agreement the consent or approval of one party is required to an act of the other party, such consent or approval shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.
13.4 **No Third Party Beneficiaries.** Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to create and the parties do not intend to create any rights in third parties.

13.5 **Applicable Law and Forum.** This Agreement shall be construed and interpreted according to the substantive law of California, regardless of the law of conflicts to the contrary in any jurisdiction. Any action to enforce the terms of this Agreement or for the breach thereof shall be brought and tried in Santa Rosa or the forum nearest to the City of Santa Rosa, in the County of Sonoma.

13.6 **Captions.** The captions in this Agreement are solely for convenience of reference. They are not a part of this Agreement and shall have no effect on its construction or interpretation.

13.7 **Merger.** This writing is intended both as the final expression of the Agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1856. No modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless and until such modification is evidenced by a writing signed by both parties.

13.8 **Time of Essence.** Time is and shall be of the essence of this Agreement and every provision hereof.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as set forth below.

CONSULTANT

Dated:___________

By:________________________
   Chad Porter, CPA for Smith Marion & Co. LLP

SONOMA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Dated:___________

By:________________________
   Kathleen H. Kane, Executive Director

CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE ON FILE WITH AND APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE BY THE CDC

Dated:___________

By:________________________
   Kathleen H. Kane, Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Dated:___________

By:________________________
   County Counsel
Exhibit A

SCOPE OF WORK & PAYMENT

Scope of Work

Auditor will audit the financial statements of the Sonoma County Community Development Commission (CDC) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2016. The audit will encompass a financial and compliance examination of the CDC’s basic financial statements, supplementary information and compliance reports. The auditors will perform an audit of the governmental activities, each major fund, and aggregate remaining fund information which comprise the financial statements of the CDC.

These audits will be performed in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards issued by American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Governmental Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards set forth in 2 CFR Part 200. The audits and the reports will meet the requirements of 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart F, as applicable.

The CDC-wide report is to be completed by September 30th of 2016.

The auditor will express an opinion on the fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. The auditor will provide an “in-relation-to” opinion on the supporting schedules based on the auditing procedures applied during the audit of the financial statements.

The auditor will prepare the following reports based on the financial statements:

1. A report on the fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles;
2. A report on the fair presentation of the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards;
3. A report on the fair presentation of the HUD-required Financial Data Schedule (FDS);
4. A report on compliance with applicable laws, regulations and provisions of contracts or grant agreements. The auditor will report on any noncompliance which could have a material effect on the financial statements and any noncompliance which could have a direct and material effect on each major program;
5. A report on the internal control structure used in administering federal financial assistance programs;
6. A schedule of findings and questioned costs which shall include a summary of the audit’s results, findings related to the financial statements and findings and questioned costs pertaining to the administration of federal awards; and
7. The auditor will also prepare any other 2 CFR Part 200 required reporting that are specifically require to be prepared by the auditor per the Circular.

The auditor is obligated to provide information as may be requested by accountants working for the County of Sonoma (county employees) and Independent Public Accounting firms contracting with the County of Sonoma.
The auditor will provide other accounting services during the course of the engagement. The other accounting services include:

1. Reviewing the financial statements;
2. Consult and advise on presentation of financial statements in conformity with the GASB 34 report model;
3. Consult and advise on the Management’s Discussion and Analysis;
4. Consult and advise on financial statement footnotes;
5. Consult and advise on Required Supplementary Information; and
6. Binding and duplicating the audit reports.
7. The auditor will supply the CDC with one unbound copy of the report. The auditor will supply the CDC with 6 bound copies of the CDC-wide report.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is the CDC’s primary funding source. Auditor will become familiar with reports required by HUD for those programs administered by the CDC. In relation to HUD-funded programs the Auditor will also:

1. Provide an opinion as required by HUD on supplementary information;
2. Acquire a user ID and password from HUD for access into HUD’s REAC computer system prior to August 21, 2016;
3. Consult and advise on the Financial Data online submission as required by HUD;
4. Complete the auditor’s section of the online submission;
5. Attest to the data as to its “fair presentation in relation to audited basic financial statements;” Auditor will provide a separate attestation of agreed-upon procedures engagements where by the auditor compares the electronically submitted data in the REAC staging database to the hard copy of the audit report and Financial Data Schedule (FDS); and
6. Adhere to HUD-published requirements while preparing the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards.

The CDC staff will be responsible for the preparation of the Data Collection Form on Audits of State, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations. Auditor will consult and advise on this Bureau of Census Data Collection form. The auditor will complete the AUDITOR INFORMATION section of the report. The CDC will be responsible for sending said report to the Federal Audit Clearing House.

The total all-inclusive maximum amount to be paid to the auditor under this agreement is not to exceed $35,525. The price includes all direct and indirect costs including all out-of-pocket auditor expenses pertaining to the CDC-wide audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2016.

If it should become necessary for the CDC to request the auditor to render any additional services to either supplement the services specified in this agreement or to perform additional work as a result of the specific recommendations included in any report issued on this engagement, then such additional work shall be performed only if set forth in an addendum to the contract between the CDC and the audit firm.

The CDC’s agency-wide audit report is submitted to the County of Sonoma Auditor–Controller’s office on or before September 30 annually. The selected audit firm will be asked to coordinate with the audit firm selected by the County of Sonoma in an effort to coordinate the presentation of audited financial information.

All reports rendered to the CDC are the exclusive property of the CDC and are subject to its use and control. Auditor working papers are the property of the audit firm.
This agreement is for audit services and related work for a one-year period.

All working papers and reports must be retained, at the auditor’s expense, for a minimum of four (4) years, unless the firm is notified in writing by the CDC of the need to shorten or extend the retention period. The auditor will be required to make working papers available to the following parties or their designees: County of Sonoma, CDC, the California State Controller’s Office and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In addition, the auditor shall respond to the reasonable inquiries of successor auditors and allow successor auditors to review working papers relating to matters of continuing accounting significance.

The CDC reserves the right to reduce the contract amount by $100 for every calendar day between October 1, 2016 and the date of receipt of the final CDC-wide audit report. The CDC is responsible for providing all normal records necessary for an audit. The CDC may allow one day extension for each day a material portion of the records are not available after August 25, 2016.

During the term of this agreement the CDC will contact the auditor as an information resource. The auditor may be asked to provide guidance on implementation of GASB requirements and specifics of federal and state regulations as they may affect local government accounting.
Schedule of Professional Fees and Expenses for the Audit of the June 30, 2016 Financial Statements

Name of audit firm: Smith Marion & Company, LLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountants</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other staff</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of pocket costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all-inclusive maximum price for the June 30, 2016 audit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sonoma County Community Development Commission
INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain insurance as described below unless such insurance has been expressly waived by the attachment of a Waiver of Insurance Requirements. Any requirement for insurance to be maintained after completion of the work shall survive this agreement.

1. Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance
   a. Required if Consultant has employees.
   b. Workers' Compensation insurance with statutory limits as required by the Labor Code of the State of California.
   c. Employers' Liability with limits of 1,000,000 per Accident; 1,000,000 Disease per employee; 1,000,000 Disease per policy.
   d. Required Evidence of Coverage:
      i. Certificate of Insurance.

If Consultant currently has no employees, Consultant agrees to obtain the above-specified Workers’ Compensation and Employers' Liability insurance should any employees be engaged during the term of this Agreement or any extensions of the term.

2. General Liability Insurance
   a. Commercial General Liability Insurance on a standard occurrence form, no less broad than ISO form CG 00 01.
   b. Minimum Limits: 1,000,000 per Occurrence; 2,000,000 General Aggregate; 2,000,000 Products/Completed Operations Aggregate.
   c. Consultant shall disclose any deductible or self-insured retention in excess of $25,000 and such deductible or self-insured retention must be approved in advance by CDC. Consultant is responsible for any deductible or self-insured retention.
   d. CDC, their officers, agents and employees, 1440 Guerneville Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95403 shall be additional insured’s for liability arising out of operations by or on behalf of the Consultant in the performance of this agreement.
   e. The insurance provided to CDC, et al. as additional insured’s shall apply on a primary and non-contributory basis with respect to any insurance or self-insurance program maintained by them.
   f. The policy definition of “insured contract” shall include assumptions of liability arising out of both ongoing operations and the products-completed operations hazard (broad form contractual liability coverage including the “f” definition of insured contract in ISO form CG 00 01, or equivalent).
   g. The policy shall cover inter-insured suits between CDC and Consultant and include a “separation of insured’s” or “severability” clause which treats each insured separately.
   h. Required Evidence of Coverage:
      i. Copy of the additional insured endorsement or policy language granting additional insured status, and
      ii. Certificate of Insurance.
3. **Automobile Liability Insurance**
   a. Minimum Limit: $300,000 Combined Single Limit per Accident; or Bodily Injury: $100,000 per person/$300,000 per accident and Property Damage: $50,000 per accident.
   b. **Required Evidence of Coverage:**
      i. Copy of Auto Policy Declarations Page or Certificate of Insurance.

4. **Professional Liability Insurance**
   a. Minimum Limit: $1,000,000.
   b. Consultant shall disclose any deductible or self-insured retention in excess of $25,000 and such deductible or self-insured retention must be approved in advance by CDC. Consultant is responsible for any deductible or self-insured retention.
   c. If the insurance is on a Claims-Made basis, the retroactive date shall be no later than the commencement of the work.
   d. Coverage applicable to the work performed under this Agreement shall be continued for two (2) years after completion of the work. Such continuation coverage may be provided by one of the following: (1) renewal of the existing policy; (2) an extended reporting period endorsement; or (3) replacement insurance with a retroactive date no later than the commencement of the work under this Agreement.
   e. **Required Evidence of Coverage:**
      i. Certificate of Insurance.

5. **Standards for Insurance Companies**
   Insurers shall have an A.M. Best's rating of at least A:VII.

6. **Documentation**
   a. The Certificate of Insurance must include the following reference: **Agreement for Auditing Services**.
   b. All required Evidence of Coverage shall be submitted prior to the execution of this Agreement. Consultant agrees to maintain current Evidence of Coverage on file with CDC for the required period of insurance.
   c. The name and address for Additional Insured endorsements and Certificates of Insurance is: **ATTN: Accounting, Sonoma County Community Development Commission, 1440 Guerneville Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95403**.
   d. Required Evidence of Coverage shall be submitted for any renewal or replacement of a policy that already exists, at least ten (10) days before expiration or other termination of the existing policy.
   e. Consultant shall provide immediate written notice if: (1) any of the required insurance policies is terminated; (2) the limits of any of the required policies are reduced; or (3) the deductible or self-insured retention is increased.
   f. Upon written request, certified copies of required insurance policies must be provided within thirty (30) days.

7. **Policy Obligations**
   Consultant's indemnity and other obligations shall not be limited by the foregoing insurance requirements.
8. **Material Breach**

If Consultant fails to maintain insurance coverage which is required pursuant to this Agreement, it shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement. CDC, at its sole option, may terminate this Agreement and obtain damages from Consultant resulting from said breach. Alternatively, CDC may purchase the required insurance coverage, and without further notice to Consultant, CDC may deduct from sums due to Consultant any premium costs advanced by CDC for such insurance. These remedies shall be in addition to any other remedies available to CDC.
## Agenda Item Summary Report

### County of Sonoma

#### Agenda Item:

**Summary Report**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerk of the Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>575 Administration Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA 95403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Board of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Agenda Date:</td>
<td>April 5, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Requirement:</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Agency Name(s):</th>
<th>Permit and Resource Management Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Name and Phone Number:</td>
<td>Melinda Grosch 707-565-2397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory District(s):</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Title: | Lot Line Adjustment between three parcels under Land Conservation Act Contracts for Dennis Maas; LLA13-0035 |

### Recommended Actions:

Adopt a Resolution and Conditions of Approval for a Lot Line Adjustment between three parcels subject to Land Conservation Act Contracts for 245.53 +/- acres located at 7606 and 7610 Valley Ford Road, Petaluma; APN's 022-050-011 and 022-050-009.

### Executive Summary:

**Project Description, Location, and Zoning:** Dennis Maas is requesting a Lot Line Adjustment among three parcels within two Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN’s): Parcel A - APN: 022-050-009 - 36.76 acres; Parcel B - APN: 022-050-011 (portion) 38.9 acres; and Parcel C – APN: 022-050-011 (portion) 116.7 acres. The Lot Line Adjustment results in three parcels: 75.66 acres (Parcel A); 41.7 acres (Parcel B); and 75.0 acres (Parcel C). The current parcel configuration is the result of the issuance of Administrative Certificates of Compliance which established the historic legal lots underlying the current Assessor’s Parcels numbers. Parcel A is under a separate non-Prime Land Conservation Contract (Book 2516 Sonoma County Records, Page 479). Parcels B and C are currently under the same contract (Book 2841 of Sonoma County Records, Page 367). The purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to reconfigure the lots so that each lot meets the minimum parcel size for Non-Prime Land Conservation Contracts, which is 40 acres.

The parcels are located at 7606 and 7610 Valley Ford Road, Petaluma. The Zoning designation for the site is LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) with an allowable density of one dwelling unit per 100 acres and the following combining districts: Z (Second Unit Exclusion) and RC (Riparian Corridor) 50/50 (50-foot setback from the top of the highest bank). Parcel A is located in Agricultural Preserve 2-388 and both Parcels B and C are located in Agricultural Preserve 2-252.

Existing Parcel A is developed with a residence, a feed shed, and a hay/equipment barn. Existing Parcel B is developed with a residence, a bunk house, a garage, three barns, a tractor shed, and several small...
miscellaneous storage sheds. Existing Parcel C has no development but there is a pond of approximately 2 acres on the site.

The proposed Lot Line Adjustment will result in all of the structures being located on reconfigured Parcel A. Parcel B will have no development and Parcel C will have the pond and no development. A condition of approval requires that the residential structures be designated as a primary and either Agricultural Employee or Farm Family dwellings to remain in compliance with the Uniform Rules. The Uniform Rules allow only one primary dwelling and dwellings associated with the agricultural use. The owner must provide documentation that there is a qualifying agricultural use to support the Agricultural Employee unit and the Farm Family unit must be occupied by a member of the owner of the land.

**Land Conservation Act:**
To facilitate a lot line adjustment of contracted land, a landowner and the County may mutually agree to rescind a land conservation contract or contracts and to simultaneously enter into a new contract or contracts. Uniform Rule 10.0 of the Sonoma County Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones (Uniform Rules) requires the Board to make specific findings that new contract or contracts satisfy all requirements of the Land Conservation Act and the Uniform Rules and that the findings required by Government Code section 51257 can be made. The project is consistent with all of the required findings which are described completely in the attached draft resolution (Attachment A).

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Board make all the required findings based on the facts contained in the Resolution and approve the proposed Lot Line Adjustment subject to the attached Conditions of Approval. All parcels will continue to be devoted to a qualifying agricultural use. Conditions of Approval require that prior to recording the Grant Deeds for the Lot Line Adjustment, the property owner submit the appropriate applications and filing fees to designate all residential structures on Parcel A as uses compliant with the Uniform Rules. The designations must be approved and covenants ready to record concurrently with the Lot Line Adjustment Grant Deeds. An application to rescind and replace the existing contracts with three new Non-Prime Land Conservation contracts on Parcels A, B, and C has already been made. Once the Lot Line Adjustment Grant Deeds are recorded, then the County can proceed with preparation of the new contracts, and include the new legal descriptions for each parcel. Furthermore, the Board should make a finding that all parcels involved in the Lot Line Adjustment are under the same land use and zoning designation and there is no increase in overall subdivision potential as a result of the Lot Line Adjustment.

**Prior Board Actions:**
None

**Strategic Plan Alignment**

| Goal 2: Economic and Environmental Stewardship |
| The Board of Supervisors has endorsed the continuation of the County’s agricultural preserve program to preserve a maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural, open space, scenic, and critical habitat lands within the county, to discourage premature and unnecessary conversion of such lands to urban land uses, to promote vitality in the agricultural economy, and to ensure an adequate, varied, and healthy supply of food and fiber for current and future generations. The purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to bring each of the parcels into compliance with the minimum lot size for Non-Prime |
Land Conservation Contracts. In addition, the rescission and replacement of Land Conservation contracts for all of the subject parcels will facilitate further agricultural investment and support agricultural viability and help preserve open space land in Sonoma County.

### Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Req'd.</td>
<td>$ State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Fees/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Use of Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):**

This Lot Line Adjustment would have no fiscal impact. The fiscal impacts of the subsequent replacement Land Conservation Contracts will be included when those Contracts come before the Board for approval.

### Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**

None.

### Attachments:

- Draft Board of Supervisors Resolution
- Attachment A: Conditions of Approval
- Exhibit A: Proposal Statement
- Exhibit B: Assessor’s Parcel Map
- Exhibit C: Lot Line Adjustment Site Plan

### Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:

None.
Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Of The County Of Sonoma, State Of California, Granting The Request By Dennis Maas For A Minor Lot Line Adjustment For Property Located At 7606 And 7610 Valley Ford Road, Petaluma; APN’s 022-050-011 and 022-050-009.

Whereas, the applicant Dennis Maas, filed an application with the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department for a Lot Line Adjustment between three parcels of 36.76 acres, 38.9 acres, and 116.7 in size resulting in three parcels of 75.66 acres, 41.7 acres, and 75.0 acres in size with all parcels subject to Land Conservation Act Contracts for property located at 7606 And 7610 Valley Ford Road, Petaluma, APN’s 022-050-011 and 022-050-009; Zoned LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) 100-acre density with the Z (Second Unit Exclusion) and RC (Riparian Corridor) 50/50 combining districts; Supervisorial District No. 2; and

Whereas, to facilitate a Lot Line Adjustment, Government Code Section 51257, authorizes parties to a Land Conservation Contract or Contracts to mutually rescind the Contract or Contracts and simultaneously enter into a new Contract or Contracts;

Whereas, on December 13, 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted the updated Sonoma County Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones (Uniform Rules) (Resolution No. 11-0678); and

Whereas, in accordance with the provisions of law, the Board of Supervisors held a public meeting to review the request on April 5, 2016; and

Whereas, the purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to adjust property lines to reconfigure the lots so that each lot meets the minimum parcel size for Non-Prime Land Conservation Contracts.

Whereas, Government Code Section 51257 requires that the Board of Supervisors make certain findings before existing Land Conservation Act Contracts may be rescinded and replaced to facilitate a Lot Line Adjustment.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Board of Supervisors makes the following
findings consistent with Government Code Section 51257:

a. The new contracts will enforce and restrict the adjusted boundaries of the parcels for an initial term for at least as long as the unexpired term of the rescinded contracts, but for not less than 10 years.

b. There is no net decrease in the amount of the acreage restricted by a contract.

c. The Lot Line Adjustment results in 100 percent (100%) of the land under the original contracts remaining restricted under the two new Prime contracts required as a Condition of Approval for the Lot Line Adjustment.

d. After the Lot Line Adjustment, the parcels of land subject to contract will be large enough to sustain their agricultural use, as defined in Section 51222. Resultant Parcels A, B, and C will each exceed the 40-acre minimum acreage requirement for Non-Prime contracts and each will exceed the minimum gross income requirement of $2,000 minimum gross income per Farm Operation and $2.50 Gross Income per Acre of Production and will be devoted to agriculture with any non-agricultural uses to be compatible with the agricultural use.

e. The Lot Line Adjustment will not compromise the long-term agricultural productivity of the parcel or other agricultural lands subject to a contract or contracts.

f. The Lot Line Adjustment is not likely to result in the removal of adjacent land from agricultural use. The land use and zoning designations on the parcels will remain as Land Extensive Agriculture 100-acres per dwelling unit. The parcels will have no subdivision potential before or after the Lot Line Adjustment.

g. The property owners of Parcels A, B, and C have submitted the appropriate applications and filing fees to rescind and replace the existing contracts with three new Non-Prime Land Conservation Act Contracts as applicable. Once the Lot Line Adjustment grant deeds are recorded, then the County can proceed with preparation of the new contracts, and include the new legal descriptions for each parcel.

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Board of Supervisors hereby finds that substantial evidence in the record before it supports the above findings, and further finds that the Minor Lot Line Adjustment meets the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and the Land Conservation Act.

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Board of Supervisors finds the requested action described in this Resolution is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15305 Class 5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) in that the project is a minor Lot Line Adjustment.
Be It Further Resolved that the Board of Supervisors hereby grants the request by Dennis Maas for the requested Minor Lot Line Adjustment subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment “A,” attached hereto which includes a condition to rescind and replace the existing Land Conservation Contract.

Be It Further Resolved that the Board of Supervisors designates the Clerk of the Board as the custodian of the documents and other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the decision herein is based. These documents may be found at the office of the Clerk of the Board, 575 Administration Drive, Room 100-A, Santa Rosa, California 95403.

Supervisors:

Gorin: Rabbitt: Zane: Gore: Carrillo:

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

So Ordered.
Attachment A

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SONOMA COUNTY

Conditions of Approval

Staff: Melinda Grosch
Date: April 5, 2016
Applicant: Dennis Maas
File No.: LLA13-0035
Owner: Dennis Maas
APN: 022-050-009 and 022-050-011
Address: 7606 and 7610 Valley Ford Road, Petaluma

Project Description: Request for a Minor Lot Line Adjustment between three Administrative Certificates of Compliance parcels of 36.76 acres, 38.9 acres, and 116.7 acres in size resulting in three parcels of 75.66 acres, 41.7 acres, and 75.0 acres in size. All parcels are subject to Land Conservation Contracts.

NOTE: Amendments and changes to approved Lot Line Adjustment conditions may be considered by Board of Supervisors at a later date if additional information justifies the changes and does not increase the intensity of use approved by the original approval. The Director of the Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) will determine if a public hearing is necessary and if additional fees are required.

NOTE: These conditions must be met and the application validated within 24 months (April 5, 2018) unless a request for an extension of time is received before the expiration date.

SURVEYOR:

1. A minimum 20 foot access and public utility easement to either ‘Lot B’ or ‘Lot C’ as shown on the site map submitted with the application shall be described as Parcel Two and included in the legal descriptions. The following note shall be included in the deed:

“SAID DEED IS MADE AND ACCEPTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

PARCEL TWO easement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the respective heirs, personal representatives, successors, and assigns of the grantor and grantee and that all specifications of the easement shall pertain to and run with the land.

Said provision of the easement is a condition relative to approval of LLA 13-0035 and may not be altered or eliminated without the express written consent of the Permit and Resource Management Department.

The use of the area designated as a private access easement by the grantor shall be restricted from uses which are incompatible with proper use. This shall include structures, vehicular parking, any and all uses which would disrupt the use of said access easement.

The easement shall include the rights of the grantee to do all things reasonably necessary to inspect, repair, and maintain said private access in a good and passable condition.”

PLANNING:

2. Submit verification to Planning that taxes and/or assessments, which are a lien and termed as payable, are paid to the Treasurer-Tax Collector’s Department on all parcels affected by the adjustment. The Treasurer-Tax Collector knows the amount of the tax due.
3. A draft description, prepared by a licensed land surveyor or civil engineer authorized to practice land surveying, showing the combination of lots or transfer of property shall be submitted to the County Surveyor for approval. The following note shall be placed on the deed or deeds. “The purpose of this deed is for a Lot Line Adjustment for reconfiguration of the Lands of Knudson as described by deed recorded under Document No.2012-004126, Sonoma County Records, APN 022-050-009 and 022-050-011. This deed is pursuant to LLA13-0035 on file in the office of the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. It is the express intent of the signatory hereto that the recordation of this deed extinguishes any underlying parcels or portions of parcels.” It is the responsibility of the surveyor/engineer preparing the deeds to insure that the information contained within the combination note is correct. Note: The County Surveyor may modify the above described note.

4. After approval by the County Surveyor, a grant deed or deeds shall be prepared.

5. A site plan map of the Lot Line Adjustment shall be prepared by a licensed surveyor or civil engineer and attached to the deed(s) to be recorded. The site plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the County Surveyor. The following note shall be placed on said plan: “THIS EXHIBIT IS FOR GRAPHIC PURPOSES ONLY. Any errors or omissions on this exhibit shall not affect the deed description.”

6. The grant deeds shall be approved by the Project Review planner by stamping and signing the front of the grant deeds. The stamped deeds with the original description and site plan attached shall be recorded.

7. The property owners shall execute a Right-to-Farm Declaration on a form provided by PRMD to be submitted before the Lot Line Adjustment is cleared by PRMD for recordation. The Right-to-Farm Declaration shall be recorded concurrently with the PRMD approved Lot Line Adjustment Grant Deed(S) to reflect the newly configured parcels.

8. Prior to recordation of the Grant Deed(s) a Zoning Permit shall be applied for and approved designating the dwelling units located on Parcel A as a Primary Unit and Agricultural Employee Units (one could be designated as a Farm Family Unit). The Agricultural Employee and/or Farm Family Dwelling Unit covenants shall be recorded concurrently with the PRMD approved Lot Line Adjustment Grant Deed(s).

9. This “At Cost” entitlement is not vested until all permit processing costs are paid in full. Additionally, no grading or building permits shall be issued until all permit processing costs are paid in full.
PROPOSAL STATEMENT

The purpose of this Lot Line Adjustment is to reconfigure three Administrative Certificates of Compliance parcels recorded as Document Nos. 1997-093348 (ACC 24-116.7 acres, 1997-0993349 (ACC 25-38.9 acres and 2013-032859-36.76 acres) into 3 lots to meet with Williamson Act requirements for size. The adjusted lots will be: Lot “A” 77.8 acres, Lot “B” 41.7 acres, Lot “C” 75.0 acres.

The water for these parcels is provided by existing wells and existing septic systems.
NOTE: Assessor's parcels do not necessarily constitute legal lots. To verify legal parcel status, check with the appropriate city or county community development or planning division.
PROJECT
OWNER/APPLICANT: ALVIN JAMES HANSEN TRUST
C/O THOM KNUDSEN
36 FIFTH STREET
PETALUMA, CA 94952
707-763-8911
APN: 022-050-009 & -011 (PTN)
SITUS ADDRESS: 7606 VALLEY FORK RD
PETALUMA, CA
SITUS ZONING: LEA 68-100, NONE
SEWERAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SEPTIC SYSTEMS
WATER SUPPLY: EXISTING WELLS
INDUCED AREAS: NONE

LOT EXISTING PROPOSED % CHANGE
A 36.76 AC ± 75.66 AC ± + 106
B 41.7 AC ± 75.0 AC ± - 36
C 116.7 AC ± 75.0 AC ± - 36

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT
I, RAY C. CARLSON, A LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY STATE THAT THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY ME, OR UNDER MY DIRECTION, AS REQUESTED BY THOM KNUDSEN ON JULY 2013.

THIS MAP HAS BEEN COMPILED FROM VARIOUS RECORDED DATA SOURCES. A BOUNDARY SURVEY HAS NOT BEEN PERFORMED BY THE SURVEYOR. THE LANDOWNERS HEREDITY, TITLE, OR LIABILITY IS ASSUMED OR GUARANTEED BY THE PREPARATION OF BOUNDARY LINES OR THE ACCURACY OR ADEQUACY FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS MAP.

LOCATION MAP
SHOWING A PROPOSED LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT TO THE LANDS OF WARREN THOM KNUDSEN, SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE UNDER THE ALVIN JAMES HANSEN TRUST AGREEMENT DATED AUGUST 14, 2006 IN THAT DOCUMENT DATED JANUARY 11, 2012 NO. 2012-004126, SONOMA COUNTY RECORDS.
LOCATED WITHIN SECTION 13, TSN, R9W AND SECTION 18, TSN, R9W, M.0.M.
COUNTY OF SONOMA
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SURVEYOR
RAY C. CARLSON
36/7-5/8-005

SITE MAP
SHOWING A PROPOSED LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT TO THE LANDS OF WARREN THOM KNUDSEN, SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE UNDER THE ALVIN JAMES HANSEN TRUST AGREEMENT DATED AUGUST 14, 2006 IN THAT DOCUMENT DATED JANUARY 11, 2012 NO. 2012-004126, SONOMA COUNTY RECORDS.
LOCATED WITHIN SECTION 13, TSN, R9W AND SECTION 18, TSN, R9W.
COUNTY OF SONOMA
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mapping from Truth
36/7-5/8-005

APN 022-050-009 & -011 (PTN)
July 2013 Sheet 1 of 1 JOB 2012-004126 009 LLA
County of Sonoma
Agenda Item
Summary Report

Clerk of the Board
575 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To: Board of Supervisors

Board Agenda Date: April 5, 2016

Vote Requirement: Majority

Department or Agency Name(s): Permit and Resource Management Department

Staff Name and Phone Number: Melinda Grosch 565-2397

Supervisory District(s): Second

Title: Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels under a Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Contract, by Patricia and Robin Klaus; PLP15-0046.

Recommended Actions:

Adopt a Resolution and Conditions of Approval for a Lot Line Adjustment between two Administrative Certificate of Compliance (ACC) parcels subject to a Land Conservation Act Contract for property located at 1002 Chileno Valley Road, Petaluma; APN 020-010-010.

Executive Summary:

Introduction: This Lot Line Adjustment requires Board of Supervisors approval because of the existing Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Contract. Lot Line Adjustments are normally approved administratively by the Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) or by the Project Review and Advisory Committee.

Project Description, Location, and Zoning: This is a request for a Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels resulting from an Administrative Certificate of Compliance (ACC) determination completed on August 17, 2015. The parcels have one Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 020-010-010 and are 160 acres (Lot A) and 80 (Lot B) acres in size. The ACC determination was that the singular APN represented two separate legal parcels. The parcels were not in a preferred configuration which would allow the property owners to sell the land not used for their agricultural and horse operations. Thus they are requesting a Lot Line Adjustment. The Lot Line Adjustment results in two parcels of 199 acres (Lot A) and 41 acres (Lot B). The property is under an existing Non-Prime Land Conservation Contract (recorded under Document No.: Book 2838 of Records, Page 995). The purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to separate the property on the south side of Chileno Valley Road from the property on the north side.

The parcels are located at 1002 Chileno Valley Road about ¾ of a mile from the Sonoma / Marin County line. The parcels are zoned LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) 100-acre density with the RC 50/50 (Riparian Corridor: 50-foot setback from the top of the highest bank) combining district. The property is located in Agricultural Preserve 2-317.

Revision No. 20140617-1
**Land Conservation Act:** To facilitate a Lot Line Adjustment, Gov. Code Section 51257 permits the contracting parties to rescind the existing contracts and simultaneously enter into new contracts if required findings can be made. Staff has determined the Lot Line Adjustment can meet the required findings as described in the Resolution (see Attachment A) because both Lots A and B individually meet the requirements of a Land Conservation Act Contract.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Board find that all Government Code Section 51257 findings are satisfied in connection with the proposed Lot Line Adjustment, and approve the proposed Lot Line Adjustment subject to the attached Conditions of Approval. Both lots will continue to be devoted to a qualifying agricultural use primarily as grazing land. Conditions of Approval require that prior to recording the Grant Deed for the Lot Line Adjustment, the property owner shall submit the appropriate applications and filing fees to rescind and replace the existing contract with two new Land Conservation Act Contracts. The Lot Line Adjustment does not result in a greater number of developable parcels. Under their current General Plan land use designation of Land Extensive Agriculture 100 acres per dwelling unit, neither parcel is eligible for a subdivision currently or as a result of the Lot Line Adjustment.

**Prior Board Actions:**

None.

**Strategic Plan Alignment**

**Goal 2: Economic and Environmental Stewardship**

The Board of Supervisors has endorsed the continuation of the County’s agricultural preserve program to preserve a maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural, open space, scenic, and critical habitat lands within the county, to discourage premature and unnecessary conversion of such lands to urban land uses, to promote vitality in the agricultural economy, and to ensure an adequate, varied, and healthy supply of food and fiber for current and future generations. The purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to improve the management of the existing grazing operation on each parcel. In addition, the rescission and replacement of Land Conservation contract for both of the subject parcels will facilitate further agricultural investment and support agricultural viability and help preserve open space land in Sonoma County.

**Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$ State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Fees/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Use of Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ Total Sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

This Lot Line Adjustment would have no fiscal impact. The fiscal impacts of the subsequent replacement Land Conservation Contracts will be included when those Contracts come before the Board for approval.

Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

None.

Attachments:

Draft Board of Supervisors Resolution
Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval
Exhibit B: Proposal Statement
Exhibit C: Assessor’s Parcel Map
Exhibit D: Lot Line Adjustment Site Plan

Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:

None.
Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Of The County Of Sonoma, State Of California, Granting The Request By Patricia And Robin Klaus For A Minor Lot Line Adjustment Between Two Parcels Subject To Land Conservation Act Contracts For Property Located At 1002 Chileno Valley Road, Petaluma; APN 020-010-010.

Whereas, the applicants, Patricia and Robin Klaus, filed a Minor Lot Line Adjustment application with the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department between two Administrative Certificate of Compliance parcels of 160 (Lot A) and 80 (Lot B) acres in size resulting in two parcels of 199 acres (Lot A) and 41 acres (Lot B) in size for property located at 1002 Chileno Valley Road, Petaluma; APN 020-010-010; Zoned LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) 100-acre density with the RC 50/50 (Riparian Corridor) combining district; Supervisorial District No 2; and

Whereas, to facilitate a Lot Line Adjustment, Government Code Section 51257, authorizes parties to a Land Conservation Contract or Contracts to mutually rescind the Contract or Contracts and simultaneously enter into a new Contract or Contracts;

Whereas, on December 13, 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted the updated Sonoma County Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones (Uniform Rules) (Resolution No. 11-0678); and

Whereas, in accordance with the provisions of law, the Board of Supervisors held a public meeting to review the request on April 5, 2016; and

Whereas, the purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to separate the property on the south side of Chileno Valley Road from the property on the north side.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Board of Supervisors makes the following findings consistent with Government Code Section 51257:

a. The new contract or contracts will enforce and restrict the adjusted boundaries of the parcel for an initial term for at least as long as the unexpired term of the rescinded contract, but for not less than 10 years. A condition of
approval for the Lot Line Adjustment requires the rescission and replacement of the existing contract with two new Non-Prime contracts. The new contracts are for a term not less than 10 years, renewing automatically every January 1st. The rescission and replacement of the existing contracts will require a separate and subsequent Board action to be scheduled at a later date.

b. There is no net decrease in the amount of the acreage restricted by a Land Conservation Act Contract. The aggregate acreage of land under contract will remain the same after the Lot Line Adjustment as both resulting parcels will be subject to contracts.

c. All (100 percent) of the land under the former contract will be under the new contracts required as a Condition of Approval of the Lot Line Adjustment.

d. After the Lot Line Adjustment, the parcels of land subject to contract will be large enough to sustain their agricultural use, as defined in Section 51222. Non-Prime contracts require a minimum parcel size of 40 acres. After the Lot Line Adjustment Lot A will be 199 acres and Lot B will be 41 acres thus exceeding the minimum lot size, and will exceed the minimum gross income requirement of $2,000 gross total income per farm and $2.50 gross income per acre of production, and will continue to be large enough to sustain their respective agricultural use (horse breeding - 13.89 acres currently, cattle grazing - 140 acres currently, and olive orchard - 1 acre currently) with over 50% of each parcel used for grazing.

e. The Lot Line Adjustment does not compromise the long-term agricultural productivity of the parcel or other agricultural lands subject to a contract or contracts. The purpose of the Lot Line Adjustment is to realign the property boundary with Chileno Valley Road so that agricultural operations may be conducted independently on each.

f. The Lot Line Adjustment is not likely to result in the removal of adjacent land from agricultural use. The General Plan and Zoning Designations will remain the same and the parcels will continue to be used for agricultural purposes so the Lot Line Adjustment will not affect adjacent lands or their agriculture uses.

g. The Lot Line Adjustment does not result in a greater number of developable parcels than existed prior to the adjustment, or an adjusted lot that is inconsistent with the General Plan. The owners have provided documentation on the proposed use of each of the reconfigured parcels indicating that Lot A will remain primarily cattle grazing and will retain the horse breeding operation as well as the olive orchard, and some additional crops such as herbs and flowers and that Lot B will have a cattle operation complying with the Uniform Rules. In addition Lot A will continue to have several compatible uses as it is currently
developed with a single family dwelling and a barn and riding arena for a horse boarding and riding stable. Lot A also has several storage sheds for farm equipment and supplies, a small milk barn converted to an office for the farm and stable operations, and a hay storage barn; all considered as agricultural support services. Lot B is currently undeveloped. Once the parcels are reconfigured as a result of the Lot Line Adjustment, each parcel will be required to apply for replacement Land Conservation contracts and will again document how they comply with the Uniform Rules. If ownership changes for any of the parcels, each property owner must verify compliance with the Land Conservation Act and Uniform Rules.

Be It Further Resolved that the Board of Supervisors hereby finds that substantial evidence in the record before it supports the above findings, and further finds that the Lot Line Adjustment meets the requirements of the above findings.

Be It Further Resolved that the Board of Supervisors finds the requested action described in this Resolution is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15305 Class 5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) in that the project is a minor Lot Line Adjustment.

Be It Further Resolved that the Board of Supervisors hereby grants the request by Patricia and Robin Klaus for the requested Minor Lot Line Adjustment subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment "A," attached hereto which includes a condition to rescind and replace the existing Land Conservation Contract.

Be It Further Resolved that the Board of Supervisors designates the Clerk of the Board as the custodian of the documents and other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the decision herein is based. These documents may be found at the office of the Clerk of the Board, 575 Administration Drive, Room 100-A, Santa Rosa, California 95403.

Supervisors:

Gorin: Rabbitt: Zane: Gore: Carrillo:

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

So Ordered.
SONOMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Conditions of Approval

Staff: Melinda Grosch       Date: April 5, 2016
Applicant: Patricia and Robin Klaus       File No.: PLP15-0046
Owner: Patricia and Robin Klaus       APN: 020-010-010
Address: 1002 Chileno Valley Road, Petaluma

Project Description: Request for a minor Lot Line Adjustment between two Administrative Certificate of Compliance parcels of 160 acres and 80 acres in size resulting in two parcels of 199 acres and 41 acres in size. Both parcels are subject to a Land Conservation Act Contract.

NOTE: Amendments and changes to approved Lot Line Adjustment conditions may be considered by the Board of Supervisors at a later date if additional information justifies the changes and does not increase the intensity of use approved by the original approval. The Director of the Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) will determine if a public hearing is necessary and if additional fees are required.

1. Submit verification to Planning that taxes and/or assessments, which are a lien and termed as payable, are paid to the Treasurer-Tax Collector's Department on all parcels affected by the adjustment. The Treasurer-Tax Collector knows the amount of the tax due.

2. A draft description, prepared by a licensed land surveyor or civil engineer authorized to practice land surveying, showing the combination of lots or transfer of property shall be submitted to the County Surveyor for approval. The following note shall be placed on the deed or deeds. "The purpose of this deed is for a Lot Line Adjustment for the reconfiguration of the Lands of Klaus Family Investments Limited Partnership, an Arizona Limited Partnership as described by deed recorded under Document No.2006-025845, Sonoma County Records, APN 020-010-010 (ACC15-0027, Document No. 2015-072845 and ACC15-0028, Document No. 2015-072846). This deed is pursuant to PLP15-0046 on file in the office of the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. It is the express intent of the signatory hereto that the recordation of this deed extinguishes any underlying parcels or portions of parcels." It is the responsibility of the surveyor/engineer preparing the deeds to insure that the information contained within the combination note is correct. Note: The County Surveyor may modify the above described note.

3. After approval of the description by the County Surveyor, a grant deed or deeds shall be prepared.

4. A site plan map of the Lot Line Adjustment shall be prepared by a licensed surveyor or civil engineer and attached to the deed(s) to be recorded. The site plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the County Surveyor. The following note shall be placed on said plan: "THIS EXHIBIT IS FOR GRAPHIC PURPOSES ONLY. Any errors or omissions on this exhibit shall not affect the deed description."

5. Prior to recordation of the deeds an application to rescind and replace the existing Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Contract with two new contracts that conform to the reconfigured parcels shall be made.

6. The grant deeds shall be approved by the Project Review planner by stamping and signing the front of the grant deeds. The stamped deeds with site plan attached shall be recorded.

7. The property owners shall execute a Right-to-Farm Declaration on a form provided by PRMD to
be submitted before the Lot Line Adjustment is cleared by PRMD for recordation. The Right-to-Farm Declaration shall be recorded concurrently with the PRMD approved Lot Line Adjustment grant deed(s) to reflect the newly configured parcels.

8. This “At Cost” entitlement is not vested until all permit processing costs are paid in full. Additionally, no grading or building permits shall be issued until all permit processing costs are paid in full.
PROPOSAL STATEMENT

Patricia and Robin Klaus own a 240 acre +/- parcel at 1002 Chileno Valley Road in Petaluma; they would like a Lot Line Adjustment to separate the residence from the Agricultural property and to flow with the natural contours of the land.

The water for these parcels is provided by wells, water tank and septic systems.

JOB NO. 2014-030
APN 020-010-010
MAY 2015
| **County of Sonoma** | **Agenda Item Number:** 4  
| **Summary Report** | (This Section for use by Clerk of the Board Only.) |
| Clerk of the Board | |
| 575 Administration Drive | |
| Santa Rosa, CA 95403 | |
| **To:** Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County | |
| **Board Agenda Date:** April 5, 2016 | **Vote Requirement:** Majority |
| **Department or Agency Name(s):** Probation | |
| **Staff Name and Phone Number:** | **Supervisiorial District(s):** |
| David Koch, 565-2168 | Countywide |
| **Title:** University of Cincinnati Research Institute (UCRI) Probation Training Services | |
| **Recommended Actions:** | |
| Authorize the Chief Probation Officer to execute an agreement with the University of Cincinnati Corrections Research Institute (UCRI) for specialized evidence-based practices training, coaching and consultation for the period of April 5, 2016 through June 30, 2019, for a total amount not to exceed $250,000, with two one-year renewal options. | |
| **Executive Summary:** | |
| Today’s recommended action is to approve and authorize the Chief Probation Officer to execute with UCRI a three-year agreement, with two one-year renewal options to provide evidence-based practices (EBP) training, coaching, and consultation to Probation staff. Total expenditures for all services provided under the agreement are not to exceed $250,000 over the contract period. | |
| In May 2013, as a result of a Request for Proposal procurement process, the Sonoma County Probation Department entered into a three-year agreement with the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) for staff training and development in EBP programming and services. The Probation Department has been training both Adult and Juvenile Probation Officers within a structured framework developed by UCCI for offender interactions, with specific intervention techniques targeting criminogenic needs. Training for Juvenile Correctional Counselors provides staff with increased skills to effectively build a professional alliance with juvenile offenders and assist them in changing behaviors connected with reoffending. | |
| Services provided by UCCI are now contracted through the University of Cincinnati Corrections Research Institute (UCRI). UCRI is a tax exempt, non-profit 501(c)(3) Ohio corporation, which utilizes University of Cincinnati business centers to meet government agency needs. UCRI will use UCCI as the university business center to perform all of the EBP training programs and services in the contract. | |
| The proposed agreement with UCRI will allow the Probation Department to further build upon the foundation of existing EBP initiatives and to expand knowledge within the Department. This will be | |

Revision No. 20121026-1
achieved through the delivery of training designed to develop the capacity of staff to effectively use EBP approaches and principles within institutional facilities and community supervision. Research provides a sound basis for the position that corrections professionals can influence constructive change in offenders and reduce recidivism when they adhere to the principles of effective intervention and utilize certain core correctional practices.

The agreement also includes provisions for follow-up training to evaluate and reinforce staff participants’ knowledge and application of the tools/techniques presented in the training sessions through ongoing skills practice opportunities, along with supervisor coaching and quality assurance measures. In addition, the agreement includes train-the-trainer options, which will prepare participants to facilitate EBP trainings for Probation staff in the future. Ultimately these trainings will build the Probations Department’s capacity to conduct its own trainings, thereby sustaining its investment in the EBP initiatives, and reducing the cost associated with UCCI conducting future trainings. Coaching and consultation time are included in the contract to support the Department’s implementation and development of its newly trained trainers. Finally, the agreement allows for any additional program development requested by the Department, as future training needs become apparent. The various activities in the contract offer the Department opportunities to fully integrate best practices and quality assurance measures into the Department’s case management and custodial supervision practices.

UCCI developed the curriculum for EBP trainings the Probation Department has conducted since 2013: Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS), Core Correctional Practices (CCP), and Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions (CBI). Probation Department staff, working with County Purchasing, have determined that it is in the County’s best interest to contract with UCRI, in order to continue obtaining trainings and services from UCCI, the sole provider of its EPICS, CCP and CBI EBP trainings and services. In doing so, the County will continue to build upon its investment to date in the EBP initiatives and avoid incurring the costs, time and effort to re-train up to 280 probation officers and juvenile corrections counselors.

Prior Board Actions:
None.

Strategic Plan Alignment
Goal 1: Safe, Healthy, and Caring Community

The services included in this Agreement are designed to provide staff with a structured approach to enhancing motivation to change, more constructive and targeted interactions, along with educational and skill-building groups. All of these elements will increase the likelihood of staff’s ability to successfully influence positive change in offenders and ultimately should reduce recidivism.
### Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):**

Funding for any training in FY 15-16 was included in the FY 15-16 General Fund and AB109 Realignment budgets. In subsequent fiscal years, UCCI shall provide follow-up, train-the-trainer and additional training as needed, and the Department shall budget accordingly.

### Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**

None.

**Attachments:**

University of Cincinnati Corrections Research Institute (UCCR) Training Services Agreement

**Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:**

None.
AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

This agreement ("Agreement"), dated as of April 5, 2016 ("Effective Date") is by and between the County of Sonoma, a political subdivision of the State of California (hereinafter "County"), and University of Cincinnati Corrections Research Institute, a tax exempt, non-profit 501(c)(3) Ohio corporation (hereinafter "Consultant").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Consultant represents that it is a duly qualified and experienced in the development and delivery of customized Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) training for Probation staff; and

WHEREAS, in the judgment of the Board of Supervisors, it is necessary and desirable to employ the services of Consultant for the development and delivery of training to probation staff.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Scope of Services.

1.1 Consultant's Specified Services.

Consultant shall have University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) perform the following services within the times or by the dates provided below and pursuant to Article 7, Prosecution of Work:

Upon request of County and at the direction of the Sonoma County Probation Department, Consultant shall perform the services described in Exhibit "A," attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (hereinafter "Scope of Work"), and within the times or by the dates provided for in Exhibit "A" and pursuant to Article 7, Prosecution of Work. In the event of a conflict between the body of this Agreement and Exhibit "A", the provisions in the body of this Agreement shall control. The County does not guarantee any minimum or maximum amount of work under this agreement.

1.2 Cooperation With County. Consultant shall cooperate with County and County staff in the performance of all work hereunder.
1.3 **Performance Standard.** Consultant shall perform all work hereunder in a manner consistent with the level of competency and standard of care normally observed by a person practicing in Consultant's profession. County has relied upon the professional ability and training of Consultant as a material inducement to enter into this Agreement. Consultant hereby agrees to provide all services under this Agreement in accordance with generally accepted professional practices and standards of care, as well as the requirements of applicable federal, state and local laws, it being understood that acceptance of Contractor's work by County shall not operate as a waiver or release. If County determines that any of Consultant's work is not in accordance with such level of competency and standard of care, County, in its sole discretion, shall have the right to do any or all of the following: (a) require Consultant to meet with County to review the quality of the work and resolve matters of concern; (b) require Consultant to repeat the work at no additional charge until it is satisfactory; (c) terminate this Agreement pursuant to the provisions of Article 4; or (d) pursue any and all other remedies at law or in equity.

1.4 **Assigned Personnel.**

   a. Consultant shall assign only competent personnel to perform work hereunder. Consultant will have the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) perform all of the EBP training programs and services in this Agreement. In the event that at any time County, in its sole discretion, desires the removal of any person or persons assigned by Consultant to perform work hereunder, Consultant shall remove such person or persons immediately upon receiving written notice from County.

   b. Direct service personnel may be fingerprinted before performing any services under this Agreement. Consultant’s employees shall follow the fingerprinting procedure set forth in “Exhibit C”, incorporated herein by this reference. County’s Chief Probation Officer shall have the discretion to approve Consultant’s employees for working with the clients served under this Agreement.

   c. All persons assigned to perform services under this Agreement on behalf of the Consultant are subject to background investigations performed by or under the direction of the Probation Department.

   d. All persons assigned to perform services under this Agreement on behalf of the Consultant must comply with the requirements of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA) and Probation Department policies regarding PREA.
f. All persons assigned to perform services under this Agreement on behalf of Consultant shall submit certification of appropriate training to deliver proprietary programming.

g. Consultant shall notify the County in writing within 30 days of any change in personnel holding the positions of Executive Director or Financial Director within its organization. Consultant's failure to comply with the provisions of this Section shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement and may result in a loss of funding and/or contract termination.

h. In the event that any of Consultant's personnel assigned to perform services under this Agreement become unavailable due to resignation, sickness or other factors outside of Consultant's control, Consultant shall be responsible for timely provision of adequately qualified replacements.

1.5 Access to Probation Department Facilities. Consultant shall be permitted access to Probation Department facilities for the purpose of performing the services required under this Agreement. Consultant shall ensure that persons not otherwise authorized to perform services hereunder do not enter the facilities with Consultant. Consultant agrees to comply with all Probation Department policies and procedures, and any directives issued by Probation Department staff, relating to safety and security while performing services in the facilities.

2. Payment. For all services and incidental costs required hereunder, Consultant shall be paid on a time and material/expense basis in accordance with the budget set forth in Exhibit “A,” provided, however, that total payments to Consultant shall not exceed Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000.00), without the prior written approval of County. Such payments shall be made within 30 days of presentation of an invoice by Consultant setting forth in detail the services performed and number of hours/days incurred for each service. Consultant shall not be entitled to reimbursement of any expenses incurred in connection with the performance of this Agreement.

Unless otherwise noted in this agreement, payments shall be made within the normal course of county business after presentation of an invoice in a form approved by the County for services performed. Payments shall be made only upon the satisfactory completion of the services as determined by the County.

Pursuant to California Revenue and Taxation code (R&TC) Section 18662, the County shall withhold seven percent of the income paid to Consultant for services performed within the State of California under this agreement, for payment and reporting to the California Franchise Tax Board, if Consultant does not qualify as: (1) a corporation with its principal place of business in California, (2) an LLC or Partnership with a permanent place of business in California, (3) a corporation/LLC or Partnership qualified to do business in California by the Secretary of State, or (4) an individual with a permanent residence in the State of California.
California, (2) an LLC or Partnership with a permanent place of business in California, (3) a corporation/LLC or Partnership qualified to do business in California by the Secretary of State, or (4) an individual with a permanent residence in the State of California.

If Consultant does not qualify, County requires that a completed and signed Form 587 be provided by the Consultant in order for payments to be made. If consultant is qualified, then the County requires a completed Form 590. Forms 587 and 590 remain valid for the duration of the Agreement provided there is no material change in facts. By signing either form, the contractor agrees to promptly notify the County of any changes in the facts. Forms should be sent to the County pursuant to Article 13. To reduce the amount withheld, Consultant has the option to provide County with either a full or partial waiver from the State of California.

3. Term of Agreement. The term of this Agreement shall be from April 5, 2016 to June 30, 2019 unless terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 below. The County has the option to renew this Agreement two (2) times for a period of one (1) year per extension, on the same terms and conditions as set forth herein.

4. Termination.

4.1 Termination Without Cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, at any time and without cause, County shall have the right, in its sole discretion, to terminate this Agreement by giving 5 days written notice to Consultant.

4.2 Termination for Cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, should Consultant fail to perform any of its obligations hereunder, within the time and in the manner herein provided, or otherwise violate any of the terms of this Agreement, County may immediately terminate this Agreement by giving Consultant written notice of such termination, stating the reason for termination.

4.3 Delivery of Work Product and Final Payment Upon Termination. In the event of termination, Consultant, within 14 days following the date of termination, shall deliver to County all materials and work product subject to Section 9.10 (Ownership and Disclosure of Work Product) and shall submit to County an invoice showing the services performed, hours worked, and copies of receipts for reimbursable expenses up to the date of termination.

4.4 Payment Upon Termination. Upon termination of this Agreement by County, Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment for all services satisfactorily rendered and expenses incurred hereunder, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total payment specified in the Agreement as the services satisfactorily rendered hereunder by Consultant bear to the total services otherwise required to be performed for such total payment; provided, however, that if services which have been satisfactorily rendered are to be paid on a per-hour or per-day basis, Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment an amount equal to the number of hours or days actually worked prior to the termination times the applicable hourly or daily rate; and further provided, however, that if County terminates the
Agreement for cause pursuant to Section 4.2, County shall deduct from such amount the amount of damage, if any, sustained by County by virtue of the breach of the Agreement by Consultant.

4.5 Authority to Terminate. The Board of Supervisors has the authority to terminate this Agreement on behalf of the County. In addition, the Purchasing Agent or Chief Probation Officer, in consultation with County Counsel, shall have the authority to terminate this Agreement on behalf of the County.

5. Indemnification. Consultant agrees to accept all responsibility for loss or damage to any person or entity, including County, and to indemnify, hold harmless, and release County, its officers, agents, and employees, from and against any actions, claims, damages, liabilities, disabilities, or expenses, that may be asserted by any person or entity, including Consultant, that arise out of, pertain to, or relate to Consultant’s or its agents’, employees’, contractors’, subcontractors’, or invitees’ performance or obligations under this Agreement. Consultant agrees to provide a complete defense for any claim or action brought against County based upon a claim relating to such Consultant’s or its agents’, employees, contractors, subcontractors, or invitees performance or obligations under this Agreement. Consultant’s obligations under this Section apply whether or not there is concurrent negligence on County’s part, but to the extent required by law, excluding liability due to County’s conduct. County shall have the right to select its legal counsel at Consultant’s expense, subject to Consultant’s approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld. This indemnification obligation is not limited in any way by any limitation on the amount or type of damages or compensation payable to or for Consultant or its agents under workers' compensation acts, disability benefits acts, or other employee benefit acts.

6. Insurance. With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain, insurance as described in Exhibit B, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

7. Prosecution of Work. The execution of this Agreement shall constitute Consultant’s authority to proceed immediately with the performance of this Agreement. Performance of the services hereunder shall be completed within the time required herein, provided, however, that if the performance is delayed by earthquake, flood, high water, or other Act of God or by strike, lockout, or similar labor disturbances, the time for Consultant’s performance of this Agreement shall be extended by a number of days equal to the number of days Consultant has been delayed.

8. Extra or Changed Work. Extra or changed work or other changes to the Agreement may be authorized only by written amendment to this Agreement, signed by both parties. Minor changes, which do not increase the amount paid under the Agreement, and which do not significantly change the scope of work or significantly lengthen time schedules may be executed by the Department Head in a form approved by County Counsel. The Board of Supervisors/Purchasing Agent must authorize all other extra or changed work. The parties expressly recognize that, pursuant to Sonoma County Code Section 1-11, County personnel are without authorization to order extra or changed work or waive Agreement requirements. Failure
of Consultant to secure such written authorization for extra or changed work shall constitute a waiver of any and all right to adjustment in the Agreement price or Agreement time due to such unauthorized work and thereafter Consultant shall be entitled to no compensation whatsoever for the performance of such work. Consultant further expressly waives any and all right or remedy by way of restitution and quantum meruit for any and all extra work performed without such express and prior written authorization of the County.

9. Confidentiality Requirements. Consultant and its directors, officers, employees, agents, and subcontractors shall ensure that:

9.1 All records concerning any individual or client made or kept in connection with the administration of any provision of the services provided by this agreement shall be confidential, and shall not be open to examination for any purpose not directly connected with the administration of the services provided here, except a requested in writing by County or as required by law.

9.2 No person shall publish, disclose, use, permit, or cause to be published, disclosed, or used any confidential or identifying information pertaining to any individual or client that is obtained in connection with the administration of any provision of the services provided by this Agreement, except as requested in writing by County or as required by law.

9.3 Consultant and its officers, employees, agents or subcontractors, shall not voluntarily provide declarations, letters of support, testimony at depositions, response to interrogatories, or other information concerning the work performed under this Agreement. Response to a subpoena or court order shall not be considered “voluntary” provided Consultant gives notice to the Probation of such court order or subpoena prior to compliance.


10.1 Standard of Care. County has relied upon the professional ability and training of Consultant as a material inducement to enter into this Agreement. Consultant hereby agrees that all its work will be performed and that its operations shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted and applicable professional practices and standards as well as the requirements of applicable federal, state and local laws, it being understood that acceptance of Consultant's work by County shall not operate as a waiver or release.

10.2 Status of Consultant. The parties intend that Consultant, in performing the services specified herein, shall act as an independent contractor and shall control the work and the manner in which it is performed. Consultant is not to be considered an agent or employee of County and is not entitled to participate in any pension plan, worker’s compensation plan, insurance, bonus, or similar benefits County provides its employees. In the event County exercises its right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 4, above, Consultant expressly agrees that it shall have no recourse or right of appeal under rules, regulations, ordinances, or laws applicable to employees.
10.3 No Suspension or Debarment. Consultant warrants that it is not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in covered transactions by any federal department or agency. Consultant also warrants that it is not suspended or debarred from receiving federal funds as listed in the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement or Non-procurement Programs issued by the General Services Administration. If the Consultant becomes debarred, consultant has the obligation to inform the County.

10.4 Taxes. Consultant agrees to file federal and state tax returns and pay all applicable taxes on amounts paid pursuant to this Agreement and shall be solely liable and responsible to pay such taxes and other obligations, including, but not limited to, state and federal income and FICA taxes. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold County harmless from any liability which it may incur to the United States or to the State of California as a consequence of Consultant's failure to pay, when due, all such taxes and obligations. In case County is audited for compliance regarding any withholding or other applicable taxes, Consultant agrees to furnish County with proof of payment of taxes on these earnings.

10.5 Records Maintenance. Consultant shall keep and maintain full and complete documentation and accounting records concerning all services performed that are compensable under this Agreement and shall make such documents and records available to County for inspection at any reasonable time. Consultant shall maintain such records for a period of four (4) years following completion of work hereunder.

10.6 Conflict of Interest. Consultant covenants that it presently has no interest and that it will not acquire any interest, direct or indirect, that represents a financial conflict of interest under state law or that would otherwise conflict in any manner or degree with the performance of its services hereunder. Consultant further covenants that in the performance of this Agreement no person having any such interests shall be employed. In addition, if requested to do so by County, Consultant shall complete and file and shall require any other person doing work under this Agreement to complete and file a "Statement of Economic Interest" with County disclosing Consultant's or such other person's financial interests.

10.7 Statutory Compliance. Contractor agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations, statutes and policies applicable to the services provided under this Agreement as they exist now and as they are changed, amended or modified during the term of this Agreement.

10.8 Nondiscrimination. Without limiting any other provision hereunder, Consultant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations in regard to nondiscrimination in employment because of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, marital status, age, medical condition, pregnancy, disability, sexual orientation or other prohibited basis, including without limitation, the County's Non-Discrimination Policy. All nondiscrimination rules or regulations required by law to be included in this Agreement are incorporated herein by this reference.
10.9 AIDS Discrimination. Consultant agrees to comply with the provisions of Chapter 19, Article II, of the Sonoma County Code prohibiting discrimination in housing, employment, and services because of AIDS or HIV infection during the term of this Agreement and any extensions of the term.

10.10 Assignment of Rights. Consultant assigns to County all rights throughout the world in perpetuity in the nature of copyright, trademark, patent, right to ideas, in and to all versions of the plans and specifications, if any, now or later prepared by Consultant in connection with this Agreement. Consultant agrees to take such actions as are necessary to protect the rights assigned to County in this Agreement, and to refrain from taking any action which would impair those rights. Consultant's responsibilities under this provision include, but are not limited to, placing proper notice of copyright on all versions of the plans and specifications as County may direct, and refraining from disclosing any versions of the plans and specifications to any third party without first obtaining written permission of County. Consultant shall not use or permit another to use the plans and specifications in connection with this or any other project without first obtaining written permission of County.

10.11 Ownership and Disclosure of Work Product. All reports, original drawings, graphics, plans, studies, and other data or documents ("documents"), in whatever form or format, assembled or prepared by Consultant or Consultant’s subcontractors, consultants, and other agents in connection with this Agreement shall be the property of County. County shall be entitled to immediate possession of such documents upon completion of the work pursuant to this Agreement. Upon expiration or termination of this Agreement, Consultant shall promptly deliver to County all such documents, which have not already been provided to County in such form or format, as County deems appropriate. Such documents shall be and will remain the property of County without restriction or limitation. Consultant may retain copies of the above-described documents but agrees not to disclose or discuss any information gathered, discovered, or generated in any way through this Agreement without the express written permission of County.

10.12 Authority. The undersigned hereby represents and warrants that he or she has authority to execute and deliver this Agreement on behalf of Consultant.

11. Demand for Assurance. Each party to this Agreement undertakes the obligation that the other's expectation of receiving due performance will not be impaired. When reasonable grounds for insecurity arise with respect to the performance of either party, the other may in writing demand adequate assurance of due performance and until such assurance is received may, if commercially reasonable, suspend any performance for which the agreed return has not been received. "Commercially reasonable" includes not only the conduct of a party with respect to performance under this Agreement, but also conduct with respect to other agreements with parties to this Agreement or others. After receipt of a justified demand, failure to provide within a reasonable time, but not exceeding thirty (30) days, such assurance of due performance as is adequate under the circumstances of the particular case is a repudiation of this Agreement. Acceptance of any improper delivery, service, or payment does not prejudice the aggrieved party.
party’s right to demand adequate assurance of future performance. Nothing in this Article limits County’s right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 4.

12. Assignment and Delegation. Neither party hereto shall assign, delegate, sublet, or transfer any interest in or duty under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no such transfer shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

13. Method and Place of Giving Notice, Submitting Bills and Making Payments. All notices, bills, and payments shall be made in writing and shall be given by personal delivery or by U.S. Mail or courier service. Notices, bills, and payments shall be addressed as follows:

TO: COUNTY:  
Attention: Probation’s Administration  
Sonoma County Probation Department  
600 Administration Dr., #104J  
Santa Rosa, California 95403  
Phone: (707) 565-8077

TO: CONSULTANT:  
Attention: David Linger  
University of Cincinnati Research Institute  
P.O. 19614  
Cincinnati, OH 45219  
Phone: 513-558-5585  
Fax: 513-556-4820  
David.linger@ucri.org

When a notice, bill or payment is given by a generally recognized overnight courier service, the notice, bill or payment shall be deemed received on the next business day. When a copy of a notice, bill or payment is sent by facsimile or email, the notice, bill or payment shall be deemed received upon transmission as long as (1) the original copy of the notice, bill or payment is promptly deposited in the U.S. mail and postmarked on the date of the facsimile or email (for a payment, on or before the due date), (2) the sender has a written confirmation of the facsimile transmission or email, and (3) the facsimile or email is transmitted before 5 p.m. (recipient’s time). In all other instances, notices, bills and payments shall be effective upon receipt by the recipient. Changes may be made in the names and addresses of the person to whom notices are to be given by giving notice pursuant to this paragraph.


14.1 No Waiver of Breach. The waiver by County of any breach of any term or promise contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver of such term or provision or any subsequent breach of the same or any other term or promise contained in this Agreement.
14.2 Construction. To the fullest extent allowed by law, the provisions of this Agreement shall be construed and given effect in a manner that avoids any violation of statute, ordinance, regulation, or law. The parties covenant and agree that in the event that any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remainder of the provisions hereof shall remain in full force and effect and shall in no way be affected, impaired, or invalidated thereby. Consultant and County acknowledge that they have each contributed to the making of this Agreement and that, in the event of a dispute over the interpretation of this Agreement, the language of the Agreement will not be construed against one party in favor of the other. Consultant and County acknowledge that they have each had an adequate opportunity to consult with counsel in the negotiation and preparation of this Agreement.

14.3 Consent. Wherever in this Agreement the consent or approval of one party is required to an act of the other party, such consent or approval shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.

14.4 No Third Party Beneficiaries. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to create and the parties do not intend to create any rights in third parties.

14.5 Applicable Law and Forum. The Agreement shall be construed and interpreted according to the laws of a state of competent jurisdiction in that state’s courts.

14.6 Captions. The captions in this Agreement are solely for convenience of reference. They are not a part of this Agreement and shall have no effect on its construction or interpretation.

14.7 Merger. This writing is intended both as the final expression of the Agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1856. No modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless and until such modification is evidenced by a writing signed by both parties.

14.8 Survival of Terms. All express representations, waivers, indemnifications, and limitations of liability included in this Agreement will survive its completion or termination for any reason.

14.9 Time of Essence. Time is and shall be of the essence of this Agreement and every provision hereof.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the Effective Date.

CONSULTANT: University of Cincinnati Corrections Research Institute (UCRI)

By: ________________________________
Name: ______________________________
Title: ______________________________
Date: ______________________________

COUNTY: COUNTY OF SONOMA

By: ________________________________
Linda Rodecap, Purchasing Manager

CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE ON FILE WITH AND APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE FOR COUNTY:

By: ________________________________
Robert Ochs, Chief Probation Officer

Date: ______________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM FOR COUNTY:

By: ________________________________
Tambra Curtis, Deputy County Counsel

Date: 3-16-16
EXHIBIT A

SCOPE OF WORK

EPICS (Effective Practices in Community Supervision):

A. EPICS 5-day Training for Trainers (T4T) for up to 5 County staff.
   - 5-day onsite training conducted by 1 UCCI staff
   - Post 5-day training, UCCI will observe newly trained staff deliver the 3-day end user training to new staff.
   - Cost: $12,000

B. EPICS 1-day training for up to 12 Probation Services Supervisors and other designated employees, for coding of audiotapes and coaching and delivering feedback to trainees
   - Conducted by 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $4,000

C. EPICS 3-day training for up to 30 Probation Services Line Staff. Includes 5 ongoing video conference group-coaching sessions for participants in the training, and 5 pre-video conferences telecom coaching sessions for their supervisors.
   - 3-day onsite training conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Follow up coaching provided by 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $20,000

D. EPICS/MI Integration (Optional) 1-day course for up to 30 staff to provide an overview on the integration of EPICS/MI techniques
   - Conducted by 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $4,000

CCP (Core Correctional Practices):

A. CCP T4T 5-day training for up to 12 staff
   - Conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Days 1-3 will be in class training for new trainers, conducted by 2 UCCI staff
   - Days 4-5, new trainers will split into groups of no more than 6 (under the observation of 1 UCCI staff per group) to deliver the 2-day end user training to additional staff.
   - No more than 30 staff per group for the end user training; a combined total of no more than 60 for the two groups.
   - Cost: $19,500

B. CCP 2-day training for up to 30 Juvenile Correctional Counselors
   - Conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $10,000
CCP (Core Correctional Practices, continued):

C. CCP/MI Integration (Optional) 1-day course to provide an overview on the integration of CCP/MI techniques for up to 30 staff
   - Conducted by 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $4,000

D. CCP follow-up 2-day coaching sessions for up to 15 staff, if needed
   - Conducted by 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $6,500

CBI-CC (Cognitive Behavioral Interventions – Comprehensive Curriculum):

A. CBI-CC 4-day facilitator training for up to 18 staff on Nine modules with specialized modules that target common offender needs
   - Conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $17,250

B. Training for up to 18 staff on CBI Cognates when available
   - Conducted by 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost*: $7,500 for a 2-day onsite training, $10,000 for a 3-day onsite training

*Please note that UCCI cannot currently estimate how long it will take to provide this training as the modules are currently being developed, and expected to be available at a later date in 2016.

C. CBI-CC T4T Pilot, 4-day training for up to 12 staff
   - Conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $14,000

MI (MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING):

A. MI T4T, 5-day training for up to 10 staff
   - Conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Days 1-3 will be in class training for new trainers, conducted by 2 UCCI staff
   - Days 4-5, new trainers will split into groups of no more than 5 (under the observation of 1 UCCI staff per group) to deliver the 2-day end user training to additional staff.
   - No more than 24 staff per group for the end user training; a combined total of no more than 48 for the two groups.
   - Cost: $19,250

B. MI 2-day training for up to 24 staff
   - Conducted by up to 2 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $10,000
COACHING OR REFRESHER COURSES*:

A. Refresher course for no more than 12 EPICS coaches, half to one full day trainings, as requested, to refresh skills and provide support. Onsite training would be in conjunction with other planned travel to Sonoma County.
   - Conducted by up to 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $3,000 for a full day / $1,500 for a half day

B. Refresher course for no more than 12 CCP coaches, half to one full day trainings, as requested, to refresh skills and provide support. Onsite training would be in conjunction with other planned travel to Sonoma County.
   - Conducted by up to 1 UCCI staff
   - Cost: $3,000 for a full day / $1,500 for a half day

*Depending on the topic, UCCI may be able to provide a refresher course combining both EPICS and CCP coaches. This can be negotiated as needed.

UCCI CONSULTATION:

A. General hourly consultations via email/telecom or videoconference, as requested or if onsite, in conjunction with other planned travel to Sonoma County.
   - Cost: $125 per hour for general technical assistance / $1,000 per video conference call up to 4 hours / $2,500 per day onsite

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT:

A. MI integration consultations or other program development via telecom or videoconference, as requested or if onsite, in conjunction with other planned travel to Sonoma County.
   - Cost: $125 per hour for general technical assistance / $1,000 per video conference call up to 4 hours / $2,500 per day onsite
   - Development time will vary based on the needs of the site.
EXHIBIT B

INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain insurance as described below unless such insurance has been expressly waived by the attachment of a Waiver of Insurance Requirements. County reserves the right to review any and all of the required insurance policies and/or endorsements, but has no obligation to do so. Failure to demand evidence of full compliance with the insurance requirements set forth in this Agreement or failure to identify any insurance deficiency shall not relieve Consultant from, nor be construed or deemed a waiver of, its obligation to maintain the required insurance at all times during the performance of this Agreement.

1. **Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance**
   a. Required if Consultant has employees.
   b. Workers Compensation insurance with statutory limits as required by the Labor Code of the State of California.
   c. Employers Liability with minimum limits of $1,000,000 per Accident; $1,000,000 Disease per employee; $1,000,000 Disease per policy.
   d. **Required Evidence of Insurance:** Certificate of Insurance.

   If Consultant currently has no employees, Consultant agrees to obtain the above-specified Workers Compensation and Employers Liability insurance should any employees be engaged during the term of this Agreement or any extensions of the term.

2. **General Liability Insurance**
   a. Commercial General Liability Insurance on a standard occurrence form, no less broad than Insurance Services Office (ISO) form CG 00 01.
   b. Minimum Limits: $1,000,000 per Occurrence; $2,000,000 General Aggregate; $2,000,000 Products/Completed Operations Aggregate. The required limits may be provided by a combination of General Liability Insurance and Commercial Umbrella Liability Insurance. If Consultant maintains higher limits than the specified minimum limits, County requires and shall be entitled to coverage for the higher limits maintained by Consultant.
   c. Any deductible or self-insured retention shall be shown on the Certificate of Insurance. If the deductible or self-insured retention exceeds $25,000 it must be approved in advance by County. Consultant is responsible for any deductible or self-insured retention and shall fund it upon County’s written request, regardless of whether Consultant has a claim against the insurance or is named as a party in any action involving the County.
   d. County of Sonoma, its Officers, Agents and Employees shall be additional insureds for liability arising out of operations by or on behalf of the Consultant in the performance of this Agreement.
   e. The insurance provided to the additional insureds shall be primary to, and non-contributory with, any insurance or self-insurance program maintained by them.
   f. The policy definition of “insured contract” shall include assumptions of liability.
arising out of both ongoing operations and the products-completed operations
hazard (broad form contractual liability coverage including the “f” definition of
insured contract in Insurance Services Office form CG 00 01, or equivalent).
g. The policy shall cover inter-insured suits between County and Consultant and
include a “separation of insureds” or “severability” clause which treats each
insured separately.
h. **Required Evidence of Insurance:**
   i. Copy of the additional insured endorsement or policy language granting
      additional insured status; and
   ii. Certificate of Insurance.

3. **Standards for Insurance Companies**
   Insurers, other than the California State Compensation Insurance Fund, shall have an
   A.M. Best's rating of at least A:VII.

4. **Documentation**
   a. The Certificate of Insurance must include the following reference: Sonoma
      County Administration.
   b. All required Evidence of Insurance shall be submitted prior to the execution of
      this Agreement. Consultant agrees to maintain current Evidence of Insurance on
      file with County for the entire term of this Agreement.
   c. The name and address for Additional Insured endorsements and Certificates of
      Insurance is: County of Sonoma, its Officers, Agents and Employees
      Attn: Probation Department
      600 Administration Dr., #104-J
      Santa Rosa, CA 95403
   d. Required Evidence of Insurance shall be submitted for any renewal or
      replacement of a policy that already exists, at least ten (10) days before expiration
      or other termination of the existing policy.
   e. Consultant shall provide immediate written notice if: (1) any of the required
      insurance policies is terminated; (2) the limits of any of the required policies are
      reduced; or (3) the deductible or self-insured retention is increased.
   f. Upon written request, certified copies of required insurance policies must be
      provided within thirty (30) days.

5. **Policy Obligations**
   Consultant's indemnity and other obligations shall not be limited by the foregoing
   insurance requirements.

6. **Material Breach**
   If Consultant fails to maintain insurance which is required pursuant to this
   Agreement, it shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement. County, at its
   sole option, may terminate this Agreement and obtain damages from Consultant
   resulting from said breach. Alternatively, County may purchase the required
   insurance, and without further notice to Consultant, County may deduct from sums
   due to Consultant any premium costs advanced by County for such insurance. These
   remedies shall be in addition to any other remedies available to County.

Exhibit B – Insurance Requirements
EXHIBIT C

FINGERPRINTING PROCEDURE

Any individual who may provide services under this Agreement, or who otherwise has one-on-one contact with juveniles that County has referred to Consultant, must be fingerprinted as required by the County Probation Department guidelines. Accordingly, each individual must follow the procedures below:

1. Prior to having livescan fingerprints taken, the individual will complete the “Agreement to Background Check” form and submit it to the Probation Administrative Aide or HR Liaison. Forms may be faxed to 565-2503.

2. Call Probation HR Administrative Aide, at 565-2798 to begin the fingerprinting process and to receive instructions on scheduling your fingerprinting appointment.

3. Provide HR Administrative Aide with the following information for the livescan form: Name, AKA’s, Address, Place of Birth, Sex, Date of Birth, Social Security #, Height, Weight, Eye Color, Hair Color.

4. On the day of your appointment, you must pick up the fingerprint form from HR Administrative Aide at the Probation Department, 600 Administration Drive, Room 104J, Santa Rosa.

5. Take the form to the Sheriff’s Department located at 2796 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, or to the Juvenile Justice Center at 7425 Los Guilicos Road in Santa Rosa, where the fingerprinting procedure will be completed. You will be required to present your California Driver’s License at your fingerprinting appointment.

6. Return the fingerprint form to HR Administrative Aide at the Probation Department immediately following your appointment.
Agreement to Background Check

I, ______________________, understand that I have a right to privacy guaranteed by the Constitution of the State of California. I further understand that in order for me to be considered for assignment to work with/provide services to clients of the Sonoma County Probation Department (Probation), it is necessary that a background check be run on me by Probation. I hereby consent and permit Probation to conduct such a background check on me. In addition, I hereby release and discharge Probation from and against any and all claims, liability, or damages that may result therefrom.

I understand that if I am assigned to perform work with Probation clients, I may come into contact with confidential and privileged documents. I further understand that in the course of being employed, I may hear privileged or confidential conversations. I agree that I will keep these conversations and documents private and confidential and will not disclose them to any person or entity unless required to do so by law.

Applicant Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Witness Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
County of Sonoma
Agenda Item
Summary Report

Clerk of the Board
575 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To: Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Board Agenda Date: April 5, 2016
Vote Requirement: Majority

Department or Agency Name(s): Sheriff’s Office

Staff Name and Phone Number: Yvonne Shu, 565-3922
Supervisory District(s): All Supervisorial Districts

Title: 2016 Domestic Cannabis Eradication Suppression Program Letter of Agreement

Recommended Actions:

Authorize the Sheriff to execute the 2016 Domestic Cannabis Eradication / Suppression Program (DCE/SP) Letter of Agreement and any Amendments that do not substantially alter the scope of the Agreement with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). The Sheriff’s Office will receive a minimum of $40,000 to be used for marijuana suppression and eradication activities for the period of January 1, 2016 to September 30, 2016.

Executive Summary:

The Letter of Agreement from the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) was received by the Sheriff’s Office on February 25, 2016. Funds received by the Sheriff’s Office are expected to be fully expended during the 9-month grant period, with peak marijuana eradication season typically occurring during the months of August through October. The DEA changed the cycle of its grant year in 2016 to correspond with the federal fiscal year; as a result, the nine-month period of this year’s grant represents the transitional period between a calendar year grant period and a federal fiscal year of October 1 through September 30. The DEA advised that funding would be very limited for the 2016 grant year, and our award reflects a sharp reduction from the $120,000 received in 2015.

Since 1995, the Sheriff’s Office has received grants from the Domestic Cannabis Eradication / Suppression Program (DCE/SP) to support the Sheriff’s marijuana suppression efforts. Grant funds are currently administered by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and are designated to specifically cover seasonal marijuana eradication efforts.

Decreasing eradication numbers are anticipated and are due to the shift toward smaller, indoor growing operations versus large, remote open spaces, as well as a shift toward a larger plant size, which results in higher product volume per plant. Small-scale residential operations are more difficult and time-consuming to eradicate because they require more pre-investigative work, including search warrants, interviews, research into claims of growing under the provisions of medical marijuana, and subsequent
court appearances. Funding provided by DCE/SP provides additional resources to disrupt small “residential” grows, in addition to eradication of large scale outdoor grows.

$40,000 is available to the Sheriff’s Office for the nine-month period of January – September 2016. The grant will fund deputy overtime, expendable and non-expendable equipment, aircraft rental, and training/travel costs, which have historically been approved by the DEA.

Prior Board Actions:

Board approval of agreements for the Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Program for the past 19 fiscal years (FY 96-97 through FY 15-16).

Strategic Plan Alignment  Goal 1: Safe, Healthy, and Caring Community

This agreement for Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Program will promote a safer community by providing funds that enable the Sheriff’s Office to continue disruption of illegal narcotics activity in Sonoma County.

Fiscal Summary - FY 16-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>County General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>Total Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

No matching funds are required for DCE/SP participation. Revenues and expenditures for 2016 DCE/SP are included in the Sheriff’s Office FY 16-17 budget in the amount of $40,000, with expenditures reduced from previous years to reflect the grant amount for 2016.

Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Domestic Cannabis Eradication Suppression Program Letter of Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:**
Agreement Number 2016-53

This Letter of Agreement (LOA) is entered into between the SONOMA COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE, hereinafter referred to as (THE AGENCY), and the DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION (DEA) OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ), hereinafter referred to as DEA, in reference to the following:

There is evidence that trafficking in marijuana (illicit cannabis) has a substantial and detrimental effect on the health and general welfare of the people of the State of California. The parties hereto agree that it is to their mutual benefit to cooperate in locating and eradicating illicit cannabis plants and to investigate and prosecute those cases before the courts of the United States (U.S.) and the courts of the State of California. DEA, pursuant to the authority of 21 U.S.C. § 873, proposes to provide certain necessary funds and THE AGENCY is desirous of securing funds.

NOW, therefore, in consideration of the mutual covenants hereinafter contained, the parties hereto have agreed as follows:

1. THE AGENCY will, with its own law enforcement personnel and employees, as hereinafter specified, perform the activities and duties described below:
   a. Gather and report intelligence data relating to the illicit cultivation, possession, and distribution of illicit cannabis.
   b. Investigate and report instances involving the trafficking in controlled substances.
   c. Provide law enforcement personnel for the eradication of illicit cannabis located within the State of California.
   d. Make arrests and refer to the appropriate prosecutorial authority cases for prosecution under controlled substances laws and other criminal laws.
   e. Send required samples of eradicated illicit cannabis to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) Potency Monitoring Project.
   f. MANDATORY requirement for THE AGENCY to utilize the Web-based DEA internet Capability Endeavor (DICE) or if applicable the Firebird based DEA Analysis/Response Tracking System (DARTS) to report all statistics and seizures per incident, to include the submission of significant items for de-confliction and information sharing purposes.
   g. Submit to DEA quarterly expenditure reports.
2. It is understood and agreed by the parties to this Agreement that the activities described in Sub-paragraphs a, b, c, d, e, f, and g of paragraph one shall be accomplished with existing personnel, and that the scope of THE AGENCY’s program with respect to those activities by such personnel shall be solely at THE AGENCY’s discretion, subject to appropriate limitations contained in the budget adopted by THE AGENCY, except that THE AGENCY understands and agrees that DEA funds and the result of expended funds (e.g. equipment, supplies and other resources) must be directly related to and must only be used for marijuana eradication program activities in a manner consistent with the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), 21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.

3. DEA will pay to THE AGENCY Federal funds in the amount of FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($40,000.00) for the period of JANUARY 1, 2016, to SEPTEMBER 30, 2016, to defray costs relating to the eradication and suppression of illicit cannabis. These Federal funds shall only be used for the eradication of illicit cannabis as provided in this agreement. THE AGENCY understands and agrees that Federal funds provided to THE AGENCY under this Agreement will not be used to defray costs relating to herbicidal eradication of illicit cannabis without the advance written consent of DEA. DCE/SP funding is provided for the storage, protection, and destruction of illicit cultivated marijuana. Funding is not provided nor expenditures allowed for the development of technology to assist with the identification of indoor and/or outdoor growing sites. Additionally funding and expenditures are not permitted for the eradication of “Ditch Weed”. THE AGENCY understands and agrees that Federal funds will not be used to perform any of the following functions: (i) issuing licenses, permits, or other forms of authorization permitting the holder to manufacture, distribute, sell, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (ii) conducting ancillary activities related to the issuance of such licenses and permits, such as background checks on applicants; (iii) collecting state or local tax or licensing revenue related to the manufacture, distribution, or sale of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (iv) preparing or issuing regulations governing the manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (v) monitoring compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (vi) the purchase of evidence and the purchase of information. The result of expended funds (e.g. equipment, supplies and other resources) must be directly related to and must only be used for marijuana eradication activities. While using the Federal funds provided to THE AGENCY under this Agreement for activities on Federal land, THE AGENCY agrees to notify the appropriate local office of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, (Forest Service) and the U.S. Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and/or Bureau of Reclamation) of THE AGENCY’s presence on Federal land.

4. The Federal funds provided to THE AGENCY are primarily intended for payment of deputies’/officers’ overtime while those deputies and officers are directly engaged in the illicit cannabis eradication process. (per DOJ policy, the annual maximum overtime reimbursement rate is based on the current year General Pay Scale / rest of the United States and cannot exceed 25% of a GS-12, Step 1; the funds shall only be used to pay the normal overtime rate, i.e. time and a half. The overtime reimbursement rate “shall not include any cost for benefits, such as retirement, FICA, or other expenses”, which is
specifically prohibited by DOJ) and for per diem and other direct costs related to the actual conduct of illicit cannabis eradication. Examples of such costs includes rental of aircraft, fuel for aircraft, and minor repairs and maintenance necessitated by use to support illicit cannabis eradication. These Federal funds are not intended as a primary source of funding for the purchase of equipment, supplies, or other resources. When Domestic Cannabis Eradication Suppression Program (DCE/SP) funds are used to purchase supplies, equipment, or other resources, those items must be directly related to and must only be used for marijuana eradication activities and may not be used to perform any of the following functions: (i) issuing licenses, permits, or other forms of authorization permitting the holder to manufacture, distribute, sell, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (ii) conducting ancillary activities related to the issuance of such licenses and permits, such as background checks on applicants; (iii) collecting state or local tax or licensing revenue related to the manufacture, distribution, or sale of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (iv) preparing or issuing regulations governing the manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (v) monitoring compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA. Under Section 524 (c) (1) (I)1 of title 28, United States Code, states that the Assets Forfeiture Fund may be used for payment of overtime salaries, travel, fuel, training, equipment, and other similar costs of State or local law enforcement officers that are incurred in a joint law enforcement operation with a Federal law enforcement agency participatiing in the Fund;” [Agency Initial________]  

All purchases of equipment, supplies and other resources must be requested in writing, through the respective DEA Division, to the Investigative Support Section (OMS). Requests must include manufacturer specifications and pricing of the item (including tax, if applicable) to be purchased. OMS will notify the state/local agency whether or not the purchase has been approved. [Agency Initial______]. Expenditures for equipment, supplies, and other resources should not exceed 10% of the total Federal funds awarded. Although equipment, supplies, and other resources may be specifically itemized in the Operation Plan, they are not automatically approved for purchase. All requests for purchases must be received in HQ/OMS by July 15th. Exemptions to any of these requirements must have prior HQ/OMS approval.

Per the DOJ, none of the funds allocated to you may be used to purchase promotional items, gifts, mementos, tokens of appreciation, or other similar items. Prohibited purchases include items justified as training aids if they are embossed, engraved or printed with THE AGENCY or program logos. Additionally, the use of DCE/SP funds for Demand Reduction expenses is no longer authorized.

5. In compliance with Section 623 of Public Law 102-141, THE AGENCY agrees that no amount of these funds shall be used to finance the acquisition of goods or services unless THE AGENCY:

(a) Specifies in any announcement of the awarding of the contract for the procurement of the goods and services involved the amount of Federal funds that will be used to finance the acquisition; and
(b) Expresses the amount announced pursuant to paragraph (a) as a percentage of the
(c) total cost of the planned acquisition.

The above requirements only apply to procurements for goods or services that have an aggregate value of $500,000 or more. Any goods or services acquired under this provision of the agreement must be directly related to and must only be used for marijuana eradication activities and may not be used to perform any of the following functions: (i) issuing licenses, permits, or other forms of authorization permitting the holder to manufacture, distribute, sell, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (ii) conducting ancillary activities related to the issuance of such licenses and permits, such as background checks on applicants; (iii) collecting state or local tax or licensing revenue related to the manufacture, distribution, or sale of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (iv) preparing or issuing regulations governing the manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (v) monitoring compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA.

6. If DEA approves the purchase of supplies (all tangible personal property other than “equipment” as defined by 28 C.F.R. § 66.32/66.33), and there is a residual inventory of unused supplies exceeding $5,000 in total aggregate fair market value upon termination or completion of this Agreement, and if the supplies are not needed for any other federally sponsored programs or projects, THE AGENCY shall compensate DEA for DEA’s share and in any case the supplies will not be used directly or indirectly to support any state, county or local entity that authorizes cultivating marijuana or has direct oversight or regulatory responsibilities for a state authorized marijuana program. THE AGENCY agrees that any unused supplies not exceeding $5,000 in total aggregate fair market value upon termination or completion of this Agreement will either be used for the marijuana eradication activities, returned to DEA, or destroyed, but in any case will not be used to perform any of the following functions: (i) issuing licenses, permits, or other forms of authorization permitting the holder to manufacture, distribute, sell, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (ii) conducting ancillary activities related to the issuance of such licenses and permits, such as background checks on applicants; (iii) collecting state or local tax or licensing revenue related to the manufacture, distribution, or sale of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (iv) preparing or issuing regulations governing the manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (v) monitoring compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA.

7. If DEA approves the purchase of equipment (tangible, non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit) for the use of THE AGENCY’s personnel engaged in illicit cannabis eradication under this Agreement, THE AGENCY will use, manage, and dispose of the equipment in accordance with 28 C.F.R. § 66.32/66.33, except that in no case, regardless of useful life and acquisition cost, will the equipment be used directly or indirectly to perform any of the following functions: (i) issuing licenses, permits, or other forms of authorization permitting the holder to manufacture, distribute, sell, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (ii) conducting ancillary activities related to the issuance of such licenses and permits, such as background checks on applicants; (iii) collecting state or local tax or licensing revenue related to the manufacture, distribution, or sale of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (iv) preparing or issuing regulations governing the manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (v) monitoring compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA.
manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (v) monitoring compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA.

8. Payment by DEA to **THE AGENCY** will be in accordance with a schedule determined by DEA and said payment will be made pursuant to the execution by **THE AGENCY** of a Request for Advance or Reimbursement (SF-270) and receipt of same by DEA. However, no funds will be paid by DEA to **THE AGENCY** under this Agreement until DEA has received to its satisfaction an accounting of the expenditures of all funds paid to **THE AGENCY** during the previous year Agreement. The final/closeout expenditure report will be documented on a Financial Status Report (SF-425) and July thru September (FINAL) Accounting Form.

9. It is understood and agreed by **THE AGENCY** that, in return for DEA’s payment to **THE AGENCY** for Federal funds, **THE AGENCY** will comply with all applicable Federal statutes, regulations, guidance, and orders, including previous OMB guidance under OMB Circular A-102 (Grants and Cooperative Agreements With State and Local Governments), OMB Circular A-87 (Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments), and OMB Circular A-133 (Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations), which have been combined in 2 CFR 200, effective December 26, 2014. In addition, 2 C.F.R. Part 2867 (Non-Procurement Debarment and Suspension), 28 C.F.R. Part 83 (Drug-Free Workplace Act common rule), 28 C.F.R. Part 69 (Byrd Anti-Lobbying Amendment common rule) specifically apply. (Note: The LOA is reimbursable agreement, not a grant; therefore for purposes of the DCE/SP, DEA requires an audit completed regardless of the threshold amount listed in 2 CFR 200. The DCE/SP does not have an assigned Catalog of Federal of Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number. Audits can be conducted and submitted accordingly to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse database, without a CFDA number. The auditor must enter the audit information in the Federal Audit Clearinghouse database. In conjunction with the beginning date of the award, the audit report period of **THE AGENCY** under the single audit requirement is 01/01/2016 through 09/30/2016.

10. **THE AGENCY** acknowledges that arrangements have been made for any required financial and compliance audits and audits will be made within the prescribed audit reporting cycle. **THE AGENCY** understands that failure to furnish an acceptable audit as determined by the cognizant Federal agency may be a basis for denial of future Federal funds and/or refunding of Federal funds and may be a basis for limiting **THE AGENCY** to payment by reimbursement on a cash basis. **THE AGENCY** further understands that its use of DEA funds or the result of expended DEA funds (e.g. equipment, supplies and other resources) for any use other than the marijuana eradication program activities, including but not limited to its use directly or indirectly to perform any of the following functions: (i) issuing licenses, permits, or other forms of authorization permitting the holder to manufacture, distribute, sell, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (ii) conducting ancillary activities related to the issuance of such licenses and permits, such as background checks on applicants; (iii) collecting state or local tax or licensing revenue related to the manufacture, distribution, or sale of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; (iv) preparing or issuing regulations governing the manufacture, distribution, sale, or possession of marijuana in contravention of the CSA; or (v) monitoring
compliance with state or local laws or regulations that permit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use marijuana in contravention of the CSA, will be a basis for denial of future Federal funds and/or refunding of Federal funds and may be a basis for limiting THE AGENCY to payment by reimbursements on a cash basis.

11. THE AGENCY shall maintain complete and accurate reports, records, and accounts of all obligations and expenditures of DEA funds under this Agreement in accordance with generally accepted government accounting principles and in accordance with state laws and procedures for expending and accounting for its own funds. THE AGENCY shall further maintain its records of all obligations and expenditures of DEA funds under this Agreement in accordance with all instructions provided by DEA to facilitate on-site inspection and auditing of such records and accounts.

12. THE AGENCY shall permit and have available for examination and auditing by DEA, the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office, and any of their duly authorized agents and representatives, any and all investigative reports, records, documents, accounts, invoices, receipts, and expenditures relating to this Agreement. In addition, THE AGENCY will maintain all such foregoing reports and records for three years after termination of this Agreement or until after all audits and examinations are completed and resolved, whichever is longer.

13. THE AGENCY agrees that an authorized officer or employee will execute and return to the DEA Regional Contractor, the LOA; Request for Advance or Reimbursement (SF-270); Electronic Funds Transfer Memorandum; Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension, & Other Responsibility Matters; Drug Free Workplace Requirements (OJP Form 406 1/6); and the Assurances (OJP Form 4000/3). THE AGENCY acknowledges that this Agreement will not take effect and that no Federal funds will be awarded by DEA until DEA receives the completed LOA package.

14. Employees of THE AGENCY shall at no time be considered employees of the U.S. Government or DEA for any purpose, nor will this Agreement establish an agency relationship between THE AGENCY and DEA.

15. THE AGENCY shall be responsible for the acts or omissions of THE AGENCY’s personnel. THE AGENCY and THE AGENCY’s employees shall not be considered as the agent of any other participating entity. Nothing herein is intended to waive or limit sovereign immunity under other federal or state statutory or constitutional authority. This Agreement creates no liability on the part of the DEA, its agents or employees, or the U.S. Government for any claims, demands, suits, liabilities, or causes of action of whatever kind and designation, and wherever located in the State of California resulting from the DCE/SP funded by DEA.

16. THE AGENCY shall comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, and all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the regulations of the U.S. Department of Justice implementing those laws, 28 C.F.R. Part 42, Subparts C, F, G, H, and I.
17. Within ten (10) days after termination of the Agreement, **THE AGENCY** will prepare an July thru September (FINAL) Accounting Form and a Financial Status Report SF-425, itemizing the breakdown of final expenditures. The July thru September (FINAL) Accounting Form and the SF-425, along with a refund check, payable to DEA funds not obligated or expended funds which were advanced by DEA pursuant to this Agreement, will be returned to the DEA Regional Contractor by October 14th.

18. Upon submission of the July thru September (FINAL) Accounting Form and Financial Status Report SF-425 to your regional contractor for the preceding year, a copy of the general ledger and the underlying supporting documentation reflecting the expenditures for equipment in excess of $2,500, that was previously approved by OMS, and the expenses associated with the rental or leasing of vehicles or aircraft must be attached.

19. The duration of this Agreement shall be as specified in Paragraph 3, except that this Agreement may be terminated by either party after 30 day written notice to the other party. All obligations that are outstanding on the above prescribed termination date or on the date of any thirty (30) day notice of termination shall be liquidated by **THE AGENCY** within sixty (60) days thereof, in which event DEA will only be liable for obligations incurred by **THE AGENCY** during the terms of this Agreement. In no event shall **THE AGENCY** incur any new obligations during the period of notice of termination. **THE AGENCY** shall return to DEA all unexpended funds forthwith after the sixty (60) day liquidation period. In the event that the agreement is terminated, any DEA funds that have been obligated or expended and the result of expended funds (e.g. equipment, supplies and other resources) will be used and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

20. **THE AGENCY** must be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) to receive payment of Federal funds. There are two steps to registering in SAM. First, **THE AGENCY** must have a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number. [A “+4 extension” to a DUNS number (DUNS+4) is required when there is a need for more than one bank/electronic funds transfer account for a location.] A DUNS number may be obtained via the internet (http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform) or by phone (U.S. and U.S. Virgin Islands: 1-866-705-5711; Alaska and Puerto Rico: 1-800-234-3867). Second, **THE AGENCY** must then register with SAM via the internet SAM www.sam.gov. Questions regarding the internet registration process may be directed to 1-866-606-8220 (follow the prompts for SAM). Both the DUNS number and registration in SAM are free of charge.

**Note:** It is **THE AGENCY**’s responsibility to update their SAM registration annually or whenever a change occurs.

**THE AGENCY**’s current DUNS No. is _______________________________________.

**THE AGENCY**’s opportunity to enter into this Agreement with DEA and to receive the Federal funds expires sixty days from date of issuance. Agreement issued on 03-01-2016. 
THE SONOMA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Printed Name:____________________________________
Signature:_______________________________________    (Blue Ink Only)
Title:_____________________________________________ Date:______________

Agency, please submit original signed LOA & associated paperwork to your DEA Regional Contractor.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Printed Name:____________________________________
Signature:_______________________________________    (Blue Ink Only)
Special Agent in Charge – San Francisco Field Division Date:______________
SAC, please submit original signed LOA & associated paperwork to your Fiscal Office.

DEA DIVISIONAL FISCAL CLERK MUST INPUT INTO UFMS & COMPLETE THE BOTTOM OF THIS SECTION

ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION/OBLIGATION NUMBER:

2016/S1R/OM/8210000/DOM-G2/01IB/DCE/OPS:________________________________________

UFMS Input Date:_____________    DNC No. ____________________________
DNO No. ________________________    DDP No. __________________________
Printed Name: ____________________    Signature:__________________________

Fiscal, please submit original signed LOA & associated paperwork to your DEA Regional Contractor.
County of Sonoma
Agenda Item Summary Report

Clerk of the Board
575 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To: Board of Supervisors

Board Agenda Date: April 5, 2016
Vote Requirement: Majority

Department or Agency Name(s): Transportation and Public Works

Staff Name and Phone Number: Susan Klassen, (707) 565-2231

Supervisory District(s): First, Second, and Fifth

Title: Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) System for the Annapolis, Guerneville, Roblar, and Sonoma Legacy Landfill Sites.

Recommended Actions:

Authorize the Chairman to execute an Agreement for Professional Services with SCS Engineers to design and install a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System ("SCADA") to automate the monitoring and management of the leachate collection systems at the County’s Annapolis, Guerneville, Roblar, and Sonoma legacy landfill sites in the amount of $175,108 and to provide five years of ongoing support in the amount of $14,029 per year, with a term of April 5, 2016 through June 30, 2021, for a total contract amount of $245,253.

Executive Summary:

Staff is recommending that the Board approve the Professional Service Agreement for Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System ("SCADA") for legacy landfill sites ("Agreement") be awarded to SCS Engineers in the total amount of $245,253. Through its proposal, SCS Engineers has demonstrated a level of capability and service that will allow it to perform the work in a manner meeting the County’s regulatory and budgetary needs. In addition, SCS Engineers is a local company that has over 10 years of field services experience at the County’s closed landfills.

Background:

Federal and State regulations require post-closure maintenance, monitoring, and reporting for closed landfills sites in order to safeguard the health and welfare of the public and to protect the environment. Although the County of Sonoma effectuated the Master Operations Agreement for all active disposal operations on April 1, 2015, the County is still responsible for required active monitoring and maintenance of remedial collection systems at the closed landfill sites. A key/primary function of the SCADA system will be to automate the monitoring and management of leachate collection systems at the outer sites. Integrated Waste Division (IWD) personnel currently perform this monitoring with one half time position, which requires driving to multiple locations in order to assure compliance and to effectively manage
leachate at each site. By automating these functions, leachate collection and management will be more efficient with associated cost benefits. At this time, tanker trucks are sent to pump leachate storage facilities/tanks without knowing if they have enough material/leachate to encompass a full trucking load. With the new SCADA system in place, trucks will only be sent to sites when a full load is available to be trucked, thereby lowering the average cost per gallon trucked to the treatment plant.

The Agreement with SCS Engineers will allow for the design and installation of a SCADA system to effectively monitor the leachate collection systems at the Annapolis, Guerneville, Roblar, and Sonoma closed landfill sites. In essence, this provides the ability to notify and dispatch vendors’ tanker trucks when storage tanks need to be pumped, and notify County Staff with real time system data when downed equipment needs service for events such as pump and power failures. In addition, SCS Engineers has committed to providing a five-year warranty and services of all hardware and software products, including web hosting for five years. SCS Engineers will provide full support with the Cloud SCADA system that includes timely software updates for application software, communications, and peripherals. Consultant staff will be available 24/7 and will respond to the County’s request for services within one (1) hour, and have appropriate staff on site within two (2) hours during normal business hours and within three (3) hours evenings, weekends and holidays. The SCADA system will be operational approximately 90 days after approval of the Agreement.

**Request for Proposals:** In late 2015 the County authored a Request for Proposals (RFP) to seek a design-build team that would facilitate the design and installation of a SCADA system to effectively monitor critical operations at specific closed landfill sites in the County. The RFP also required proposals to address all aspects of the County’s needs for a guaranteed five-year period.

The SCADA RFP was advertised on October 16, 2015 through December 17, 2015, using the County’s electronic web portal. One proposal was received from SCS Engineers. On December 21, 2015, the County was notified by SCS Engineers that an error was contained within the project bid. A replacement bid of $258,838 was submitted shortly thereafter. The County subsequently requested a line item bid to provide an optional LED Touch-to-Show-Data collection point at the Guerneville closed landfill and an option to install weather stations at all legacy landfill locations identified in the RFP, which brought the total bid with all optional equipment to $304,223.

Department staff performed a detailed analysis of the costs and corresponding technical proposal paying special attention to the personnel that would be performing the majority of the work for this project and reviewing references for other similar work performed by the Consultant. Based on this review, it was determined that SCS Engineers had the ability to perform the work and provide an overall product that would serve the County’s needs.

**Cost and Work Scope Negotiation:**

With the initial proposal in hand, the County entered into technical and cost discussions with SCS Engineers to modify its proposed work scope to minimize costs to the extent practical while at the same time receiving a SCADA system that met the County’s overall needs. On January 15, 2016, a revised scope with a final system price of $245,251 was negotiated with the following changes:

- **Cellular Data and Cloud Storage Costs** – The system specifications were modified to provide data every minute as opposed to every second in order to save money yet achieve effective
real time data.

- **HD wireless Video System** – The County elected not to utilize this option at this time, though the system remains capable to perform this feature in the future if desired.

- **Hardware Installation Costs** – SCS Engineers will utilize the County’s facilities specialist to help install the system, performing cross training on the operation at the same time, thereby reducing proposed labor costs.

- **Optional LED Touch to Show collection Point and Orion Weather Stations** – The County has reviewed these optional items as desirable to integrate into the SCADA system. In order to be cost effective, the County, in consultation with SCS Engineers, will complete the installation using existing IWD staff to install the weather stations.

**Prior Board Actions:**

None.

**Strategic Plan Alignment**

Goal 2: Economic and Environmental Stewardship

This agreement provides for an economic and environmentally sound method of collecting data and monitoring remote legacy landfill sites to ensure timely compliance with State and Federal laws and regulations.

### Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$ 189,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 189,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Fund Balance $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingencies $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 189,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td>$ 189,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):**

$75,850 is budgeted in the Former Rural Landfill fund for the equipment ($70,200) and licensing ($5,650) for the Annapolis and Guerneville closed landfills, which is funded from solid waste franchise fees. $113,750 for the equipment ($105,300) and licensing ($8,450) for the Roblar and Sonoma closed landfills is budgeted in the Former Urban Landfill fund, which is funded by concession fees collected under the Master Operations Agreement. The annual licensing expense will be budgeted in the future budget cycles for the remaining term of the Agreement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Staffing Impacts</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**


**Attachments:**

None.

**Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:**

Professional Service Agreement for Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (“SCADA”) for Legacy Landfill Sites.
## County of Sonoma
### Agenda Item
#### Summary Report

Clerk of the Board  
575 Administration Drive  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To: Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Agenda Date:</th>
<th>April 5, 2016</th>
<th>Vote Requirement:</th>
<th>Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Department or Agency Name(s):**  Transportation and Public Works – Airport Division

**Staff Name and Phone Number:**  
Susan Klassen  707-565-2231

**Supervisorial District(s):**  
All Districts

**Title:**  Website Design Agreement with Already Set Up, Inc.

**Recommended Actions:**

Approve and authorize Chair to execute an Agreement with Already Set Up, Inc. in the amount of $92,995 with a term ending December 31, 2019 for website design, hosting, maintenance and AdWord marketing for the Charles M. Schulz – Sonoma County Airport.

**Executive Summary:**

The Charles M. Schulz – Sonoma County Airport (Airport) is seeking to develop a website that is attractive, user friendly, engaging, intuitive, informative, accessible, and technologically advanced. The website will be used as a tool for passengers, neighbors, and pilots seeking information regarding air travel, car rentals, weather, hangar rentals, real estate development and business opportunities, airport project status, upcoming events, regulatory notices, and other airport activities.

In August, 2015 the Airport released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for website design, hosting, maintenance and AdWord marketing. The RFP was advertised on both the County Vendor Portal and the Airport website. The Airport received twelve (12) responses. The RFP required respondents to include their experience and strategy for meeting four (4) points: Meeting County website standards, including ADA requirements; creation of interactive websites which provides information, branding and marketing tools; cost and timeline; and meet or exceeding current technical standards for websites. After reviewing and rating the proposals, four (4) firms were invited to interview in October. Already Set Up, Inc. (ASU) was selected as best qualified to meet the website needs of the Airport. ASU is a local firm with expertise in website design and internet marketing strategies.

The newly designed website will be the new “face” of the Airport allowing for easier access to Airport information, implementation of functional mobile device presence, and enhanced marketing tools. Design and implementation of the new site is anticipated to take three to five months to complete.
Funding for the agreement is available within the Airport Enterprise Fund. The Information Systems Department has reviewed and consulted with the division to write the RFQ and Counsel has reviewed the agreement.

**Prior Board Actions:**
11/10/09: Board approved agreement with Nu-Designs Web Marketing, LLC for website design and web marketing.

**Strategic Plan Alignment**
Goal 3: Invest in the Future

The agreement meets the Strategic Plan goal of investing in the future by enabling the Airport to use the internet to effectively disburse information regarding the Airport, as well as, to market the services available at the Airport.

**Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$ 62,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 62,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):**

Funding for the agreement is available within the Airport Enterprise Fund. Funding for future years’ ($15,040 in FY16-17 and $15,040 in FY17-18) will be included within the respective annual budget requests.

**Staffing Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**

None.

**Attachments:**

None.

Revision No. 20151201-1
### Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:

- Agreement.
### Executive Summary:

Your Board is requested to approve the appointment of Richard Savel and the reappointment of George Johnston to serve as Commissioners representing the County of Sonoma on the Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission to a four-year term ending May 31, 2020.

### Background

The Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) consists of seven members as follows: two representing the County of Sonoma, two representing the cities in the county, two appointed by the public airport managers in the county, and one representing the general public appointed by the other six commissioners. Each commissioner’s term is four-years at which point they should be re-appointed or replaced. Commissioners volunteer their time and are not compensated.

The ALUC has the following powers and duties:

1. Assist local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of airports;
2. Provide for the orderly development of air transportation while protecting the public health, safety, and welfare;
3. Prepare and adopt a comprehensive airport land use plan; and
4. Review the plans and actions of local agencies and airport operators.

A Notice and Press Release announcing the vacancy and inviting interested parties to apply was initially issued on October 13, 2015 and the application period was extended to March 1, 2016.
Prior Board Actions:
Resolution 10-0320 – Appointment of George Johnston to the Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission

Strategic Plan Alignment: Goal 4: Civic Services and Engagement

Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Req'd.</td>
<td>State/Federal $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees/Other $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Fund Balance $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingencies $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

Attachments:
None.

Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:
None.
**Board Agenda Date:** April 5, 2016  
**Vote Requirement:** Majority

**Department or Agency Name(s):** Board of Supervisors

**Staff Name and Phone Number:** Supervisor Efren Carrillo 565-2241  
**Supervisiorial District(s):** Fifth District

**Title:** Gold Resolution

**Recommended Actions:**
Adopt a Resolution recognizing AmeriCorps and Senior Corps volunteers and proclaiming April 5, 2016 as County Day of Recognition for National Service. (Countywide)

**Executive Summary:**
On April 5, 2016, mayors, tribal leaders, and county executives from across the country will highlight the impact of AmeriCorps and Senior Corps and thank all those who volunteer on the [Fourth Annual County Day of Recognition for National Service](https://www.loveyourcommunity.org/).

**Prior Board Actions:**
Approved a Gold Resolution for this on April 7, 2015.

**Strategic Plan Alignment**  
Goal 4: Civic Services and Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):


### Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

None.

### Attachments:

Resolution.

### Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:

None.
Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Of The County Of Sonoma, State Of California,
Do Hereby Proclaim April 5, 2016, As National Service Recognition Day

WHEREAS, service to others is a hallmark of the American character, and central to how we meet our challenges; and

WHEREAS, the nation’s counties are increasingly turning to national service and volunteerism as a cost-effective strategy to meet county needs; and

WHEREAS, AmeriCorps and Senior Corps participants address the most pressing challenges facing our communities, from educating students for the jobs of the 21st century and supporting veterans and military families to providing health services and helping communities recover from natural disasters; and

WHEREAS, national service expands economic opportunity by creating more sustainable, resilient communities and providing education, career skills, and leadership abilities for those who serve; and

WHEREAS, AmeriCorps and Senior Corps participants serve in more than 50,000 locations across the country, bolstering the civic, neighborhood, and faith-based organizations that are so vital to our economic and social well-being; and

WHEREAS, national service participants increase the impact of the organizations they serve, both through their direct service and by managing millions of additional volunteers; and

WHEREAS, national service represents a unique public-private partnership that invests in community solutions and leverages non-federal resources to strengthen community impact and increase the return on taxpayer dollars; and

WHEREAS, the Corporation for National and Community Service shares a priority with county executives nationwide to engage citizens, improve lives, and strengthen communities; and is joining with the National Association of Counties and county executives across the country for the County Day of Recognition for National Service on April 5, 2016; and

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors do hereby proclaim April 5, 2016, as National Service Recognition Day, and encourage residents to recognize the positive impact
of national service in our county; to thank those who serve; and to find ways to give back to their communities.

**Supervisors:**

Gorin: Rabbitt: Zane: Gore: Carrillo:

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

So Ordered.
To: Board of Supervisors

Board Agenda Date: April 5, 2016
Vote Requirement: No Vote Required

Department or Agency Name(s): Board of Supervisors

Staff Name and Phone Number: Supervisor Susan Gorin, 707/565-2241

Supervisory District(s): First

Title: Gold Resolution

Recommended Actions:
Adopt a Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Honoring the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Programs at Sonoma Developmental Center as part of the Day of Recognition for National Service, April 5th, 2016

Executive Summary:

Prior Board Actions:

Strategic Plan Alignment: Not Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revision No. 20131002-1
### Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staffing Impacts

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**

**Attachments:**

**Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:**
Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Of The County Of Sonoma, State Of California, Honoring the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Programs at Sonoma Developmental Center as part of the Day of Recognition for National Service, April 5th, 2016

Whereas, the Board of Supervisors is honored to celebrate those who graciously serve at the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Program at Sonoma Developmental Center. The volunteers provide invaluable service to the men and women at Sonoma Developmental Center; and

Whereas, The Foster Grandparent program came to Sonoma Developmental Center in 1972 and six years later, the Senior Companions component was added. Both programs have provided valuable assistance to both children and adults with exceptional physical and intellectual disabilities for over 44 years; and

Whereas, Foster Grandparents specifically provides mentoring and coaching in an academic setting to students with exceptional and intellectual disabilities under the age of 23 years; and

Whereas, Senior Companions provide friendship and companionship, along with life experiences to adults with intellectual disabilities; and

Whereas, Through the National Senior Service Corporation, Senior Volunteer Assignments are designed to ensure that priority community needs are addressed while the lives of volunteers are enriched. The unique program matches low-income persons aged 55 and over to remain physically and mentally active and to enhance their self-esteem through continued participation in community service. Volunteers receive a modest daily stipend, meal and assistance with transportation for the days they serve; and

Whereas, Today, The Sonoma Developmental Center has 66 Volunteers with ages ranging from 55-94 years of age. There are 128 residents who receive volunteer services from the Foster Grandparent/Senior Companion program. Some of our volunteers have served residents at Sonoma Developmental Center for over 20 years; and

Whereas, At the close of last Fiscal Year (June 2014-July 2015) Volunteers through both programs had provided over 61,831 service hours to the residents at Sonoma Developmental Center and children attending special education programs through the Sonoma County Office of Education; and

Whereas, as noted by Quaker Missionary, Etienne de Grellet: “I shall pass through this world but once. Any good thing therefore that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer it or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again.”
community is grateful for the important contributions of the Grandparents and Senior Companion volunteers to care for and comfort our most vulnerable citizens.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Honors the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Programs at Sonoma Developmental Center as part of the Day of Recognition for National Service, April 5th, 2016

Supervisors:

Gorin: Zane: Gore: Carrillo: Rabbitt:

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

So Ordered.
Title: Gold Resolution

Recommended Actions:

Adopt a Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Of The County Of Sonoma, State Of California, proclaiming April 27, 2016 as Sonoma County World Hunger Awareness Day

Executive Summary:

Prior Board Actions:

Strategic Plan Alignment: Not Applicable

Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Req'd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):


### Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):


### Attachments:


### Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:
Resolution Of The Board Of Supervisors Of The County Of Sonoma, State Of California, Declaring April 27, 2016 as Sonoma County World Hunger Awareness Day

Whereas, the mission of End World Hunger is to educate and inspire people of conscience to act toward ending world hunger; and,

Whereas, EWH’s vision is to create a change in people’s attitudes about giving to create a world without hunger by 2030; and,

Whereas, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals cite the year 2030 as a realistic goal to end world hunger if we work together; and,

Whereas, this planet’s population needs to eat to live productively and all people in the world deserve to have access to food; and,

Whereas, Sonoma County recognizes the important role education plays in raising awareness and inspiring people to act to consciously end world hunger

Whereas, End World Hunger has researched and supports highly effective NGOs who are successfully combating hunger; and,

Whereas Sonoma County Restaurants are supporting End World Hunger Day on April 27th by donating a portions of revenue to EWH; and,

Whereas, End World Hunger is passing through 100% of those donations directly to its partner organizations in the field; and,

Whereas, End World Hunger asks Sonoma County Board of Supervisors to endorse this CALL TO ACTION to dine at participating restaurants on 4/27/16, Sonoma County World Hunger Awareness Day;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors declares April 27, 2016 as Sonoma County World Hunger Awareness Day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gorin:</th>
<th>Zane:</th>
<th>Gore:</th>
<th>Carrillo:</th>
<th>Rabbitt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So Ordered.
Clerk of the Board
575 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To: Board of Supervisors

Board Agenda Date: April 5, 2016

Vote Requirement: Majority

Department or Agency Name(s): County Administrator

Staff Name and Phone Number: Veronica Ferguson - (707) 565-2431

Supervisory District(s): All

Title: Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector Interview and Appointment

Recommended Actions:

Interview and Appoint Donna Dunk as Auditor-Controller Treasurer-Tax Collector effective April 5, 2016 through January 7, 2019 to complete the unexpired term of David Sundstrom.

Executive Summary:

The Auditor-Controller Treasurer-Tax Collector (ACTTC) position is currently vacant as a result of the retirement of David Sundstrom effective date of March 30, 2016, prior to the completion of his term.

County Counsel affirms that California Government Code (section 25304) requires the Board of Supervisors to fill by appointment, all vacancies that occur in any elective county office. Pursuant to State Statute, the Board is required to interview and to make the appointment of a successor in a public meeting of the Board. Pending such appointment, per California Government Code Section 24105, the chief deputy, assistant or deputy of the vacant officer next in authority to such officer may temporarily discharge all duties of the office until the vacancy in the office is filled in a manner provided by law. Donna Dunk, Assistant Auditor-Controller has been discharging all duties of the ACTTC since Mr. Sundstrom’s retirement.

This report recommends the interview and appointment of Donna Dunk, Assistant Auditor-Controller to fill the vacancy through the expiration of the Mr. Sundstrom’s term, and provides an alternative approach to filling the vacancy.

Background

David Sundstrom was appointed to the post of Sonoma County Auditor-Controller Treasurer-Tax Collector (ACTTC) on December 12, 2011 to complete the unexpired term of Rod Dole. Mr. Sundstrom was subsequently elected to the office in June 2014 for a term of 4 years which expires on January 7, 2019.
During the period between Mr. Dole’s retirement and the appointment of Mr. Sundstrom from June 2011 – January 2012, Ms. Dunk served as Interim ACTTC and ranked a strong second behind Mr. Sundstrom in the extensive recruitment process that was undertaken at that time.

**Qualifications for an Appointee**

The appointee must reside in California and be registered to vote in Sonoma County by the date of appointment (California Government Code Section 1020). In addition, the Board has determined that the individual must meet the statutory requirements for both the office of Auditor and Treasurer (Sonoma County Code Sec. 2.33.14) which are detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications for an Appointee in Sonoma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any appointee for <strong>County Auditor</strong> must meet <em>at least one</em> of the following requirements (California Government Code Section 26945):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess valid California certification as a certified public accountant (CPA); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess B.A. in accounting or its equivalent and served within the last five years in a senior fiscal management position in a public agency, private firm, or non-profit, for a continuous period of at least three years; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess valid certification as a designated professional internal auditor with a minimum of 16 semester units in accounting, auditing or finance; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have served as county auditor, chief deputy county auditor or chief assistant county auditor for a continuous period of at least three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donna Dunk’s Qualifications:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed CPA. License #57156E since 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Management with an emphasis in Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has served as the Assistant Auditor-Controller for 12 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AND**

| Any appointee for **Treasurer Tax-Collector** must meet *at least one* of the following requirements (California Government Code Section 27000.7): |
| Have served in a senior financial management position in a county, city, or other public agency dealing with similar financial responsibilities for a continuous period of at least three years, in the role of treasurer, tax collector, auditor, auditor-controller, or the chief deputy or assistant of these offices; or |
| Possess B.A., M.A, or Ph.D. in business administration, public administration, economics, finance, accounting or a related field; or |
| Possess valid California certification as a certified public accountant (CPA); or |
| Possess valid certification as a Chartered Financial Analyst; or |
| Possess valid certification as a Certified Cash Manager. |
| **Donna Dunk’s Qualifications:** |
| Has served as the Assistant Auditor-Controller for 12 years |
| B.A. in Management with an emphasis in Accounting |
| Licensed CPA. License #57156E since 1990 |
Recommendation

Staff recommends the Board interview and appoint Donna Dunk as Auditor-Controller Treasurer-Tax Collector effective April 5, 2016 through January 7, 2019. In addition to far exceeding the minimum qualifications for both Auditor and Treasurer-Tax Collector, as shown in the table above, Ms. Dunk has served as the County’s Auditor-Controller Treasurer-Tax Collector on an interim basis from June 2011 – January 2012. Ms. Dunk has worked in the ACTTC’s Office for over 30 years. Her appointment would provide long tenured leadership, experience and knowledge of the Department, as well as stability in the oversight of the County’s finances.

As required by statute, Ms. Dunk is attending today’s meeting and is prepared to be interviewed by the Board and to discuss her possible appointment.

Alternative for Filling the Current Vacancy

The alternative to the immediate appointment of Ms. Dunk, is for the Board to direct staff to initiate a recruitment. To do this, the Board would publicly announce the vacant office and directs staff to solicit applications/resumes and to review submissions for statutorily determined minimum qualifications and other criteria established by the Board. The most highly qualified candidates would be presented to the Board for consideration. The Board would then have the option to interview any/all candidates on the regular calendar of a publicly noticed board meeting, and appoint the chosen candidate as ACTTC at that same, or a later publicly noticed board meeting.

Prior Board Actions:

June 7, 2011 – Appointed Interim Auditor-Controller Donna Dunk to assume duties of the ACTTC on an interim basis
Dec 12, 2011 – Appointed David Sundstrom to the Unexpired Term of Rod Dole

Strategic Plan Alignment

Goal 4: Civic Services and Engagement

This appointment will provide fiscally responsible, professional management of the County’s fiscal operations.

Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Req'd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):
There is no fiscal impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Title</strong> (Payroll Classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

Attachments:
Attachment A: Donna Dunk’s Resume
Attachment B: Summary of Qualifications for Auditor/Controller and Treasurer/Tax Collector Positions

Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:
DONNA DUNK  
SONOMA COUNTY ASSISTANT-AUDITOR-CONTROLLER  
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT

QUALIFICATIONS

COUNTY of SONOMA EXPERTISE
- Thirty plus years serving the citizens of Sonoma County holding positions ranging from Accountant I/II to Interim Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector
- Extensive and Complex Financial Investment management experience
- Thorough knowledge of governmental accounting standards and practices
- Significant treasury experience
- Thorough knowledge of financial reporting and reimbursement claiming requirements imposed on local governments in California
- Thorough knowledge of the Revenue and Taxation Codes as it relates to the collection and allocation of local property taxes in California
- Experience with all types of Governmental Funds including enterprise funds and special districts

EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
- Certified Public Accountant – Since September 1990
- Bachelor of Arts in Management/Accounting Emphasis – Sonoma State University, 1982 Graduate
- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants – Member since 1991
- California Society of Certified Public Accountants – Member since 1991

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Interim Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector 6-1-11 – 1/31/12

County of Sonoma
- Ultimate responsibility for all 10 divisions within the Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector’s (ACTTC) Department representing a total budget of $150 million dollars and 92 staff members.
  - In my capacity as Interim Sonoma County Auditor-Controller
  - In my capacity as Interim Sonoma County Treasurer
    - Responsibility for County’s $1.6 billion Pooled Investments
    - Annual issuance and sale of Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes
    - Debt Advisory Committee Chair
    - Treasury Oversight Committee Member
    - President, Sonoma County Tobacco Securitization Corporation
    - Program Administrator of the $340 million County-wide Deferred Compensation Program
  - In my capacity as Interim Sonoma County Tax Collector
    - Responsibility for $978 million in annual Property Tax Collection and apportionment to all taxing jurisdictions
    - Administrator of the $49 million Sonoma County Energy Independence Program
    - Ex-officio Board member of the $2.5 billion Sonoma County Employees Retirement Association (SCERA)
    - SCERA Investment Committee Member
    - SCERA Audit Committee Member
Assistant Auditor-Controller  
**County of Sonoma**  
2004-Present  
- Team Leader in the 2006 consolidation of the Auditor-Controller and Treasurer-Tax Collector’s Departments.  
- Manage five divisions within the Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector’s (ACTTC) Department including the Payroll Division, Accounting Division, Client Accounting Division, the Enterprise Financial System (EFS) Division, and the Property Tax Accounting Division. Managed the Internal Audit Division from 2004 until 2012 when the division was reassigned to the elected Auditor-Controller-Treasurer Tax Collector to enhance independence.  
- As a member of the management team, participate in strategic planning, budget planning, departmental goal setting, and day to day departmental decision making activities.  
- Support the Department Head in managing the day to day activities of the ACTTC Department.  
- Support all County departments by providing accounting expertise along with establishing Countywide accounting policies.  
- Interpret and implement all new Governmental Accounting Standards Pronouncements.  
- Project Manager in the implementation of the County-Wide Kronos time keeping system implementation.  
- Executive Committee member for the County-Wide Enterprise Financial System (EFS) and Human Resources Management System (HRMS) implementations.  
- Immediate Past Chairperson for the statewide Policy & Interpretations subcommittee of the State Association of County Auditors.

Accounting Manager  
**County of Sonoma**  
1993-2004  
- Managed the Client Accounting Division which provides contract accounting services to a variety of clients such as county departments, special districts, and others as requested on a cost reimbursement basis.  
- The division is completely funded by fees charged to clients for services rendered.  
- Directed a staff of 19 professionals. Made staffing and hiring decisions and prepared performance evaluations.  
- Negotiated contracts for services with clients.  
- Prepared the budget for the division.  
- Read and interpreted new Governmental Accounting Standards for impact on clients and their financial reporting.  
- Read and interpreted new legislation, including property tax legislation, for impact on clients.
Auditor I/II

County of Sonoma

• Performed dozens of audits annually on special districts under local boards, county enterprise and special revenue funds. The audits were performed in accordance with auditing standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.
• Developed recommendations on internal controls and financial reporting for clients and received and reviewed management responses to findings and recommendations.
• Participated in the Request for Proposal for the countywide audit.
• Mentored several other auditors who were in the process of obtaining their Certified Public Accountant license.

Accountant I/II

County of Sonoma

• Prepared Financial Statements, budgets and State Reports for the Road Department, the Refuse Enterprise Fund, the Airport Enterprise Fund and the Sanitation Districts.

VOLUNTEER WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Tobacco Securitization Authority</td>
<td>Board Member and Chairperson</td>
<td>2011-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Tobacco Securitization Corporation</td>
<td>Board Member and Chairperson</td>
<td>2011-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Association of County Auditor-Controllers</td>
<td>Chairperson of the Policy &amp; Interpretation Committee</td>
<td>2011-Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR AUDITOR/CONTROLLER AND TREASURER/TAX COLLECTOR POSITIONS

NOTE:
FOR MOST COUNTIES, THE STATE REQUIRES CANDIDATES FOR CONSOLIDATED POSITIONS MEET EITHER BUT NOT BOTH OF THE QUALIFICATIONS BELOW. SONOMA COUNTY REQUIRES THE AUDITOR/CONTROLLER/TREASURER/TAX COLLECTOR TO MEET BOTH SETS OF REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Code section 26945 (Auditor qualifications)</th>
<th>Government Code section 27000.7 (Treasurer qualifications)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must meet at least ONE of the following:</td>
<td>Must meet at least ONE of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA or public accountant certificate</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in accounting or equivalent AND has served in senior fiscal management position with last 5 years for not less than 3 years</td>
<td>Baccalaureate, masters, or doctoral degree in business administration, public administration, economics, finance, accounting, or a related field, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served as county auditor, chief deputy county auditor, or chief assistant county auditor for a continuous period of not less than three years</td>
<td>Held senior financial management position in a county, city, or other public agency dealing with similar financial responsibilities for a continuous period of not less than 3 years, including, but not limited to, treasurer, tax collector, auditor, auditor-controller, or the chief deputy or an assistant in those offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor with minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance</td>
<td>Chartered Financial Analyst, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certified Cash Manager, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full Statutory Text:

26945. No person shall hereafter be elected or appointed to the office of county auditor of any county unless the person meets at least one of the following criteria:
   (a) The person possesses a valid certificate issued by the California Board of Accountancy under Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 5000) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code showing the person to be, and a permit authorizing the person to practice as, a certified public accountant or as a public accountant.
   (b) The person possesses a baccalaureate degree from an accredited university, college, or other four-year institution, with a major in accounting or its equivalent, as described in subdivision (a) of Section 5081.1 of the Business and Professions Code, and has served within the last five years in a senior fiscal management position in a county, city, or other public agency, a private firm, or a nonprofit organization, dealing with similar fiscal responsibilities, for a continuous period of not less than three years.
   (c) The person possesses a certificate issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors showing the person to be a designated professional internal auditor, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance.
   (d) The person has served as county auditor, chief deputy county auditor, or chief assistant county auditor for a continuous period of not less than three years.

27000.7. (a) No person shall be eligible for election or appointment to the office of county treasurer, county tax collector, or county treasurer-tax collector of any county unless that person meets at least one of the following criteria:
   (1) The person has served in a senior financial management position in a county, city, or other public agency dealing with similar financial responsibilities for a continuous period of not less than three years, including, but not limited to, treasurer, tax collector, auditor, auditor-controller, or the chief deputy or an assistant in those offices.
   (2) The person possesses a valid baccalaureate, masters, or doctoral degree from an accredited college or university in any of the following major fields of study: business administration, public administration, economics, finance, accounting, or a related field, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance.
   (3) The person possesses a valid certificate issued by the California Board of Accountancy pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 5000) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code, showing that person to be, and a permit authorizing that person to practice as, a certified public accountant.
   (4) The person possesses a valid charter issued by the Institute of Chartered Financial Analysts showing the person to be designated a Chartered Financial Analyst, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance.
   (5) The person possesses a valid certificate issued by the Treasury Management Association showing the person to be designated a Certified Cash Manager, with a minimum of 16 college semester units, or their equivalent, in accounting, auditing, or finance.
### County of Sonoma

**Agenda Item**

**Summary Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerk of the Board</th>
<th>575 Administration Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA 95403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To:** Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

**Board Agenda Date:** April 5, 2016

**Vote Requirement:** Majority

**Department or Agency Name(s):** Dept of Health Services and Human Services Dept

**Staff Name and Phone Number:**

- Health Services: Stephan Betz, 565-4418
- Human Services: Diane Kaljian, 565-5950

**Supervisory District(s):** All

**Title:** Aging Together Sonoma County Update

Board Approval Request to Join the World Health Organization’s Age-Friendly City and Community Network and Funding Request

**Recommended Actions:**

1. Accept an update from the *Aging Together Sonoma County* initiative
2. Approve submission of an application to join the World Health Organization’s Age-Friendly City and Community Network.
3. Allocate $10,000 in General Funds for FY 15-16 and $50,000 per year for a four-year period effective FY 16-17 to support the initiative. Matching federal funds will be used to increase the total funding amount.

**Executive Summary:**

The *Aging Together Sonoma County* initiative envisions Sonoma County as a healthy place to live, work and play; a place that supports all people to thrive across their lifespan and achieve their life potential. The *Aging Together* initiative was developed through successful participation in a grant from the Centers for Disease Control funded National Leadership Academy for the Public’s Health. The grant extended from January through December 2014.

In 2015, Aging Together accomplished the following:

1. Launched the *Aging Together* initiative with a kickoff event, “Community Connections Across Generations,” at Sonoma State University on May 20, 2015. The event was attended by more than 200 older adults and members of collaborative organizations. The keynote speaker was Roz Chast, a *New Yorker* cartoonist and award-winning author of the bestselling book about aging and caregiving *Can’t We Talk About Something More Pleasant?* The event also included presentations by local leaders in government, higher education, health care and human services. Additionally, breakout sessions on intergenerational storytelling, aging with vitality and optimal physical health, as well as information tables on healthy aging resources were included.
2. Hosted a second event, “Healthy Brain – Healthy Aging,” on December 10, 2015, at the Finley Community
Center-Person Senior Wing. More than 80 older adults and members of collaborative organizations attended this workshop. Local experts, Geriatric Neuropsychologist Nancy Hoffman, PhD, and Lucy Andrews, RN, DNP(c), identified indicators of dementia and tools and strategies to maintain a healthy brain throughout the aging process.

3. Met with potential grantors to discuss private funding and in-kind donations.

4. Gave 10 media interviews/presentations to community and business groups, including KRSO, Windsor Senior Center, Friends of Burbank Heights and Orchards senior housing in Sebastopol, North Bay Leadership Council and Leadership Santa Rosa about Aging Together’s vision, goals and framework for action. Presentations about the project were also made at the National Association of Counties (NACO) conference and the California Welfare Directors of California (CWDA) conference.

5. Identified the World Health Organization’s (WHO’s) Network of Age-Friendly City and Communities as consistent with Aging Together’s vision and goals. Membership in WHO’s Age-Friendly network will demonstrate the County commitment to making Sonoma County a “livable community” for older adults and provide leadership for local cities to be designated as an Age-Friendly City.

6. Researched the requirements for the County of Sonoma to apply for membership in WHO’s Age-Friendly City and Community network and prepared a letter of support for Board approval.

**WHO Age-Friendly Communities**

Aging Together staff have consulted and visited nearby counties about their Age Friendly Communities initiatives. Marin, Santa Clara and San Francisco all have established initiatives to increase the local focus on the needs of older adults and increasing older adults involvement in local communities. Age-Friendly Communities is a key strategy supported by the World Health Organization to facilitate the inclusion of older persons to make our world more age-friendly. The majority of older people live in their homes and communities, in environments that have not been designed with their needs and capacities in mind.

In Sonoma County:

- More than 23% of residents are age 60 and older.
- 29% of seniors are age 75 and older.
- Seniors age 85 and older number more than 10,400.
- A lack of safe, affordable and accessible housing and transportation make it difficult for many older adults to remain independent and “age in place.”
- Many seniors experience a lack of mental and social stimulation after leaving the workforce, placing them at risk for depression and cognitive decline.
- Fragmented health and community systems leave some older adults vulnerable to neglect and isolation.

Older people everywhere face increasing challenges due to the sensory and other changes that age brings. To support governments in developing and strengthening health and social policies in an aging world, WHO maintains a policy framework on “active aging” defined as “optimizing opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age.” The active aging approach is grounded in the UN-Recognized principles of independence, participation, dignity, care and self-fulfillment. In practical terms, age-friendly cities and communities adapt structures and services to be accessible to and inclusive of older people with varying needs and capacities. Age-friendly service providers, public officials, community leaders, faith leaders and business people:

- Recognize the great diversity among older persons
- Promote their inclusion and contribution in all areas of community life
- Respect their decision and lifestyle choices
- Anticipate and respond feasibly to aging-related needs and preferences
- 

If approved by the Board to pursue membership in WHO’s Network of Age-Friendly City and Communities, the
County of Sonoma will be designated an Age-Friendly Community. This designation will support current efforts to strengthen the systems, structures and planning for seniors. A benefit of membership includes the network of resources and guidance on best practices of other member cities and communities. There is no charge for membership. Memberships is a five-year commitment.

The requirements include:

1. Establishment of mechanisms to involve older people throughout the Age-Friendly Cities and Communities four-step cycle including establishing a steering committee and work groups to mobilize volunteers in the planning and execution of the baseline assessment, communitywide plan and monitoring.
2. Development of a baseline assessment of the age-friendliness of the community
3. Development of a three-year communitywide plan based on the findings of the assessment
4. Identification of indicators to monitor progress against this plan

Aging Together will serve as a resource for cities in Sonoma County to exchange information and strategies for developing their own applications and fulfilling the membership requirements. At the conclusion of the project, Sonoma County and the cities will have fully assessed community needs and implemented strategies to assist seniors to age independently in their homes and communities. Seniors will be vibrantly involved in civic engagement addressing issues of housing, transportation, health, learning, employment and community based services that integrate concern for senior independence and support.

Funding request:

The Human Services Department provides staff support and resources to the Aging Together Sonoma County initiative. The Department of Health Services remains an active partner in this collaborative work and will continue to provide staff support as available.

In order for Aging Together to complete the WHO Age-Friendly Communities requirements, $50,000 in County general funds are requested each year. Human Services will leverage this funding with federal funds and private donations to total $100,000 annually. Funding is requested annually for the five year commitment. The total request is $210,000 over 5 years (FY 15-16 through FY 19-20). The current year (FY15-16) request is $10,000. Human Services will contract with a local service provider for the Age Friendly communities project.

Human Services will conduct a competitive bid process to award the contract for the Age Friendly communities requirements listed above. The contract will include hiring an Age-Friendly Communities coordinator. Contract requirements will also include the development and administration of the required baseline community assessment and the broad outreach elements of the WHO Age-Friendly communities framework. The AFC coordinator will establish a steering committee and workgroups as well as recruit volunteers to assist in the planning and assessment effort. The responsibilities also include development of indicators that will inform the 3-year AFC plan and monitor the progress. Community wide outreach efforts will include liaison to each Sonoma County city to inform them about the Age-Friendly requirements and develop support for for adoption of the initiative by city government. The AFC Coordinator will establish a website and media campaign that will insure a two-way flow of information about the initiative.

If these requests are approved, the Departments will return annually to provide an update on Aging Together and the Age-Friendly Community initiative.

Aging Together’s Leadership Committee completed the National Leadership Academy for the Public’s Health (NLAPH) grant project by developing a framework for action for the Aging Together initiative. Sonoma County was one of 29 community health project teams selected to participate in NLAPH’s annual leadership academy in 2014, funded by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Aging Together’s Leadership Committee (in
alphabetical order) includes: Ellen Bauer, Sonoma County Public Health Division Director; Oscar Chavez, Assistant Director of Sonoma County Human Services; Diane Kaljian, Sonoma County Adult and Aging Services Division Director; Marrianne McBride, President and CEO of Council on Aging; and Shirlee Zane, Sonoma County Third District Supervisor.

Prior Board Actions:

January 27, 2015: Accepted an update from Aging Together Sonoma County.

Strategic Plan Alignment

Goal 1: Safe, Healthy, and Caring Community

Promotes healthy aging within the community, enabling seniors to live safely and independently at home. The community benefits from older adults’ knowledge, experience, and participation.

Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

The total funding request for FY 15-16 is $20,000. $10,000 from General Fund will match $10,000 in federal funding from IHSS and APS funding streams. Beginning in FY 16-17, $50,000 per year from General Fund will draw down an equal match from IHSS and APS funding streams. Total funding through FY 19-20 will be $420,000. There are no costs associated with the WHO application.

Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

None

Attachments:

Letter of Support from the Board Chair Efren Carrillo

Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:

None

Revision No. 20151201-1
April 5, 2016

FCH/ACL
Main Building – World Health Organization
Avenue Appia 20
1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland

Dear WHO Global Network of Age-Friendly City and Communities Administrators,

On behalf of the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, I am submitting this letter to express the Board’s interest in having Sonoma County join the worldwide WHO Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities. We applaud WHO for forming this association to help address the challenges and opportunities that aging populations around the globe present to local cities and communities and to thus improve livability for older adults.

In Sonoma County more than 23% of residents are age 60 years and older. Our Board is committed to providing the necessary structures and systems to ensure older adults enjoy a high quality of life. Helping older adults helps our entire community flourish.

WHO’s Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities’ eight domains and policy framework on “active aging” align with the visions and goals of an established local initiative: Aging Together Sonoma County. This initiative provides a solid foundation on which Age-Friendly Sonoma County will build upon and leverage work that has already been done to help older people age actively in the county.

Aging Together envisions Sonoma County as a healthy place to live, work and play; a place that supports all people to thrive across the lifespan and achieve their life potential. In a collective impact model, the County of Sonoma provides the backbone for the initiative and will do the same for Age-Friendly Sonoma County.

The Aging Together Leadership Committee will lead the Sonoma County Age-Friendly Community assessment, action plan, measurement and reporting. This committee has already shown impressive determination and accomplishments in coalescing individuals and organizations around improving the quality of life for all older residents. In addition, this team will serve as leaders for cities throughout Sonoma County in applying for and fulfilling the requirements of membership.

Thank you very much from the entire Board for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Efren Carrillo
Chair
Aging Together vision

Sonoma County is a healthy place to live, work and play... a place that supports all people to thrive across the lifespan and achieve their life potential...

All individuals and families, including older adults, have the opportunity to be connected to community life, have access to resources and support they need to thrive and achieve their life potential.
2015 Accomplishments

- Hosted two events:
  - Community Connections Across Generations, 5/15
  - Healthy Brain – Healthy Aging, 12/15
2015 Accomplishments cont’d.

• Conducted 10 media interviews/presentations

• Identified World Health Organization’s (WHO’s) Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities
Age Friendly Cities and Communities

• Key WHO Strategy: Make World More Age Friendly

• WHO’s “Active Aging” Framework -- opportunities for health, participation and security to enhance quality of life as people age
Age Friendly Cities and Communities

WHO’s Strategy & Framework

• Address Sonoma County Demographics

- 23% + of residents are 60 +
- 25% of seniors are 75 +
- More than 10,400 are 85 +
Age Friendly Cities and Communities

• WHO’s Age Friendly Requirements:
  – Involve older adults in four-step process
  – Assessment
  – Plan
  – Indicators

• Age Friendly Sonoma County:
  – Join other CA counties & cities in the Age Friendly Network
  – Convene, guide & support Sonoma County cities in joining Age Friendly Network
Funding Request

- Five years
- Leverage federal funds & private donations
- Competitive bid process for an Age-Friendly Cities and Communities Coordinator
- Development and execution of WHO requirements
Many of us will live to 100...
What’s your plan?
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**Board Study Session:**

1. Review the American Institutes for Research *Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County* report.

2. Receive informational report reviewing recommended strategies and options to achieving universal quality preschool in Sonoma County.

**Executive Summary:**

**The Need for High-Quality Child Care and Preschool in Sonoma County**

In addition to being crucial to brain development and a proven solution to reducing social, health and educations disparities, universal quality preschool is also proven to be sound fiscal policy with a proven high return on investment. As noted in other recent reports in Sonoma County, critical gaps currently exist in the availability of high-quality preschool, particularly in low-income and rural areas of the County. According to *A Portrait of Sonoma County*, only about 50 percent of Sonoma County’s 3- and 4-year-old children are enrolled in preschool; among Latinos, the rate is 39 percent. There is an unmet need for seats in preschool facilities for approximately 4,177 children, with 2,013 of these children living below 300 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).

Furthermore, even if the total number of state and federally subsidized preschool seats were increased to bridge the gap, there still exists a great need for local facilities to house the programs and resources to ensure that teacher and caregiver training and supports are in place to provide the high quality of care and education that research shows is crucial to kindergarten readiness and long-term academic success. Given that the quality of service and staff is fundamental to achieving the potential benefits of preschool, it is important to also consider the role that compensation plays in attracting and retaining qualified preschool workers. According to the California Employment Development Department (2015),
the median hourly wage for child care personnel in the Santa Rosa-Petaluma metro area is just $12.97, compared to the median hourly wage for a Santa Rosa elementary schoolteacher, which is $29.

**Board Actions to Date to Support Increased Access to High Quality Preschool**

To date, in addition to approving a report from the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct a study of potential options for funding universal preschool in Sonoma County, the Board has also taken a number of immediate actions that have resulted in increased availability of high quality preschool seats in Sonoma County. This support has included the prioritization of preschool expansion with community partners as a Board priority as well as investments in local facilities that were crucial in retaining and expanding the availability of state and federally funded preschool seats. These actions allowed the county to retain 264 state and federally subsidized preschool seats worth approximately $2.4 million per year [See “Prior Board Actions” section below].

**Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County**

Based on direction from the Board on December 2, 2014, the Department of Health Services (DHS) and First 5 Sonoma County commissioned a study from the American Institutes for Research (AIR) on options for funding and financing a universal quality preschool system in Sonoma County.

Key features of the AIR report include:

- A summary of funding levels, phase-in plans, and finance mechanisms of 12 city and other regional preschool initiatives across the United States;
- An analysis of potential funding and financing options for Sonoma County;
- Two estimates for the per-child cost of providing full-day, full-year preschool: one based on current expenditures and one with an increase in compensation to a competitive living wage to support quality;
- Ten options for phasing in universal access to quality preschool over a 10-year period in Sonoma County;
- Recommendations from AIR for funding and phasing in access to quality preschool for all children.

Based on the findings of the study, AIR recommends that in order to have a successful universal preschool system in Sonoma County, the following are needed:

- Clearly defined goals for preschool-age children
- An established framework for quality
- Maximization of existing funding streams
- Development of a dedicated new funding stream for preschool
- A public education campaign on the benefits of investing in quality preschool
- A phased in approach with expansion occurring over 5-10 years
- Development of partnerships with local schools and businesses

**Local Options and Recommendations**

In response to the findings of the AIR report and input provided by First 5 Sonoma County, Health Action’s Cradle to Career Operations Team, local preschool providers, and community stakeholders, DHS recommends that the following be considered when moving forward with implementing a universal quality preschool model in Sonoma County:
1. Aim to provide access for all 3- and 4-year old children in the County and develop a phased-in approach that starts with guaranteeing preschool for the children and families in highest need.

2. Start with providing subsidized high quality preschool seats for all 3- and 4-year olds under 300% of the FPL.

3. To support working families, provide 8-hour day, year around preschool with options for before and after care.

4. To promote teacher retention and preschool quality, recommend and support competitive preschool teacher wages.

5. Phase in the program over 5 to 10 years as resources become available. The estimated number of seats needed to cover all children in families below 300% FPL is 2,013. Factoring in a $15.00 per hour wage for preschool teachers, the cost estimated to provide full-year (12 month) full-day (8 hour) preschool is approximately $13,143 per seat for a total of $26 million. This amount does not include an estimated one-time $5.8M for facilities costs or factor in the subsidies that may come from leveraging additional state and federally funded preschool allocations (estimated $6M annually in potential leveraged funds).

6. To ensure preschool quality, fully implement the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). In non-prioritized areas where additional preschool seats may not be needed, recommend focusing on quality enhancements.

7. Implement a mixed delivery system with public schools, private schools, for-profit schools, community non-profit centers, faith-based organizations, child care homes and charter schools providing preschool programs to leverage partnerships with all stakeholders.

8. Recommend including 0-3 school readiness programs in future planning, such as AVANCE, Pasitos, and Nurse-Family Partnership to create a continuum of high-quality school readiness programs from 0 to 5.

Considerations for Immediate Opportunities

As discussed in previous Board items, there are several opportunities, both immediate and long-term, to mitigate the shortage of high-quality early care and education opportunities in Sonoma County. For immediate action to expand the availability of preschool, DHS and First 5 recommend the following be considered:

Preschool Facilities Grant Program

To address the continued critical shortage in early care facilities moving forward, DHS and First 5 recommend expanding the First 5 Preschool Facilities Grant Program to include funding preschool programming needs identified in rural communities. In remote parts of the County, physical space is not the only barrier to access, but unique staffing needs are – expanding the scope of the grant program would allow for flexibility where needed.

Partnering with early education providers and school districts will ensure that existing state and federal revenue sources, such as Title 5, State Preschool, Head Start, Transitional Kindergarten, and Title I, are being fully maximized to support school readiness programs.

For the upcoming school year, the following partners have already made an investment to contribute to the Preschool Facilities Grant Program beyond the Board’s initial investment: $200,000 from First 5
Sonoma County, $50,000 from the Sonoma Valley Vintners and Growers through their Sonoma Wine Country Weekend auction, $3,000 from Fort Ross Educational Foundation, and $153,000 from The John Jordan Foundation. The total amounts of contributions to date for the upcoming school year is $406,000.

Currently, in collaboration with school districts and local providers, a cost analysis for ten facilities projects representing up to 332 preschool seats across the County has been completed by First 5 and DHS staff. The total amount of facilities funds needed to support these ten projects is estimated to be a one-time investment of $1.23 million, leaving an $824,000 funding gap. It is estimated that these ten projects would draw down $2.23 million in state subsidized preschool contracts per year if completed.

In addition to the ten currently identified facilities projects, First 5 recently sent out a survey to all 38 districts with elementary schools campuses in the county to identify preschool facilities and to assess if districts were interested in expanding access to preschool. The survey responses identified an additional nine facilities project requests. These newly identified projects brings the total of potential preschool facilities projects to 19 at an estimated cost of $3,025,000 and a minimum of 524 state seats if successfully completed. While not all of these potential projects fall within high priority areas, they do represent opportunities to expand the availability of preschool with one time facilities investments. Priority for facilities funding will be given to districts that can leverage other funding sources and seek to increase access in high need areas in the county.

Pay For Success Proof of Concept Pilot

Building off the work that DHS and First 5 staff has conducted over the past year to research the feasibility of a potential Pay For Success (PFS) transaction to support preschool, First 5 is exploring dedicating up to $1M for a proof of concept project to provide up to 2 years of quality preschool access for 3 and 4 year olds in the highest need areas. This project will then be assessed over the 5 years to gauge the effectiveness of quality preschool on their academic success including kindergarten readiness, math and third-grade reading levels.

In order to support the development of a PFS transaction, staff will work with the Nonprofit Finance Fund (NFF) on a Pay For Success grant opportunity. The NFF will be awarding competitive grants under the Federal Social Innovation Fund to successful applicants that have completed feasibility studies and are working on next steps to construct a Pay for Success transaction. This grant would provide matching funds to coordinate, administer and evaluate a local Pay for Success transaction to support increasing access to quality preschool.

The goal of the pilot will be to evaluate the effectiveness of a PFS model in Sonoma County looking at both outcomes for students and financial feasibility. If the proof of concept project is successful, Sonoma County can utilize the results to expand access to high quality preschool in future years to cover need across all of the Portrait priority areas.

Considerations for Long Term Opportunities

Dedicated Local Revenue Considerations

As indicated in the AIR report, in addition to maximizing all currently available preschool funding, the report recommends that the county also consider development of a dedicated new funding stream to support preschool. Given the limits to the currently available funds to support preschool and the remaining large gaps in availability, even for a subset of families and neighborhoods most in need, a new
determined funding stream remains one of the few options for developing a universal quality preschool system in Sonoma County.

To this end, staff recommends working with County partners and community stakeholders to develop a proposal to finance expansion of quality early care and education opportunities, including a model for universal preschool. This would include consideration and evaluation of local tax revenue options.

**Local Support for Universal Preschool**

In March 2016, First 5 Sonoma County, as part of its comprehensive community education and engagement plan, conducted a community survey of over 600 likely voters to gauge local support for programs serving children 0-5 years old.

Key findings from the survey showed two-thirds (66%) of the respondents perceived a need for additional support and funding for childcare and preschool programs; an average of approximately 70% would likely support a proposed ballot measure to fund expansion of access to early education, health and nutrition services for children; and respondents were particularly in support of programs that helped homeless children, assisted with teacher training, expanded mental health services for children, supported early dental care, and provided affordable high quality preschool for all families.

These findings demonstrate that local support for preschool is high and that a potential tax revenue initiative to support broad early care and education programs for young children is viable.

**Aligned Initiatives**

Increasing access to universal preschool aligns with the First 5 Strategic Plan, the Child Care Planning Council strategic plan, Sonoma County Upstream Investments and is a priority identified by Cradle to Career Sonoma County, a subcommittee of Health Action.

Cradle to Career is comprised of representatives and stakeholders from all levels of education, examples of the partners include: United Way of the Wine Country, Sonoma State University, Santa Rosa Junior College, Sonoma County Office of Education, Community Foundation Sonoma County, Sonoma Valley Unified School District, Santa Rosa City Schools, Guerneville Union School District, Chop’s Teen Club, John Muir Charter School, Community Action Partnership, John Jordan Foundation, Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce, Sonoma County Human Services Department, Social Advocates for Youth, the Career Technical Education Foundation and the Boys and Girls Club of Central Sonoma County. Cradle to Career promotes and expands educational opportunities from birth to career with the goal of preparing all youth for success. Cradle to Career aligns three goal areas: school readiness, academic achievement, and college and career success. Initial strategy development focuses on the First 5 Sonoma County Strategic Plan goal area 1: every child enters kindergarten ready to succeed, and increasing access to quality preschool is one of the identified priorities.

**Prior Board Actions:**

2/2/16: The Board took action to accept two contributions for the Preschool Facilities Grant Program, $50,000 from Sonoma Valley Vintners and Growers with funds raised from the Sonoma Wine Country Weekend auction and $3,000 from the Fort Ross Educational Foundation. The Board asked staff to review capacity of current facilities operating quality preschool programs.

5/19/15: The Board allocated $305,000 to develop the Sonoma County Preschool Facilities Grant Program, with additional investment of $350,000 from the First 5 Sonoma County Commission. From
this investment, the County saved 264 state and federally subsidized preschool seats and $2.4 million in state and federal contracts for the county.

5/19/15: The Board approved a contract between DHS and the American Institute for Research (AIR) to conduct a study exploring “Funding Analysis and Options for School Readiness Programs in Sonoma County.”

1/30/15: Sonoma County Board of Supervisors identified as a Board priority for 2015 to “coordinate with community partners to provide access to preschool for all Sonoma County children”.

12/2/2014: The Board accepted the report on the gaps in access to quality preschool and provided direction on next steps towards developing a model of universal preschool in Sonoma County. The Board asked county staff to explore and analyze options for financing the increase in access to quality preschool for all County residents and to return with a detailed report of findings.

11/24/14: The Board accepted the report on Strategies to Reduce Poverty in Sonoma County from the Blue Sky Consulting Group. Among the key strategies highlighted included “increasing access to early childhood education.”

5/20/2014: The Board accepted the Sonoma County community health assessment report: A Portrait of Sonoma County. “Make universal preschool a reality” was identified as one of the priority strategies for reducing disparities in the report’s agenda for action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Plan Alignment</strong></th>
<th>Goal 1: Safe, Healthy, and Caring Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This item serves to provide a safe, healthy, and caring community by supporting overall health through the healthy development of children and by promoting improved quality of life. Universal quality preschool is an investment in the future; leading to reduced poverty, increased opportunities for quality education, and better health.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This item aligns with the Agenda for Action within A Portrait of Sonoma County in supporting universal preschool as a population-based intervention. Evidence shows that disadvantaged children who benefit from a high-quality preschool experience are less likely to repeat grades and more likely to graduate from high school and college, marry, earn more, and be healthier as adults than those who do not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, this item aligns with 1) Sonoma County Health Action: Action Plan 2013 - 2016 and the Community Health Needs Assessment, 2013-2016 by working to reduce disparities in education and improve educational attainment; 2) Upstream Investments as an early and wise investment; 3) Cradle to Career efforts to help students be successful; and 4) First 5 in promoting, supporting, and improving the early development of children from the prenatal stage through age five.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fiscal Summary - FY 15-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgeted Amount</strong></td>
<td>$0 County General Fund $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add AppropriationsReqd.</strong></td>
<td>$0 State/Federal $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0 Fees/Other $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0 Use of Fund Balance $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0 Contingencies $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$0 Total Sources $0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):**

There are no fiscal impacts associated with this item.

### Staffing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title (Payroll Classification)</th>
<th>Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)</th>
<th>Additions (Number)</th>
<th>Deletions (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):**

N/A

### Attachments:

- Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County - Final Report

### Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:

None
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Purpose and Background

The purpose of this report, as prepared by American Institutes for Research (AIR), is to help Sonoma County develop a plan “to make universal preschool a reality” as recommended in *A Portrait of Sonoma County* (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014). In line with *Strategies to Reduce Poverty in Sonoma County* (Blue Sky Consulting Group, 2014), this report also offers guidance on how to phase in access to quality preschool, beginning in the areas of highest unmet need.

Specifically, this report will do the following:

- Describe the key features, including funding levels, phase-in plans, and finance mechanisms, of 12 city and other regional preschool initiatives being implemented across the United States.
- Analyze potential funding options.
- Provide two estimates for the per child cost of providing full-day (i.e., eight hours), full-year (12 months) preschool in Sonoma County: one based on the current expenditures for programs meeting the minimum standards for Title 5 State Preschool or Head Start in California, and one with an increase in compensation to a living wage intended to help recruit and retain qualified staff.
- Present 10 options for phasing in universal access to quality preschool in the county across a 10-year period, beginning in the areas with the highest proportion of children from low-income families and the least access to preschool.
- Make recommendations for funding and phasing in access to quality preschool for all children in Sonoma County.

Research findings highlight the benefits of expanding access to high-quality preschool, especially for children who are disadvantaged, to improve the long-term outcomes for children and their families. For children at risk of falling behind in school, quality early learning and care programs can help improve their readiness for school and school success, with better attendance, higher test scores, and reduced grade-level retention (Karoly & Bigelow, 2005; Reynolds, Temple, & Ou, 2007). Other lasting benefits include higher rates of high school completion, greater likelihood of attending college, and higher lifetime earnings (Reynolds & Ou, 2011). By reducing grade retention, the use of special education and welfare, and involvement in crime, these quality programs can save between $4 and $17 for every dollar invested (Reynolds, Temple, & Ou, 2007; Schweinhart et al., 2005). Of particular interest, given the demographics of California and Sonoma County in particular, is that high-quality preschool programs have been found to benefit children from Latino backgrounds whose mothers have little education, have low incomes, and are linguistically isolated (Karoly, Ghosh-Dastidar, Zellman, Perlman, & Fernyhough, 2008).

Although the benefits of preschool are less dramatic for children from more advantaged backgrounds, attending a quality program is associated with higher achievement in elementary school for children from all income groups (Gormley & Phillips, 2005). The educational benefits of quality programs for preschool-aged children who are not disadvantaged are substantial, perhaps 75 percent as large as those for children from low-income families (Pianta, Barnett,
Burchinal, & Thornburg, 2009). An important caveat, however, is that only quality programs have been found to produce improved child outcomes, and no evidence exists that preschool programs of average quality lead to the same results (Barnett, 2008). Moreover, shortfalls in the quality of early learning and care programs have been found to affect children in all income groups in California (Karoly, Ghosh-Dastidar, Zellman, Perlman, & Fernyhough, 2008).

As noted in other recent reports in Sonoma County, critical gaps currently exist in the availability of high-quality preschool, particularly in low-income and less populated areas of the county. According to A Portrait of Sonoma County (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014), only about 50 percent of Sonoma County’s 3- and 4-year-old children are enrolled in preschool; among Latinos, the rate falls to 39 percent. From 2009 to 2013, state budget cuts led to a loss of 600 state-subsidized spaces and the closure of many preschool classrooms in Sonoma County; although opportunities now exist to restore these spaces thanks to a Preschool Facilities Grant Fund created by the Board of Supervisors and First 5 Sonoma County (County of Sonoma, 2015b), districts and community preschool providers are finding it difficult to fund and develop the new classrooms to house the services for children who are subsidy eligible (Nilsson Consulting, 2014).

Even middle-income families have difficulty affording center-based preschools, with the average cost per child estimated at one third of the median annual income in the county (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014). Moreover, given that the quality of service is fundamental to achieving the potential benefits of preschool, it is important to offer sufficient compensation to attract and retain qualified preschool personnel. According to the California Employment Development Department (2015), the median hourly wage for child care personnel in the Santa Rosa-Petaluma metro area is just $12.97, but the median hourly wage for a Santa Rosa elementary schoolteacher is $29 (Salary.com, 2015).

Building on Sonoma County’s interest in universal preschool, and the body of work already conducted in the county supporting it, this report provides a plan both to expand access to preschool and raise the quality of service to a level sufficient to achieve the promised benefits of preschool.
Findings From Other Preschool Initiatives Implemented Across the United States: Summary of Key Features

We examined 12 city and other regional preschool initiatives being implemented across the United States. Of these, nine are working toward eventually providing universal access: Boston, Massachusetts; Denver, Colorado; Los Angeles, California; New York City, New York; San Antonio, Texas; San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington; Washington, D.C. (the District of Columbia); and West Sacramento, California. Of the remaining three initiatives, two—Elk Grove Unified School District (California) and the Chicago Child-Parent Centers (CPCs; Illinois)—have aimed to provide access to preschool to children in certain Title I school catchment areas but do not bill themselves as universal preschool programs. The other initiative—Salt Lake (Utah)—is targeted to a low-income, disadvantaged population of children.

In the sections that follow, we summarize the key features across the preschool initiatives that were examined: primary funding mechanisms, other sources of funding for enrolled children, funding levels, expenditure per child, implementation status, the number of children served, target population, hours and days of operation, family fees, types of providers or provisions for facilities, administering entity, phase-in plan, teacher qualifications, other quality measures, provision for professional development, and political leadership.

Primary Funding Mechanisms

The primary funding mechanism for most of the preschool initiatives is a tax or a set-aside. For example, the primary funding mechanism in Denver and San Antonio is a dedicated sales tax, and Seattle’s primary funding mechanism is a property tax levy. San Francisco’s primary funding mechanism is a set-aside in the city budget, called the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF; San Francisco Public Schools, 2015), which is financed by a portion of the local property tax. Washington, D.C., and Boston have similar primary funding mechanisms in that both cities use a combination of district and city funds as their primary funding mechanisms. Other primary funding sources for the preschool initiatives include First 5 California (e.g., Power of Preschool grants) and, in the case of New York City, a recent state grant.

We chose to include Elk Grove because of its Title I-funded preschool program. Salt Lake also was included in our analysis because its Pay for Success bond provides preschool services to a select group of children. CPCs were included because they are an example of an initiative that uses both Title I and Pay for Success as sources of funding for their preschool initiative. Table 1 briefly describes the primary funding mechanisms for each initiative.
### Table 1. Primary Funding Mechanisms for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Primary Funding Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Boston: Boston Public Schools (BPS)                        | BPS: city and district budget, including Title I funds  
Boston K1DS: no primary mechanism (see later discussion)  
PEG: a federal grant                                         |
| Chicago: CPCs                                             | Historically, funding is primarily from Title I, with a recent expansion paid for by a 2012 Investing in Innovation (i3) grant from the U.S. Department of Education. |
| Denver: Denver Preschool Program (DPP)                    | Dedicated sales tax of 0.15 percent (was 0.12 percent in 2014)                                                                                           |
| Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool     | Title I                                                                                                                                                   |
| Los Angeles: Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP)       | First 5 California                                                                                                                                           |
| New York City: Prekindergarten for All                     | State grant to the city                                                                                                                                      |
| Salt Lake: School Readiness                               | Pay for Success bond financed by Goldman Sachs and J. B. Pritzker, backed by the state of Utah                                                               |
| San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA                                    | Dedicated sales tax of 0.125 percent                                                                                                                        |
| San Francisco: Preschool for All (PFA)                    | PEEF: A set-aside in the city budget initially funded by 3 percent reserved from the local property tax. First passed in 2004 (Proposition H), expanded and extended in 2014 (Proposition C), with an increase in the portion reserved from the property tax from 3 percent to 4 percent. |
| Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program                        | Four-year property tax levy                                                                                                                                   |
| Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program | Public and charter school classrooms are primarily funded by the District of Columbia Public Schools, using the district’s per child funding formula. Community-based organizations (CBOs) are funded by the city’s general fund. No tax or other funding stream is specifically dedicated to preschool, so the money must be appropriated by the city every year. The Prekindergarten Acceleration and Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2010, which was passed by the city council, requires the mayor to fund CBOs at the levels specified by the 2008 act. |
| West Sacramento: UP4WS                                    | First 5 California                                                                                                                                           |

*Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Connors (2014); Dardick & Perez (2014); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Samuels & Ash (2014); SPUR (2004); SPUR (2014); Stewart (2013); United Way of Salt Lake (2014); Watson (2010).*
Other Sources of Funding for Children Enrolled in the Preschool Initiatives

Across the preschool initiatives, a variety of other funding sources also provide funds to support the preschool initiatives. For example, the primary funding mechanism in Seattle is a property tax levy, but parent fees and Head Start and state Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) grants are also used to support the program. West Sacramento is primarily funded by First 5 California, but additional support comes from First 5 Yolo, private donations, federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, a portion of a 0.5 percent city sales tax, district funds, and in-kind donations from the city. San Antonio’s primary funding mechanism is a dedicated sales tax of 0.125 percent, but additional support comes from state and local matching funds, the federal Child and Adult Care Food Program, local donors, and parent fees. However, Denver’s primary funding mechanism is the only source of funding for the tuition subsidies it provides. Table 2 briefly describes the other sources of funding for children enrolled in each initiative.

Table 2. Other Sources of Funding for Children Enrolled in Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Other Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Boston: Boston K1DS; PEG                                  | Boston K1DS: a combination of city and district money, Race to the Top grant funds, and foundation grants  
PEG: foundation grants, Head Start, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families vouchers, and other government subsidies |
| Chicago: CPCs                                             | Pay for Success bond funded by Goldman Sachs, Northern Trust, and the Pritzker Family Foundation |
| Denver: DPP                                               | DPP receives all its revenue for the preschool initiative from the sales tax. Providers may receive funding from other sources, such as state and federal subsidies and parent fees. |
| Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool    | Individual classrooms are funded by Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and Title I. Teachers can and do teach in classrooms funded by different streams, but classrooms are kept segregated by funding source. |
| Los Angeles: LAUP                                         | Parent fees, Race to the Top grant funds, Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) block grants, and private donations. Also, many of the participating programs receive grants from Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and other state and federally funded programs. |
| New York City: Prekindergarten for All                    | Additional funds from local sources and other state grants                               |
| Salt Lake: School Readiness                              | Providers included in the Pay for Success bond also serve other children through Title I and parent fees. However, these other sources of funding (e.g., Title I and parent fees) are not used to fund children in the Pay for Success program. |
| San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA                                   | Although 85 percent of the funds come from the sales tax, additional funding sources include state and local matching funds for a small portion of the children served, a Child and Adult Care Food Program grant, local donors, and parent fees. |
| San Francisco: Preschool for All (PFA)                    | Received about $10 million total in First 5 California funds from 2005 through 2015. Developer impact fees and federal CDBG funds are used for |
### Preschool Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preschool Initiative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other Sources of Funding</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Parent fees for 4-year-old children living above 300 percent of the federal poverty line (3-year-old children living above 300 percent of the federal poverty line are not eligible for the program); also leverages Head Start money and state ECEAP grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td>Public schools also receive Head Start funding and funding for children with special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>First 5 Yolo, private donations, CDBG funds, a portion of a 0.5 percent city sales tax, district funds, and in-kind donations from the city. First 5 California funding will no longer available after 2015, so the current model is not sustainable. Currently searching for alternative funding sources. Developer impact fees are used for facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett, Carolan, Squires, Clarke Brown, & Horowitz (2015); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento Engineering Department (2015); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Yolo Elections Office (n.d.a); Yolo Elections Office (n.d.b).

### Funding Levels

Across the preschool initiatives, the level of funding varies widely depending on the sources of revenue, with the amount of funding sought influenced by the size of the population to be served, the quality of the program, the number of hours and days of service, and the proportion of the total expenditure for preschool that the initiative aims to finance.

In general, the programs with the most stable funding levels have a dedicated funding mechanism for preschool (e.g., sales tax, property tax, or set-aside from a general fund). Federal Title I funds and other district funds can be a major source of revenue, as in Chicago, Boston, and Elk Grove, which require school board action every year. But even those programs with a dedicated funding mechanism rely on other sources of revenue. In the largest initiatives (e.g., New York City; Washington, D.C.; and Boston), local and state policies often work together, resulting in state action that provides funds for local initiatives or requiring localities to make good on the funding levels for preschool they have promised.

As might be expected, of the 12 initiatives we examined, New York City has the highest funding level and provides services to the most children, with 53,000 preschool spaces for 4-year-old children in 2015 financed primarily by $300 million in the city’s education budget coming from a recent state appropriation for universal preschool. This special allocation from the state was awarded in a compromise between the state and the city after the New York City mayor’s efforts to raise the income tax to finance universal preschool were unsuccessful.

The District of Columbia’s preschool initiative has the next highest funding level, with more than $191 million from sources including a set-aside in the city budget spent on more than
12,000 preschool children, representing 86 percent of the 3- and 4-year-old children in the city. City council legislation requires the mayor to fund the preschool at the level intended.

San Francisco’s PFA has one of the more stable funding sources for preschool. As of 2014, it generated $27 million per year and served approximately 4,000 children. First enacted in 2004, Proposition H created PEEF, from which one third is reserved for universal preschool. The initiative was reauthorized in 2014, extended for 25 years, and expanded from a 3 percent set-aside of local property taxes to a 4 percent set-aside.

The funding level sought for an initiative also varies depending on the quality requirements and intensity of the program. For example, the fourth highest funding level for the preschool initiatives examined for this study is in San Antonio, where the sales tax increase generates $31 million per year. The program currently aims to provide high-quality care to only 2,000 children in four centers, representing about 10 percent of the 4-year-old children in the city. Although some expansion is underway, plans for major growth await a future election.

Initiatives that require lead teachers in a preschool classroom to have a bachelor’s degree (i.e., San Antonio, Seattle, District of Columbia, Boston, New York City, Elk Grove, and Chicago) or fund full-day preschool services (i.e., San Antonio, Seattle, District of Columbia, Boston, and New York City) tend to have higher funding levels. In addition, for some initiatives, the funding level covers the full cost of the program (i.e., San Antonio, Boston, Elk Grove, and Salt Lake), whereas the funding level covers only a portion of the cost of preschool for most children enrolled in other initiatives. Other sources of funding, such as parent fees, and other public programs, such as Head Start and state-funded preschool, are used to make up the difference (i.e., Denver, Los Angeles, Seattle, and San Francisco). Table 3 briefly describes the funding level for each initiative.

Table 3. Funding Level for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Boston: BPS Early Education; PEG                          | BPS: $24 million per year  
PEG: $14 million across four years                                                                                           |
| Chicago: CPCs                                            | Primarily funded through Title I, with an additional $17 million across four years from a Pay for Success bond                             |
| Denver: DPP                                              | $13 million per year from a sales tax increase (forecast to increase to $19 million)                                                      |
| Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool    | $1.3 million annually in Title I funds                                                                                                   |
| Los Angeles: LAUP                                        | $48.6 million from First 5 LA, $1.5 million in donations, and approximately $25 million from other sources in fiscal year (FY) 2014          |
| New York City: Prekindergarten for All                    | $300 million state grant in 2014 to fund full-day preschools; additional funds to expand half-day programs to full-day programs             |
| Salt Lake: School Readiness                              | Initial investment of $1 million for the first year and $3 million per year for the remainder of the five-year period (Not all of the $3 million is designated for this Pay for Success bond; some funds are designated for |

Table 3: Funding Level for Preschool Initiatives
### Preschool Initiative Expenditures per Child

Preschool initiative expenditures per child vary across the preschool initiatives depending on the quality requirements and the intensity of the program. For example, San Antonio, Seattle, the District of Columbia, and Boston all fund a full-day (at least six-hour) program with relatively high-quality standards or requirements, and their expenditures per child per year range from $13,000 to $15,372. In contrast, although it has relatively high-quality standards, Elk Grove supports only a partial-day program, and the expenditure per child per year is $6,500. Salt Lake’s program has the lowest expenditure per child per year because it provides a partial-day, school-year program; in addition, its teachers are considered hourly employees, so the expenditure per child does not include benefits for the personnel.

The per child expenditure for four initiatives (San Antonio, Boston, Elk Grove, and Salt Lake) covers the full cost of the program. For example, in San Antonio, the preschool initiative expenditure per child of $14,500 covers the cost of the program, but professional development funds are not considered part of the per child costs, even though the main funding mechanism (e.g., sales tax) funds professional development. In Boston, the preschool initiative expenditure per child is $10,000–$15,000 per year depending on whether overhead is included, and this covers the full cost of the program. In Elk Grove, Title I funds classrooms at $6,500 per child per year for a half-day program. The Salt Lake Pay for Success bond covers the full cost of the program for the children participating in the bond program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>$31 million per year for eight years from a sales tax increase, plus state and local matching funds of $3 million per year. State funding covers less than 25 percent of the costs for eligible children. Funds from the sales tax cover professional development and facilities costs, which San Antonio does not include in its per child expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>$27.2 million annually from PEEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>$58 million across four years from levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td>The total prekindergarten spending by the district in FY 2014 was $191,016,442, according to National Institute for Early Education Research report but may not include funds for CBOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>For FY 2015: $913,000 from First 5 California, $100,000 from the city (dedicated sales tax), $100,000 from First 5 Yolo; $1.3 million each from the district and the county; CDBG funds; and grants from corporations and nonprofit organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett, Carolan, Squires, Clarke Brown, & Horowitz (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Connors (2014); Dardick & Perez (2014); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Samuels & Ash (2014); SPUR (2014); Stewart (2013).*
In contrast to initiatives that provide the full cost of the program, the expenditures per child in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle provide a fraction of the full cost of providing either a full- or half-day program. For example, Denver provides up to $680 per month per child to participating providers based on a number of factors, including family income, the quality rating of the providers, and the receipt of other government subsidies. In Denver, the monthly per child expenditure does not cover the full cost of providing full-day preschool for any children. In Los Angeles, the proportion of the full cost covered by LAUP depends primarily on the level of support the program receives from other sources of publicly funded early care and education, such as Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and state and federally subsidized child care. Table 4 briefly describes the expenditures per child for each initiative.

Table 4. Expenditure per Child for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Expenditure per Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; PEG</td>
<td>BPS: $10,000–$15,000 per year per child in FY 2015, depending on whether overhead is included &lt;br&gt;PEG: $8,000–$16,000 per year per child, depending on whether the child is receiving a government subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>$29–$680 per month for full-day programs, depending on family income and provider quality (FY 2016); expenditures are prorated for half- and extended-day programs. Providers vary in terms of the number of months that they provide preschool. Thus, annual per child expenditures could range from $290 to $6,800 for a 10-month program or $348–$8,160 for a 12-month program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>$6,500 per year from Title I funds in FY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>$96–$495 per month, depending on ZIP code of residence and whether the child is receiving a government subsidy (FY 2014). Los Angeles provides only school-year programs, so the annual per child expenditures for a 10-month program could be approximately $960–$4,950.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>Funds a full-day school-year program at no cost to families; unable to confirm a per child expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>$1,550 per year for 4-year-old children, approximately $900 per year for 3-year-old children in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>$14,500 per year for FY 2014–FY 2021 (does not include facilities or professional development costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>PFA reimburses from $4,950 to $6,000 per year per 4-year-old child in FY 2016, based on lead teacher qualifications. In settings where child care subsidies support eligible child enrollment, PFA reimbursements are deducted from the applicable subsidy earnings (such as Alternative Payment Program vouchers, California Department of Education, or Head Start) for that child’s enrollment. In these cases, PFA does not fund the child’s enrollment; rather, PFA funds an “enhancement” to the program, supplementing the subsidy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Expenditure per Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Approximately $13,000 per year for FY 2016–FY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett, Carolan, Squires, Clarke Brown, & Horowitz (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014).

**Implementation Status**

The preschool initiatives are at varying stages of implementation. For example, Seattle is just preparing to launch the first year of its program. In contrast, Denver, Elk Grove, Los Angeles, San Francisco, the District of Columbia, and West Sacramento are all fully implemented to the extent that their funding levels will support. Other initiatives are still working to expand access, such as Boston and San Antonio, and Chicago is attempting to both restore services that were lost in the past decade and expand. Table 5 briefly describes the implementation status of each initiative.

**Table 5. Implementation Status of Preschool Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS</td>
<td>BPS: fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K1DS: ending its three-year run in November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEG: preparing a request for proposal for partner organizations and will launch in fall 2015. The city of Boston is considering expansion through a mixed delivery system to provide universal access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Began in 1967, reached its peak with 25 centers and 1,500 children (prekindergarten–Grade 3) in the 1980s, but cut back to 10 centers serving 670 preschool children by 2009. The 2012 grant allowed the district to reopen six centers and expand others. The Pay for Success initiative will allow another expansion to begin in 2015, adding six classrooms for 374 four-year-old children, increasing to 2,000 children in four years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>The school-year program is fully implemented with 5,000 children served (about 56 percent of all eligible children) as of 2013. The 2014 increase allowed additional funding to go toward summer programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>Fully implemented as of 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>Fully implemented as of 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City:</td>
<td>Fully implemented as of the 2015–16 school year; any 4-year-old child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preschool Initiative                      Implementation Status

Prekindergarten for All                      who wants to participate in prekindergarten will have that opportunity.

Salt Lake: School Readiness                  About to begin the third year of a five-year program. Year 1 was the “proof of concept” year, guaranteed by the United Way of Salt Lake and Salt Lake County. Starting in the second year (2014–15), the Pay for Success loan has been guaranteed by the state of Utah.

San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA                      About to begin the third year of an eight-year plan

San Francisco: PFA                           Fully implemented as of 2014

Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program           Preparing for launch in the 2015–16 school year

Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program Universal access implemented by 2013–14; focus is now moving to quality improvement.

West Sacramento: UP4WS                       Fully implemented as of 2010

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Harris (2012); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Nyhan (2013); Samuels & Ash (2014); Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning (2015).

Target Population and Number Children Served

The majority of the preschool initiatives target services to 4-year-old children. For example, Denver, San Antonio, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York City all primarily target their 4-year-old populations. However, in addition to providing preschool for 4-year-old children, Seattle will provide preschool for 3-year-old children who are at 300 percent of federal poverty line and below. In San Francisco, the reauthorization of PEEF includes a goal of serving all children in San Francisco less than 6 years old while still giving priority to 4-year-old children. West Sacramento has broadened the goal of its initiative to provide services for children birth to 5 years old but focused first on providing universal access to 4-year-old children. Given the projected loss of First 5 California funds to support services, the extent of the expansion in West Sacramento is unclear. The District of Columbia, Salt Lake, and Elk Grove all provide preschool to 3- and 4-year-old children.

The preschool initiatives also differ in the extent to which they serve all children in the locality or, put another way, in the percentage of theoretically eligible children they serve. New York City is unusual because it aimed from the outset to make preschool available to all 4-year-old children in the city, regardless of family income. Most of the preschool initiatives, however, have started out by expanding or improving preschool in low-performing neighborhoods. In Denver, the program is now fully implemented and serves 56 percent of its 4-year-old children, yet the city estimates that a majority of its funds still go to children who are disadvantaged. San Francisco, also fully implemented, set a goal of serving 65 percent of its 4-year-old children. Of the children enrolled in San Francisco’s PFA, more than 70 percent are enrolled in a program that is subsidized by the state or federal government (e.g., Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool).
Boston estimates that its BPS program serves about one half of the 4-year-old children in the city.

Salt Lake does not have a goal of serving children beyond those with high needs, and, in that sense, it does not really fit our definition of a universal preschool program. San Antonio has so far limited funds to children who are disadvantaged. CPCs, by virtue of their location in Chicago, primarily serve low-income families.

Of course, some of the variation in the number of children or the percentage of eligible population served is explained by the program’s implementation status. For example, some initiatives chose to start small and gradually expand to serve their target populations. Seattle, for example, will serve about 270 children during the first year (2015–16) of its preschool program, with plans to expand to 2,000 by 2018–19. San Antonio will serve about 3,700 children by 2017, still a relatively small percentage of the 4-year-old children in the city (18.5 percent of approximately 20,000 four-year-old children). Table 6 briefly describes the target population and the number of children served for each initiative.

### Table 6. Target Population and Number of Children Served of Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Number of Children Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS | Four-year-old children living in Boston, with some spaces available to 3-year-old children with special needs  
BPS: open to all regardless of income  
PEG: 200 percent of the federal poverty line | BPS: 2,400 in 2014, which is about one half the 4-year-old population  
K1DS: 400 children  
PEG: 300–400 children |
<p>| Chicago: CPCs | Children ages 3 through Grade 3 living within Title I school boundaries of the Chicago Public Schools | The goal is 4,000 spaces for 3- and 4-year-old children, starting with 374 four-year-old children in 2015. |
| Denver: DPP | Four-year-old children living in Denver | About 5,000 in 2015 (56 percent of the 4-year-old population) |
| Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool | Three- and 4-year-old children living within Title I school boundaries of the Elk Grove district, with priority to older children | In the 2015–16 school year, 200 children in 10 classrooms at eight school sites |
| Los Angeles: LAUP | Four-year-old children who are residents of Los Angeles County | 11,000 in 2014 |
| New York City: Prekindergarten for All | Four-year-old children living in the five boroughs | 53,000 4-year olds in full-day programs, 2014-15 school year |
| Salt Lake: School Readiness | Three- and 4-year-old children who are eligible for free and reduced lunch; Granite School District also | Six hundred in 2013–14, 750 per year in 2014–16, 1,000 per year from 2016 to the end of the grant period. (Granite School District... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Number of Children Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</strong></td>
<td>Four-year-old children living in San Antonio, primarily children defined as in need by Texas state guidelines</td>
<td>Seven hundred in 2013–14 and 1,500 in 2014–15; plans to ramp up to 3,700 per year by 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco: PFA</strong></td>
<td>Four-year-old children living in San Francisco; universal access with a special focus on low-income neighborhoods</td>
<td>4,000 (in 2014–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</strong></td>
<td>Three- and 4-year-old children living in Seattle; open to all 4-year-old children and to 3-year-old children at 300 percent of the federal poverty line and below; targets neighborhoods with low-performing schools.</td>
<td>About 270 in 2015–16, ramping up to 2,000 by 2018–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</strong></td>
<td>Three- and 4-year-old children living in the District of Columbia</td>
<td>A total of 12,426 in 2013–14 (86 percent of all 3- and 4-year-old children in the District of Columbia); the district has the capacity to serve 95 percent of the preschool-age population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Sacramento: UP4WS</strong></td>
<td>All children 0–5 years old living in West Sacramento, with subsidies to children from low-income families. The city claims universal access to affordable preschool for all 4-year-old children.</td>
<td>Approximately 160 infants and toddlers and 200 three-year-old children in 2015; unable to determine the number of 4-year-old children served because enrollment in partner programs is not tracked. However, the city claims universal access to affordable preschool for all 4-year-old children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d.); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.); Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning (2015).

**Hours and Days of Operation**

Among the preschool initiatives, three main categories of preschool exist in terms of hours of operation: (1) half-day programs that operate up to four hours per day; (2) full-day programs that operate up to 6.5 hours per day (the typical school day); and (3) full-day programs that operate eight to 10 hours per day, which is more similar to the schedules of working parents. Half-day programs are usually operated in two sessions: morning and afternoon. Some of the initiatives
examined offer exclusively half- or full-day (defined as up to 6.5 hours) preschool, whereas others provide parents with the option of either half- or full-day preschool. The initiatives that either offer up to 6.5 hours or require it from their providers are San Antonio, Seattle, the District of Columbia, Boston, and New York City. The initiatives offering only half-day programs are Los Angeles, Salt Lake, Elk Grove, and Chicago. Denver, West Sacramento, and San Francisco support both half-day and full-day (defined as up to 6.5 hours) programs at varying levels. None of the initiatives we studied defined a full day as eight or more hours, although San Antonio is notable for providing free extended care services both before and after hours to those families who need it.

Most of the initiatives examined operate or fund preschool only during the school year, although a few, such as Denver, provide some funding for programs that operate during the summer. Most of the programs profiled offer preschool classes five days per week. Salt Lake is an exception, with classes provided four days per week to 4-year-old children and two days per week for 3-year-old children. Table 7 briefly describes the hours and days of operation for each initiative.

**Table 7. Hours and Days of Operation of Preschool Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Hours and Days of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS (PEG)</td>
<td>BPS: school day (six hours), school year only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K1DS/PEG: full day (10 hours), year round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Half day, school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>Full-day and partial-day programs; varies depending on providers; expanded to summer programs in June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>Partial-day, school-year programs; morning, afternoon, and twilight sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>Half-day, school-year programs, with morning and afternoon sessions; exact hours depend on the providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>Full-day (six hours and 20 minutes) programs, five days per week, school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>Half-day, school-year program: four days per week for 4-year-old children and two days per week for 3-year-old children; morning and afternoon sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Full-day program (8 a.m.–3 p.m.) with extended care hours (7:15 a.m.–6 p.m.) from late August through early June; no summer program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>Offers half- and full-day programs; exact schedule and child care options, including summer hours, depend on the provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Full-day program, six hours per day, five days per week; school-year and year-round programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td>Full-day (6.5 hours), school-year programs, five days per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hours and Days of Operation
West Sacramento: UP4WS Partial-day and full-day, school-year and full-year programs, some with extra child care hours

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d.); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

Family Fees
Of the 12 preschool initiatives profiled, 50 percent charge fees to at least some parents who participate, and 50 percent do not charge any fees. The latter includes Salt Lake because parents whose children are eligible to participate in the Pay for Success program are not charged fees, although there may be fee-paying children in the same classrooms. All programs that charge fees apply a sliding scale based on income, and most are free to children meeting defined eligibility guidelines, such as living at a certain percentage of the federal poverty line or eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. Typically, parent fees are paid directly to the preschool provider, whether that is the initiative itself (San Antonio) or a partner provider (e.g., Denver, San Francisco, and Los Angeles). Table 7 briefly describes the family fees for each initiative.

Table 8. Family Fees for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Family Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>Sliding scale based on income and quality level of preschool chosen (higher quality preschools receive larger subsidy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>None for children receiving a government subsidy; parent investment fee for others, based on ZIP code (waivers granted for eligible parents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>None for children covered by the Pay for Success bond. Families that do not qualify for participation through Title I can pay the full fee of $1,550 (for the 4-year-old program) if spaces are available in the district. Families also pay full fees if they live outside the district or are not eligible for the Pay for Success funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Free to children who meet Texas eligibility requirements (e.g., eligible for free or reduced-price lunch) and live in participating districts; sliding scale tuition to children chosen by lottery, including qualifying children living outside participating districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>No fee for half-day programs; full-day programs are discounted, usually at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preschool Initiative | Family Fees
--- | ---
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program | Free to children from families at 300 percent of the federal poverty line, sliding scale for all others
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program | None
West Sacramento: UP4WS | Sliding scale based on income for city-run programs

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

**Providers or Facilities**

The preschool initiatives we examined fall into two broad categories: mixed delivery systems and single provider systems. In a mixed delivery system, preschool services are provided by different types of programs, such as public schools, private schools, for-profit schools, community nonprofit centers, faith-based organizations, charter schools, or family child care. In a single provider system, all providers are of the same type or only one provider is in a district.

Of the preschool initiatives we profiled, only BPS Early Education, Elk Grove Unified School District, and CPCs operate on a single provider system, in each case a public district, although Boston is moving toward a mixed-delivery model. The remaining nine initiatives operate on some level of mixed delivery or, in the case of San Antonio, will be launching its mixed delivery component in the 2016–17 school year. Not every initiative is open to all types of partner providers. For example, some initiatives do not currently partner with family child care providers (including Seattle, the District of Columbia, and New York City). In almost all cases, partner providers are required to go through a competitive application process and meet certain quality standards (see Table 9 for more details). Two of these mixed delivery preschool initiatives (San Antonio and West Sacramento) operate their own preschool classrooms and fund (or plan soon to fund) partner providers.

Table 9. Providers or Facilities for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Providers/Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS (PEG)</td>
<td>BPS: Currently public schools only, although looking at expanding to a mixed delivery system K1DS/PEG: Community providers chosen through a competitive process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Selected Chicago Public Schools Title I schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>Two hundred fifty partner preschools, including public, private,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preschool Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Providers/Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>Elk Grove Unified School District Title I schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>Public, private, community, charter, and home-based providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>District schools and community providers provide services. Participating community providers are referred to as New York City Early Education Centers, which are selected through a competitive application process. District schools offer classes at both regular elementary schools and at prekindergarten centers that exclusively serve preschool children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>Six programs, operated by Granite School District (Salt Lake City), Park City School District, a nonprofit community organization (YMCA), two for-profits organizations (Smart Kids &amp; Lit’l Scholars), and one charter school (Guadalupe). Most children (624 in 2015–16) are served by Granite School District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Currently four model centers built and operated by Pre-K 4 SA; will expand to qualified public and private providers starting in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>Qualified public, private, and family providers receive grants based on the number of qualifying children served and based on the availability of funding; priority funding for underserved neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Public and private providers; schools and providers apply for eligibility. CBOs are selected though a competitive process, and public schools may contract directly without competing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td>District of Columbia Public Schools, charter schools, and CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>Two centers operated by the city; partner providers, including the district and CBOs, operate other centers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d.); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

## Administering Entity

Preschool initiatives can be administered through various types of agencies, such as a district, an office or agency within the local government (typically a local district or local education agency), or an independent nonprofit organization. The initiatives in our study are split almost evenly among these different types of agencies. Boston, Elk Grove, and Chicago are initiatives operated by a district. Seattle, West Sacramento, the District of Columbia, and New York City are initiatives administered by a city agency. Denver, San Antonio, and Los Angeles are initiatives administered by a nonprofit organization. Until recently, San Francisco’s initiative has
been administered by First 5 San Francisco, but it is being transferred to a city government office. The Salt Lake initiative is different from the others because no single, overarching administrator manages the initiative. Six providers operate their programs independently; the United Way of Salt Lake, a nonprofit organization, facilitates communication between the programs, the investors, and the backing agency.

Except for the public districts and two other initiatives (West Sacramento and San Antonio), the administering agency does not operate any preschool classrooms. Instead, this agency is typically responsible for distributing funds and managing quality initiatives. Table 10 briefly describes the administering entity for each initiative.

**Table 10. Administering Entity for Preschool Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Who Administers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Chicago Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>DPP, an independent nonprofit organization under contract to the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>LAUP is an independent nonprofit created by First 5 Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>New York City Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>United Way of Salt Lake is the intermediary for the Pay for Success bond. Individual providers operate the programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Pre-K 4 SA is nonprofit organization legally separate from the city but works closely with the mayor’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>Currently First 5 San Francisco, transitioning to the city-run Office of Early Care and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Department of Education and Early Learning, City of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td>Division of Early Learning, part of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>Early Learning Services Division, City of West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d.); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

**Phase-In Plan**

The length of the phase-in plans for the preschool initiatives varies widely. Some initiatives (e.g., San Francisco) phased in gradually during a 10-year period. Other initiatives (e.g., Denver, New
York City) attempted to serve their target populations during the first year of implementation. Interestingly, most of the initiative directors we interviewed, including those who had attempted a rapid implementation, advised a gradual phase-in to allow time for quality improvement and obtaining sufficient facilities. Table 11 briefly describes the phase-in plans for each initiative.

### Table 11. Phase-In Plans for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Phase-In Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS</td>
<td>BPS: In 2005, the city of Boston provided 700 free preschool spaces, mostly in inclusive classrooms. By 2010, 85 percent of the elementary schools had at least one preschool classroom, with more than 2,000 spaces for 4-year-old children. As of 2015, 95 percent of the elementary schools have a preschool classroom, with 2,400 spaces available. Currently cannot expand further because of space and budget limitations. PEG: Starting with 15–20 classrooms in fall 2015, depending on possible foundation funding. May expand further if the city decides to fund a mixed delivery program to increase spaces in BPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>None; open to all Denver 4-year-old children at the start of operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>Started as a twilight program in conjunction with adult education programs in six schools. As the adult education program was phased out, preschool moved into more classrooms during the day. In the 2015–16 school year, the district will have 10 Title I–funded classrooms in eight schools. All of these schools also have other preschool classrooms funded by Head Start or Title 5 State Preschool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>In 2002, adopted a goal of universal preschool for 4-year-old children by 2014. Received a Power of Preschool grant in 2006 and started by targeting areas of greatest need by ZIP code. In 2007, created 4,034 new spaces and 4,360 upgraded spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>During the 2014–15 school year, expanded existing spaces from half day to full day, added new spaces, and improved the quality of existing full-day spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>United Way of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County backed the loan for the proof of concept year in the first year of the program, with 600 children. Starting with the second year of the program, the state of Utah is guaranteeing the loan, and the program expanded to 750 children. The program will serve 750 children in the third year and expand to serve 1,000 children in the final years of the grant period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Started with two city-run centers in 2013–14, added two more in 2014–15, and will add a limited number of public and private providers starting in 2016–17. Full implementation is expected in 2017–18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>Initially targeted low-income and high-need neighborhoods and became citywide in 2008. City funding was meant to phase in across a five-year period but was not fully funded or fully implemented until 2014. The additional funds from the 2014 renewal will phase in across the next few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Starting with 14–15 classrooms in 2015–16, expanding to 39 in 2016–17, 70 in 2017–18, and 100 in 2018–19, with 2,000 children served in the last year. At that time, the program will be evaluated for renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Phase-In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>Program implemented with a grant from First 5 California in 2005. The first class was 135 children. By 2010, the city had the capacity to provide access to high-quality preschool to all 4-year-old children in the city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d.); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014).*

**Teacher Qualifications, Other Quality Measures, and Provision for Professional Development and Tuition Reimbursement for Personnel**

Requirements for quality measures (e.g., teacher qualifications, adult-to-child ratios, the use of an evidence-based curricula, evaluations based on classroom assessment tools, and standardized child assessment measures) vary across the preschool initiatives. Six initiatives (Seattle, District of Columbia, Boston, New York City, Elk Grove, and Chicago) require teachers to have bachelor’s degrees. Other initiatives, such as Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, have less rigorous teacher qualification requirements but provide higher reimbursements to programs that meet higher QRIS levels and include a requirement for teachers at the highest level to have bachelor’s degrees. Denver, Los Angeles, and Seattle all use their state or local QRIS as the framework for quality, and providers must meet a specific QRIS rating level to participate and provide preschool through the initiative. Almost all the initiatives have requirements for ratios and total class sizes, but these varied, with some using Head Start standards for ratios and others using Title 5 State Preschool or state licensing standards that tend not to require as protective ratios.

The preschool initiatives also vary in the degree to which they provide professional development or tuition reimbursement to encourage teachers to obtain more education. San Antonio, Boston, and Salt Lake offer the most in terms of professional development. These three initiatives provide regular coaching and professional development. San Antonio also offers tuition credits to preschool teachers taking courses leading toward degrees.

Finally, many of the preschool initiatives require that programs receive an independent assessment of quality using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) or the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). Scores on these assessments are factored into the overall quality rating of the program in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle, with the assessment also used as a foundation for professional development.

Table 12 briefly describes teacher qualifications, other quality measures, and provision for professional development or tuition reimbursement as an incentive for professional development for each initiative.
Table 12. Teacher Qualifications, Other Quality Measures, and Provision for Professional Development and Tuition Reimbursement for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Teacher Qualifications</th>
<th>Other Quality Measures</th>
<th>Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS</td>
<td>BPS: Teachers must meet same requirements as K–12 teachers (bachelor’s degree and credential with plans to receive a master’s degree within five years). K1DS: Teachers must have a bachelor’s degree in early childhood education.</td>
<td>BPS: Working toward National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation for all district-operated classrooms (currently 30 are accredited). Staff-to-child ratio of 2:22, negotiated by union contract because teachers have master’s degrees. K1DS/PEG: Must be licensed by the state and either NAEYC accredited or working toward accreditation; staff-to-child ratio of 2:20. All programs: Must use standard curriculum, OWL and Building Blocks, which is aligned with BPS kindergarten curriculum. Teacher coaching and observations. Required to allow time for professional development.</td>
<td>Professional development opportunities offered through the public school system and paid for by PEG. BPS also offers extensive curriculum training and coaching, with one coach per every 10 classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Each center has one head teacher with certification and a bachelor’s degree or higher. Classroom teachers also must be certified with a bachelor’s degree. Assistants have an associate’s degree, 60 hours in early childhood education, or a Child Development Associate credential.</td>
<td>Class size limited to 17 with at least two teaching staff. Curriculum is aligned with the associated elementary school program. Parent engagement standards include at least 2.5 hours per week of participation.</td>
<td>Provides coaching and at least two professional development sessions per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>Other Quality Measures</td>
<td>Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>No single requirement exists, although teacher qualifications are taken into account by the Colorado Shines QRIS, and programs must have a Level 3 QRIS rating or be taking specific measures to reach that rating to participate in the initiative.</td>
<td>Programs are evaluated and rated by Colorado Shines, NAEYC, or the National Association of Family Child Care. Programs must have a Level 3 Colorado Shines QRIS rating or be taking specific measures to reach that rating. Teacher qualifications, adult-to-child ratios, classroom size, curriculum, and other quality measures are considered as part of the rating process.</td>
<td>Each program receives a quality improvement plan from DPP. Depending on need, DPP invests in coaching, tuition, or other professional development activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>Credentialed teachers with a bachelor’s degree and 12 hours of early childhood education; newly hired assistants are required to have 48 college units or an associate’s degree. Five teachers without bachelor’s degrees were grandfathered into the system.</td>
<td>Individual classrooms meet standards for their specific funding source: Head Start classrooms meet Head Start standards, and Title 5 State Preschool classrooms meet state standards. Title I classrooms meet state licensing requirements, with a classroom size of 20 and a staff-to-child ratio of 1:10.</td>
<td>Professional development opportunities are provided through Race to the Top funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>The lead teacher must hold a Child Development Teacher permit, and assistants must have a Child Development Assistant permit. For QRIS Level 4 programs, lead teachers must have an associate’s degree in early childhood education or a related field; for QRIS Level 5 programs, lead teachers must have a bachelor’s degree.</td>
<td>Staff-to-child ratio of 1:8, with at least one adult qualifying as a lead teacher. NAEYC-accredited programs with at least a five-star rating may operate at 1:20. The maximum class size is 24. Programs must follow one of eight approved curricula or follow the Montessori or Reggio Emilia approach. Quality certification through QRIS is required, and higher rated programs receive higher reimbursements.</td>
<td>Program support specialists offer training opportunities and facilitate learning communities for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>Other Quality Measures</td>
<td>Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>All teachers must have a bachelor’s degree and either early childhood certification or be on track to get it within three years. No grace period exists after the three years are passed.</td>
<td>All programs are evaluated using ECERS and CLASS evaluations. Class sizes and ratios are based on Department of Health regulations. The curriculum must meet New York State Common Core requirements for preschool, and programs must meet requirements for parent engagement. All programs must be licensed and receive regular safety inspections.</td>
<td>Professional development and trainings offered by the New York City Department of Education throughout the school year, as well as on-site support at both the classroom and the program levels. Past partnership with City University of New York (CUNY) helps teachers become certified. CUNY’S Early Childhood Professional Development Institute advises teachers and provides professional development resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>Lead teachers must have at least a Child Development Associate credential or an associate’s degree in early childhood education or a related field. Many lead teachers have bachelor’s degrees. Assistant teachers often have Child Development Associate credentials, but only a high school diploma is required.</td>
<td>Adult-to-child ratio of 1:10 is required. The We Can! Early Childhood Curriculum is an evidence-based curriculum. Special education consultants, speech-language pathologists, and other service providers provide additional support.</td>
<td>Teachers receive monthly evidence-based professional development and coaching. No monetary support is provided for teachers to attain bachelor’s degrees, but the program provides release time and other in-kind support for teachers working on their degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Teachers must be certified in early childhood education. Most have bachelor’s degrees; some have master’s degrees. Assistants must have Child Development Associate credential or an associate’s degree. All are required to have at least three years of early childhood teaching experience (most have much more).</td>
<td>Classroom ratio of 2:20, with eight floating assistants. Unable to confirm additional quality measures.</td>
<td>Offers coaching and tuition credits. Holds free on-site training sessions that also are open to preschool teachers throughout the state of Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>Other Quality Measures</td>
<td>Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: PFA</td>
<td>The minimum qualifications for a lead teacher include a California Child Development Permit at the teacher level (24 units of early childhood education and child development including core courses plus 16 general education units); the second teacher must be at least an associate teacher, and the third teacher must be at least an assistant teacher. Each site also must have a program director with a bachelor’s degree or a site director with a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Site Supervisor Permit for agencies operating multiple sites. Program or site directors must have 24 early childhood education and child development units (including core) plus six units of administration and two units of adult supervision. Family child care programs are exempt from the program director qualifications but must meet the lead teacher qualifications.</td>
<td>All preschool classrooms must have a minimum score of 4.50 on ECERS or the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCERS) and must maintain a score of 4.00 across the entire facility. Curriculum documentation also must be provided. Classroom size of no more than 24, staff-to-child ratio of 1:8 (or 1:10 for Head Start or Title 5 State Preschool).</td>
<td>Professional development supports are developed by citywide trend data from CLASS/ECERS, and cohorts are formed as professional learning communities (project, dual language, science, and curriculum). Sites may choose from a menu of options and must commit to setting aside funding from their PFA budget for release time of staff (one session per month). Also provides on-site coaching. Every participating program must have a quality improvement plan that is linked to their professional development and the PFA budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>Other Quality Measures</td>
<td>Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>Lead teachers: Bachelor’s degree in early childhood education or a bachelor’s degree and a Washington State teaching certificate with a P–3 endorsement. Assistant teachers: Associate’s degree in early childhood education or two years of coursework in early childhood education meeting Washington State Core Competencies for Early Care and Educational Professionals. Teachers have four years to meet these requirements. Tuition support is provided.</td>
<td>All programs must have a QRIS rating of at least 3. A six-hour day is required. The maximum class size is 20, with a 1:10 adult-to-child ratio. Programs must offer one of two approved curriculums (High Scope or Creative), and curriculum training is required.</td>
<td>Tuition assistance is available. High Scope and Creative curriculum training is offered at no cost to providers, along with other professional development opportunities and on-site coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td>Must have bachelor’s degree (for nonpublic schools) or an associate’s degree with plans to get a bachelor’s degree by September 2017. Assistant teachers must have associate’s degree, 48 credits, or a paraprofessional credential. A Child Development Associate credential is acceptable only for nonpublic schools. Charter schools do not have specific teacher requirements.</td>
<td>Classroom sizes no larger than 20 for 4-year-old children and 16 for 3-year-old children. Staff-to-child ratio of 2:16 for 3-year-old children and 2:20 for 4-year-old children. Mixed-age classrooms follow the three-year previous standard. Participating CBO programs must be nationally accredited. All programs operated by public schools or CBOs use a curriculum aligned with the District of Columbia Public Schools early learning standards and perform required developmental screenings. Charter schools are not bound by these requirements, but they undergo regular reviews by the District of Columbia Public School Charter Board.</td>
<td>Offers free and low-cost training sessions, including free Child Development Associate credential trainings with books and other materials included. The University of the District of Columbia also offers a scholarship fund, initially funded by the Initiative, which covers the cost of classes and books for teachers seeking certification or advanced degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>Other Quality Measures</td>
<td>Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>Master teachers or program directors (i.e., site directors) will possess (or be in the process of obtaining) bachelor’s degrees in early childhood education and child development. Assistant teachers will possess associate’s degrees with 24 core early childhood education units. Any teaching staff not meeting the above requirements must follow a written plan to satisfy them by 2015.</td>
<td>All programs must receive passing scores on ECERS, FCCERS, or the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale, as determined by the city of West Sacramento, and must complete CLASS evaluations. Teacher-to-child ratio of 2:20 or 3:24 at preschools (lower for toddlers and infants). Programs that exceed minimum requirements receive higher reimbursements.</td>
<td>None specifically, but partner organizations often use funds from UP4WS for professional development purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett, Carolan, Squires, Clarke Brown, & Horowitz (2015); Boston Public Schools (n.d.); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.b); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014a); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b).*

*aThe Child Development Permit is a document that authorizes service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program. It verifies that the individual has fulfilled the requirements established by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for assisting, teaching, or supervising in a child development program in the state of California. A provider must have a permit to be eligible for child care and development teaching or administrative positions funded by California Department of Education’s Child Development Division.*
Political Leadership

Almost every initiative we studied had a local politician or other leader who took on preschool as a cause. In several cases, a city mayor or other elected official acted as an advocate for the preschool program. For example, Mayors John Hickenlooper and Michael Hancock of Denver, Julián Castro of San Antonio, Ed Murray of Seattle, and Christopher Cabaldon of West Sacramento, as well as City Council President Tim Burgess of Seattle and County Supervisor Tom Ammiano of San Francisco, were particularly instrumental in helping pass ballot initiatives relating to preschool programs in their cities. Mayors also have influenced the creation of preschool initiatives in other ways, such as Bill de Blasio of New York City encouraging the state legislature to drastically increase funding for the state’s universal preschool program or Mayors Tom Menino and Martin Walsh working with the local district to expand preschool opportunities in Boston.

Community organizers and education advocates also provide key leadership in many localities. Particularly potent is the combination of advocacy with elected leaders, as in Salt Lake City, where the local United Way and local education leaders worked together to convince the state to back Pay for Success initiatives, or in Washington, D.C., where then-Council Chair Vincent Gray joined with advocacy groups to help pass the 2008 city council measure that funded universal preschool in that city.

Table 13. Political Leadership for Preschool Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool Initiative</th>
<th>Political Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS</td>
<td>Former Mayor Thomas Menino and current Mayor Martin Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago: CPCs</td>
<td>Original CPCs: former CPS Superintendent Lorraine Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay for Success expansion: Mayor Rahm Emanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver: DPP</td>
<td>Former Mayor John Hickenlooper (now governor of Colorado; initial program) and current Mayor Michael Hancock (2014 expansion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool</td>
<td>Elizabeth Pinkerton, long-time district teacher and administrator, and Dave Gordon, district superintendent from 1995 to 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles: LAUP</td>
<td>LAUP board and leadership team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City: Prekindergarten for All</td>
<td>Mayor Bill de Blasio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake: School Readiness</td>
<td>United Way of Salt Lake, Voices for Utah Children, Salt Lake County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Ben McAdams, State Representative Greg Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA</td>
<td>Mayor Julián Castro, local business leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco: (PFA)</td>
<td>Community organizers, former County supervisor Tom Ammiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program</td>
<td>City Council President Tim Burgess and Mayor Ed Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Political Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten</td>
<td>Former District of Columbia Council Chair Vincent Gray (later mayor), current Mayor Muriel Bowser, and various community organizations and nonprofit organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement and Expansion Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento: UP4WS</td>
<td>Mayor Christopher Cabaldon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (2015); City of Seattle (2015b); City of West Sacramento (n.d. a); Connors (2014); Dardick & Perez (2014); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Goldsmith (2008); Haskins (2014); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); United Way of Salt Lake (2014); U.S. Conference of Mayors (2014a); U.S. Conference of Mayors (2014b); Watson (2010).*
Analysis of Potential Funding Sources

Both benefits and challenges are associated with the various funding sources for financing universal preschool. The following sections briefly review the attributes of the primary funding mechanisms used by the preschool initiatives we studied, including sales taxes, property taxes, set-asides from city budgets, Pay for Success bonds, and Title I. We also discuss business involvement in direct funding as well as advocacy for publicly funded early care and education initiatives.

Sales Tax

Denver, San Antonio, and West Sacramento fund their preschool programs—at least in part—through a voter-approved, dedicated sales tax. According to the stakeholders interviewed, Denver successfully imposed a sales tax in 2006, after two prior efforts failed, by undertaking an extensive public education campaign that promoted the value of preschool to its citizens. The initial 2006 measure in Denver passed narrowly, winning 50.6 percent of the vote (50 percent was required for the measure to pass; J. Murray, 2014). A renewal and expansion of the preschool measure in 2014 won by a much more comfortable margin, garnering 55 percent of the vote (Robles, 2014).

San Antonio’s tax passed in 2012 with 53 percent of the vote (Baugh & Cesar, 2012). West Sacramento’s sales tax was a general sales tax, and only some of the revenues are dedicated to preschool services (City of West Sacramento, 2006). The tax passed with 64.5 percent of the vote (Yolo Elections Office, n.d.a), and the advisory measure connected to it passed with 82.3 percent of the vote (Yolo Elections Office, n.d.b).

California has a complicated tax structure, with strict rules about how taxes may be raised. Taxes are levied at the state, county, and city levels, and cities may impose additional taxes. Currently, counties and cities may impose additional sales taxes of up to 2 percent (Roberts, 2015). However, if both county and city taxes are imposed, the revenue is collected only once, with the city collecting its percentage on purchases made within city limits, and the county collecting its percentage on purchases made in the county but outside city limits (Institute for Local Government, 2013).

In California, sales taxes may be raised only by ballot measure. Government agencies may impose two types of taxes: general taxes and special taxes. General taxes are imposed to raise general-purpose revenue, which may be used toward any legal purpose. To be considered a general tax, no restrictions may be placed on the use of the revenue. A general tax increase must be approved by a simple majority of the affected voters. Special taxes are imposed to raise money for a specific purpose and can be used only toward the specified purpose. A special tax must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the affected voters (Institute for Local Government, 2013). In 1996, California voters passed Proposition 218, which gives local voters broad authority to file suit and challenge local taxes and fees (Legislative Analyst’s Office, 1996).

Because a general tax requires a simple majority of the vote, it is typically considered the easier way to pass a tax measure. However, general taxes are more likely to be challenged in the courts, especially if they are written in such a way that they could be confused with a special tax. With a
general tax, voters have no guarantee that the additional funding would be used for any specific purpose. In contrast, a special tax is typically considered more difficult to pass than a general tax because it requires a two-thirds majority, but with this type of tax, the voters are assured that the funds will be used for a specific purpose.

Although Sonoma County historically votes to support education and other government initiatives, according to the stakeholders interviewed, two recent tax increase measures failed on the ballot. Measure M, which was on the November 2014 ballot, was a 0.125 percent sales tax that would have provided support for the county library system. The measure faced no organized opposition, but it still failed to pass because it required a two-thirds majority for passage (Ballotpedia, 2014). The other recent tax increase failure was Measure A on the June 2015 ballot. In part because of the failure of Measure M, the supporters of Measure A wrote it as a general tax. Measure A was a general sales tax that, if approved, would have authorized the county to levy an additional sales tax of 0.25 percent, increasing the county’s sales tax rate from 8.25 percent to 8.5 percent. County officials estimated the tax would have raised $20 million per year in additional revenue. The plan for the revenue involved 44 percent going to the county and the remainder going to cities within the county. County officials indicated that with approval of the measure, the county would have had the funds needed to repair and maintain the county’s 12,383 miles of roads. The specific purposes listed in the ballot questions, however, also included transit services and public safety. Opponents critiqued Measure A because of its general purpose, arguing that because the county sold the sales tax as a way to repair the roads, it should have fully restricted its purpose to roads. Opponents also argued that there was no guarantee that the county would have used Measure A tax revenue for roads and might have diverted the revenue to pay off debt from the county’s public pensions (Ballotpedia, 2015; Gullixson, 2015; Hart, 2015). The measure was soundly rejected, gaining only 37.3 percent of the vote (Ballotpedia, 2015). Had the measure passed, local taxpayer associations were planning to challenge it in court, based on their belief that it was really a special tax, not a general tax, and should have required a two-thirds majority (Kennedy, 2015).

In part because of the failure of Measure A and the previous failure of Measure M, the local stakeholders we interviewed expressed concerns about the prospects of a voter-supported tax increase winning on the ballot in Sonoma County. However, these same stakeholders also reported that they believed that tax money is the only stable, sustainable way to pay for expanded preschool, without increased funding from the state or federal government. In addition, the stakeholders involved in other preschool initiatives, including Denver, San Antonio, and San Francisco, agreed that a sales tax increase was a sustainable way of funding preschool expansion. However, these stakeholders also noted that one disadvantage of a sales tax increase is that there will be decreases in revenue when the economy is in a down cycle. However, these stakeholders also noted that officials can factor possible economic downturns into the percentage increase to ensure a more stable revenue stream.

**Property Tax**

Another type of local tax that has been used to fund preschool initiatives is a property tax. Property taxes are assessed on owners of real property, including both residential and commercial properties. In California, the maximum rate is 1 percent, although short-term increases can be assessed for specific capital improvements. Similar to sales taxes used for
specific purposes, in California, such increases must be approved by two thirds of the voters (Institute for Local Government, 2013). Seattle is funding its universal preschool program primarily through a property tax increase. According to the stakeholders interviewed, the city has a history of using the Families and Education Levy for education-related purposes (City of Seattle, 2015a). The tax increase passed in 2014 with 67 percent of the vote (Beekman, 2014).

**Set-Asides**

A set-aside is another way that some preschool initiatives have been funded. A set-aside, also known as an earmark, is a commitment from a local government to use money from its general fund for a specific purpose. A set-aside can be a specified amount, a percentage of revenue, or a combination of both. Some advantages of set-asides include their predictability from year to year and their ability to get citizens involved in the voting process. The disadvantages include a lack of flexibility as circumstances change or during a budget crisis (SPUR, 2008). San Francisco and Washington, D.C., largely fund their universal preschool programs through set-asides, according to the stakeholders interviewed for both initiatives. San Francisco’s set-aside was created by the passage of Measure H in 2004, and it passed with more than 70 percent of the vote. San Francisco’s set-aside from the general fund is actually financed by a 4 percent (initially 3 percent) set-aside from property tax revenues but did not increase the property tax itself.

Although sales taxes and property taxes have been successful through ballot measures for preschool initiatives in other states, the battle is likely to be greater for any local tax initiative to win in California because of the two-thirds majority requirement. The two places in California that have reached that level of support are San Francisco, which has a long history of supporting similar efforts, and West Sacramento, where only a very small portion of the tax increase goes toward providing preschool services. In San Francisco, the measure was part of a PEEF (Public Education Enrichment Fund) for educating older children, which may have increased its chances of passage.

**Pay for Success**

The benefits and challenges associated with other funding mechanisms, such as Pay for Success bonds, abound. The following briefly reviews Pay for Success and its history as well as its use as a funding source for the Salt Lake School Readiness initiative and CPCs.

Known in Australia and the United Kingdom as social impact bonds, Pay for Success is a new funding model that partners government and other nonprofit agencies with private investment firms. The investors pay for social intervention programs or improvements up front, and the government agency returns the money with interest after the programs begin to provide savings in other areas. The funds are repaid only if the savings are realized, based on specific metrics and outcomes agreed on in advance. The first social impact bond was issued in September 2010 by Social Impact UK, and the model has gained great interest in the United States during the last few years (Government of the United Kingdom, 2013; Nonprofit Finance Fund, 2013).

Within the last few years, several Pay for Success initiatives have launched in the United States; five have been funded as of February 2015. Two of these initiatives (Chicago and Salt Lake City/Park City, Utah) are targeted to funding preschool education for children from low-income
families (Golden & Nagendra, 2015). Preschool education is an area of interest to Pay for Success funders, in part because of a report from the National Bureau of Economic Research (Heckman, Moon, Pinto, Savelyev, & Yavetz, 2009) showing a 7 percent to 10 percent return on investment from the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program, which targeted African-American youth who were disadvantaged.

Because private investors bear the lion’s share of the risk, Pay for Success initiatives are attractive. Supporters of the model suggest that shifting the financial risk onto private investors provides room for government agencies to experiment with new and different approaches (Hoback, 2015). However, the model also has its critics. In its study on a proposed Pay for Success initiative to fund prisoner reentry programs, the Maryland Department of Legislative Services (2013) found that such a program, on its own, was unlikely to pay back enough dividends to cover the costs of administering the initiative, much less reward investors. Hoback (2015) cites Susan Brown, public policy director of the Minnesota Council on Nonprofits, who expresses concerns about the time and expense of evaluating the programs to determine whether the metrics are being met. Other issues raised include the difficulty of quantifying outcomes and the risk of services being compromised by the incentive to hit specific targets (McHugh, Sinclair, Roy, Huckfield, & Donaldson, 2013). A similar project in the United Kingdom was shown to have affected the services provided by a reentry organization called Pathways to Work, when they shaped their policies to suit the terms of their contract with the investor rather than the needs of their clients (Hudson, Phillips, Ray, Vegeris, & Davidson, 2010). Others, such as Congressman Ross Hunter, see the interest rates charged by these private investors as too high compared with traditional government-backed bonds (he cites a difference of 9 percent to 11 percent compared with rates as low as 4 percent; Hoback, 2015).

Salt Lake has finished its second year of a program, called School Readiness, to expand preschool access for 3- and 4-year-old children from low-income families using Pay for Success. Because School Readiness is the first attempt in the United States to fund early childhood education on the Pay for Success model, the project has attracted national attention. It will likely be considered a test case as to whether the Pay for Success scheme is a feasible way to fund early childhood education programs (Lu, 2014; Meehan, 2013).

The impetus for the program was based on a study by Voices for Utah Children (2011), which followed a cohort of children who attended high-quality Title I preschools in Salt Lake City’s Granite School District. The study showed that these children used special education services at a much lower rate, resulting in reduced costs for the district. According to the stakeholders interviewed, because the preschool program provided such a well-delineated return on investment, early childhood leaders in the city felt it would make an excellent candidate for a Pay for Success bond. Goldman Sachs and philanthropic investor J. B. Pritzker fronted the funds for the initial investment (Meehan, 2013). Initially, the state was unwilling to pass a bill that would provide backing funds for the loan. United Way of Salt Lake and Salt Lake County set up the initial contracts and put up backing funds ($1 million from the United Way and $350,000 from the county) for the first year of the program, referred to as a “proof of concept” year. This provided an example framework for the state, and the state came onboard, setting aside the backing funding by passing HB 96 in 2014. HB 96 created the School Readiness Board, which guarantees the Salt Lake Pay for Success project and offered competitive grants to other preschool programs wanting to improve their quality standards in hopes of attracting future Pay for Success
funding. The bill appropriated $3 million for the grants and to back or guarantee the remaining years of the School Readiness Pay for Success grant (Utah State Legislature, 2014). The Early Intervention Research Unit of Utah State University will measure the outcomes. If the agreed-on outcomes are not reached, the loan will not be repaid (United Way of Salt Lake, 2014).

The Salt Lake Pay for Success grant pays the full cost of a $1,550 per child, three-hour preschool program for approximately 750 children from low-income families currently and will expand to 1,000 children during the final two years of the grant. The Salt Lake stakeholders interviewed reported that the intent of this particular Pay for Success bond was not to serve every child from a low-income family in Salt Lake. Instead, they are taking the opportunity to reach out to low-income families and educate them on the importance of preschool and work with the Utah State Legislature to expand preschool opportunities throughout the state. The director of preschool services for Granite School District, one of the providers for the Pay for Success grant, estimated that the district’s preschool program serves approximately 3,000 children, of which approximately 624 receive preschool services through the Pay for Success grant. In addition, she estimated that the district’s preschool program serves only 50 percent of the eligible population in the district.

The CPC program in Chicago also is using Pay for Success to expand its program for 3- and 4-year-old children. The program was founded in 1967 by a former superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, Lorraine Sullivan, and was designed to provide preschool to children from low-income families not already being served by Head Start. It is known for being the first preschool program to be funded with federal Title I dollars, as well as for the Chicago Longitudinal Study, which tracks students to show the long-term benefits of attending a high-quality preschool (University of Minnesota, 2015). The program runs from age 3 through third grade, with 3- and 4-year-old children attending half-day preschool at a center colocated with an elementary school. The program also requires parent participation, both at home and in the classroom. However, because of budget cuts, school closures, and declining enrollment, the program had been slowly losing seats (Harris, 2012), down from a high of 25 centers and 1,500 three-year-old children through third graders served per year in the 1980s to only 10 centers with 670 preschool spaces in 2009 (Nyhan, 2013). In 2011, the city was part of a consortium that received an i3 grant to expand the CPC model to more cities, primarily in the Midwest. Chicago’s portion of the $15 million five-year grant provided services to 1,200 children at 15 sites starting in fall 2012 (Human Capital Research Collaborative, 2011). To build on this expansion, in October 2014, Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel announced a $17 million social impact bond that would fund an additional 2,600 CPC spaces across three years (Connors, 2014). Goldman Sachs and Northern Trust are the primary funders. The program is administered by the Chicago Public Schools and will be evaluated by a consortium of three local nonprofit groups (Dardick & Perez, 2014). The new spaces will be opened in six schools, including two existing CPC locations, three locations added in the 2012 expansion, and one entirely new location. Capital construction costs will be funded by the city and the state of Illinois, not the social impact bond (Human Capital Research Collaborative, 2014b).

As with Salt Lake, the Chicago CPC Pay for Success grant is already garnering national interest, but it also has its critics. Rick Cohen (2014) pointed out that the CPC program already has a proven record of success (a 20-year longitudinal study from a team from the University of Rochester showed more than $7 returned per dollar invested (Reynolds, Temple, White, Ou, & Roberston, 2011)) and suggests that the city would be better served by paying for the program up
front rather than giving the money back to investors later on. Other fiscal evaluations suggest that the cost of administering the bond may outweigh the savings to the city (Sanchez, 2014).

Overall, Pay for Success in the United States, as used in Salt Lake and Chicago, is limited. First, Pay for Success requires an initial private investor willing to assume the risk of funding the initiative without guarantee of repayment. In addition, it is important to note that Salt Lake uses Pay for Success funding to pay for a very small percentage of the 4-year-old population, and in Chicago, the Pay for Success bond is not the primary source of funding. However, it will be important to keep an eye on these two “experiments” to see if it might one day be possible to use this model to fund an initiative on a larger scale or if they raise public awareness of the importance of early education, thereby contributing to increased support for more stable public funding for preschool.

**Federal Title I**

One of the oldest sources of public funding for preschool initiatives is federal Title I funds, which are used in Chicago and Elk Grove. In 2014–15, the Elk Grove Unified School District designated approximately 8.5 percent of its Title I funds to provide preschool services in Title I–eligible schools. The provision of Title I funds allowed the Elk Grove district to serve children just above the income eligibility limits for other publicly subsidized programs and provide compensation to preschool teachers equivalent to that of K–12 personnel.

The advantages of using Title I funds for preschool include the flexibility of the funding source; in schools with schoolwide Title I programs, the funds can be used for any child, regardless of family income, attending a Title I school, to improve the quality of service and compensation for personnel and extend the hours or days of service.

The primary disadvantage of Title I as a funding source for preschool, unless federal Title I funds are increased overall, is that the federal government has provided these funds to schools to support students in all grades, from prekindergarten to Grade 12. In 2006–07, less than 1 percent (approximately 0.6 percent) of California’s Title I funds were allocated for preschool (Karoly, Reardon, & Cho, 2007), compared with 3 percent nationally (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). During the recent Great Recession, it is likely that even schools that had been using Title I for preschool-age children faced pressure to use the funds to fill deficits in services for older children. That said, Title I remains an important part of preschool finance in CPCs, perhaps the most thoroughly evaluated preschool program showing one of the highest returns on investment. Using Title I funds to support preschool in combination with another funding mechanism, as in Chicago, may be a workable approach.

**Partnerships With Local Businesses**

Another potential approach for obtaining support for preschool is to develop partnerships with local businesses. Business support might be direct, as in the provision of on-site programs for preschool-age children or infants and toddlers or the provision of employee benefits to pay for preschool or child care, or indirect, by engaging business support for a preschool initiative supported by public funds. For example, chambers of commerce provided key support for preschool initiatives in Denver (Goldsmith, 2008) and San Antonio (Baugh & Cesar, 2012), by
not only endorsing the measures but also helping to craft them, with representatives serving on working groups and task forces from the early stages of the process.

Many chamber of commerce organizations encourage their members to provide support for their employees’ child care needs. The Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce is one local leader in this area. Through its WHEEL Plus program, and in partnership with First 5 Sonoma County, the Chamber promotes the importance of early childhood education to its members, and they sponsor an annual tour of high-quality child care facilities (Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce, n.d.). The Santa Rosa chamber worked with local businesses to apply for a grant from First 5 Sonoma County, which would have provided support for companies to provide on-site child care. The proposal was not funded, but according to the stakeholders interviewed, the chamber continues to be interested in supporting efforts to expand child care programs in the county.

Sonoma County stakeholders who were interviewed identified a lack of employers large enough to provide a sustainable population of children of the right age to make it cost effective to hire staff at the ratios required for licensing as the key barrier to employers providing on-site child care for their employees. One potential solution suggested was finding ways to encourage employers located near each other, such as in an office park, to work together to fund a child care center.

One large Sonoma County employer, Graton Resort & Casino in Rohnert Park, proposed to offer on-site child care to its employees (Mason, 2008), but this does not seem to have become a reality. However, many casinos host or provide on-site child care facilities for their employees. Two Las Vegas casinos—the Venetian and Texas Station—opened the first such facilities in 2000. The centers were owned and operated by Children’s Choice Learning Centers, a for-profit company (purchased by Bright Horizons in 2013) that paid for the centers’ construction and operation. The casinos donated the land, and the Venetian subsidized parent fees at 20 percent below market rates (Strow, 2000). Some states, such as Massachusetts, have passed laws authorizing municipalities to require casinos to build child care centers (Timmins, 2013).

Another potential employer to target for providing child care to its employees is Kaiser Permanente. Many hospitals provide on-site or subsidized child care to their employees. Large hospitals with on-site employee child care centers include Stanford Hospital and Florida Hospital Waterman (Galt, 2013), as well as Rex Hospital at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill and Riverside Methodist Hospital in Columbus, Ohio (Fields, Rodak, Roney, & Tawoda, 2012).

Although it seems unlikely that businesses will be a primary operator of preschools, there may be opportunities for Sonoma County to work with the business community to expand access to preschool, and having business support for a locally funded preschool initiative could well be invaluable in garnering larger community support for such an initiative.
Cost Estimates and Phase-In Plans

The Cost per Child for Universal Preschool

To determine the funds necessary to support universal preschool in Sonoma County, it is first important to determine the expenditure per child for such an initiative. To do so, we estimated the current per child cost of a full-day preschool initiative serving 3- and 4-year-old children in Sonoma County—$11,590 per child—by reviewing the budgets and staffing patterns of preschool programs, including Head Start and Title 5 State Preschool, the two publicly funded programs whose standards are generally thought to represent the minimum level of quality necessary to promote improved early learning and increase child outcomes (Karoly & Bigelow, 2005). Federal Head Start Performance Standards roughly translate to a Level 4 rating on California’s five-level Race to the Top QRIS framework, which is currently being implemented in 16 counties, whereas Title 5 State Preschool standards roughly translate to a QRIS Level 3 rating. As we saw in the descriptions of the 12 preschool initiatives, several initiatives, such as those in Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, currently use QRIS Level 3 ratings as one of the entry-level requirements for receiving preschool initiative funding.

Staffing patterns and adult-to-child ratios in preschool classrooms were similar across the centers we studied. For example, class sizes were limited to 20 children with at least two adults—two teachers—all day, plus 1.8 full-time equivalent teaching assistants (i.e., the teaching assistants are present most of the day but typically not in the early morning or late afternoon when fewer children are in full-day programs). Per child costs also were similar, although centers allocated nonteaching staff resources differently. For example, the Head Start program hired a family outreach worker, whereas another preschool used a facilities specialist and a fiscal specialist. We assumed a full-day (eight-hour), full-year (12-month) program. It is important to note that although the budgets we reviewed defined “full day, full year” in this manner, perhaps as a way of making the hours of preschool service more closely match those of working parents, this is not the definition we later found to be used in most of the initiatives, which typically define a full day as up to 6.5 hours and operate on a school-year (10-month) versus 12-month basis.

The current per child cost of a full-day preschool initiative serving 3- and 4-year-old children in Sonoma County—$11,590 per child—breaks out to approximately 44 percent instructional staff salaries, 11 percent other staff salaries, 18 percent staff benefits, and 27 percent non-personnel costs. Further details of the costs included in the per child cost estimate are noted in Appendix C.

Based on direction from Sonoma County, raising the wages of the staff across the board to a living wage was the main approach for improving quality, with the intent of retaining as well as recruiting future qualified employees.

We estimated the cost per child if wages are increased to a living wage by setting $15 per hour as the minimum wage. For the lowest paid employee, a teacher assistant, this represented an increase of 15.74 percent. Nonteaching administrative staff (e.g., fiscal specialists, family outreach workers, and facilities specialists) are already paid a living wage. In developing the living wage budgets, because teachers are given notable raises, we gave these staff raises as well to recognize the roles they play in establishing a quality program. However, because the nonteaching administrative staff were already earning more than $15 per hour as a group, we...
selected a 5 percent raise instead of 15.74 percent. This process resulted in a per child cost of $13,143.

The per child cost if wages were raised to living wages—$13,143—breaks out by budget category in approximately the same manner as the current salaries cost per child, given that non-personnel costs and benefits are estimated as a percentage of salaries. Further details of the costs included in the per child cost estimate are noted in Appendix C.

Although increasing wages may help retain personnel, $15 is still a long way from the median wage for an elementary school teacher in Santa Rosa ($29 per hour; Salary.com, 2015). Salary increases have to be greater to attract and retain teachers who are more qualified. Also, the county may wish to consider the cost of implementing other quality elements, such as classroom assessments, professional development, coaching and mentors, curriculum, and family engagement.

It should be noted that various factors could increase or decrease the per child cost of preschool. The major factors that might increase the cost would be raising the requirements for lead teachers to include bachelor’s degrees and that of assistant teachers to have associate’s degrees, increasing the pay of qualified teachers to be commensurate with their qualifications closer to those of K–12 teachers, hiring a staff person to address family engagement, introducing a new evidence-based curriculum, offering teachers tuition reimbursement to obtain additional training, and conducting assessments of classroom quality. The major factor that would decrease the cost of the program would be to offer services six hours per day and 10 months per year, as in most of the preschool initiatives we examined. Estimating the precise savings from such a reduction in hours and months of service is beyond the current scope of this project but might be sufficient to help Sonoma County provide some of the quality elements found in other preschool initiatives without raising the expenditure per child beyond that found for a living wage in this report.

**Phase-In Plan Scenarios for Universal Preschool**

Based on input from Sonoma County staff, we developed 10 scenarios using four approaches to phase in additional preschool spaces to meet unmet need for preschool access among 3- and 4-year-old children. For each approach, we estimated the cost for phasing in using the estimated cost at current salaries and then for living wages. The four main approaches for phasing in additional preschool spaces to meet unmet need for preschool among 3- and 4-year-old children are as follows:

- To serve all children in the highest-priority areas in Sonoma County
- To serve all children living below 300 percent of the federal poverty line
- To serve all children in the county at an 85 percent participation rate
- To make preschool available to 100 percent of children in the county

We examined the highest-priority areas in Sonoma County in two ways. First, we identified the ZIP codes associated with highest-priority schools in the county (i.e., schools with the highest unduplicated counts of homeless students, English learners, and students eligible for free or
reduced-price lunch), according to First 5 Sonoma\(^1\). Second, we looked at the five high-risk-priority areas per *A Portrait of Sonoma County*\(^2\) by census tracts as identified in the Sonoma County Child Care Planning Council’s supplement to the 2014 Child Care Needs Assessment (Nilsson Consulting, 2015). In those high-priority census tracts, information was available only on the number of children in any type of care, so we defined “unmet need” as the number of children not in any type of care. Sonoma County may wish to revisit this definition of preschool and impose higher quality standards. In the lowest performing school ZIP codes, less unmet need was identified than in the high-priority census tracts, even though the lowest-performing school ZIP codes together housed more 3- and 4-year-old children in total because very few preschool spaces are available in the high-priority census tracts.

**Unmet Need**

The phase-in plans described in Tables 14–18 aim to create new full-day (e.g., eight-hour), full-year (12-month) preschool spaces for all 3- and 4-year-old children who are not already enrolled in a licensed program. To estimate the total number of three- and four-year-olds in Sonoma County, we used the latest three-year averages from the American Community Survey. For total population counts, this data was from 2013. According to the Survey, there are 6,022 4-year-old children in Sonoma County and 5,536 3-year-old children. For both high-priority area population estimates, we used 2012 data disaggregated to the ZIP code level from AIR’s Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool.

To estimate the number of children enrolled in preschool in order to identify remaining unmet need, we relied on varying data sources. In the case of the 300 percent of the federal poverty line scenario, we took into account only publicly subsidized spaces (Head Start and California Title 5 State Preschool programs), assuming that families living just above the 70 percent state median income Title 5 eligibility threshold but under 300 percent of the federal poverty line would be unable to afford high-quality private preschool programs. In the case of the high-priority census tracts scenario, we counted children in any type of center or family child care, as these were the data available from the census tract.

---

\(^1\) Highest priority schools and associated zip codes are listed in Appendix D.

\(^2\) The five high-risk priority areas include census tracts in the following areas: East Cloverdale, Fetters Springs/Agua Caliente West, Northwest Santa Rosa, Southwest Santa Rosa, and Southeast Santa Rosa. The exact census tracts associated with these high-risk priority areas are listed in Appendix D.
Serving All 3- and 4-Year-Old Children in the Highest-Priority Areas

Table 14 illustrates a suggested phase-in plan for serving all 3- and 4-year-old children in the ZIP codes associated with the First 5 high-priority schools across five years and the cost per year.

Table 14. Scenario 1. High-Priority School ZIP Codes at Current Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of spaces to add (unmet need)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$11,590</td>
<td>$11,937</td>
<td>$12,295</td>
<td>$12,664</td>
<td>$13,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$927,162</td>
<td>$1,909,954</td>
<td>$2,950,879</td>
<td>$4,052,540</td>
<td>$5,622,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Sonoma County adds 80 new preschool spaces (i.e., four classrooms) each year during the next four years and five new classrooms in Year 5, we estimate that all children in the lowest performing school ZIP codes will have access to a preschool space by Year 5. The total cost in Year 5 is estimated to be $5.63 million. If staff wages are increased to a living wage, we estimate that the cost will be $6.38 million.

Alternatively, if Sonoma focuses on serving children only in the highest-priority census tracts (Table 15), four new classrooms would need to be created in Year 1, followed by eight new classrooms in Years 2 and 3 and 12 new classrooms in Years 4 and 5, for a total cost in Year 5 of $11.5 million. If staff wages are increased to a living wage, the cost is estimated at $13 million.

Table 15. Scenario 2. High-Priority Census Tracts at Current Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of spaces to add (unmet need)</td>
<td>881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$11,590</td>
<td>$11,937</td>
<td>$12,295</td>
<td>$12,664</td>
<td>$13,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$927,162</td>
<td>$2,864,931</td>
<td>$4,918,131</td>
<td>$8,105,080</td>
<td>$11,487,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serving All 3- and 4-Year-Old Children Below 300 Percent of the Federal Poverty Line

Table 16 illustrates a suggested phase-in plan for serving all 3- and 4-year-old children in the county living below 300 percent of the federal poverty line and the cost per year.

If Sonoma adds 80 new preschool spaces (four classrooms) next year and increases this gradually during a period of 10 years, we estimate that all children living below 300 percent of the federal poverty line will have access to a preschool space by Year 10. The total cost in Year 10 is estimated to be $30.4 million. If staff wages are increased to a living wage, we estimate the cost will be $34.5 million.

Table 16. Scenario 3. Under 300 Percent of the Federal Poverty Line at Current Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of children</th>
<th>7,191</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of spaces to add (unmet need)</td>
<td>2,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$11,590</td>
<td>$11,937</td>
<td>$12,295</td>
<td>$12,664</td>
<td>$13,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$927,162</td>
<td>$2,387,442</td>
<td>$3,934,505</td>
<td>$6,078,810</td>
<td>$8,348,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$13,435</td>
<td>$13,839</td>
<td>$14,254</td>
<td>$14,681</td>
<td>$15,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$11,285,767</td>
<td>$14,945,580</td>
<td>$19,384,970</td>
<td>$24,664,525</td>
<td>$30,439,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serving All 3- and 4-Year-Old Children Countywide With an 85 Percent Participation Rate

Providing universal preschool access significantly increases the cost. Table 17 illustrates a suggested phase-in plan for serving 85 percent of all 3- and 4-year-old children in Sonoma County, assuming the remaining 15 percent would elect not to participate in the program but rather be cared for by family. To reach full phase-in within 10 years, Sonoma County might begin by creating 80 new spaces (four new classrooms) in Year 1, adding 120 new spaces (six new classrooms) in each of Years 2 and 3, and increasing gradually the number of classrooms added on top of continuing spaces each year, for a full phased-in cost of approximately $36.9 million in Year 10 and each subsequent year (with small increases each year for cost-of-living adjustments). If staff wages are increased to a living wage, we estimate the annual cost at full phase-in will be $41.9 million.

Table 17. Scenario 4. Universal at 85 Percent Participation at Current Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of children</th>
<th>9,824</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of spaces to add (unmet need)</td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$11,590</td>
<td>$11,937</td>
<td>$12,295</td>
<td>$12,664</td>
<td>$13,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$927,162</td>
<td>$2,387,442</td>
<td>$3,934,505</td>
<td>$6,078,810</td>
<td>$8,869,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$13,435</td>
<td>$13,839</td>
<td>$14,254</td>
<td>$14,681</td>
<td>$15,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$12,360,602</td>
<td>$16,882,971</td>
<td>$22,235,703</td>
<td>$29,068,905</td>
<td>$36,941,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making Preschool Available to 100 Percent of 3- and 4-Year-Old Children Countywide

Providing a truly universal program where all 3- and 4-year-old children are offered access to a preschool space should be phased in across at least 10 years. Table 18 shows a suggested phase-in plan for this universal access across 10 years, although Sonoma County may choose to aim for an even longer period, given that the county would need to create at least 20 new classrooms (400 new spaces with class sizes of 20 children) each year to reach full implementation in 10 years. In Year 10 (fully implemented), we estimate the cost will be $63.2 million. At living wages for staff, the cost is estimated to increase to $71.6 million.

Table 18. Scenario 5. Universal at 100 Percent Participation at Current Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of children</th>
<th>11,558</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of spaces to add (unmet need)</td>
<td>4,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$11,590</td>
<td>$11,937</td>
<td>$12,295</td>
<td>$12,664</td>
<td>$13,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$927,162</td>
<td>$2,387,442</td>
<td>$4,426,318</td>
<td>$7,598,513</td>
<td>$13,044,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New spaces</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing spaces created in prior years</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per child (increasing 3 percent per year)</td>
<td>$13,435</td>
<td>$13,839</td>
<td>$14,254</td>
<td>$14,681</td>
<td>$15,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost each year</td>
<td>$19,884,447</td>
<td>$28,784,081</td>
<td>$38,484,870</td>
<td>$49,622,676</td>
<td>$63,157,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that several factors could significantly reduce the cost of these phase-in scenarios. First, if Sonoma County funded only 4-year-old children, at least in the initial years, the cost would be dramatically reduced. Second, if California expands Title 5 State Preschool or Transitional Kindergarten, or the federal government expands its investment in preschool, these additional funds would be available to provide preschool access to 4-year-old children. This would reduce the number of 4-year-old children Sonoma County would need to find funding to serve and allow Sonoma County to focus on serving 3-year-old children and 4-year-old children not eligible for these programs (typically middle-class working families).
Cost Estimate and Phase-In Plan for Expanding Access
to Home Visiting Programs for Children Ages 0–3 Years

In addition to expanding to universal preschool, Sonoma County also has expressed an interest in expanding evidence-based home visiting services such as the Nurse-Family Partnership (N-FP) to families beginning at pregnancy to age 2. With its focus on both mother and baby, N-FP takes a two-generation approach to reduce potential risk factors and enhance protective factors that result in well-documented improvements in pregnancy and child health outcomes, as well as economic self-sufficiency for the whole family (Nurse-Family Partnership, 2011).

Health Policy, Planning, and Evaluation staff from the Sonoma County Department of Health Services provided us with the current cost per child of home visiting services through the N-FP model, which is approximately $6,536 per family per year. Currently, the county is only able to enroll approximately 11.25 percent of eligible families (first-time pregnant women who are eligible for Medi-Cal or WIC), which is an active caseload of 240 families in a given year, served by a team of eight nurses.

The county’s goal, however, is to serve up to 25 percent of eligible families. Given the nurse-to-families ratios to which N-FP staff must adhere, the most feasible way to reach, or nearly reach, this goal is to double the team of nurses. This will allow the program to serve a caseload of 480 families—or an estimated 22.5 percent of the eligible population—simultaneously. Because the program provides services beginning at pregnancy until the child’s second birthday, most families participate for more than one year. However, there is also some attrition in participation. Accounting for both of these factors, enrolling 180 new families per year (double the current 90 families typically enrolled in a year) would yield an average caseload of 480 families at any one time. The cost to serve these new families (180 new enrollees per year, for a total annual caseload of 480 families) is estimated at approximately $3.1 million, an increase of about $1.6 million over current costs if implemented immediately. Given the current 35 percent federal match, approximately $2 million of this cost is expected to fall on Sonoma County. It is estimated that scaling up N-FP over five years (assuming a 3 percent annual increase) would cost $3.5 million in the final year to serve 480 families.
Recommendations for Funding and Phasing in Universal Preschool in Sonoma County

By examining the 12 preschool initiatives, interviewing Sonoma County stakeholders, conducting cost analyses, and reviewing the pros and cons of various funding options, AIR offers the following 10 recommendations for financing and phasing in universal access to quality preschool in Sonoma County.

What Is the Ultimate Goal?

1. Clearly define the county’s ultimate goal as providing access to quality preschool for all 3- and 4-year-old children in the county.

Defining universal or providing access to all is important. As will be discussed here, providing access to all does not necessarily mean making preschool free to all. However, a universal preschool initiative typically aims to allow all children regardless of family income to participate. Some research indicates that children who are disadvantaged do better when enrolled in preschool programs with peers from a variety of social and economic backgrounds (Schechter & Bye, 2007). Thus, even though most universal preschool initiatives start by expanding and enhancing services in low-income neighborhoods, they typically offer preschool services to all children, regardless of family income, who live in those neighborhoods.

As emphasized throughout this report, it also is important to stress that the goal is to increase access to a level of preschool quality that can be expected to enhance child outcomes. In some of the preschool initiatives that we analyzed, such as San Francisco, a majority of the initiative funds are used to enhance the quality of services partially funded by other public sources, not to fund the entire per child cost.

In addition, it is wise to set a goal for serving both 3- and 4-year-old children. Research indicates that two years of preschool lead to better results than one year, and a two-year focus provides flexibility for shifting any new local funds that become available to support 3-year-old children if a federal or state measure at some point makes funds available to serve all 4-year-old children. Stakeholders in Seattle specifically noted that Sonoma County should be aware of what is happening at the state and federal levels. They indicated that one reason not to start out “too big, too fast” is that then you can build a system that responds to increased funding from state and federal sources. During the last decade, multiple efforts have been made at the state level and, in recent years, at the federal level, to expand access to preschool. The lack of success to date of these efforts in obtaining sufficient funds even to serve all 4-year-olds from economically disadvantaged backgrounds underscores the interest in and need for local initiatives. That said, local initiatives should be sufficiently flexible to incorporate and invest any new state and federal dollars that eventually become available.

Finally, it may be important to focus on the word preschool. Clearly, preschool is not the only form of early care and education that can make a case for public support. A strong evidence base exists for other programs, such as home visiting and high-quality care for infants and toddlers. However, efforts to obtain public support for one initiative for a broad array of services, however
empirically justified, may be less apt to succeed compared with a more narrowly defined program. In Denver, two efforts to mount a ballot initiative for a broad array of services, which included home visiting and other forms of child care as well as preschool, failed with less than 30 percent support. In response to these disappointing results, advocates conducted polling and learned that the broad range of services confused voters. However, the voters understood and resonated with the concept of preschool. When the initiative was reframed to focus on preschool, it passed. Thus, as Sonoma County considers a possible preschool initiative, it will be important to make sure that the wording and the scope of the initiative make sense to the public asked to support the effort.

**Free Versus Sliding Scale Support**

2. **Plan to provide free preschool to families below 300 percent of the federal poverty line and on a sliding scale to families above that income level.**

Determining exactly how much financial assistance a universal preschool initiative can provide and for which children depends, of course, on the type and level of revenue that is available. If a universal preschool measure is supported as part of public school funding, as in Boston, it might indeed be free to all. But many of the preschool initiatives we examined in some way provide more financial help to children from lower income families and significantly less support for children from higher income families.

Seattle, now launching its first year of implementation, will make preschool free to children from families below 300 percent of the federal poverty line in 2015, or $72,750 for a family of four, and will have a sliding fee schedule for children from higher income families. Denver, which began implementing its universal preschool initiative in 2007, offers preschool tuition credits to families, with the credit ranging from $14 to $662 per month—depending on family income, the level of service chosen (half day, full day, or extended day), and the quality rating of the provider—toward the full cost of the program. By limiting the level of credit given to higher income families, Denver is able to provide some assistance to 56 percent of the 5,000 four-year-old children in the city.

AIR’s recommendation to limit free services in Sonoma County to the Seattle level of 300 percent of the federal poverty line is based partly on the proportion of family income that paying for the full cost of preschool would absorb. Paying the full $13,414 we estimate is necessary to pay for full-day, full-year preschool for even one child would require 18 percent of the income of a family of four at 300 percent of the federal poverty line and 36 percent for two preschool-age children. Families up to that income level may indeed have difficulty paying for a quality preschool program.

Obtaining a revenue source sufficient to achieve the goal of making preschool free to all preschool-age children in families below 300 percent of the federal poverty line would cost between $30 million and $35 million, most likely at the high end of the level the county is likely to be able to raise from a sales tax or property tax increase or a set-aside from the general fund alone. As noted earlier in this report, a ballot initiative to increase the sales tax in Sonoma County by 0.25 percent to expand access to transportation would have raised approximately $20 million.
If the revenue for universal preschool is not sufficient to provide services free to children up to 300 percent of the federal poverty line, the county might consider offering free services to those up to 185 percent of the federal poverty line, which is the maximum income for eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. This would make services free to a family of four with an income of up to $44,863.

Alternatively, the county might decide to provide free preschool to children from families up to 300 percent of the federal poverty line but reduce the cost by supporting a school day (six hours) rather than a full day (eight to 10 hours) of service. This option could significantly reduce the cost of the initiative. As in San Francisco, families might still choose a full day of service, but the cost of the extended day would have to be supported by other public or private sources or the family itself.

Determining the proportion of children who will be eligible for free preschool services, of course, also has implications for the sliding fee scale and how generous the county can be in helping families with somewhat higher incomes afford quality preschool. Based on the 12 preschool initiatives we examined, the level of support provided to families regardless of family income varies greatly. In Seattle, families pay from 0 percent to 95 percent of the tuition cost of preschool. Families living at or below 300 percent of federal poverty line pay no fees, whereas families at or above 760 percent pay 95 percent of the tuition. In contrast, preschool initiatives in Boston, the District of Columbia, and New York City do not implement a sliding scale and actually make preschool free to all regardless of family income.

**Leverage Existing Revenue Sources**

3. **Maximize leverage of existing state and federal revenue sources: Title 5 State Preschool, Head Start, Transitional Kindergarten, and Title I.**

To expand access to quality preschool, Sonoma County would do well to ensure that it is obtaining all the existing state and federal revenue for preschool for which it is eligible.

As California attempts to restore Title 5 State Preschool spaces that were cut during the Great Recession, the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County has applied for an additional 48 full-day restored spaces, and North Bay Children’s Center has applied for 24 full-day restored spaces. In addition, because of the loss of facilities or the need to renovate them, the county and First 5 Sonoma County created a grant fund of $655,000 to help address these facilities issues, which had placed a total of 144 existing Head Start spaces and 98 Title 5 State Preschool spaces at risk (Collier, 2015; Hansen, 2015).

Going forward it will be important for the county to watch for any new Title 5 State Preschool spaces for which it may apply and follow the progress of AB 47 and next year’s state budget. If implemented and funded, AB 47 in its August 2015 form calls on the state to make Title 5 State Preschool available to all eligible 4-year-old children, which, at 70 percent of the state median income, would mean all 4-year-old children living in families with incomes up to approximately $53,974 for a family of four, per the 2011–13 American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). If such an initiative were enacted, Sonoma County might gain up to 1,151 new
state-funded preschool spaces. However, the state measure would address only the unmet need for 4-year-old children. It would not provide support to many lower middle-income families having difficulty paying for child care. This state measure also would probably cover only about two thirds of the real cost of a full day of preschool estimated in this report, even for preschools paying teachers less than a living wage. Finally, Governor Brown has not signed similar measures in the past.

Equally important is to ensure that Sonoma County maximizes its use of Transitional Kindergarten funds. Recent trailer language in the state budget bill now allows districts to enroll 4-year-old children in Transitional Kindergarten, with the caveat that districts will not receive state average daily attendance funding until these children turn 5 years old later in the school year. However, some districts, such as the Los Angeles Unified School District, have chosen to serve more 4-year-old children in Transitional Kindergarten rather than in preschool because per-pupil funding for elementary school (which varies under the new local control funding formula depending on the district’s specific demographics) is typically substantially higher than the per-child reimbursement rates for Title 5 State Preschool programs. Children in Transitional Kindergarten also are taught by a well-trained, credentialed teacher who aligns instruction with the kindergarten curriculum, factors that may support better academic outcomes for children later.

Finally, Sonoma County might convene superintendents of Title I schools to discuss the possibility of their investing federal Title I funds in preschool. As seen in Elk Grove and in Chicago, Title I funds can be spent on preschool for any child, regardless of income, attending a Title I school, and can provide the funds necessary to support a school-wide initiative that makes preschool free to all in the school. The funds are flexible, and can be spent to increase teacher salaries and other quality improvements. According to our research, no school district in Sonoma County currently invests Title I funds in preschool. However, it should be noted that in FY 2006-2007 the state of California only spent a total of $12.6 million in Title I funds on preschool programs (Karoly, Reardon & Cho, 2007). The main obstacle to obtaining Title I funds, as stated above, for preschool is simply the need to provide compensatory services to older children, even though evidence proves that investments in services for younger children are more effective and help reduce the need for compensatory education later on (Heckman et al., 2009).

The Need for Additional Revenue

4. Recognize that existing state and federal revenues are not enough—and are unlikely ever to be enough—to fund universal preschool in Sonoma County. Consequently, increased local revenue is needed to make universal preschool a reality.

Based on AIR’s cost analysis and phase-in options for universal preschool in Sonoma County, none of the existing state and federal sources would be sufficient to support a countywide initiative. Even the least expensive option, limiting access to the lowest performing school ZIP codes using current salaries, would cost $5.63 million. Even if the Title I schools in these neighborhoods diverted all their Title I funds from other age groups to focus on preschool

---

3 We estimated the number of eligible 4-year-old children living at 70 percent of the state median income using AIR’s Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool.
services, a phenomenon that is highly unlikely, these Title I funds likely would not be enough to fund the entire cost of the initiative. For example, Elk Grove’s current Title I preschool program serves only 200 children in a part-day, school-year program that is funded with $1.3 million annually from Title I funds. By using a portion of the district’s Title I funds, Elk Grove is able to serve only a portion of its eligible preschool population. The district uses Head Start funds to serve additional children. And financing a broader initiative of $30 million or more would clearly require much greater revenue than is currently available.

Determining the type of finance mechanism that would work best in Sonoma County is as much a political decision as a research question. Based on our examination of preschool initiatives across the United States, the mechanism might be a sales tax increase, which raises $13 million per year in Denver and $31 million per year in San Antonio. Or it could be a property tax increase, which is expected to raise $58 million in four years in Seattle. Or it could be a set-aside from the county’s general fund, which generates $27.2 million per year for preschool in San Francisco; because the funding for this set-aside actually comes from dedicating 4 percent of the property tax revenue to the fund, it may be seen as an indirect way of using property taxes to finance preschool without actually increasing the tax. Or it could be, as in Washington, D.C., a combination of district funding, Head Start funds, and a set-aside from the city’s general fund, which generates $191 million per year. California’s requirement for a two-thirds majority to pass either a sales tax dedicated to a specific purpose or a property tax poses a significant hurdle. As suggested later in these recommendations, Sonoma County might be able to surmount this hurdle by mounting a public education campaign as done in Denver after two prior ballot measures failed there. In addition, an additional sales tax might not be enough on its own. For example, Sonoma County’s Measure A, the failed transportation measure, was a 0.25 percent sales tax increase that county officials estimated would raise $20 million per year. If the county proposed a similar sales tax measure, it would likely need to either reduce the hours of service to six versus eight hours of service or provide tuition credits rather than the full cost of preschool for those above 185 percent of the federal poverty line or begin by phasing in the program for only 4-year-old children. A set-aside from the county general fund, as in San Francisco, might be worthy of consideration, but no set-aside currently exists for education, and the entire budget allocation from the county for the Department of Health in 2014–15 was $41 million.

We also considered the merits of some newer, more innovative finance mechanisms. In Chicago, although Title I remains the primary financing mechanism for the renowned CPCs, the initiative is now receiving $17 million across a four-year period from a Pay for Success bond to expand services. Similarly, Salt Lake is obtaining nearly $3 million per year from a Pay for Success bond. Both of these bonds were initially financed by private entities, which will eventually obtain the savings generated by the bonds. Hence, the Pay for Success approach requires finding an entity to float the bond and also makes a promise to pay back the investor with some percentage of the total cost savings, based on meeting metrics agreed on under the terms of the loan. Therefore, some of the savings realized by implementing a preschool program would be returned to the investor, rather than reinvested in expanding or upgrading the preschool services themselves.

An interesting, smaller-scale finance mechanism that we discovered in the course of our examination of preschool initiatives is in New Orleans, where a portion of golf course fees from a facility near an Educare program (Educare, n.d.) is being reserved to help finance early care
and education services. Although the fees are expected to generate only $250,000–$350,000 per year, a small fraction of the center’s total operating cost, the buy-in from the golf club members may help increase public and business community awareness and support for this center and perhaps generate interest in the broader implementation of preschool services. Sonoma County might investigate the possibility of requesting some limited support from golf course fees or wine club memberships, especially where these activities are adjacent to preschool facilities.

It also may be important to rule out some revenue sources as the primary funding mechanism for universal preschool. For many years, First 5 California and local First 5 commissions have provided some of the most significant new funds for improving and expanding preschool services in California. Although First 5 support continues to be the major source of funding for LAUP and West Sacramento’s preschool initiative, the decline in Proposition 10 revenues from the tobacco tax limits the amount of new preschool spaces that First 5 dollars can support. In addition, the First 5 California preschool grant funding that these two programs currently use as a primary funding source is set to end in 2015. Already, West Sacramento, which relied on First 5 support as its major revenue for universal preschool, is looking for replacement funding.

In summary, most of the leaders of the preschool initiatives we examined, as well as the Sonoma County stakeholders we interviewed, stressed that a dedicated new local funding stream is essential for implementing a successful universal preschool initiative. A sales tax increase would be an effective dedicated funding stream, but it will require a substantial public education campaign to meet the two-thirds voter support requirement. A set-aside from the county general fund, as in San Francisco, also would be effective, but we are unsure whether the current level of revenue collected from the property tax for that fund would be sufficient to fund most of the phase-in options provided in this report. AIR recommends that Sonoma County consider either the sales tax increase or the set-aside from the general fund, but only if these measures are accompanied by a substantial public education campaign. A Pay for Success bond would be an appealing accompaniment to a dedicated public funding stream, but it is best viewed as less than a primary funding mechanism for a countywide universal preschool initiative.

**Finding New Revenue for Facilities**

5. **Adopt a separate funding source or reserve a specific percentage of any new revenue for preschool facilities.**

From the outset of our exploration of finance options for universal preschool in Sonoma County, it is clear that a lack of facilities poses a significant barrier to expanding services. Neither Title 5 State Preschool nor Head Start supplies funds specifically for facilities. Consequently, programs often obtain or rent space in schools for which schools are willing to donate the space at a reduced or little cost during periods of declining enrollment, but then may reclaim the space when demands for enrolling older children increase. Thus, this year Sonoma County had to request $305,000 from the Board of Supervisors plus $350,000 from First 5 Sonoma simply to create enough facilities to restore spaces that were cut during the Great Recession and for which the state of California is now making funds available to restore (Collier, 2015).

As part of the planning for universal preschool, AIR therefore recommends that at least 10 percent of any new revenue source for preschool be reserved for constructing and renovating
facilities. If Sonoma County decides to seek and is successful in obtaining a new revenue source dedicated to preschool, during at least the first two years of program implementation, a much greater proportion of the funds might be invested in facility construction and renovation.

From our examination of other preschool initiatives, we learned that other programs faced similar challenges as Sonoma County currently faces with regard to facilities for preschool. For example, San Antonio and Seattle dealt with this issue specifically by setting aside money from within their main funding mechanisms for facilities. West Sacramento and San Francisco are examples of programs that used other funding sources outside the primary funding mechanism, such as developer impact fees and CDBG funds, to pay for building and improving facilities.

Developer impact fees are fees typically assessed per unit and levied on new construction projects. They are used to fund off-site capital projects and improvements that are necessary to support the development and the people who will live or work there (Duncan Associates, n.d.). Impact fees are most often associated with infrastructure, such as roads or sewer and water lines, but they also can be used to fund school buildings, improvements, and expansions. For example, San Francisco requires new office and hotel development projects to provide in-house child care facilities or pay a fee to the city’s Child Care Capital Fund (City of San Francisco, 2010). West Sacramento also levies a child care impact fee on new development. The city has used funds from this fee to provide capital improvements to its partner providers and build two city-run preschool classrooms. Per the Permit and Resource Management Department (2015), Sonoma County already levies building permit fees that can include fees targeted toward school improvements, depending on where the project is built.

CDBG funds are another type of funding mechanism that can be used to fund child care facilities. These grants, administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (n.d.), are primarily designated for low-income housing, but they also can be used to fund services that aid in economic support, such as child care facilities. The two main types of CDBG funding are entitlement programs and state programs. Entitlement programs are direct funding from the federal government that is available to cities of 200,000 people or more as well as certain urbanized counties. State programs, also known as the Small Cities CDBG program, offer funds to cities and towns that do not qualify as entitlement areas. The city of San Francisco has used CDBG funds to plan and build new preschools through the Low Income Investment Fund. The city of West Sacramento also has used CDBG money to supplement preschool tuition grants through the Small Cities CDBG program, but the restrictions placed on these funds can change, so they cannot always be budgeted for this purpose.

Mount a Public Education Campaign

6. Invest in and mount a public education campaign to build the case for the additional revenue needed.

Critical to the success of attempts to raise taxes to support a preschool initiative in Sonoma County will be the development of a public education campaign. Denver provides a good example of the importance of public awareness campaigns. Denver’s history of trying to get a universal preschool program established goes back to the early 2000s, when two attempts at passing an education sales tax failed miserably, garnering less than 30 percent of the vote each
time. When John Hickenlooper was elected mayor, he worked to build a coalition to draft a proposal, and the city ran an extensive television education campaign that raised public awareness and most likely led to the successful outcome. Even with the extensive campaign, the November 2006 ballot measure was narrowly approved, by fewer than 2,000 votes. When the initiative went back to the ballot in 2014, asking voters to extend the program until 2026 and raise the tax to 0.15 percent, the city touted the positive results of the program, citing improved third-grade standardized test scores from children who had been preschool students in the first few years of the program. Voters approved the 2014 measure with 55 percent of the vote.

In our interviews with San Francisco stakeholders and Jolene Smith of First 5 Santa Clara, the interviewees stressed the importance of conducting polling to determine the needs and the type of education campaign required. These interviewees also indicated that the timing of the ballot initiative also could contribute to its success or failure. For example, if the measure is on a ballot at a time when there will most likely be low voter turnout, the likelihood of the measure passing is small. If the measure is on a ballot at a time when there will likely be other measures for voters to consider, the result also could be detrimental.

These interviewees also reported that the wording of the ballot initiative could impact the outcome at the polls. For example, in Denver, according to the stakeholders interviewed, the first two ballot measures failed because they were too broad, and the voters were unclear as to what they were voting for. The first two measures in Denver were worded as birth to age 5 initiatives and included child care, home visiting, and some health components.

Stakeholders across almost all the preschool initiatives also reported on the importance of building partnerships as part of the planning process. In particular, stakeholders in Salt Lake, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, San Antonio, and Boston all noted working with districts and community child care and advocacy groups. San Antonio and Denver also specifically included representatives from the business community in the coalitions that developed the plans for their programs.

Based on the experience of these other preschool initiatives, it will be important for Sonoma County to strengthen its coalition of support for universal preschool. Assembling district superintendents as well as local chambers of commerce would be helpful. As discussed earlier in this report, most of the successful preschool initiatives have had a mayor, a school superintendent, or other key local champion.

An Evidence-Based Framework

7. Establish an evidence-based framework for quality programs that will achieve the promised benefits of preschool.

All the preschool initiative leaders we interviewed stressed the importance of establishing a framework for quality likely to achieve the promised benefits of investing in preschool, such as reduced grade repetition, less use of special education and welfare, and higher rates of school attendance and achievement.
Most of the preschool initiatives we examined place a premium on enhancing lead teacher requirements for preschool programs, often to a level of education required for K–12 teachers with a level of compensation approaching if not equaling that of K–12 teachers. Other quality elements of some programs include having a master-level teacher provide support to several classrooms, having a robust family engagement component, assessing classrooms and providing coaching to meet the shortfalls identified, and having a research-based curriculum. San Francisco interviewees noted that they had to slow down the implementation of their initiative when they discovered through classroom assessments that many of the participating programs required significant improvement.

That said, some of the preschool initiatives, most notably Denver and San Francisco, set less stringent entry-level requirements for preschool providers but provide incentives for the programs to meet higher standards. In Denver, the entry-level requirement is to meet Level 3 of the Colorado Shines QRIS. Denver offers higher reimbursement rates for preschool programs that meet higher standards. Across the years, a higher proportion of participating programs have met the higher requirements, and a greater proportion of families are choosing the higher rated programs.

Given that 16 California counties, including Los Angeles and San Francisco, are already adopting the Race to the Top QRIS, we recommend that Sonoma County consider this system as a framework for its preschool initiative. Although the county is not one of the initial 16 counties in the QRIS, the county might set entry-level requirements for provider participation at Level 3 on the Race to the Top QRIS, with higher reimbursement rates for programs meeting Level 4 or Level 5 standards. Other important quality QRIS components include conducting classroom assessments using ECERS and CLASS and providing coaching or professional development.

**Making Connections**

8. Attach preschool programs to elementary schools where possible but also allow for the participation of community preschool providers.

As noted in *A Portrait of Sonoma County* (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014), attaching preschool programs to elementary schools, such as in El Verano in Sonoma County, is an attractive model for implementing new preschool programs. Doing so helps involve families early on in their children’s education outside the home and may lead to their continuing engagement as their children advance to kindergarten and beyond. Access to support services, such as a school nurse, early intervention, and even transportation and food services, may be greater in a public school setting.

However, it also is wise to allow for the participation of community preschool providers in the initiative. First, some families prefer to have their preschool-age children enrolled in the same settings as their infants and toddlers. Second, some prefer a smaller setting or a program with a specific curriculum. Finally, even when a local initiative is based on or receives strong support from public schools, as in Boston, schools may run out of space to house the programs, and additional services must be sought from community preschool providers.
9. **Plan for at least a full-day (six hours), school-year program to achieve educational goals, with opportunities to obtain extended day, extended-year services.**

Most of the preschool initiatives we examined provide families the option of at least a six-hour, school-year program (i.e., eight initiatives offer at least a six-hour, school-year program: San Antonio, Seattle, the District of Columbia, Boston, New York, Denver, West Sacramento, and San Francisco). Denver, West Sacramento, and San Francisco support both half-day and full-day programs at varying levels, and families can choose full-day services but the cost of the extended day is supported by other public or private sources or by the family itself.

The reasons for at least a six-hour day include that a partial-day schedule is simply inaccessible for many working families and may pose a barrier to enrollment for some children who would most benefit from the program. Although a longer day of eight to 10 hours may be necessary for many families with preschool-age children, that length of day may be too long for most 3- and 4-year-old children, and a supplementary extended-day program of a different type is advisable for this age group.

As discussed in the cost estimate section of this report, AIR suggests that Sonoma County consider using the expenditure-per-child we estimated for an initiative using the living wage to pay preschool personnel but reduce the hours of service covered by the initiative to up to 6.5 hours, thereby freeing up some of the funds to improve the quality of service. Families needing the longer hours of service would still be able to choose this option, with the additional hours covered by parent fees or subsidized child care for eligible children.

**Phase in the Program**

10. **Phase in the preschool initiative across 10 years to ensure program quality and allow time for the construction of facilities, beginning in the areas of highest need.**

Most of the preschool initiatives that we examined phased in gradually or their interviewed stakeholders recommended phasing in gradually based on experience. For example, in San Francisco, city funding was meant to phase in within five years, but the program was not fully funded or implemented until 2014, which was actually a 10-year time frame. San Francisco interviewees also recommended phasing in gradually based on their experience of conducting a needs assessment and realizing that it would take more than five years to have enough providers that met the quality standards for the program. In contrast, Denver and New York phased in rather quickly. For example, Denver began the program with 250 providers at full implementation and allowed providers to join provisionally, with improvement plans to increase quality. This is in contrast to San Francisco, where providers were allowed to participate only after they had met the quality standards.

Based on our examination of preschool initiatives across the United States, AIR advises that Sonoma County consider a 10-year phase-in period for the full implementation of its preschool initiative. Hence, the county might begin by implementing the initiative in the ZIP codes or census tracts with the most children who are disadvantaged and the greatest unmet need,
achieving this objective by Year 5 of the initiative. Meanwhile, the initiative also could support the construction or the renovation of facilities, coaching and other professional development for the staff, and overall upgrading of the quality of service. Full implementation would be at 85 percent participation by Year 10. None of the preschool initiatives we examined are at 100 percent participation. Furthermore, as indicated in many parts of this report, the cost of full implementation may be significantly reduced by several factors: increases in other funding streams, such as Title 5 State Preschool and Transitional Kindergarten, providing less than eight to 10 hours or a full year (12 months) of service, and limiting the contribution of the initiative to higher income families by implementing a sliding fee scale.

**Summary**

Based on AIR’s research on 12 preschool initiatives, a cost analysis, and interviews with area stakeholders, making universal preschool a reality is feasible in Sonoma County. A successful universal preschool initiative in the county will require the following:

- Clearly defining the goals for preschool-age children
- Establishing a framework for quality
- Making the most of existing funding streams
- Obtaining a dedicated new funding stream for preschool
- Conducting a public education campaign on the benefits of investing in quality preschool
- Phasing in the preschool initiative across a period of up to 10 years, beginning in the neighborhoods of greatest unmet need
- Developing partnerships with business and schools
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Appendix A. Methodology

Our methodology included four main activities:

- An examination of 12 preschool initiatives being implemented across the United States
- Interviews with Sonoma County stakeholders
- Interviews and a literature review related to facilities and funding mechanisms
- The development of cost estimates and phase-in plans

The 12 preschool initiatives examined are in Denver, Colorado; San Antonio, Texas; Seattle, Washington; Elk Grove, California; West Sacramento, California; Salt Lake County, Utah; San Francisco, California; Washington, D.C.; Boston, Massachusetts; Los Angeles, California; New York City, New York; and Chicago, Illinois. Our examination of these initiatives included a thorough review of the initiative websites and documentation provided on these websites, such as provider applications, evaluation reports, white papers, fact sheets, and other programmatic documentation. In addition, we conducted at least one in-depth interview with key informants for the following initiatives: Denver, San Antonio, Seattle, Elk Grove, West Sacramento, Salt Lake County, and San Francisco. We conducted brief telephone conversations as well as e-mail correspondence to confirm information included in this report for Boston, New York City, and the District of Columbia. We were able to confirm information by means of e-mail alone for Los Angeles. The information included in this report for Chicago is based solely on our review of the CPC website and accompanying documentation. In addition, for the Educare model, we reviewed the Educare website and accompanying documentation and conducted interviews with two representatives from areas implementing the Educare model: Jolene Smith, chief executive officer of First 5 Santa Clara, and Jermaine Smith, the development director for Educare New Orleans.

We conducted interviews with a few Sonoma County stakeholders to help provide context and budget information for the development of our cost estimates and phase-in plans as well as information on the local context for making our recommendations on the funding options. We conducted interviews with the following Sonoma County stakeholders: Melanie Dodson and Jim Walters from the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County; Lisa Grocott, the director Head Start/Early Head Start for the Sonoma County Community Action Partnership; Susan Gilmore, the founder and executive director of the North Bay Children’s Center; and Kelly Bass Seibel, the vice president of public policy for the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce.

To provide detailed information on potential sources of funding for universal preschool, including facilities, we reviewed documents and websites related to funding mechanisms being used by the 12 preschool initiatives as well as the Educare centers in Santa Clara and New Orleans. In addition, we interviewed Mary Garvey and Megan Golden from the Institute for Child Success about their work related to Pay for Success bonds. We interviewed Candace Wong, the director of California Child Development Programs for the San Francisco office of the Low Income Investment Fund, about the fund's work related to improving and building child care facilities. We also interviewed Jolene Smith about the funding mechanism for the Santa Clara Educare facilities as well as the funding mechanisms for the Educare model program in Santa Clara.
We developed two cost estimates for the purpose of this report. One cost estimate assumes current salaries, and the other increases salaries to a living wage. For both cost estimates, we collected budget information from three different programs that included Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and one community-based provider.

We developed 10 phase-in plan scenarios for meeting the unmet need for preschool in Sonoma County. These scenarios include the cost to serve different segments of the 3- and 4-year-old population (e.g., all children in high-priority areas, all children at 300 percent of the federal poverty line or below, all children in the county at an 85 percent participation rate, and all children in the county at a 100 percent participation rate) at both current salaries and living wages. To develop these phase-in plan scenarios, we used two tools that our team had already developed for this type of work: (1) the Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool, which brings together data from multiple sources to identify the areas of highest need in the county, and (2) the Cost Estimator Tool, a user-friendly tool to assess the cost of phasing in access to preschool. We supplemented the information in these tools with American Community Survey data at the ZIP code level for population estimates where necessary. We also used information from the Sonoma County Child Care Planning Council’s supplement to the 2014 Child Care Needs Assessment to estimate the number of preschool spaces needed in high-priority census tracts.
Appendix B. Interviews Conducted

The interviewees are listed alphabetically by last name.

Ailish Brady, senior advisor in the Division of Early Childhood Education at the New York City Department of Education

Margaret Brodkin, chief executive officer of Margaret Brodkin and Associates and founder of Funding the Next Generation

Kathy Bruck, chief executive officer for Pre-K 4 SA

Claudia Charter, program specialist for the Elk Grove Unified School District

Melanie Dodson, executive director for the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County

Chris Ellis, partnership director for Early Learning Outcomes at the United Way of Salt Lake

Mary C. Garvey, associate director of Pay for Success financing at the Institute for Child Success

Susan Gilmore, founder and executive director of the North Bay Children’s Center

Megan Golden, senior fellow at the Institute for Child Success

Lisa Grocott, director of Head Start for the Sonoma County Community Action Partnership

Elizabeth Groginsky, assistant superintendent of early learning for the Office of the State Superintendent of Education in the District of Columbia

Nancy Herota, director of the School Readiness Department in the Sacramento County Office of Education (previously with the Elk Grove Unified School District)

Justine Jimenez, early learning program director for the City of West Sacramento

Erica Johnson, project manager of the Seattle Preschool Program

Laurel Kloomok, executive director of First 5 San Francisco

Jennifer Landrum, president and chief executive officer of DPP

Freddy Martinez, fiscal administrator for Pre-K 4 SA

Lauren Meyer, director of program assessment in the Division of Early Childhood Education at the New York City Department of Education

Holly Miller, director of the Department of Education and Early Learning of the City of Seattle

Sophia Pappas, chief executive officer in the Division of Early Childhood Education at the New York City Department of Education

Carol Richardson, assistant city manager for the City of West Sacramento

Jason Sachs, director of early childhood for BPS

Kelly Bass Seibel, vice president of public policy for the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce
Jolene Smith, chief executive officer of First 5 Santa Clara  

Jermaine Smith, development director for Educare New Orleans  

Brenda Van Gorder, director of preschool services for Granite School District in Salt Lake City  

Jim Walters, facilities director for the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County  

Candace Wong, director of California Child Development Programs for the Low Income Investment Fund Child Care Facilities Fund
### Table C-1. Detailed Budget for Estimating per Child Cost of Preschool at Current Wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>FTEs or %</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Supervisor (also a Master Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$42,057.00</td>
<td>$42,057.00</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$34,028.00</td>
<td>$34,028.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,910.00</td>
<td>$59,820.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$26,906.00</td>
<td>$48,430.80</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County + 5% (staff have received only one 2% COLA increase since 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>$28,959.00</td>
<td>$15,927.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager (3 sites)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$37,512.72</td>
<td>$12,379.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$67,594.80</td>
<td>$5,632.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Director (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$52,830.96</td>
<td>$4,226.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Resource Specialist (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$42,325.92</td>
<td>$3,386.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager/Fiscal Supervisor (1.25 FTE for 12 sites)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$59,841.60</td>
<td>$6,233.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Specialist (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$37,128.00</td>
<td>$2,970.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Maintenance Specialist (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$40,906.32</td>
<td>$3,272.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal—Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1875</td>
<td>$255,864.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>FTEs or %</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes and Worker Compensation</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,217.58</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County—Average %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Insurance</td>
<td>15.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,298.60</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County—Average %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,516.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$338,380.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personnel | FTEs or % | Salary | TOTAL | Source
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Non-Personnel Costs** | | | | We have assumed 37% here to make up for recent cuts and to cover additional staff training costs to assist programs in making quality improvements.

Total Cost | | | $ 463,581.05 |
Total Cost per Child | | | $ 11,589.53 |

Table C-2. Detailed Budget for Estimating per Child Cost of Preschool at Living Wage

Number of 3- and 4-year-olds served: 40  
Number of classrooms: 2  
Number of sessions per day: 1 FULL DAY/FULL YEAR  
Class size: 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>FTEs or %</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Living Wage Increases</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Supervisor (also a Master Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$42,057.00</td>
<td>$42,057.00</td>
<td>$48,676.77</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County + 15.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$34,028.00</td>
<td>$34,028.00</td>
<td>$39,384.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,910.00</td>
<td>$59,820.00</td>
<td>$69,235.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$26,906.00</td>
<td>$48,430.80</td>
<td>$56,053.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>$28,959.00</td>
<td>$15,927.45</td>
<td>$18,434.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager (3 sites)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$37,512.72</td>
<td>$12,379.20</td>
<td>$12,998.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$67,594.80</td>
<td>$5,632.90</td>
<td>$5,914.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Director (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$52,830.96</td>
<td>$4,226.48</td>
<td>$4,437.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Resource Specialist (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$42,325.92</td>
<td>$3,386.07</td>
<td>$3,555.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager/Fiscal Supervisor (1.25 FTE for 12 sites)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$59,841.60</td>
<td>$6,233.50</td>
<td>$6,545.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Specialist (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$37,128.00</td>
<td>$2,970.24</td>
<td>$3,118.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Maintenance Specialist (12 sites)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$40,906.32</td>
<td>$3,272.51</td>
<td>$3,436.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>$18,375.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal—Salaries</strong></td>
<td>7.1875</td>
<td>$255,864.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$290,165.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefits**

Payroll Taxes and Worker Compensation | 16.50% | $42,217.58 | | $47,877.33 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>FTEs or %</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Living Wage Increases</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Insurance</td>
<td>15.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,298.60</td>
<td>$45,701.09</td>
<td>Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County average %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,516.19</td>
<td>$93,578.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$338,380.33</td>
<td>$383,744.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Personnel Costs</strong></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,200.72</td>
<td>$141,985.29</td>
<td>We have assumed 37% here to make up for recent cuts and to cover additional staff training costs to assist programs in making quality improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$463,581.05</td>
<td>$525,729.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost per Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,589.53</td>
<td>$13,143.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To calculate living wage, we began with the lowest paid staff, teacher assistants, who earn $12.94 per hour in the current budget. To get to $15/hour, the assumed minimum living wage, these staff would require a 15.74 percent increase. Staff already paid at professional levels were given a 5 percent increase.*
Appendix D. Highest Priority Schools and Associated ZIP Codes and High Risk Priority Areas per *A Portrait of Sonoma County* and Associated Census Tracts

Table D-1. First 5 Identified Highest Priority Schools and Associated ZIP Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Priority Schools</th>
<th>ZIP Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Abraham Lincoln Elementary</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. James Monroe Elementary</td>
<td>95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Luther Burbank Elementary</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. McDowell Elementary</td>
<td>94954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Steele Lane Elementary</td>
<td>95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sheppard Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Roseland Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kawana Elementary</td>
<td>95404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Helen M. Lehman Elementary</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Taylor Mountain Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bellevue Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meadow View Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Roseland Creek Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Brook Hill Elementary</td>
<td>95404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. John Reed Primary</td>
<td>94928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Kid Street Learning Center Charter</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Robert L. Stevens Elementary</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Healdsburg Elementary</td>
<td>95448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Horicon Elementary</td>
<td>95412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. El Verano Elementary</td>
<td>95433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Albert F. Biella Elementary</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sassarini Elementary</td>
<td>95476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cesar Chavez Language Academy</td>
<td>95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Cinnabar Charter</td>
<td>94952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Wright Charter</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Miwok Valley Language Academy Charter</td>
<td>94954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Geyserville Elementary</td>
<td>95441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Dunbar Elementary</td>
<td>95442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Thomas Page Academy</td>
<td>94931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Monte Rio Elementary</td>
<td>95462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. J.X. Wilson Elementary</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Priority Schools</td>
<td>ZIP Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32    Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>95425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33    Flowery Elementary</td>
<td>95476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34    La Tercera Elementary</td>
<td>94954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35    Loma Vista Immersion Academy</td>
<td>94954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36    Morrice Shaefer Charter</td>
<td>95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37    Guerneville Elementary</td>
<td>95446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38    Cali Calmecac Language Academy</td>
<td>95492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39    Mark West Elementary</td>
<td>95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40    Binkley Elementary Charter</td>
<td>95405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41    Park Side Elementary</td>
<td>95472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42    Whited Elementary Charter</td>
<td>95405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43    Olivet Elementary Charter</td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44    Forestville Elementary</td>
<td>95436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45    Jack London Elementary</td>
<td>95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46    Village Elementary Charter</td>
<td>95405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D-2. High-Risk Priority Areas per *A Portrait of Sonoma County* and Associated Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>ZIP Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Cloverdale</td>
<td>Central Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Tract 1542.01</td>
<td>East Cloverdale</td>
<td>95425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cloverdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetters Springs/Agua Caliente West</td>
<td>Fetters Springs/Agua Caliente West</td>
<td>95431, 95433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coddingtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comstock</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicentennial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td>95401, 95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland</td>
<td></td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawana Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td>95404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>95404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Building Universal Access to Quality Preschool in Sonoma County

Report to the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
April, 2016
A Portrait of Sonoma County – Make Universal Preschool a Reality

- **65%** of White 3-4 year old children enrolled in public or private school, compared to **38%** of Latino children (52% overall)

- Median hourly wage for child care personnel is **$12.97**

- **53%** of White third graders read proficiently at 3rd grade, compared to **22%** of Latino students (39% overall)
High Cost of Preschool in Sonoma County

Average annual cost of center-based preschool per year for one child in Sonoma County: $11,590

Median Sonoma County Earnings

- Latinos: $21,695
- Women: $25,519
Studies show high-quality preschool can:

- Erase achievement gaps for most at-risk children
- Increase overall academic achievement for all kids
- Increase graduation rates
- More than double the odds of enrollment in a 4-year college
HOW ARE READY’S KINDERGARTNERS DOING?

Less than 2 in 5 children entered kindergarten “ready-to-go” in 2015. Children who enter kindergarten ready-to-go are more likely to be reading at grade level in second and third grade, and more likely to succeed later on.

Immediate Follow-Up: 7%
Monthly Monitoring: 24%
Quarterly Monitoring: 33%
Ready-to-Go: 36%
Key 2015-16 READY Findings

- Preschool was the strongest predictor of school readiness.
- Disparity in access to preschool between Latino & English only households.
- Latino children not attending preschool are 3 times more likely to need intensive intervention compared to Latino children with some preschool.
AIR Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County

Summary
Report Content

- Key features, including funding levels, phase-in plans, and finance mechanisms, of 12 city and other regional preschool initiatives across the United States;
- Analysis of potential funding options;
- Two estimates for the per child cost of providing full-day, full-year preschool: current expenditures vs living wage;
- Ten options for phasing in universal access to quality preschool over a 10-year period;
- Recommendations for funding and phasing in access to quality preschool for all children.

American Institutes for Research®
12 Preschool Initiatives Studied

- Boston, MA: Boston Public Schools Early Childhood Education; Boston K1DS (ending in November 2015 and being replaced by the Massachusetts Preschool Expansion Grant)
- Chicago, IL: Child-Parent Centers
- Denver, CO: Denver Preschool Program
- Elk Grove, CA: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool
- Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles Universal Preschool
- New York City, NY: Prekindergarten for All
- Salt Lake City, UT: School Readiness
- San Antonio, TX: Pre-K 4 San Antonio
- San Francisco, CA: Preschool for All
- Seattle, WA: Seattle Preschool Program
- Washington, DC: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program
- West Sacramento, CA: UP4WS
Key Findings from 12 Preschool Initiatives

- Participation rates vary from program to program
- Most programs target services to specific populations
- Hours and days of operation varied
- Most had a dedicated funding source for preschool, half at least some fees to families
- Quality was a key consideration for all
- Most implement a mixed delivery system (public/private schools, CBO’s, for-profit, faith-based, etc.)
- Political leadership was a key component for all
The annual per child cost for full-day (8 hours), full-year (12 months) preschool serving 3- and 4-year-olds at current salaries is estimated to be $11,590.

Increasing salaries to a competitive $15 per-hour wage, the per child cost is estimated to be $13,143.
Summary of Phase-in Options

Last year of phase-in plan cost estimate for each scenario for both current salaries and increasing salaries to a living wage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase-in Scenario</th>
<th>Current Salaries Cost</th>
<th>Living Wage Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Serving all 3- and 4-year-olds in the highest priority area zip codes</td>
<td>$5.63 million</td>
<td>$6.38 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Serving all 3- and 4-year-olds in the highest priority area census tracts</td>
<td>$11.5 million</td>
<td>$13 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Serving all 3- and 4-year-olds under 300 percent of the federal poverty line</td>
<td>$30.4 million</td>
<td>$34.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serving all 3- and 4-year-olds countywide with an 85 percent participation rate</td>
<td>$36.9 million</td>
<td>$41.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Serving all 3- and 4-year-olds countywide with a 100 percent participation rate</td>
<td>$63.2 million</td>
<td>$71.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scenarios 1 and 2 are 5-year phase-in plans, all others are phased in over a 10-year period.
Summary

A successful universal preschool initiative in the county will require the following:

- Clearly defining the goals for preschool-age children
- Establishing a framework for quality
- Making the most of existing funding streams
- Obtaining a dedicated new funding stream for preschool
- Conducting a public education campaign on the benefits of investing in quality preschool
- Phasing in the preschool initiative across a period of up to 10 years, beginning in the neighborhoods of greatest unmet need
- Developing partnerships with business and schools
Community Recommendations

- Provide high quality preschool for all 3 and 4 year old children with a phase-in period that starts with preschool for the children in highest need.

- Provide subsidized high quality preschool seats to all families under 300% of the federal poverty level (FPL).

- Provide an 8-hour day, full-year preschool to families with the option for parents to pay for before and after care.
Community Recommendations

- Fully maximize state/ federal funds and develop partnerships with schools and businesses.
- Provide competitive preschool wages to promote teacher retention and quality.
- Implement a mixed delivery system
- Focus on both access and quality.
- Include support for 0-3 in future planning
Increased Access to Quality Preschool

Immediate Opportunities
- Facilities & Services Grant Program
- Pay for Success

Long Term Opportunities
- AIR Study
- Dedicated Funding
Immediate Opportunities – Facilities Grant Program

- 19 facilities projects identified across the county representing at least 524 preschool seats
- Estimated funding needed to support all 19 facilities is approx $3mil
- Current facility funding at $406,000 with contributions from First 5 and community partners
- Expand to include program funding for rural areas
### Immediate Opportunities – Facilities Grant Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>$ Request</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>48 FT</td>
<td>Wright Early Learner Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, Fort Ross</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>8 PT</td>
<td>Two District Shared School Readiness Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>48 FT</td>
<td>Kawana Preschool Outdoor Classroom and Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland Elementary</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>48 FT</td>
<td>Roseland Early Learner Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rohnert Park</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>48 FT</td>
<td>Gold Ridge Infant/Toddler Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Valley Union</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Bennett Valley Special Needs Integrated Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horicon/Kashia</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>4 PT</td>
<td>Horicon/Kashia School Readiness Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>48 FT</td>
<td>Cloverdale Early Learner Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geyserville</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>8 PT</td>
<td>Support for Geyserville Preschool Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>48 FT</td>
<td>Valley Vista Outdoor Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Valley</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>24 FT</td>
<td>El Verano Expansion &amp; Prestwood Elementary Outdoor Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rock Union</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 FT</td>
<td>Two Rock Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Union</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Castle Preschool Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Adobe Union</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Loma Vista Preschool Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Valley Union</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Rincon Valley Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnabar</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Cinnabar Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piner-Olivet Union</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Piner-Olivet Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg Unified</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>24 PT</td>
<td>Fitch Mountain Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,025,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>524 (minimum)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Immediate Opportunities – Pay for Success

- Continue to explore Pay for Success as a financing mechanism
- Sign letter of commitment for Non-Profit Finance Fund Grant Opportunity
Key Features of Pay for Success Financing

- Socially minded investors pay to implement effective programs on a large scale
- Government contracts to pay for agreed-on, measurable RESULTS
- An impartial evaluator assesses whether results are achieved
Increased Access to Quality Preschool

**Immediate Opportunities**
- Facilities & Services Grant Program
- Pay for Success

**Long Term Opportunities**
- AIR Study
- Dedicated Funding
Long Term Opportunities–Dedicated Funding

Serving all 3- and 4-Year-olds (2443 Seats)
$41.9 Million + 15.6 Million (Facilities)

Serving all 3 - and 4-Year-olds (300% FPL, 2013 seats)
$34.5 M + $ 12.9 M (Facilities)

5 Portrait Areas
(300% FPL, 70% PR, 881 Seats)
$12.2M + $5.8 M (Facilities)
Sonoma County
Survey Highlights --
Funding for Early Childhood Education

Key Findings of a Survey Conducted
March 5-8, 2016
Methodology

- 603 telephone interviews with voters likely to cast ballots in November 2016 in Sonoma County
- Interviews conducted March 5-8, 2016
- Interviews on landlines and cell phones
- Margin of sampling error of +/- 4.0% at the 95% confidence level
- Some percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding
Key Findings

- Virtually two-thirds of respondents perceive a need for additional funding for childcare and pre-K programs.
- Two-thirds of respondents are likely to vote “yes” on a proposed *Sonoma County Young Children’s Services Measure*.
  - Services for homeless children, providing training to early childhood educators and providing access to mental health care for young children are perceived as most important.
- The level of support remains consistent throughout the survey.
Two-thirds see a need for additional funding for childcare and pre-K.

I am going to read a short list of public services in Sonoma County. Please tell me if you think there a great need for additional funding, some need, a little need, or no real need for additional funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
<th>Some Need</th>
<th>A Little Need</th>
<th>No Real Need</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
<th>Great/Some Need</th>
<th>Little/No Real Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school and early childhood education</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helping homeless children, teacher training, and mental health treatment are viewed as the most important funding priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Ext./Very Impt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping children under five whose families are homeless</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training teachers who work with young children</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding mental health treatment for children and youth</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing regular dental health checkups for children</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing affordable, high-quality pre-school</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing early childhood wellness programs to ensure young children’s health</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am going to read you a list of different ways that public funds from this measure might be invested in Sonoma County. Please tell me whether you consider each to be an extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important priority.
(BRAIN DEVELOPMENT) Research shows that 90% of a child’s brain development occurs before age five. These critical years lay the foundation for the rest of a child’s life. By expanding access to quality pre-school, we can help ensure that every child in Sonoma County gets off to strong start.

(SCHOOL READINESS) By increasing access to quality pre-school programs, this measure strengthens K-12 education. Currently, over half of Sonoma County kids enter kindergarten unprepared and are reading below grade level in third grade. Studies show that kids who go to high quality pre-school are more likely to read proficiently by the third grade, and more likely to graduate and go on to college.

(EQUITY) Pre-school should not be a luxury only available to a few families. In Sonoma County, the cost of sending a child to pre-school is nearly $13,000 dollars per year – that’s 39% of the median annual income for Sonoma County women. This measure will make early education available and affordable to families of all incomes, including middle-class families.

(BENEFIT ACROSS COUNTY) There is a massive shortage of pre-school seats in Sonoma, with over 2,000 children on the wait-list for early childhood education. More than half of local kids are not attending pre-school. This measure will provide new slots to ensure that these kids who need pre-school have a place to get it.
**Informational Themes**

**Smar INVESTMENT**  Passing this measure is a smart investment. It qualifies Sonoma County to receive our fair share of millions of dollars in state and federal matching funds that would otherwise go to other counties. For every dollar in local funding generated, our county could receive as much as an additional five dollars back in matching funds, and as much as nine dollars in benefits to the community.

**WORD GAP**  Children in low-income families have heard 30 million fewer words by the age of three, alone, than their higher income peers, putting them further behind when they enter school. This measure will be critical in closing this gap and putting all our kids on the path to success.

**BROAD BENEFITS**  Children who miss out on early education are 70% more likely to commit violent crime later in life, and are more likely to drop out of school and develop drug and alcohol problems. But children that go to pre-school are more likely to attend college, and earn higher incomes. This measure will put Sonoma County kids on a better path.

**LOCAL WORKFORCE**  Sonoma County does not have a shortage of jobs, but it does have a shortage of skilled workers. In order to create a local skilled workforce, we need to start investing in early education to ensure that that our children have a solid foundation to succeed and be competitive from the start.
Arguments related to brain development, school readiness, and equal access to pre-K resonate with voters.
Conclusions

- The Sonoma County Young Children’s Services Measure is potentially viable in a November 2016 election.
- Respondents consistently support the measure at the two-thirds level throughout the survey.
- Consultants recommend continued community engagement and planning towards a potential measure.
Opportunities for Next Steps

- Accept AIR Report
- Develop Proposal to Finance Expansion
- Expand Preschool Facilities Grant Program
- Explore a Pay For Grant Feasibility Study Pilot