California's Local Crisis

The Uber and Lyft Revolution?

A Conversation with Bill Easterly
Dean's Message

Sometimes your brand is your curse. UC Berkeley strongly identifies with the 1964–5 Free Speech Movement — the first mass civil disobedience by students in the 1960s. The FSM called for lifting the existing ban on campus political activities and for allowing students the rights of free speech and academic freedom. The FSM made it possible for students to invite speakers of any political persuasion to campus.

In this past year, Berkeley has been tested by conservative campus organizations that have invited far-right “controversialists” Milo Yiannopoulos and Ann Coulter to speak. On February 1st of this year, peaceful demonstrators were upstaged and literally shoved out of the way by anarchist “anti fascist” members who destroyed property, started a fire, and engaged in altercations with people near Bancroft and Telegraph. Yiannopoulos’s speech was canceled about two hours before the planned starting time because administrators feared for public safety.

Milo is certainly controversial, and I think that his mockery, posturing, juvenility, and bloviation adds nothing to academic debate and dialogue. Nevertheless, as the FSM argued, students and student groups should have the right to invite whom they want. Indeed, as a public institution, Berkeley must provide First Amendment free speech rights without respect to political perspectives, and we can only impose viewpoint neutral “time, place, and manner” restrictions meant to protect public safety and to allow the campus to get on with its work of educating students. The First Amendment, our public status, and the legacy of the Free Speech Movement impose strong legal and moral strictures on what we do. Among other things, the Supreme Court has made it clear that even “hate speech” is protected speech as long as it does not try to incite violence.

In September the campus was tested again as the campus Republicans invited conservative author Ben Shapiro to come. Police were recruited from other UC campuses around the state so that an overwhelming police presence could ensure public safety. The talk went off with only minor problems and the Wall Street Journal grudgingly said that “The University of California at Berkeley’s new chancellor, Carol Christ, has done a democratic service by defending free speech on campus,” but they noted that it cost $600,000 to provide adequate security.

The campus was even more severely tested when a small campus online newspaper group, the Berkeley Patriot, invited Milo Yiannopoulos back to campus in the fall. Once again, the campus mobilized, spent about $800,000, reorganized several days of campus life, and prepared for these events. In the end, it turned out the events were more fantasy than fact. Yiannopoulos still showed up on Sproul Plaza on Sunday, surrounded by hundreds of police to provide protection, and made a fifteen minute speech. The Los Angeles Times described “How the ‘Coachella of Conservatism’ fizzled into an ‘expensive photo opp’ at Berkeley.” The San Francisco Chronicle asked “And the point of all this was what exactly?”

The point was that Berkeley showed that it could protect free speech and continue the tradition started by the Free Speech Movement. Still, important issues remain. What kind of “time, place, and manner” restrictions should a university impose to make sure that outside speakers do not interrupt its teaching and research mission? And should there be some limits on how much a university has to spend each year to provide protection at campus speaking events? Once again, Berkeley is a leader in thinking about how we protect free speech while undertaking the basic mission of a university.
California’s Local Street and Road System is in Crisis

By Margot Yapp, PE (MPP ’05)

EVERY MORNING, when we open our front door, whether we drive or bike to work, take our kids to school, take the bus or train, or go to the farmer’s market, we begin our trip on a city street or county road.

But these are challenging times due to increased demands and unreliable funding. In California, there is a significant focus on climate change and building sustainable communities, yet sustainable communities cannot function without a well-maintained local street and road system. The need for multi-modal opportunities on the local system has never been more essential. Every component of California’s transportation system is critical to providing a seamless, interconnected system that will connect us to our homes, workplaces, and communities.

In California, there is a significant focus on local streets and roads — a level of participation that makes clear the local interest in addressing the growing problems of crumbling streets and roads.

The transport system is composed of three categories: Pavements, essential components (traffic, safety and regulatory) and bridges.

**Pavements**

On a scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent), the statewide average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) has deteriorated to 65 (“at risk” category) in 2016. Even more alarming, 52 of 58 counties are either at risk or have poor pavements (the maps illustrate the changes in condition since 2008).

In order to use the taxpayer’s money wisely, it makes more sense to preserve and maintain our roads in good condition, rather than let them crumble further and spend more to fix them. The costs developed in this study are based on achieving a roadway pavement condition called Best Management Practices (BMP). At this condition level, preventive maintenance treatments (i.e., slurry seals, chip seals, thin overlays) are most cost-effective. Preventive maintenance interferes less with commerce and the public’s mobility and is more environmentally friendly than rehabilitation and reconstruction.

In order to use the taxpayer’s money wisely, it makes more sense to preserve and maintain our roads in good condition, rather than let them crumble further and spend more to fix them. The costs developed in this study are based on achieving a roadway pavement condition called Best Management Practices (BMP). At this condition level, preventive maintenance treatments (i.e., slurry seals, chip seals, thin overlays) are most cost-effective. Preventive maintenance interferes less with commerce and the public’s mobility and is more environmentally friendly than rehabilitation and reconstruction.

The importance of this approach is significant. As roadway pavement conditions deteriorate, the cost to repair them increases exponentially. For example, it costs as much as fourteen times more to reconstruct a pavement than to preserve it when it is in good condition. Even a modest resurfacing is four times more expensive than maintenance in the BMP condition. Or to put it another way, employing maintenance practices consistent with BMP results in treating as much as fourteen times more road area for the same cost.

What are the Solutions?

Three funding scenarios determined that:

1. The existing funding level of $1.98 billion/year is inadequate. The PCI will deteriorate to 56, the unfunded backlog will grow from $39 billion to $59 billion and almost a quarter of the road system will be in failed condition in ten short years.
2. In order to maintain existing conditions, at least $3.5 billion/year is needed.
3. To reach Best Management Practices, $7 billion/year is needed.
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The Uber and Lyft Revolution

By Bruce Schaller (MPP '82)

RARELY DO NEW COMPANIES BURST INTO the transportation picture the way that Uber, Lyft and other app-based ride services have done since 2012. These two companies now transport 6.6 million passengers per day, roughly triple traditional taxicabs and about one-half the number of passengers traveling by local bus in the United States. What are they? How are they transforming transportation? What public policy responses, if any, are needed?

To understand what is happening, it is important to set aside the hype. Are Uber and Lyft a “new modality,” as some have claimed? Mostly, no. They look an awful lot like traditional taxicabs: on-demand, exclusive-ride transportation from your doorstep to your destination. The ease and transparency of their services, however, have felt like a revolution to many customers.

The apps show how long customers will wait for the driver to arrive and the intended route once in the cab, and enable automatic payment without fumbling for a credit card or cash. This transparency and ready availability has fueled unprecedented growth in cities across the United States and indeed, globally.

Unfortunately, what is good for the individual user — a quick and reliable way to get from A to B — is becoming problematic for society as a whole. In big, dense cities ranging from Boston, New York, Washington to San Francisco, Los Angeles and Seattle, there are concerns about the impacts of these new mobility services on traffic congestion and public transit systems. In New York City, the two fastest-growing mobility services in major US cities, he

Bruce Schaller is Principal of Schaller Consulting, based in Brooklyn, NY. An expert on issues surrounding the rise of new mobility services in major US cities, he has served as Deputy Commissioner for Traffic and Planning at the NYC Department of Transportation, Policy Director at the NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission, and consulted on urban transportation issues across the United States.

...
We have tendency in development to imagine that there’s some kind of utopian alternative, and anyone who is non-utopian is seen as pessimistic because there exists this utopian alternative that will solve everything. But there really isn’t a utopian alternative, there really is no utopian system available to us. Forging that out is not being pessimistic, it’s just being realistic.

BPPJ: Was that your impression when you were at the World Bank, that there was this general idea of a utopian possibility? WE: I wouldn’t say the World Bank was utopian. I just think they were too optimistic about trying and true solutions to development, mainly involving monetary flows of foreign aid, that the money itself would solve the problems.

BPPJ: The capital inflow. WE: Well, the foreign aid inflow, yeah. That by making foreign aid money available by itself would solve all the problems.

BPPJ: Is foreign aid simply a tool for rich countries to enact their international policy priorities? WE: One way to think about it is that it’s the lens of a social scientist. So there’s a sort of political economy of how you build support for aid. You want to sell it to the voters as this ‘aid’ is good for our foreign policy objectives and also good for helping poor people. If you can persuade the voters that they are getting a two-for-one deal and that you can both promote US foreign policy objectives and also help people at the same time, it enables you to build this kind of large alliance of power. It’s not only about US foreign policy and national security and another set of people who care only about humanitarian needs. Now you’ve got these two groups allied with each other, and you’ve got a lot of support for aid. It’s kind of understandable that it often happens. It happened during the Cold War. It’s happening now during the war on terror. However, it does have some adverse effects.

Humanitarian people strike a sort of devil’s bargain with the national security people. For example, the government gives security agencies a lot more money for drone projects but then they are forced to provide development aid to people who are allies in the war on terror, but these might be the worst environments for assistance to be effective. What happened during the Cold War is happening now. Aid is being used for foreign policy purposes, and as a humanitarian, you go along with it because you’re getting lots of money for development. A lot of money these days is being invested in a post-conflict environment and fixing failed states (what used to be called nation building). It’s much better to use aid in well-targeted health programs such as vaccinations and fighting malaria and all of that. To be fair to the humanitarian agencies, they did indeed get more money for fighting malaria from the war on terror, but the cost is that a lot of the money was going to somewhat dangerous regimes and a very bad environment for aid to work like Afghanistan.

BPPJ: Can you explain with a simple example why aid is so bad in post-conflict environments? WE: First of all, we’re often not talking about the post-conflict environment, we’re talking about where the conflict is still happening. So you’re in Afghanistan. You’re giving aid for a bridge, and the bridge is blown up by the Taliban, so the funding did not turn out to be very productive or you have extremely high overhead costs because any aid worker in war-torn Afghanistan needs a very expensive team of bodyguards. The security costs of setting up an aid agency are enormous. It’s also very hard to monitor what’s happening with aid in such an environment. So it’s much more likely that corruption is going to be a problem, of course. It’s very well-documented that corruption has been appalling in Afghanistan.

BPPJ: So aid is not a viable way to help these people during a time of conflict, is there an alternative way of thinking that the international agencies, World Bank, or aid organizations can affect the situation? WE: Before you go and give a good answer to that question, there are two other questions. Why did the aid community decide that that conflict area should get all of the attention and almost all of the resources? People who are caught in conflicts are tragic victims of really horrible stuff. There are lots of other tragic victims of many different awful problems that are more amenable to aid fixes like health, education and clean water. So again, it seems like there’s an excessive investment in an area that has a very unfavorable cost-benefit ratio and that is taking money away from a much broader set of people in other areas where it can prove to be effective. So that’s the first reaction to your question. Then people will say, “are you just going to abandon the people of Afghanistan?” I’m watching as I think many others are now, the new Ken Burns series on Vietnam. There are so many parallels to what’s now going on in Afghanistan, and a little while ago in Iraq. Invading people to give them development just seems like a terrible idea. And let me clarify that this was not the main reason for the invasion. The presence of development as an idea took a colossal ratchet upwards at the time of the Vietnam War. At this very moment, the same thing is happening again. It seems we just keep getting stuck in the same way of thinking.

BPPJ: What role can we as policy students take in these organizations/think tanks? WE: If I were to give you a good answer, I’d give you a little bit of the same answer. People tend to think of skepticism as this destructive, nihilistic thing — we forget that skepticism is central to the whole scientific process. Galileo was skeptical of the sun revolving around the earth and that made possible a huge revolution. Doctors became skeptical that starving you and drawing blood from you was good for your health and that skepticism eventually led to a huge revolution in medicine. Skepticism is just a way of vetting the possible solutions and then making sure that the one that works is the one that survives this wave of skepticism. Applying that wave of skepticism to many possible solutions is a way of killing off the bad ones but it’s also a way of making sure the good ones really do get vetted and get the kind of funding and attention they deserve.

You have to remember it’s such a wide open area; there are and there have been a lot of opportunities for success in this area. You are talking about a very large pool of poor people in the world and a pretty large pool of money from rich people in rich countries that is being made available to solve the problems of really poor people. In that situation, you should be able to find something that uses rich people’s money and technology to do good for poor people who are lacking capital and technology.

We know there already have been successes doing that — things like vaccination and fighting malaria and the progress on clean water and lots of other areas. So if you put it that way, it is indeed possible to do good. Always keep that kind of hopeful attitude. The field is wide open, there are so many possibilities.
Michael Nachi gave an invited lecture on nuclear weapons policy at CalTech, spoke on China’s maritime territorial claims at the Law and Security Council, and on KTUV on the North Korean crisis. He completed a one-year term as Interim Director of the Beedie School of East Asian Studies for Higher Education. He offered a series of lectures on management strategies for the Goldman School’s 2017 MPA class.

Bruce Wydick, professor of economics at USF, is teaching a development economics course at Goldman this semester, and is excited to be back at Berkeley. His recent paper “Devel- oping the Children: The Impact of TOMs Shoes” has continued to work with the Memorial Service for Nobel Laureate Tom Schelling at the University of Maryland at Col- lege Park. He appeared on KQED Forum with Michael Novay to discuss the Electoral Integrity Project and on KTUV on the North Korean crisis. He completed a one-year term as Interim Director of the Beedie School of East Asian Studies for Higher Education. He offered a series of lectures on management strategies for the Goldman School’s 2017 MPA class.

Robert B. Reich’s documentary Capital- ism, based on his latest book, breaks down how the economic system that he helped build made America so strong is now failing us, and it will take to fix it. It is now available on Netflix.

Richard Scheffler chaired a meeting on the “Impact of Healthcare Market Concentration on Healthcare Prices and Premiums: What Should Be Done?” at New York University in April, which brought together leading academicians and policymakers in the fields of economics and health policy. His paper with Daniel Arnold, “Insurer Market Power Lowers Prices In Numerous Concentrated Provider Markets”, was published in September issue of Health Affairs. His op-ed about the study’s findings titled “Corporations should act as their own health insurers” in The Wall Street Journal, was published in September in The Philadelphia Enquirer, and the study was covered widely in industry media. In June, he led a week-long investigation into the Spanish health care innovations and the lessons they hold for the US, bringing together US healthcare executives and Spanish clinicians, policy- makers, and academics as part of a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation grant. While in Spain, he gave the keynote address at IESE Business School’s Conference on Research and Innovations in the Hospital Ecosystem, discussing value-based healthcare.

Ari Feller was recently awarded a Spencer Foundation/National Academy of Educa- tion post-doc.

Hilary Hoyes is the Co-Director of the Berkeley Poverty Lab (Olab), a new Berkeley center dedicated to generating high quality research on the evidence on poverty, and its impact. Appointed by Nancy Pelosi, she’s also a member of the Bipartisan Federal Commission on Evidence-Based Policy Making, which presented its final report in the US Capitol on September 7th along the lines of what is already known about the subject. Named by Nancy Pelosi as the Chair of the House Democratic Caucus, she’s also the first woman to be named to the US House of Representatives.

Julie Nguyen (center) with students and teachers at a Vietnamese high school where she taught a class on the environment.

students Julie Nguyen

Before coming to the Goldman School, Julie Nguyen (MPP candi- date ’19) worked as the head of “Bureau de la Télésie et de la Pro- grammatism” (Office of Trusteeship and Programming) in the French Ministry of Environment and Energy. She spoke with Policy Notes about working on transportation policy in France and the European Union.

What kind of transportation policy work did you do in France and Europe?

In France, the Ministry of Environment and Energy is in charge of transportation, housing and urban development. It is there- fore the most important ministry in terms of human and finan- cial resources.

My team and I worked on the strategic plan for the French Institute of Science and Technology for Transport, Development, and Networks, a major player in the European research on trans- portation and civil engineering. I was also involved in the con- ception of the national transportation data platform, a study conducted jointly by the French Ministry and the National Map- ping Agency on the sovereignty risks related to the autonomous vehicles, and last but not least, the transportation in French law of the European Directives on open data.

How did you get involved in this policy area?

I was born in a small village close to Hanoi in Vietnam. Coming from a family who earned our living by cultivating flowers, I understand very well the value of nature and the land. I remember studying by the light of oil lamps because we didn’t have enough fuel and due to frequent power outages. I will never forget these hard but happy moments in my life.

I developed a strong interest in environmental policy during an internship working with the European Commissions chemi- cal and waste management frameworks. I was appointed by the French incumbent Minister of Public Affairs, Nathalie Loi- seau at the end of 2014 to participate in the World Policy Con- ference held in Seoul, which discussed the impact of climate change on worldwide public health and immigration.

After being appointed as a high-ranking civil servant by French President François Hollande in 2015, I chose to work at the French Ministry of Environment and Energy. This choice led me to work on transportation policy.

What brought you to do the Goldman School?

The Goldman School is one of the best schools in the world where students can study environment and energy policy. I am very interested in environmental equality, and the link between environmental and human rights. I hope that my two years at Goldman will deepen my knowledge and skills in these policies.

There must be some very notable differences in transportation policy between the US and Europe. Are there a couple of big ones that stand out to you?

Unlike the US federal government which can levy taxes on gas- oline or other products to finance its transportation policies, the European Union’s budget stems notably from the contribution of the 28 Member States. The total budget of the European Union is equal approximately 1% of the GDP of the 28 Member States (roughly $160B in FY 2017) whereas the federal budget of the US is more than 20% of its GDP. Therefore European Transporta- tion Policy (like any other policies in Europe) is much more related to regulation than investment.

At the national level in France, the French Ministry of Envi- ronment and Energy is in charge of transportation, housing, and urban development. Therefore, transportation policy is a branch of French environmental and energy policy. We know that the transportation sector emits 30% of greenhouse gas and consumes 35% of energy in France each year. Another notable difference between Europe and the US is that the level at which the government is involved in the transportation sector. In France, almost all the transport companies are owned by the French Ministry of Environment and Energy, who appoints the CEOs and any other key positions with the approval of the French Prime Minister.

[My thanks to classmates Benjamin Kane, Justin Lam, and Robert O’Connor who shared their knowledge of US transporta- tion policy with me.]

Are you hoping to return to this policy area after graduation? What tools and experiences are you gaining from Goldman that will be useful to you?

I would like to return to environment and energy policy work, either as a representative of the French government in the Euro- pean Union or as a judge in the French national court special- izing in environmental justice. It is also possible that I’d work in another policy area altogether. One of my goals in being here at the Goldman School is to expand my horizons by acquiring new policy tools, meeting outstanding people from different back- grounds, and gaining new experiences.
Multimodal Levels of Service
A Case for Alternative Transportation Data

By Emily Alter (MPP Candidate ’19)

TRADITIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING relies on Level of Service (LOS) analysis to evaluate the impact of new road projects on traffic. From interstate highways to low-volume residential streets, project approval depends on existing available data to ensure that new crosswalks, traffic lights, signal changes or reconfigurations don’t unintentionally slow cars down or divert them onto other roads.

These traditional approaches to planning, however, continue to yield unforeseen results. Projects anticipated to alleviate congestion have actually resulted in higher volumes of traffic. Consider the example of a two-mile extension to the 180/280 regional bypass system to be built in operation. According to the California Department of Transportation System, completion of the extension is expected to increase traffic congestion by 50%.

On the local level, some cities are acknowledging the limitations of traditional transportation planning through new and innovative transportation planning technologies aimed at encouraging alternative, cleaner modes of transportation. According to the University of California, Berkeley’s Institute of Governmental Studies, California voters disapprove of the measure by a margin of 23 points, 58 percent to 35 percent. Importantly, voters without a party preference disapprove of the measure by a staggering 35 points. Republican voters are opposed to SB 1, Republicans advanced two initiative measures that would roll back SB 1’s tax and fee increases, reversing California statute to what it was prior to the signing of SB 1. The second measure, filed by Assemblymember Travis Allen (R-Huntington Beach), a 2018 candidate for Governor, would roll back SB 1’s tax and fee increases, reversing California statute to what it was prior to the signing of SB 1. The second measure, extensively advocated by San Diego talk radio host Carl DeMaio, but rumored to be bankrolled by Republican legislators, would repeal the various tax and fee increases in SB 1. The first measure, filed by Assemblymember Traci Warren (D-Beverly Hills), would remove $5 billion in new transportation measures over the next ten years for the maintenance and operation of the state highway system. The short-term shortfall that makes up only 8 percent of all state highway lane-miles are in “good” condition. A report by the California State Association of Counties and the League of California Cities similarly found that 52 of the 58 counties in the state have pavement that are either “at risk” or in “poor condition,” and require an additional $73 billion over the next 10 years to be brought into a state of good repair. The culprit for these funding shortfalls is not mismanagement in Sacramento, but rather excise taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel. As vehicles have become increasingly fuel-efficient, these per-gallon taxes, which provide a vast majority of funding for the rehabilitation of highways, streets and roads, have generated less revenue for the state.

ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE Requires Strategic Investments in Transportation: According to the California Transportation Investment Act Coalition, the transportation sector is responsible for 38 percent of total greenhouse gas emissions in the state. To make progress in our fight against climate change, we must make strategic investments in the transportation sector that reduce or eliminate vehicular emissions and that promote “mode shift” that brings Californians out of their single-occupancy vehicles and into various forms of shared mobility, like trains and buses. While SB 1 is primarily focused on rebuiliding our crumbling state highways and local streets and roads, it also provides over $700 million annually for the maintenance and expansion of our public transportation network. This investment in public transportation is the state’s single largest commitment in more than 40 years. Additionally, SB 1 will provide $100 million annually for active transportation projects that encourage bicycling and walking, key components of a sustainable transportation network.

Using the Initiative Process to Score a Short-Term Win Will Have Long-Term Consequences: While a repeal of SB 1 will lower prices at the pump in 2018, it will compound the expense of necessary infrastructure work in the near future. An assessment by the California State Association of Counties and the League of California Cities found that, if SB 1 funding is repealed, the percentage of failed streets and roads in California will increase from 6.9% today to 22.2% by 2026. This deteriora-
What was/is your role in the military?

VERNON: I am currently a promotable Army Captain transitioning to the Strategic career field within the Army. I spent the first half of my career as a Signal Officer primarily working with tactical computer and radio networks. My transition to being a Strategic means I’ll be working on strategy and policy development at the Division and higher levels of the Army as well as working in joint units of Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine personnel and multinational (i.e. NATO) organizations.

DENNIS: I was a shock trauma platoon leader in the US Navy. A shock trauma platoon is a unit that is made up of a doctor, a nurse, and a number of corpsmen (medics) that is attached to a Marine Battalion and has the job of initial treatment of any casualties that the Marines have. It’s basically a mobile trauma bay that treats gunshots, burns, or any other injuries the Marines have while out on deployment. It’s a demanding, fast-paced job that requires you to be very flexible yet provide medical care in a mobile, high-stress environment.

LESLEI: I was an Arabic language translator for the Army. I did translation and transcription work for the Army and government agencies.

What was your path to joining the military?

LESLEI: I started thinking that I might want to join the Army while I was still in college. I wanted to be a part of something bigger than myself. I was motivated by a sense of duty and challenge and the idea of finding out what the best version of me would be.

When I started working to join the Army, “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell” was still in force and I was very out as a queer lady. Though my recruiter didn’t say it, that was the reason that my application to join was delayed for about 18 months. I moved on from that plan and found another job and was getting ready to move from my home in Massachusetts to Seattle for my new job when my recruiter called me and said that my application had finally gone through. The week before that phone call, President Obama had announced that Don’t Ask Don’t Tell was going to be repealed. I left for Basic Training a few weeks later.

VERNON: I started school at Appalachian State University with the intent of pursuing a business degree. In the first few weeks of class a friend of my roomate who was an ROTC cadet was in our room showing my roommate pictures of ROTC cadets training in the field. One picture was of a group of cadets standing in front of a Blackhawk helicopter. The cadet told me that sometimes they get to do “air assault operations.” He elaborated on this included rappelling out of helicopters. Not wanting to pass up the opportunity to rappel out of a helicopter, I went to the ROTC department the next day to sign up for the program. I have never regretted that decision. I also never got a chance to rappel out of a helicopter until I graduated and arrived at my first unit, almost five years later.

DENNIS: I joined the Navy during medical school in 2005. I had been a civilian in college and had always been interested in military service. There was a program called the Health Professionals Scholarship Program that was available for those in medical school that recruited medical students to serve in the military. There was a need in the military for doctors with both the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts. I thought this would be a way to do something meaningful with my medical degree, give back to my country, and have my medical school paid for at the same time, so I joined.

Why did you choose to pursue an MPA now at the Goldman School?

VERNON: During my time in the military and civilian world, I’ve often wished I had studied management or policy. Management of medical facilities requires a high degree of administrative and policy knowledge and I wanted to become more effective at this area of my job.

The Goldman School of Public Policy is one of the best policy schools in the country and many of its priorities, including health care, matched my interests. Public education was my path to upward mobility, and I respect the fact Berkeley is a public institution and prioritizes education for all. ROTC cadets have their own method, and require that we are pushing ourselves.

When I started the MPA, I had a pretty clear plan: I wanted to work to improve access to mental health services for active duty military members. But, hearing about the work that the other members of my cohort have been doing in all different sectors and capacities has broadened the scope of my plans. I want to find a job where my skills can be best used to help my community.

DENNIS: Some general traits that you have to pick up to be effective in military as well as medicine. I’ve spent the last 12 years in an environment that values practicality and is very results-oriented and I believe this is a good mindset to approach management and policy. Being able to work as a team is stressed in the military and in emergency medicine; those skills are used at the Goldman School for many assignments. I want to use this degree to better manage a relief effort on the ground and organize medical programs.

LESLEI: The Goldman School’s recently launched Master of Public Administration program has drawn an impressive cohort of professionals from a wide variety of backgrounds, including the United States military. Two veterans, Leslie Hamilton and Dennis O’Connor, and an active duty service member, Captain Vernon Pittman,* all MPA candidates ’18 spoke with Policy Notes about their experiences in the armed services and what drew them to graduate studies at the Goldman School.

*The views and opinions expressed here are the individual’s and do not necessarily state, reflect, or represent those of the United States Government, the Department of Defense or the US Army.

How have your experiences in the service prepared you for the MPA program? What do you hope to do with this degree?

LESLEI: The summer session for MPAs is intense: long days, lots to get done in a short time, and forming deep personal connections quickly. I was used to all those things and was able to manage my time well so that I got as much as I could out of the summer. It was, honestly, sort of a relief to have this time to focus on myself. I believe that my Army experience has helped in a few ways. First, being able to work with a diverse group of people of varying backgrounds, experiences, and knowledge is directly applicable to my cohort in the MPA. Much like the soldiers I work with, everyone in the MPA cohort comes from different walks of life with unique experiences and perspectives that they are able to bring into the classroom. This diversity makes us better as a cohort. Secondly, I have done a great deal of work using the Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and some work with Operational Design methodology and I find some overlap between these and the Eightfold Path. Lastly, I believe that my diverse career within the Army has helped out considerably. I have worked in Signal, Aviation, Infantry, and Field Artillery units and I have been to Signal, Engineer-specific courses. What I’ve learned is that all of these schools and units have their own method, and requirements, for planning within the MDMP: sometimes with drastically different outputs. I think this has helped me understand that a person who is willing can learn to work outside of their “specialty” and still achieve success. Public Policy has so far been outside of my sphere of influence, it’s very new to me. But I believe that I and many in my cohort have faced this challenge before and come out of the other side better for the experience.

As for long-term goals or desires, I feel I’ve found it. Not only am I and many in my cohort have faced this challenge before and come out of the other side better for the experience.

As for long-term goals or desires, I feel as though my experience in the military and the education I am receiving here at the Goldman School are opening up more future opportunities than I could count. From working in public, private, or nonprofit sectors to working at one of the many think tanks in the country, the MPA program and education will prove instrumental to my future opportunities and success.
event highlights

California and the Climate Fight: The State's New Relationships with Washington and the World
An expert panel convened to discuss California’s policy options given potential conflicts with the new US administration on issues of climate change and the environment.
The Cal Day event was sponsored by the Goldman School’s Center on Civility & Democratic Engagement and Center for Environmental Public Policy.

From left: Dan Lindheim, Faculty Director, CCDE; Professor Sol Hsiang; Professor Meredith Fowlie, and Professor Carol Zabin with CEPP Executive Director Ned Helme (MPP ’99).

EPG Alumni Dinner
Students in the Environmental Policy Group hosted its annual alumni dinner, featuring Roland Hwang (MPP ‘92), Director of Energy & Transportation at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

From left: Alejandra Mejia-Cunningham (MPP ’13), Ben Gould (MPP ’17), Ankit Jain (MPP ’13), Christian Miller (MPP/ERG ’19), Ben Shapiro (MPP ’18).

Race in Shifting Times: Politics, Power, and Policymaking
Students of Color in Public Policy (SCiPP), Blacks in Public Policy (BiPP), the Graduate Assembly (GA), Women in Public Policy (WiPP), Food and Agriculture Policy, Housing and Urban Policy (HUP), and the Migration and Refugee Policy Group (MRPG) co-sponsored the 7th Annual Race and Policy Symposium, a space to think critically and strategically about how to protect the rights and lives of people of color in local communities, and at the state and national level.

PPIA
For its 36th consecutive summer, the Goldman School welcomed thirty outstanding college juniors to be a part of the Public Policy International Affairs Junior Summer Institute, designed to empower and better address the needs of historically under-served communities and prepare students for graduate education in public policy and law.

Welcoming MPAs and MPPs
The Goldman School welcomed outstanding Master of Public Affairs (summer) and Master of Public Policy (fall), and PhD cohorts.

Truth as a Common Good
Doug Spencer (MPP ’08) is currently a full-time professor at the University of Connecticut School of Law and was recently awarded tenure.

Velma Perlsyamy (MPP ’17) is currently working as City Manager on the Kayan-Dornival City council. This city has a population of 18 million and he works to address urban challenges in areas like transportation, sanitation, and waste management.

Frank Molina (MPP ’17) and Phillip Peña (MPP ’17) joined a group of Bay Area professional Latino men at LinkedIn SF to learn more about the Latino Community Foundation’s Latino Men’s SF giving circle. They were hosted by Christian Arana (MPP ’17) and consequently decided to join the LCF giving circle. They are looking forward to giving and raising funds to support small local nonprofits which are often overlooked by larger philanthropy.

Danielle Love (MPP ’11) is happily still living and working in San Francisco, as a Senior Analyst on SFUSD’s Human Capital Team. She and her partner, Luis, welcomed baby Matilda in February.

Corey Ponder (MPP ’09) was named to the Board of Directors of the Vanderbilt University Alumni Association this summer.

Christian Arana (MPP ’17) is currently the policy director at the Latino Community Foundation in San Francisco, and has recently written articles in the New York Times and the Sacramento Bee addressing issues for Dreamers and Latinos: http://nyti.ms/2yKR1Zw

Amy Vierra (MPP ’90/PHD ’02) retired from the U.S. Public Health Service and moved to California State University system where she is helping their 500+ faculty and students to finally address educational equity and her lifelong love of Africa, her photos gives them a moment’s respite from the grim calamity in which we are living. Meanwhile, she continues to have policy ideas that she can’t get anyone to act on, continues to lose in her efforts to protect open space in this country from county and city bureaucrats, mountain bikers, and self-centered members of the public.

Frank Molina (MPP ’17) and Phillip Peña (MPP ’17) joined Christian Arana (MPP ’17) at LinkedIn SF to learn about the Latino Community Foundation’s (LCF) Latino Men’s SF giving circle.

Nicole Bergeron (MPP 350/ ’96, UC Hastings) helped her prac- tice with another woman-owned firm, VIVA Strategy + Communica- tion’s (September, Consulting 7). Her firm’s grant-making and portfolio design practice. Her expertise is working with foundation, nonprofit, and government leaders on governance, leadership development, full cost funding, strategy, and communi- cations for social impact. Current clients include First 5 Alameda, and the Lawrence M. Wiener Foundation. She is President of the San Carlos School District Board of Trustees.

Stephen Rosenbaum (MPP ’79) has continued to litigate at Cali- fornia Rural Legal Assistance on behalf of low income clients to preserve public housing tenancies, stem the flow of students from community districts to alternative place- ments, and combat sexual harassment at the workplace. In May, he was a panelist at a session on “Disability and Decarceration: Defining Disability Justice in An Age of Mass Incarceration” at the Harris Institute’s annual Othering and Belonging conferences, in Oak- land. In June and July he was a video-conference guest lecturer for a series of Ateliers de la Clinique Juridique with students from a law school clinic at the Universidad de Lome in Togo. On Constitu- tion Day (September 21) Steve spoke on a panel on “Confronting Hate Speech on College Campuses” at San Joseph Delta College in Stockton. In November, he will be a panelist in Guadalajara, Mexico at the Foro Académico Mundial de los Derechos Humanos. Steve is also co-authoring an article with a SFU special education gradu- ate student on self-determination and self-advocacy for individuals with complex communication needs.

Sheetal Dhir (MPP ’13) just started as the Senior Campaigner for Crisis and Tactical Response at Amnesty International USA. As the Senior Crisis Campaigner, Sheetal is responsible for crisis campaigns globally and domestically in the US. For the most part she is devel- oping campaigns in response to conflict, crises or other events that result in sudden, widespread and serious human rights violations. She is also responsible for supporting Amnesty’s web, social and political develop- ments that threaten human rights at home.

Stuart Drown (MPP ’86) was recently featured in the top 20 Open Government Leaders You Need to Know of the StateScoop Open Government Special Report.

James Savage (PhD ’87) spent the spring 2017 semester as a Ful- bright Visiting Professor of International Relations at the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna, Austria. Two of his articles were accepted for publication: “Enforcing the European Semester: The Politics of Asym- metric and ‘Benevolent’ Fiscal and Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedures,” in the Journal of European Public Policy, and “The European Union Budget and the European Refugee and Migration Crisis,” in the OECD Journal on Budgeting.

Cyndi Spindell Berck (MPP ’85/ JD ’86) is one of the editors of “Agri- cultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Africa: Food Security in a Changing Environment” (Springer). She is currently doing research for the Future Press/ Routledge. Co-editors are Peter Berck and Salvadori Di Falco. Following the even longer gestation of “Pocah- ontas and Sacagawea: Intercultural Legacies in American History” (Commonwealth Books of Virginia, 2015), Cyndi is planning to come back as an elephant in her next life because of the shorter gestation period.

Katie Short (MPP ’13) is now working in Houston, TX with Harris County commissioner Rodney Ellis. If you find yourself in Houston, feel free to drop her a line!

Alex Greenwood (MPP ’93) is currently serving as Director of Eco- nomic & Community Development for the City of South San Fran- cisco, a position he’s had since 2014.

Paula D. Gordon (MPP/JD ’13) and Jasmine Jones (MPA candidate ’18). The Goldman School is launching a podcast! Check out http://talkpolicytome.org to hear stories from the people who are researching — and living — critical public policy issues. Hosted by Jonathan Stein (MPP/JD ’13) and Jasmine Jones (MPA candidate ’18).
THE GOLDMAN SCHOOL IS NOT THE LARGEST OF ITS KIND. The School's 237 MPA, MPP, and PhD graduate candidates account for less than 3% of UCB's graduate student population. In turn, UCB is one of ten campuses that comprise the University of California (UC) system, which, in economic terms, would qualify as the 13th largest state. GSPP is a small branch on the mighty UC tree.

The picture changes dramatically when you view GSPP in terms of influence and impact. As it moves on its path of policy research, implementation and public outreach, the Goldman School's footprint besieges any idea that it lacks heft. Consider GSPP's impact and influence across multiple fronts:

**University of California**

GSPP's engagement with the UC system starts at the top. UC President Janet Napolitano has a GSPP faculty appointment. She presented her vision for UC at a faculty meeting and discussed the challenges facing the system. Well-attended Goldman School events in LA, NYC and the Bay Area have featured President Napolitano — making a difference and changing the world for the better — could hardly be considered small. In the ways that matter, there is so much more than meets the eye at 2607 Hearst Ave. And the lives of countless people are better for it.

**Research with Impact**

GSPP is distinguished by faculty research that illuminates our most critical issues and informs policy decision-makers from local to international arenas. For example, Steve Raphael's research informed California corrections realignment spearheaded by then-CA Attorney General Kamala Harris. Rucker Johnson's findings on school desegregation definitively corrobo rates its societal value. Sol Hsiang's research on the social cost of carbon resulted in consideration in the federal budgeting process of the economic impact of climate change. Jennifer Russell's timely work focuses on natural disasters in developing countries and the incentives of governments to invest in preparedness.

**Outreach to Inform and Engage**

A robust social media and communications enterprise extends the Goldman School's sphere of impact to the greater public, both in the US and abroad. Over 5,000 alumni and friends receive the Digital with its links to articles and videos. The GSPP website is content-rich and augments Policy Notes with topical news short s. Our UCTV Public Policy Channel and library of lectures have garnered 5 million views, with over 30% international. And our new podcast series promises to add a whole new dimension of accessibility to GSPP content.

Add the multiplier effect GSPP's alumni in public leadership bring to the equation and suddenly it's clear that the School in its most important terms — making a difference and changing the world for the better — could hardly be considered small. In the ways that matter, there is so much more than meets the eye at 2607 Hearst Ave. And the lives of countless people are better for it.
In a similar spirit, CCDE sponsored a nominally left/right Homecoming panel in late October. The 2016 Election: What Working Class Voters Are Thinking, with Cal Professor Arlie Hochschild, whose recent book Strangers in Their Own Land discussed the views, values and politics of working class voters in Louisiana and Visiting Professor Steven Hayward, a frequent conservative/libertarian commentator and the former Ronald Reagan Professor of Public Policy at Pepperdine University, CCDE was pleased to co-sponsor this special event with The Berkeley Forum, a non-partisan, student-run organization here on campus that hosts debates, panels, and talks by leading experts from a variety of fields. Last Spring, CCDE sponsored a Cal Day panel on California and the Climate Fight: the State’s New Relationship with Washington and the World. Panelists included Professors Meredith Fowlie (Environmental and Resource Economics), Sol Hsiang (Goldman School), Carol Zabin (Research Director, UC Berkeley Labor Center), and Ned Helme (Executive Director, Goldman School’s Center for Environmental Public Policy). This diverse and wide-ranging panel discussed the implications for California of the changing Federal attitudes toward climate policy and the US commitment to the Paris Accords and has already garnered more than 60,000 views on UCTV. You can view these CCDE programs and more on the Goldman School’s Public Policy Channel at https://www.uctv.tv/public-policy. The CCDE is also accelerating its core work to foster greater civility and democratic engagement through various convenings, student scholarships as well as faculty and student research work. G

### Center for Civility and Democratic Engagement

**THE GOLDMAN SCHOOL’S CENTER ON CIVILITY AND DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT (CCDE)**

CCDE has been actively involved in the effort to promote free speech, working with the Chancellor to chair a faculty/student committee to create a series of point-counterpoint events where prominent people of divergent views actually converse and discuss important topical issues. It is an affirmative effort to show that meaningful and substantive discussion is possible even between people of very different viewpoints. The planning process itself has already had the effect of bringing together students and faculty from a wide range of political and interest group perspectives, who themselves are also sponsoring their own efforts to discuss difficult issues on campus.

In a similar spirit, CCDE sponsored a nominally left/right Homecoming panel in late October. The 2016 Election: What Working Class Voters Are Thinking, with Cal Professor Arlie Hochschild, whose recent book Strangers in Their Own Land discussed the views, values and politics of working class voters in Louisiana and Visiting Professor Steven Hayward, a frequent conservative/libertarian commentator and the former Ronald Reagan Professor of Public Policy at Pepperdine University, CCDE was pleased to co-sponsor this special event with The Berkeley Forum, a non-partisan, student-run organization here on campus that hosts debates, panels, and talks by leading experts from a variety of fields. Last Spring, CCDE sponsored a Cal Day panel on California and the Climate Fight: the State’s New Relationship with Washington and the World. Panelists included Professors Meredith Fowlie (Environmental and Resource Economics), Sol Hsiang (Goldman School), Carol Zabin (Research Director, UC Berkeley Labor Center), and Ned Helme (Executive Director, Goldman School’s Center for Environmental Public Policy). This diverse and wide-ranging panel discussed the implications for California of the changing Federal attitudes toward climate policy and the US commitment to the Paris Accords and has already garnered more than 60,000 views on UCTV. You can view these CCDE programs and more on the Goldman School’s Public Policy Channel at https://www.uctv.tv/public-policy. The CCDE is also accelerating its core work to foster greater civility and democratic engagement through various convenings, student scholarships as well as faculty and student research work.

**CCDE programs and more on the Goldman School’s Public Policy Channel at https://www.uctv.tv/public-policy.**

**The CCDE is also accelerating its core work to foster greater civility and democratic engagement through various convenings, student scholarships as well as faculty and student research work.**

---

**A REPORT FROM THE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC POLICY**

Provides new policy recommendations to help implement California’s recently legislated program to eliminate hotspots of severe air pollution and harming the health of people in disadvantaged communities.

Assembly Bill 617, passed by the California Legislature and signed by Gov. Jerry Brown in July, establishes that meeting regional air quality standards is not enough, and that people in communities near pollution sources must be protected from elevated exposures to harmful emissions.

“This year’s landmark climate change policies were centered around air quality, bringing about greater transparency and true climate equity in areas that have historically been disproportionately and adversely impacted by pollution,” said Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia (D-Coachella), chair of the Joint Legislative Committee on Climate Change Policies.

“AB 617 opens a new frontier in how we control air pollution and builds upon advancements in low-cost pollution sensing technologies to help fill a major public health protection gap in California and potentially other environmentally vulnerable communities across the globe,” Garcia said.

The study released by CEPP provides specific recommendations to improve public health and literally save lives in low-income and minority neighborhoods located near pollution sources like marine terminals, trucking warehouses, chemical plants, and refineries found in California, the Gulf Coast and other areas across the nation, according to Ned Helme, CEPP’s executive director.

“New, low-cost air pollution sensor technology makes it possible to target air emissions abatement at the local level. This could be a model for the nation,” he added.

The report, “Advancing Environmental Justice: A New State Regulatory Framework to Abate Community-Level Air Pollution Hotspots and Improve Health Outcomes” (https://bit.ly/advance-enviro-justices), is based on research and policy discussions with more than 40 key California government officials, environmental justice advocates and industry representatives.

It recommends actions by California to designate local hotspot areas, deploy the new sensor technology, design emission controls and engage communities in reducing excessive exposures to air pollution.

“We can now identify and reduce dangerous pollution in areas as small as a city block where the worst pollution exposures are occurring and where residents are experiencing disproportionately higher rates of emergency room admissions for asthma,” said Helme.

The CEPP study emphasizes tapping direct community involvement to make the legislature’s hotspot abatement program work. With support from the state, communities can strategically deploy sensors on the front porches of hundreds of residences to create a more precise map of affected neighborhoods that can help communities with accurate data and knowledge of their local situation.

Traditional clean air laws, while effective in lowering average pollution exposure, often overlook localized pollution hotspots.

The California Legislature will need to appropriate funding for the network of new sensors, community-based pollution reduction strategies, and CEPP-recommended financial incentives to replace dirty diesel truck engines with electric motors.

“This financing is the critical ingredient to successfully implement this path-breaking clean air legislation,” said Helme.

Jack Broadbent, executive secretary of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, participated in the discussions for the report. He said its recommendations “will transform how we as regulators can ensure protection for our most vulnerable citizens. We are eager to move forward with our communities to make this vision a reality.”

Luis Olmedo of Brawley, Calif., director of Comite Cívico Del Valle, a leading local environmental justice group in the Imperial Valley, participated in the CEPP discussions. He said it is essential that community organizations are empowered to join in monitoring local air pollution as well as in designing strategies for pollution abatement.

“We have been battling the air pollution that shortens lives in disadvantaged communities for a long time,” said Brian Beveridge, co-director of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project, and a CEPP project participant.

In his neighborhood, Beveridge said, the CEPP recommendations will provide a valuable new path for reducing pollution from marine terminals and warehouse operations.

Research for the report included extensive discussions, working groups and feedback about how to increase health protection for vulnerable populations. Participants included environmental justice groups, industry and environmental representatives, state and local agencies, labor and UC faculty experts.
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Berkeley Institute for the Future of Young Americans

By Sarah Swanbeck and James Hawkins (MPP Candidate ’18)

JUST ABOUT EVERYWHERE YOU LOOKED in the last decade, you could find more cause for alarm about the financial security of the millennial generation. As young people have continued to struggle to find their footing in the wake of the Great Recession, we have seen stagnant wages and high unemployment, increasingly less affordable housing, and mounting student debt obligations.

In August of last year, the Future of Young Americans hosted a diverse group of young Californians for its second annual summit to talk about the most pressing economic challenges with which young people in the state are grappling. The conference featured panels on the changing nature of work and its consequences for the next generation of American workers, how healthcare reform at a federal level may have important implications for young Californians seeking coverage, and the role of young activists in driving social movements. It was an opportunity to hear from young policymakers and activists across the state and to bring together activists and academics to set a comprehensive agenda for the future.

To understand the particular challenges for young people around jobs and healthcare and political engagement, we first wanted a clear picture for how the millennial generation compares to previous generations. Specifically, we wanted to know, are young people today really any worse off than their parents were at the same age?

Using the US Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS), which samples US working age adults in non-institutional settings, we were able to calculate average income over time by age cohort. The results of this analysis (Figure 1), show that, while for most age groups median income has grown since the 1960s, for 18-24 year-olds, income has remained relatively flat. In other words, while the economy has grown to about 28 times its size in the 1960s, and while other age groups have seen their incomes rise as a result of this growth, the youngest Americans have real

FIGURE 1: SEPARATE

...ized none of these gains; a Millennial today is doing only about as well as her Boomer parents were doing in the 1960s.

While much of the increase in income for older age groups can be attributed to rising wages, this is not the case for those over 65. For the elderly, wages have risen, but so has government support. Average income from Social Security benefits was about $3k in 1968 and has more than doubled since then (Figure 2). Conversely, while the young do have some educational benefits (e.g., Pell Grants) and some income support (e.g., Social Security and Disability Insurance), there is nothing on the same scale. America, as a society, has committed to seniors that they should not have to live in poverty as they leave the labor market. Our country has made significant investments in Social Security and Medicare and, as a result, the elderly poverty rate in the US has fallen from 28.5% in 1966 to 9.1% in 2012 (and plenty of policymakers would argue that we could do more). Yet our country has not made the same kind of commitment to young people as they enter the labor market. Young Americans, who are in a similarly vulnerable stage of life, who have not had time to build wealth, do not receive government support on the same scale. An entire generation of Americans is coming of age during a time of growing inequality, a widening skills gap, and stagnant wages, with little cushion for the inevitable setbacks in life. Which then leaves us with the important question: what are the kinds of investments we should be making in the millennial generation to help support them as they move into adulthood? 6

Sarah Swanbeck is the Executive Director for the Berkeley Institute for the Future of Young Americans. James Hawkins is a Master of Public Policy candidate at the Goldman School.

FIGURE 2: 16–24 vs 65+

By John Aubrey Douglass

POLICY WORKS WHO FOLLOW THE AGENDA OF MINISTRIES throughout the world know that higher education is often among the top five policy areas for new initiatives and reforms. Whether it is in China, Japan, Korea, Russia, Germany, France, South Africa, or Brazil, national leaders have embraced the idea that having a world-class system, and specifically a set of high quality research universities, is the key to global economic competitiveness and social cohesion.

The Center for Studies in Higher Education remains a productive locale for research and discussions, comparative data, for analyzing these global policy trends, as well as a forum for thinking about the future of higher education in California. CSHE is now one of four research centers located at GSPP, but its roots go back to 1957. That year, a proposal developed by Clark Kerr, Robert Gordon Sproul, faculty member T.R. McConnell, working with John Gardner — then president of the Carnegie Corporation and later the architect of President Johnson’s Great Society programs — saw a need for systematic study of America’s burgeoning higher education system.

CSHE was borne with Carnegie money, becoming the first higher education research center not only not in the US, but the world. Under the guidance first of McConnell, and later notables such as a GSP faculty member Martin Trow, CSHE also expanded its research mission to examine the rising tide of globalization and its influence on higher education — and vice versa. Always at the heart of the Center’s activities has been a devotion to pursuing multidisciplinary research and acting as a home for a network of scholars and visitors from throughout the world.

Current research programs focus on the history of universities and their role in national development; the role higher education financing plays in poverty; the role research universities play in economic development, institutional global engagement strategies, and international comparative research on the student experience via a Center based consortium of some of the world’s top research universities. CSHE also has a widely read scholarly and policy focused research publication series that reflects its multidisciplinary focus.

This year marks the Center’s 60th anniversary. To help celebrate six decades of being on the Berkeley campus, we are organizing the CSHE@60 Conference on the topic of New Nationalism and Universities on November 16 and 17 of this year. This event will gather CSHE alumni and affiliated researchers, along with leading scholars and practitioners from throughout the world, to discuss the complex forces shaping populist movements in many parts of the world and how they are influencing the missions, activities, behaviors, and productivity of major leading national universities.

Universities have been at the forefront of both national development and global integration. They undoubtedly will continue to play this dual role. But the political and policy world in which they operate is once again undergoing a transition, reflective of a significant change in domestic politics and international relations — a populist shift inwards among a key group of major nations. Participants will explore the influence of nationalism, the old and new versions, on major national universities. One session will focus on the American universities in the Trump era — an evolving story.

CSHE offers an expanded opportunity for GSPP faculty and students, and its research center to collaborate and find synergies. If you are interested in being on the CSHE listserve for notices of events and publications, please contact center staff at: cshe@berkeley.edu
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NEW NATIONALISM AND UNIVERSITIES CENTER FOR STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION CELEBRATES ITS 60TH YEAR

John Aubrey Douglass is Senior Research Fellow for Public Policy and Higher Education at CSHE. He is the lead author in The New Flagship University: Changing the Paradigm from Global Ranking to National Relevancy (Palgrave Mcmillan 2016), and most recently with John H. Hawkins Envisioning the Asian New Flagship University: Its Past and Vital Future (Berkeley Public Policy Press, 2017).

Editor’s note: the Spring 2017 issue of Policy Notes misidentified the name of CSHE’s founding director. The Center’s first director was T.R. McConnell, former Chancellor of the University of Buffalo.

Sarah Swanbeck is the Executive Director for the Berkeley Institute for the Future of Young Americans. James Hawkins is a Master of Public Policy candidate at the Goldman School.

Editor’s note: the Spring 2017 issue of Policy Notes misidentiﬁed the name of CSHE’s founding director. The Center’s first director was T.R. McConnell, former Chancellor of the University of Buffalo.

Sarah Swanbeck is the Executive Director for the Berkeley Institute for the Future of Young Americans. James Hawkins is a Master of Public Policy candidate at the Goldman School.
Berkeley Global Programs

Semester Fellows
An amazing cohort of 9 fellows graduated in Spring 2017 from the semester program at Global & Executive Programs: 5 from the Government of India and 4 from the Universiti Brunei Darussalam. This was our first year partnering with the School of Social Welfare who jointly hosted Brunei Fellow Mr. Dimang Chhan, a Masters of Public Administration student who currently serves as the Chief of Bureau for the Royal Government of Cambodia Ministry of Tourism. He was joined by a diverse cohort whose postings ranged from Federal Election Commission to the Department of Sports, from the Office of the Prime Minister to the Brunei Defense Attaché to the United States. GEP was delighted to be a recipient of such a stellar group from India and Brunei at the Goldman School.

In August, we welcomed 17 new fellows for the fall semester: 12 civil servants from Hong Kong and 5 civil servants from the Government of India. Our current Hong Kong Fellows come from a variety of offices, departments, and bureaus, including the Financial Services & Treasury Bureau, the Geotechnical Engineering Office, the Hong Kong Police Force, and the Drainage Services Department. Ms. Nettie Kai-ting Ng, one of the Hong Kong Fellows, serves as an Assistant Secretary at Hong Kong’s Development Bureau, where she assists in overseeing policies related to building and land registration in the already packed Hong Kong. During their time here, they have visited both the Oakland and Berkeley City Hall, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Bay Area Council, where they came to better understand the Bay Area’s regional intricacies and global reach.

Just as impressive and diverse are our Government of India fellows, whose postings include the Ministry of Defense, the National Institution for Transforming India, the Department of Heavy Industry, and the Maharashtra Sales Tax Department. One India Fellow, Ms. Nita Kejriwal, has the unique responsibility of managing a large team working on the implementation of the National Rural Livelihoods Mission — a flagship government program aimed at poverty alleviation through improving the rural poor’s access to financial and public services.

While here our Fall 2017 fellows join the rest of the Goldman School student body in learning from some of the best and brightest in public policy. This year the courses many are attending include Robert Reich’s The Political Economy of Inequality, Timothy Dayton’s Negotiations, and Sarah Anzia’s Political and Agency Management Aspects of Public Policy.

Executive Education Programs
During the spring and early summer GEP hosted two custom, executive education programs for visiting government officials. These two programs graduated a total of 48 outstanding civil servants from the Government of India, equipping them with the necessary tools to further advance positive change for the people and communities they serve.

April 2017’s Ethics and Governance was the fourth program of its kind for Goldman School faculty, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the Oakland Police Department, and the San Francisco Ethics Commission. Disruptive Technologies: Value of the Public Good was hosted for a third time in June at the Goldman School and provided civil servants from the Government of India’s Ministry of Information & Broadcasting with the opportunity to understand and analyze technology’s impact on governance and public service. During their time here they visited both Facebook HQ and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and left Berkeley with the knowledge and skills to better lead and serve in an ever-changing technological and media landscape.

Visit of Dr. Joyce Teo Siew Yean and Dr. Mahani Hamdan, Universiti of Brunei, Darussalam
In March 2017, Dean Henry Brady and Goldman School welcomed Dr. Joyce Teo Siew Yean, Vice President of Global Affairs, and Dr. Mahani Hamdan, Director of the Institute of Policy Studies, from the Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Their visit helped to cement the already strong relationship between the Goldman School and the Universiti and reestablished our partnership with them through the renewal of our shared Memorandum of the Understanding for the next 5 years, which Dean Brady was personally invited to sign in Brunei.

In addition to meeting with Dean Brady, the Universiti Brunei Darussalam representatives met with Jeffrey Edleson, Dean of the School of Social Welfare, to further develop and expand the new partnership.

Hague Domestic Violence Project
It has been a busy semester for the Hague Domestic Violence Project. The Hague Domestic Violence Project has released its New York Judicial Bench Guide: The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction in Case Involving Battered Respondents: A New York Bench Guide for State and Federal Court Judges. This Bench Guide was developed in partnership with the New York Hague Convention and Domestic Bench Guide Consulting Committee and a pro bono team from law firm, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.

The Hague DV Project also developed a Model Bench Guide that can be adapted for other states across the country. This Model Bench Guide is a starting point for states to create its own state-specific Bench Guide, with the goal being that every federal and state court across the United States will soon have its own Hague Convention Bench Guide.

This past year, the project has also welcomed a third year Hastings Law Student Ms. Jessica Ma as our Hague Domestic Violence Project Fellow who is also training to be a JAG lawyer, to assist with the continued development of materials and monitoring for requests for technical assistance and referrals on Hague Convention cases in the US Courts.
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tion will ultimately cost Californians more in future taxes as our deferred maintenance backlog for this infrastructure swells from $40 billion to $61 billion in 2026. By the same token, a recent report from the California Department of Transportation finds that every dollar of preventative maintenance, the type of investment that would be frontloaded by SB 1, prevents $3 dollars in rehabilitation work and $8 in replacement. As with investments in other policy domains, preventative measures in transportation are cheaper than corrective action.

For these reasons, you can expect to see business leaders, environmentalists, and good government advocates joining Democrats across the state in pushing back on Republican efforts to undermine SB 1. We will be looking to you, the informed public, to help amplify our message.