

# PPOL 200B Project Menu 2020

<b>Economic Policy</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1. Measuring Genuine Progress: Factoring Environment and Society into Economic Growth Calculations .....	3
2. The Impact of Promise Neighborhoods in California .....	4
<b>Public Budgeting and Finance</b> .....	<b>6</b>
3. Best Practices for Public Engagement for State Budget Deliberations .....	6
4. Business Revenue Options for the City of Oakland .....	7
<b>Labor Policy</b> .....	<b>8</b>
5. Designing New Ways to Build Worker Power .....	8
6. Government Workers .....	9
<b>Education Policy</b> .....	<b>10</b>
7. The Role of Stakeholder Engagement in Improved Student Outcomes.....	10
8. Investing in State-Funded Preschools.....	12
9. Academic Advising: Refining the “Who” and the “How” to Improve Student Retention .....	13
<b>Criminal Justice Policy</b> .....	<b>15</b>
10. Data-driven and Evidence-based Criminal Justice Policy.....	15
11. Oakland Police Department .....	17
12. Disrupting the Pipeline: Policies to Better Serve At-Risk Youth with Disabilities .	19
<b>Drug Policy</b> .....	<b>20</b>
13. Reducing Youth Marijuana Use in Oregon .....	20
<b>Health Policy</b> .....	<b>21</b>
14. The Hidden Costs of Neglect for Those with Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders in California: Understanding The Effects of Health Insurance Barriers. ....	21
<b>Food Policy</b> .....	<b>22</b>
15. Exploring Financing Options to Scale Healthy Food Incentives for Low-income Californians.....	22
<b>Safety Net Policy</b> .....	<b>24</b>
16. CalFresh expansion to SSI recipients: Maximizing CalFresh enrollment in California .....	24
17. Evaluating and Strengthening the Emergency Child Care Bridge Program for Foster Children.....	26
18. Understanding CalWORKs Early Engagement.....	27
<b>Housing/Homelessness Policy</b> .....	<b>28</b>
19. Preserving Unrestricted Affordable Housing: How to Translate a Promising Idea into a Statewide Program? .....	28
20. A California Resolution in Support of Community Based Solutions to End Youth Homelessness .....	30
21. Welfare Discrimination in Federal Disability Benefits .....	31

22. Exploring Unauthorized Dwelling Units and the Preservation of Housing in San Francisco .....	32
<b>Transportation Policy .....</b>	<b>35</b>
23. Transit-First Policy & Plan for San Francisco International Airport .....	35
<b>Environmental Policy .....</b>	<b>36</b>
24. Regenerative Agriculture at the Federal Level: Recommendations for the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis .....	36
25. Analyzing the Climate Impact of Government Carbon Market Allowance Retirement.....	38
26. Skip the Slip .....	39
27. Analysis of Local Policies to End Gasoline Use .....	41
28. Electrification of Trucking Industry .....	44
<b>Technology Policy .....</b>	<b>45</b>
29. Oakland Citizen Data: Understanding What's Collected and Strengthening Privacy .....	45
<b>International Development Policy .....</b>	<b>47</b>
30. Intake and Case Management Best Practices for LGBTQ Shelter and Referrals Program: Middle East-North Africa .....	47
31. Building a Strategy for Growth and Impact to Drive Community Change in East Africa .....	49

# ECONOMIC POLICY

## 1. Measuring Genuine Progress: Factoring Environment and Society into Economic Growth Calculations

**Organization:** Scioto Analysis

**Location:** Columbus, Ohio, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** Last year, Scioto Analysis conducted a research project to calculate Ohio's Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), an alternative measure of economic growth that factors economic indicators such as unemployment, environmental indicators such as pollution, and social indicators such as the value of housework and volunteering in with traditional economic indicators. This Spring 2020 project would have two phases. (1) Update the GPI calculation to include data from 2017-2019. (2) Conduct a policy analysis to guide policymakers in Ohio interested in improving Ohio's GPI.

**Organization Description:** Scioto Analysis will be reporting this report's findings to state legislators and agency staff in the state of Ohio.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Rob Moore

**Email:** rob@sciotoanalysis.com

**Phone Number:** 6147431840

**Existing connection to GSPP:** MPP, '17

*Product Type: Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Economic Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Environmental Policy*

## 2. The Impact of Promise Neighborhoods in California

**Organization:** Mission Economic Development Agency

**Location:** San Francisco, CA

**Project Description & Goals:** At the Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA), the GPSS student team will work with the Evaluation Department to analyze the financial and social impacts of the Promise Neighborhood (PN) service delivery model. MEDA serves as the lead agency for the Mission Promise Neighborhood (MPN), a federally funded initiative to connect low-income families and their school-age children to an integrated network of school- and community-based services. Launched in 2012, MPN brings together local nonprofit, public, and private-sector partners to sustain this service network for residents of San Francisco's Mission District, particularly low-income Latino families. The IPA research project will help MEDA and fellow Promise Neighborhood lead agencies to analyze the costs, benefits and community impacts of the PN model, and to support sustainability efforts amidst impending shifts in funding. Since 2010, the U.S. Department of Education has subsidized 64 different Promise Neighborhoods across the United States, including six sites in California. However, federal funding for PNs is concluding in 2020. The impending closure of the grant has required MEDA and other lead agencies to seek alternative funding streams. Most notably, MEDA has worked with state legislators to advance support for state legislation that would authorize funding to sustain California's Promise Neighborhoods and create new PNs statewide. In this context, the GSPP graduate researchers would help MEDA evaluate the concrete benefits of Promise Neighborhoods for its participants, and support advocacy efforts around state appropriations.

MEDA's IPA project will have three major components:

1. A Return on Investment (ROI) analysis of Mission Promise Neighborhood. In building a case for state-level funding, it will be helpful to show the extent to which the PN model represents a cost-effective method for connecting students and families to supportive services. For instance, a recent ROI analysis of the PN in Minneapolis, MN determined that each dollar invested into the PN had generated \$6.12 in returns--a combination of increased earning potential and decreased costs from health care, public assistance, and/or justice systems involvement. We aim to conduct a similar ROI analysis of MPN, in order to provide policymakers and stakeholders with concrete data on the economic benefits of PNs. This project would be twofold: the team will conduct an in-depth analysis of Mission Promise Neighborhood utilizing program data, and also explore the feasibility of a statewide analysis of California's other Promise Neighborhoods using publicly available data. GPSS students would participate in the creation of an analytic plan for the ROI report, and would carry out the analysis and writing under supervision from the Evaluation Department.

2. An analysis of the impact of MPN's multigenerational approach. The Mission Promise Neighborhood and fellow PNs operate under a multigenerational framework for service delivery, supporting youth in schools while simultaneously providing parents with a host of direct services, training and educational opportunities, and access to other community supports. MEDA's Evaluation team will guide the GPSS students in a mixed-methods analysis of this multigenerational service model. We seek to learn the extent to which this dual focus on youth and parents improves socioeconomic outcomes for client families, as well as identify any challenges or barriers that prevent effective service delivery. Goldman students will undertake both a quantitative analysis of service utilization data, as well as qualitative data collection with MPN community participants and service providers. We anticipate that the end result will be a short research brief that MEDA could disseminate among community partners, funders, and other key stakeholders.

3. A comparative assessment of California's six Promise Neighborhoods. Finally, we propose that the IPA research project include a landscape analysis of California's existing PNs, with a focus on how each PN is structured in response to local socioeconomic, demographic, and geographic contexts. The GSPP team will interface with key stakeholders from other Promise Neighborhoods in California to gather information, share resources, and avoid any potential duplication of effort if other cross-site analyses exist. We anticipate that the end result of this project would be a short research brief that analyzes how and whether the flexibility of the PN model serves the needs of low-income communities across diverse local contexts.

**Organization Description:** Founded in 1973, the Mission Economic Development Agency is a nonprofit organization that provides a host of social services, educational resources, and affordable housing programs for low-income Latino residents of the Mission District and the Bay Area. The Evaluation Department works broadly with MEDA's direct services, housing development, policy advocacy, and administrative teams to assess program impacts and client outcomes, build organizational capacity for data collection and analysis, and use data-driven approaches to inform decision-making. GSPP students involved in this project will help MEDA in our policy advocacy efforts at the local, regional, and state level. MEDA is already part of the California Promise Neighborhood Network (CPNN), a coalition of the lead agencies for the state's PNs, which has pushed for the retention and expansion of Promise Neighborhoods as a state-funded initiative. MEDA has long worked with policymakers to promote and advance legislation at local and state levels. These analyses of the Mission Promise Neighborhood (and the other 5 PNs in California) will support MEDA and CPNN's efforts to inform state policymakers about the effectiveness of the PN model, and build legislators' support for the expansion of the program across California. In addition, these evaluations of MPN would help MEDA serve as a resource to other community-based organizations looking to replicate the program model. Should the state legislature authorize funding for additional PNs, it will be important for any new sites to build on the experience and knowledge gathered from the first cohort of Promise Neighborhoods.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Ryan Fukumori

**Email:** rfukumori@medasf.org

**Phone Number:** 415-282-3334 ext. 139

**Secondary Contact:** Rajni Banthia, rbanthia@medasf.org 415-282-3334 ext. 137

*Policy Product Type: Evaluation*

*Primary Policy Area: Economic Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice*

# PUBLIC BUDGETING AND FINANCE

## 3. Best Practices for Public Engagement for State Budget Deliberations

**Organization:** California State Assembly, Committee on Budget

**Location:** Sacramento, CA, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** We want an IPA group to help us make the California Budget process as open and inviting to the public as possible by helping us understand how other jurisdictions adopt their budgets. The Assembly Budget Committee, and its subcommittees, had over 100 hearings in 2019, more than any other committee in the California Legislature. Many of these hearings were attended by large crowds that provided public input and every hearing was televised by the Assembly television. However, the current process isn't very easy to navigate or track.

The most effective way to advocate is for a member of the public to appear in Sacramento in person at the one hearing where their priority is on the agenda. This requires a level of sophistication that makes it difficult for the general public to really be represented. While all hearings are televised, they are often on an internet feed that is hard to find and difficult to follow. Members of the public could watch proceedings on the Cal Channel, a dedicated statewide cable channel that provided legislative content. Unfortunately, the Cal Channel will cease operations in October of 2019, eliminating this option.

With the loss of the Cal Channel, the Assembly Budget Committee is rethinking its way to engage and inform the public. We want an IPA group to look to the other 49 states and other large government entities for best practices on how to communicate budget deliberations and invite public comment. We are looking for some good examples we can then further study, with the goal of making changes in 2021.

**Organization Description:** The Assembly Budget Committee is the largest and most prolific committee in the California State Legislature. Through its work, the \$314 billion annual budget for the State of California is built in a public process.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Christian Griffith

**Email:** christian.griffith@asm.ca.gov

**Phone Number:** 9163192099

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Assemblymember Phil Ting

**Existing connection to GSPP:** GSPP Class of 1997

*Product Type: Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Public Budgeting and Finance*

*Secondary Policy Area: Public Engagement*

## 4. Business Revenue Options for the City of Oakland

**Organization:** City of Oakland, City Councilmember Nikki Fortunato Bas (District 2)

**Location:** Oakland, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** Cities in California employ a variety of methods to collect business taxes, including a gross receipts tax, a payroll tax, or a flat business tax rate. Local officials' decisions on how to tax businesses likely stem from a number of factors, including: (1) their desire to attract businesses to the area; (2) their need to generate the revenues necessary to provide services; and, (3) a desire to create a system that officials and the general public deem fair to those paying business taxes, as well as other factors. The Business License Tax, which is the City of Oakland's business tax, comprises over 13% of General Fund revenue. It is the single largest source of General Fund revenue after property taxes. The existing system is outlined in the City Charter has been in place without significant modification (aside from the inclusion of the cannabis industry) since at least 2007 when a series of clarifying changes were made to the text without altering rates. While Oakland's current business license tax structure differentiates rates by industry, within an industry all businesses are treated equally regardless of business size. What are the opportunities for the City of Oakland to create a more progressive business tax structure? The goal of this IPA project would be to create a strategic proposal for a progressive business tax structure in the City of Oakland.

We expect a complete analysis to include the following questions: : What are the components of progressive business tax structures in other jurisdictions in California (e.g., Riverside and San Francisco)? What are the compelling academic arguments that support progressive business tax structures? How would this affect businesses in Oakland specifically and which businesses would be most affected?

**Organization Description:** Oakland City Council Its eight members are elected directly by the people of Oakland. The Council is made up of one representative from each of seven districts and one at-large representative. The Council sets goals and priorities for the City. The council approves the City budget, adopts ordinances to help the City serve its community members, and appoints members to various boards and commissions.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Miya Saika Chen

**Email:** mchen@oaklandca.gov

**Phone Number:** 5102387246

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Public Budgeting and Finance*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

# LABOR POLICY

## 5. Designing New Ways to Build Worker Power

**Organization:** JFF (Jobs for the Future)

**Location:** Oakland, CA

**Project Description & Goals:** The current state of the employment in California is one of economic insecurity for many workers. Wages have stagnated, benefits and training budgets have been cut, and union membership has declined dramatically since a historical high in the 1960s. In addition to these drivers of economic insecurity, 4th Industrial Revolution trends in employer behavior such as automation, artificial intelligence, and outsourcing have and are projected to further exacerbate inequality and decrease worker power. As JFF develops an internal strategy for how best to support communities across the state in their approach to inclusive economic growth and improving economic mobility for low-wage workers, we are looking to answer the question, how can workers build power to improve wages, benefits, and job quality in the face of declining union power? This project seeks to understand alternatives to unionization that can serve the function of improving worker advocacy.

Proposed project activities:

- National and state-level scan of strategies and policies that have been used to build worker power outside of unions, with lessons learned from their implementation
- A policy analysis to determine the appropriate levers for various California stakeholders (philanthropy, non-profits, educational institutions, city and state government officials, etc) to build worker power

**Organization Description:** JFF (Jobs for the Future) is a national nonprofit that accelerates the alignment and transformation of the American workforce and education systems to ensure access to economic advancement for all. Our Oakland office is working to design place-based strategies to advance economic opportunity for Californians through the activation of cross-sector networks and an unwavering commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The work of this project will be used define JFF's national strategy and thought leadership around building worker voice as a lever for improving economic outcomes for low-income workers. Additionally, California's Secretary of Labor has prioritized an investment in worker voice, and this work will help JFF advise the state on strategies to further this agenda.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Alison Schmitt

**Email:** [aschmitt@jff.org](mailto:aschmitt@jff.org)

**Phone Number:** 201-403-7827

**Existing connection to GSPP:** GSPP Alum (MPP '19)

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis/Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Labor Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice*

## 6. Government Workers

**Organization:** Mayor's Office of Social Equity and Innovation

**Location:** Denver, CO, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** As an office focused on social equity and innovation, our overarching goal is to use insights from behavioral science and evidence-based policymaking to make Denver more equitable and more inclusive. The Mayor has committed to improving diversity and inclusion in all city services, with a particular focus on better serving communities of color who have been historically underserved. We would like the help of GSPP students to

- a) Create a comparative analysis of best practices that other mid-sized cities have used to improve race and equity in service delivery. For example, what have other cities involved in GARE (The Government Alliance for Race and Equity) done that could be translated into an innovative strategy for Denver?
- b) Finalize an overarching evaluation strategy for the city that would include a list of equity indicators that the city should track across all departments.
- c) Create a demonstration project to help Departments see how they can use their existing administrative data more effectively to measure racial disparities in service delivery. We have agreement from the Departments of Public Health and Environment and Community Planning and Development to launch a demonstration project.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Kim Desmond

**Email:** [Kimberly.Desmond@denvergov.org](mailto:Kimberly.Desmond@denvergov.org)

**Phone Number:** not provided

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Erin Brown

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Yes, we are running a couple research project with Dr. Elizabeth Linos. This includes research and evaluation.

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Labor Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

# EDUCATION POLICY

## 7. The Role of Stakeholder Engagement in Improved Student Outcomes

**Organization:** The Education Trust-West

**Location:** Oakland, CA, USA

### **Project Description & Goals:**

Background: The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) requires that California school districts complete a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), in which districts identify their plans to meet state educational priorities, improve outcomes for students, and close equity gaps. If a district is identified for additional support due to low performance, district leaders must outline their plan for improvement in the LCAP. LCFF requires districts to engage various education stakeholders in completing this plan, but the policy is not explicit on the ways in which district leaders should engage stakeholders in improvement planning if they are identified as low performing.

The question we'd like an IPA team to answer is: how does stakeholder engagement affect policy-making and/or practice? Does engaging stakeholders help decision makers meet their goals and reach their intended outcomes? Why or why not?

Why This Question: With the significant shift in California's K-12 accountability system brought on by LCFF, performance on the set of state indicators is less of a lever for district change. Once a district is identified as lower performing, district leaders have a significant amount of leeway in how they address this low performance. As an organization that advocates for California's low-income students, English learners, and students of color, Ed Trust-West is searching for means outside of performance measures to apply pressure to districts to make changes that improve outcomes for students. We believe that the inclusion of all stakeholders in important district decisions represents a vital component of a more just system. However, we'd also like to explore the ways in which stakeholder engagement also leads to improved outcomes for the most marginalized students.

Project Goals: The goal for this project is to develop a set of findings on the effects of community engagement. We'd like for these findings to inform Ed Trust-West's advocacy for more robust stakeholder engagement in local education spending decisions and school and district improvement. We would also like the team to propose a strategic plan that would require stakeholders to engage more effectively for the purpose of improving outcomes for students.

Analytic Work Required: This project would require qualitative research (e.g. case study analysis, document review, interviews, focus groups) to identify examples of stakeholder engagement in public policy-making and the impact of this engagement (within education is preferred, but other policy areas are helpful also). There could possibly be some quantitative analysis to identify impact of stakeholder engagement on outcomes.

**Organization Description:** The Education TrustWest is a research, policy and advocacy organization focused on educational justice and closely equity gaps that disadvantage low-income students, students of color, and English learners.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Natalie Wheatfall-Lum

**Email:** [nwheatfall@edtrustwest.org](mailto:nwheatfall@edtrustwest.org)

**Phone Number:** 5104656444

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Christopher Nellum,  
cnellum@edtrustwest.org, 5104656444

*Policy Product Type: Strategic Plan*

*Primary Policy Area: Education Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Public Engagement*

## 8. Investing in State-Funded Preschools

**Organization:** The Education Trust-West

**Location:** Oakland, California

**Project Description & Goals:** Research is indisputable that children who attend high-quality preschools experience significant benefits through life. In order to close opportunity gaps, we need to start before Kindergarten and support families with high-quality and affordable preschool options. Some districts have invested Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) funds toward state-funded preschool programs, and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) also offers a new framework for a federal approach to preschool.

Through this project, we seek to understand how these districts are investing in state-funded preschools to serve children with the least advantages.

Goals of the project include a written product (such as a policy brief) and a slide deck that answers the questions:

- (1) What are ESSA's requirements for districts around reporting data on early care and education programs, including Head Start and state-funded preschools?
- (2) What percentage of California districts run state-funded preschool programs?
- (3) Provide an analysis on the extent to which districts are using LCFF funds toward state-funded preschool
- (4) Elevate bright spot examples that advance equity for children of color and low-income children,
- (5) Offer policy recommendations

**Organization Description:** The Education Trust-West works for educational justice and the high academic achievement of all students at all levels, pre-K through college. We expose educational injustices and inequities that separate students of color, English learners, and low-income students from their peers, and we identify and advocate for the strategies that will forever close equity gaps. We serve as a connector between policies and communities, and mobilize community partners with tools and resources to advocate and bring meaningful change for students with the least advantages.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Hana Ma

**Email:** hma@edtrustwest.org

**Phone Number:** 408-646-4512

**Existing connection to GSPP:** We have worked with Marina Balleria and Rhina Torres, both Goldman alums.

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Education Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Child/Youth Policy*

## 9. Academic Advising: Refining the “Who” and the “How” to Improve Student Retention

**Organization:** Undergraduate Advising Center, University of Kansas

**Location:** Lawrence, Kansas, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** Academic advisors serve several functions in higher education. At the most basic level, advisors help students navigate university processes and create course schedules. They also help students connect to other university resources, such as tutoring or mental health supports. Ideally, the role of advisors is more holistic: to be trusted partners who work with students to articulate their interests, strengths, and values, and connect them to academic, career, and co-curricular opportunities that help retain students and move them towards graduation.

In recent years, the Undergraduate Advising Center at the University of Kansas has moved from a “first-come, first-served” model in which advisors saw whichever students chose to make appointments to a more strategic model that attempts to prioritize certain groups of students by reserving time on advisor calendars and requiring advising meetings for these students. This project would help us move that strategy forward by examining:

- 1) What is known about student populations who most benefit from academic advising in terms of retention and progression towards graduation? What factors could be used to identify these students on our caseloads?
- 2) What are the characteristics of contact between advisor and student that make a difference for these students? Should we be setting a goal for the number of interactions we are having each semester, and does the type of interaction matter (e.g., face-to-face meeting versus personalized email message, etc.)?
- 3) What strategies could be used to increase contact between advisors and the students we identify as most likely to benefit from advising? Presently, we place enrollment holds on student accounts that require them to meet with an advisor before enrolling in the next semester’s courses. This strategy can be seen as punitive. Are there more positive, behaviorally-informed practices we could incorporate to better connect with students?

**Organization Description:** The Undergraduate Advising Center provides academic advising for several thousand University of Kansas students who are exploring majors or awaiting admission to professional schools. The University of Kansas is the state’s flagship institution and also accepts over 90% of undergraduate applicants. Given these factors, advisors serve students with a wide range of academic preparation and interests. Student retention is a key priority for the university and its advising units. The Undergraduate Advising Center is well-positioned to take action on IPA group findings. It has a leadership team committed to improving student outcomes and authority to make decisions around which students to prioritize and how to engage them.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Michael Pahr

**Email:** mpahr@ku.edu

**Phone Number:** 202-841-8787

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Patrick Koerner, Associate Director, patrick.koerner@ku.edu, 785-864-2834

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Primary point of contact will be Michael Pahr, MPP '09

*Policy Product Type: Needs Assessment/Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Education Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY

## 10. Data-driven and Evidence-based Criminal Justice Policy

**Organization:** Contra Costa County, Office of Reentry and Justice and San Francisco County, Sheriff's Department

**Project Description & Goals:** This project will support two local county criminal justice systems -- Contra Costa County and San Francisco County -- in identifying the key programmatic interventions they currently use with justice-involved individuals, assessing the evidence-based literature with respect to these programs, developing logic models and process maps, highlighting key data collection points, and creating a framework for future evaluations of these interventions. Completion of these base elements of the strategic framework will allow the County to move more efficiently towards an assessment of its criminal justice programs and address questions surrounding which programs best meet the needs of individuals returning to the community.

Note, we are aiming for a collaborative team of four students, with two students focused on Contra Costa and two students focused on San Francisco.

### **Organization Description: Contra Costa County**

The Office of Reentry and Justice (ORJ) was launched in January 2017 by the Contra Costa County Administrator's Office to support and advance the County's public safety realignment, reentry, and justice programs and initiatives. The office is funded primarily by AB 109 Public Safety Realignment (PSR) revenues from the State of California and has responsibility for a number of programs including the AB 109 Community Programs, the Central and East County Ceasefire Program, the Racial Justice Oversight Body, and various other grant programs.

Largely a response to prison overcrowding in California, AB 109 PSR was signed into law and took effect on October 1, 2011. This legislation transferred the responsibility of supervising individuals convicted of specific lower-level felonies, and detention for parole violations, from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to local counties. In addition to transferring the responsibility of housing and supervision to counties, AB 109 allows counties to use AB 109 funds for purposes of building partnerships between County departments that seek to provide coordinated and evidence-based supervision of, and services for, the AB 109 reentry population.

In Contra Costa County, through partnerships with local health and social service agencies, individuals supervised by the Probation Department as part of AB 109 are provided with access to supportive services that help facilitate their reentry and reintegration into the community when released from custody. While this collaborative reentry infrastructure of community supervision practices and community based services seeks to support the reentry population's successful reintegration back into the community, the primary objective is to reduce the likelihood of recidivism. However, it remains unclear as to how effective this program is. CCC seeks to collaborate with CSAC and The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative to develop more data-driven and evidence-based criminal justice practices and policy making. The goal of this partnership is to further develop county capacity in the decision making and assessment tools necessary to evaluate criminal justice program performance, cost-effectiveness and results in order to produce the best outcomes for residents and the highest rate of return on county investments.

**Contra Costa Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Denise Zabkiewicz

**Email:** denise.zabkiewicz@cao.cccounty.us

**Phone Number:** 925-335-1035, 510-610-2403

**Secondary Contact:** Lara DeLaney, Director Office of Reentry & Justice

Lara.Delaney@cao.cccounty.us 925-335-1097

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Todd Billeci, Chief of Probation,  
Todd.Billeci@prob.cccounty.us, 925-313-4188

**Organization Description: San Francisco County**

This project will be managed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Department. The Sheriff's Department oversees numerous in-custody and out-of-custody programs designed to improve reentry outcomes for participants. The Sheriff's Department has worked with IPA students in the past and has made efforts to evaluate some programs.

**San Francisco Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Alissa Riker

**Email:** alissa.riker@sfgov.org

**Existing connection to GSPP:** *Working with Mia on another project.*

*Product Type: Evaluation Framework*

*Primary Policy Area: Criminal Justice Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

## 11. Oakland Police Department

\*Depending on interest level for this project, students may be assigned to Project 11, but focus either on 11a or 11b.

**Organization:** Oakland Police Commission/Community Police Review Agency

**Location:** Oakland, CA, United States

**11a. Project Description & Goals:** The City of Oakland receives many complaints every year from individuals whose property has been damaged or lost in the course of police stops, searches, homeless relocations, and vehicle towing. These complaints reflect real hardships experienced by members of the public, and contribute to problematic community/police relationships. Currently, claims relating to damaged property due to police activities are handled through the Office of the City Attorney, and most claims are denied due to financial constraints and limited city liability for police actions under California and federal law.

### 11a. Possible Project Questions:

- What is the extent of claims related to damaged property due to police activity (number of claims, complainants and dollar value)?
- What is the impact of damaged property on those affected?
- Are there disparities in who is impacted by property damaged caused by police action? If so, what are the primary determinants of those disparities, and what might they mean in terms of equity and community-police relationships?
- What are the constraints (legal, financial, administrative) to providing compensation for damaged property? What are the costs and benefits of a more- or less-generous compensation funding mechanism? What are the implications and potential problems associated with changing current City of Oakland practices?
- Are there best practices in compensating claims nationally? How might the City of Oakland employ best practices? What are current impediments to change (financial, legal, administrative, policy)?
- Are there programs, grants, or resources that could be pursued to help fund compensation? What should the city consider in pursuing such opportunities?

**11b. Project Description & Goals:** Every year the Oakland Police Department (OPD) receives tens of thousands of calls for service ranging from 911 calls about active violent crimes in progress to reports of thefts, suspicious persons, and towing requests. These calls are triaged through the department's dispatch division, which sends officers according to priority ratings that take into account the severity of the crime, the immediacy of the need, along with other factors. In some cases, police response to low priority calls can be delayed by many hours and their delayed arrival can be extremely inconvenient to the individuals who originally called for service. Additionally, in recent years there have been several high-profile cases in which the call for service itself has come under question for perceived racial or community bias. The City receives many complaints every year about the slow response times to calls for service and the demeanor of responding officers. Furthermore, complaints are regularly made about real or perceived differences in police responses between different parts and populations of the city - further undermining certain communities' relationships with the police.

### 11b. Possible Project Questions:

- What data sources are available?
- What are the main issues related to OPD calls for service responsiveness?

-Pending the existence of data, are there differences in calls and responses for service between different populations in the city? If so, what are the primary contributors to these differences and how might they be addressed?

-What issues are considered the most problematic by those calling (time to respond, demeanor of responding officers, inconvenience of time and location of police response, etc.)? What should the city prioritize in terms of addressing these issues? Are there methods the City should consider to better understand these issues (e.g., follow up to service calls, customer/service satisfaction surveys)?

-Are there current best practices with respect to responses to service calls? What are they? Does City policy follow best practice? And if not, what are the most important factors impeding their adoption (training, resources, priorities, policy, etc.)?

**Organization Description:** The Community Police Review Agency (CPRA) aims to improve police services to the community by receiving complaints, conducting parallel investigations to the Oakland Police Department, and providing insight to policy perspectives. Under the new Executive Director, John Alden we seek to expand the impact of CPRA by specializing work to advance the equity of Oakland citizens who have police engagement.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Regina Jackson

**Email:** rjackson@oaklandcommission.org

**Phone Number:** 5109121377

**Secondary Contact:** John Alden, Executive Director, CPRA JAlden@oaklandca.gov 510 238-7401

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Juanito Rus and Mrs. Amiee Albertson Alden

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Criminal Justice Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Public Engagement*

## 12. Disrupting the Pipeline: Policies to Better Serve At-Risk Youth with Disabilities

**Organization:** National Center for Learning Disabilities

**Location:** Washington, DC, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** Students with disabilities are heavily over-represented in the juvenile justice system and those with disabilities who are also in minority groups are even more so. In fact, 55% of young adults with specific learning disabilities had been involved at some point with the justice system for reasons other than a minor traffic violation (this number is closer to 30% for all young adults). Some studies indicate a third or more of incarcerated youth have learning disabilities and an even greater portion show signs of ADHD. These patterns reflect and reinforce broader injustices across our society. For example, 1 in 4 black males with IEPs received out of school suspensions in 2013-2014 compared to 1 in 10 white males with IEPs.

These statistics represent entrenched and destructive realities for young people with disabilities and the question is how to break those cycles begs two specific questions:

- 1) What are strategies and policies that can prevent the most susceptible youth with disabilities from entering the juvenile justice system?
- 2) What supports can we provide youth with disabilities already in the system to emerge with the skills to thrive and stay out of this pipeline?

We are most excited by groups that can approach both questions, but are open to group interested in just one.

**Organization Description:** The mission of NCLD is to improve the lives of the 1 in 5 children and adults nationwide with learning and attention issues—by empowering parents and young adults, transforming schools and advocating for equal rights and opportunities. We're working to create a society in which every individual possesses the academic, social and emotional skills needed to succeed in school, at work and in life. The Innovation Department of the NCLD is the thought-leadership arm of the organization as it relates to identifying new approaches to reach students with disabilities. We will utilize the group's findings to direct our advocacy and policy work on Capitol Hill and with state and local policy makers.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Ace Parsi

**Email:** aparsi@ncl.org

**Phone Number:** 339-204-1061

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Ace Parsi, MPP 2009

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis/Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Criminal Justice Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Youth Policy*

# DRUG POLICY

## 13. Reducing Youth Marijuana Use in Oregon

**Organization:** Oregon Liquor Control Commission

**Location:** Portland, OR, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** Oregon voters passed Measure 91 in November 2014, legalizing adult-use (recreational) marijuana under the regulatory authority of the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC). The first recreational marijuana licenses were issued in April 2016 and sales began in October 2016. The OLCC is seeking an IPA group to estimate the effect of legalization on youth access to and perception of marijuana, and make recommendations for policies to diminish youth access and rates of consumption.

*Project goals include:*

- Procuring data in order to perform:

- Analysis of youth perceptions/attitudes towards and use of marijuana pre- vs. post-legalization;
- Analysis of youth trends compared to other illicit drugs (and alcohol) over same time period;
- Analysis of the current sources of marijuana for youth and how these have changed over time;
- Analysis of effect of state and local policies on youth perception of and access to marijuana (e.g. the buffer area between licensed retailers, the buffer area between licensed retailers and school facilities, city/county opt out provisions, etc.);
- A comparative review of advertising allowances and restrictions in other legal states and their effects on youth perception and use; and
- Policy recommendations for Oregon to minimize youth access to and use of marijuana.

**Organization Description:** OLCC is the licensing authority for recreational marijuana. OLCC has direct rulemaking authority over recreational marijuana licensees, including advertising restrictions and packaging and labeling requirements. Depending on the findings of the IPA project, some recommendations may fall outside of OLCC's direct authority but would inform OLCC's work with the Legislature and other agencies to diminish youth access to marijuana.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** TJ Sheehy

**Email:** tj.sheehy@oregon.gov

**Phone Number:** 503-872-5017,

**Existing connection to GSPP:** MPP Alum (2013)

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis/Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Drug Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Youth Policy*

# HEALTH POLICY

## 14. The Hidden Costs of Neglect for Those with Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders in California: Understanding The Effects of Health Insurance Barriers.

**Organization:** The Kennedy Forum

**Location:** Sacramento, California, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** People with mental health and substance use disorder issues face barriers to health care access that exacerbate their symptoms. Health plans are not currently required to cover all necessary care, which has direct implications for behavioral health and insurers constantly use inappropriate medical necessity criteria when evaluating mental health and addiction treatment. Despite the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (the Federal Parity Law) and California parity laws, many health plans still apply overly stringent cost-sharing and medical management practices to behavioral health services and medications. These issues have hidden costs of neglect, including increased pressure on community and county mental health for serious mental illnesses. County systems are impacted and jails and courts largely are tasked with mitigating the issues of those with serious mental illness and/or substance use disorder.

The Kennedy Forum, in partnership with the Steinberg Institute, is examining mental health and substance use disorder parity issues that arise due to barriers in health insurance access in California. This project will quantify the downstream impacts of identified pressure points that push people with MH/SUD conditions further into the public mental health systems with a particular focus on policy failures within private health insurance. Specifically, Goldman IPA students will detail the policy failures that people with MH/SUDs may encounter in accessing care, quantify the potential financial impacts of denial of care for mental health and substance use disorder services, and provide recommendations for state policy and program improvements. This information will be used in legislative efforts around amending California state mental health and substance use disorder parity laws.

**Organization Description:** The Kennedy Forum aims to achieve health equity by advancing evidence-based practices, policies, and programming for the treatment of mental health and addiction. Students will work with the California Policy Fellow during the course of the project. Student work will directly inform the direction of the Forum's legislative work in California.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Lauren Finke

**Email:** lauren@thekennedyforum.org

**Phone Number:** 9512351852

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** David Lloyd

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Alumni, MPP 2018

*Policy Product Type: Needs Assessment*

*Primary Policy Area: Health Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

# FOOD POLICY

## 15. Exploring Financing Options to Scale Healthy Food Incentives for Low-income Californians

**Organization:** SPUR

**Location:** San Francisco, California

**Project Description & Goals:** The affordability of food is one of the biggest obstacles to healthy food access for low-income Californians. One promising set of policy tools to address this issue is healthy food incentive programs. Known by a variety of names across the country - including Double Up Food Bucks (DUFEB), Market Match and Mas Fresco/More Fresh in California - these programs provide a subsidy, in the form of “coupons” or matching dollars for produce purchases, to low-income customers. For example, a shopper who spends \$10 of SNAP benefits on California-grown fruits and vegetables at participating stores receives an extra \$10 to spend on any fresh produce in the store. The IPA students working on this project would be seeking to answer the question: which state-level revenue sources could provide stable, long-term funding for healthy food incentives? And, what is the political feasibility of each of those options?

Evaluations (including those reviewed by Goldman School IPA students in 2014) have shown healthy food incentive programs to be effective in increasing purchases and consumption of fruits and vegetables by low-income customers, which helps reduce food insecurity and has a positive impact on public health. Pilot projects at farmers markets and grocery stores have been underway in California for a number of years now and the support for programs of this type have been growing at the federal and state level.

Based on the pilot projects SPUR has identified two barriers to scaling healthy food incentives statewide. The first barrier is technical. Currently, healthy food incentive programs in California rely on printed coupons, loyalty cards, or scrip, making program administration less efficient than optimal. However, this barrier will likely be solved through the California Fruit and Vegetable EBT pilot project which SPUR and our partner California Food Policy Advocates secured through the state budget process in 2018 and will be complete by the end of 2021. The second barrier to scaling is money - particularly ongoing, stable funding.

In 2015, IPA students determined scaling healthy food incentives statewide would cost between \$150 million and \$400 million annually. What has not yet been identified is a revenue source to cover the cost of expanding healthy food incentives to SNAP participants across California.

To evaluate potential state-level revenue sources, the students would be expected to:

- a) Look nationwide for examples of how health interventions, social safety net, and local agriculture promotion efforts are funded in other states
- b) Explore the viability of numerous state level revenue sources including, but not limited to, a statewide soda tax, the state general fund and existing fees
- c) Conduct numerous interviews with state policy experts to determine what is legally and politically viable at the state level

This research will help inform a broad effort by SPUR to build support at the state level for healthy food incentive programs. We anticipate using the findings of this research to inform our policy strategy as

part of our multi-year effort to expand healthy food incentives following the completion of the EBT Integration Pilot in 2021.

**Organization Description:** SPUR's Food & Agriculture Program uses research and education to build awareness among our members, the public, and policymakers of the big problems the Bay Area food system faces. We then translate our research into policy supporting a strong regional and sustainable food system where all people have access to healthy food.

Our approach of moving from research and education to policy change is exemplified by the passage of the EBT integration pilot. Our 2015 report Healthy Food Within Reach noted that increasing the purchasing power of low-income residents is an important aspect of addressing food insecurity and that healthy food incentives are one way to do that.

Expanding healthy food incentives to all Californians meant we needed to overcome the technology barrier and began working with California Food Policy Advocates and 35 other organizations to pursue an EBT integration pilot. In early 2018, state Senator Scott Wiener authored legislation -- the California Fruit and Vegetable EBT Pilot Project (originally known as SB 900) -- that would pilot an integration of incentives with the state's EBT system. The bill had bipartisan support in the state Assembly and Senate and, in June 2018, the Governor signed a budget that included \$9 million and the full legislative language for the pilot to move forward. Looking ahead towards how the IPA project will integrate with future efforts, the results will inform SPUR's decision on where to seek funding and hopefully help us complete the multi-year advocacy campaign that has gotten us closer than ever to scaling healthy food incentives statewide.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Katie Ettman

**Email:** kettman@spur.org

**Phone Number:** 415-644-4296

**Existing connection to GSPP:** In 2015, Eli Zigas my supervisor at SPUR hosted IPA students.

*Policy Product: Best Practices Analysis/Revenue Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Food Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Public Budgeting*

# SAFETY NET POLICY

## 16. CalFresh expansion to SSI recipients: Maximizing CalFresh enrollment in California

**Organization:** California Association of Food Banks

**Location:** Oakland, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** Context: On June 1st, 2019, California reversed a decades-old policy barring SSI (Supplemental Security Income) recipients from receiving CalFresh (food stamps), effectively making over one million low-income seniors and people with disabilities eligible to apply for CalFresh. This historic change is one of the biggest policy victories in the effort towards ending hunger in California, and aligns our state with every other state in the country. Economic analysis shows the payoff from small investments in the program, as increased participation in CalFresh drives economic activity, creates jobs, and returns tax revenues to state and local governments. As of the writing of this proposal, SSI recipients in California have been eligible to apply for CalFresh for five months - in some counties, estimates suggest that upwards of 50% of the likely eligible SSI population has applied for, and is receiving, CalFresh.

While the expansion is off to a very strong beginning, indicators this fall suggest that enrollment is sharply falling. Statewide, an estimated 1.7 million Californians are eligible for CalFresh but not receiving benefits. A recent analysis shows that this is heavily skewed by language communities, with nearly all English speakers enrolled but far fewer among Spanish and other languages. Another concern is that many CalFresh applicants have received the minimum CalFresh allotment (\$16 per month) or a very low CalFresh benefit. There are several eligibility provisions that can help to ensure that applicants receive the maximum benefit for which they are entitled, including medical expense deductions and uncapped shelter deductions. Moreover, the CalFresh system is county-operated, so local implementation strategies have varied widely.

With data available on the first few months of the expansion, this is the ideal moment to analyze the progress made so far (statewide, by county, among language and demographic groups, etc.), and identify priority needs to fulfill this policy's potential. Our objective is to identify successful strategies for maximizing CalFresh allotments, as well as optimizing overall CalFresh enrollment strategies. We seek to understand the effectiveness of the various county-based strategies, so that we can elevate and advocate for the most promising and evidence based practices statewide. Many, if not all, strategies to enroll this population will assist in raising the overall CalFresh enrollment (still behind the national average) by leveraging ways to enroll all eligible households, including the "Elderly and Disabled" households identified in SNAP law.

Available data/resources:

- CDSS created a best practices framework for how to maximize SSI enrollment in CalFresh, emphasizing the processes and technology that would enable CalFresh applications over the phone. CDSS' resource toolkit has examples and ideas for successful county-based strategies.
- Counties developed and submitted 'readiness plans' to CDSS in the spring of 2019, which includes information about county approaches to the Expansion.
- The CDSS data dashboard on 'expanding CalFresh to SSI recipients,' which contains various indicators at the county level. CDSS is planning on expanding this dataset in the coming months.

- “Lost in translation: Language access solutions to increasing uptake of CDSS programs” is a report written by a GSPP student for CDSS, highlighting language access barriers in public benefit programs, and solutions for how to increase access for non-English language speakers.

Possible approaches: We propose that approximately half of the project work could be focused on reviewing data and holding interviews to understand what worked, while the other half of the work could be focused on proposing what statewide policy or administrative solutions should be prioritized.

Components of this work would likely include:

- Data review of already existing/published data on the CDSS CalFresh dashboard, and any data that becomes available during the project.
- Key informant interviews with CDSS staff and Technical Assistance unit.
- Key informant interviews with county administrators from counties with best practices.
- Key informant interviews with SSI Recipients who have or have not applied for CalFresh.

Deliverables: To the extent possible given time, data availability and other constraints, a written report that includes:

1. An assessment of the Expansion to date, focusing on administrative improvements, including best practices and options to fulfill the Expansion going forward. Highlights of reforms or investments that will benefit not just the SSI-CalFresh recipients, but the larger ‘Elderly & Disabled’ CalFresh households and/or entire eligible population.
2. Data analyses highlighting state and county performance toward existing Expansion goals, and opportunities to reach beyond those goals.
3. Maps with features such as: the relative success of the Expansion by county, breakdowns by key populations, overlays with key administrative reforms such as electronic signature over the phone, etc.

**Organization Description:** The Alliance to Transform CalFresh (ATC) is composed of leading non-profit organizations that have come together to advance an ambitious but pragmatic goal: move California from a 66% participation rate in CalFresh (among the last in the nation) to a 80% participation rate, with no county below 70% by the end on 2019 in order to significantly reduce hunger in our state. Founding members include the California Association of Food Banks, California Family Resource Association, California Food Policy Advocates, Los Angeles Regional Food Bank, SF-Marine Food Bank, Western Center on Law and Poverty, and Catholic Charities of California.

California Association of Food Banks (CAFB) is a membership organization of 41 food banks from throughout the state with a shared mission to end hunger in California and a firm commitment to providing cutting-edge leadership in the anti-hunger community. In addition to convening the Alliance to Transform CalFresh, CAFB is one of the founding members and coalition leaders of the Californians For SSI campaign, who led the effort to advocate for CalFresh expansion to SSI recipients.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Becky Gershon

**Email:** becky@cafoodbanks.org

**Phone Number:** 619-952-1767

**Secondary Contact:** Andrew Cheyne, andrew@cafoodbanks.org

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Several of our past colleagues were/are GSPP students - Carly Finkle and Diana Jensen most recently.

*Policy Product Type: Evaluation*

*Primary Policy Area: Safety Net Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Food Policy*

## 17. Evaluating and Strengthening the Emergency Child Care Bridge Program for Foster Children

**Organization:** California Department of Social Services

**Location:** Sacramento, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** This project seeks to evaluate and strengthen the data collection efforts for Emergency Child Care Bridge Program for Foster Children (Bridge Program). The Bridge Program provides funding and supportive services for child care for resource families. The goals of the program are to increase the number of foster children successfully placed in home-based family care settings, increase placement stability, increase the capacity of child care programs to meet the needs of foster children in their care, and maximize funding to support the child care needs of eligible families.

The Bridge Program seeks to bridge the gap between initial foster care placement and long-term, high-quality child care by providing continuity of care and trauma-informed early learning and care environments for foster children. The evaluation should determine whether the Bridge Program is achieving the intended goals and provide recommendations for strengthening the delivery of this vital service.

Questions include:

- Does the Bridge Program result in more children experiencing foster placement stability?
- Does the Bridge Program result in more successful recruitment and retention of resource parents and caregivers?
- Does the Bridge Program achieve these goals for the populations most in need?
- How many cases use the full 12 months of available child care?
- At the expiration of the 12 months of available child care, what is happening to the children?
- Does the Bridge Program adequately increase the capacity of child care programs to meet the needs of foster children in their care?
- How does the Bridge Program support children and families in the reunification process?

**Organization Description:** The Child Care and Intergenerational Services Bureau supports program improvements, efficient and evidence-based service delivery, and partners with counties and other state stakeholders to contribute to meaningful policy technical assistance. We work closely with the California Resource and Referral Network, County Welfare Directors Association, Children Now, Child Care Resource Center, Parent Voices, Child Care Law Center, California Department of Education, and others.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Jeremy Heebner

**Email:** jeremy.heebner@dss.ca.gov

**Phone Number:** 9166511077

**Secondary Contact:** Tracy Urban, tracy.urban@dss.ca.gov, 916-654-0611

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Jigna Shah, jigna.shah@dss.ca.gov, 916-654-1403

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Natasha Nicolai, Class of 2014

*Policy Product Type: Evaluation*

*Primary Policy Area: Social Safety Net Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Youth Policy*

## 18. Understanding CalWORKs Early Engagement

**Organization:** California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

**Location:** Sacramento, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) is a public assistance program that provides temporary cash assistance to meet the basic needs of eligible families. The CalWORKs program also provides a wide array of barrier removal, training and employment services and support for families to enter and remain in the workforce. The program is operated locally by county welfare departments in all 58 counties in the state.

The IPA team will help CalWORKs policymakers to create program metrics, a data dashboard and develop a reliable methodology to measure the program effectiveness related to clients' understanding of and early engagement in the program and to timely service delivery. CalWORKs has a universal engagement requirement to ensure recipients are participating in Welfare to Work (WTW) activities as soon as possible. Although eligibility requirements and grant levels are uniform throughout the state, counties are given considerable latitude to design WTW programs that will work best for their diverse populations, size, and culture. A positive early engagement experience, in addition to other recent changes in the CalWORKs/WTW programs, contributes to a more effective delivery of appropriate activity options and services.

The Early Engagement and Eligibility Bureau of the CalWORKs and Family Resilience Branch at the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) provides policy guidance and instructions to counties for implementing the program statewide. The project will focus on:

- 1) Evaluating the diverse methods that counties use to present the program rules to applicants; and exploring which method(s) result in the clearest understanding of the program benefits
- 2) Evaluating different county service delivery models during the eligibility determination process, which the client and county experience.

**Organization Description:** The CalWORKs and Family Resilience Branch, within the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), is responsible for the State of California's CalWORKs program designed to provide cash grants and other services, such as education, employment, child care and training programs to California's needy and vulnerable families. In reviewing/analyzing state and federal bills and legislation, drafting state regulations and implementing new program elements, the Branch provides policy instructions to and oversight of the CalWORKs program to 58 county welfare departments. As the authors of statewide guidance on CalWORKs policy (including regulations) and best practices implementation at the county level, we would be able to utilize the IPA's findings in our messaging to the counties, in writing or revising regulations, and in the development of legislative proposals to change statute if appropriate.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Rachel Skewes

**Email:** rachel.skewes@dss.ca.gov

**Phone Number:** 916-651-3979

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Elaine Ward, elaine.ward@dss.ca.gov

*Policy Product Type: Evaluation*

*Primary Policy Area: Social Safety Net Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Government Administration*

# HOUSING/HOMELESSNESS POLICY

## 19. Preserving Unrestricted Affordable Housing: How to Translate a Promising Idea into a Statewide Program?

**Organization:** California Housing Partnership

**Location:** San Francisco, California, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** California is in the midst of a crippling housing affordability crisis that disproportionately impacts low-income people and people of color [1]. Addressing this crisis will require long-term solutions to correct structural imbalances in the housing market, but more immediate remedies to create and preserve affordable homes for low-income households as quickly and efficiently as possible are badly needed to curb the housing crisis' most harmful and irreversible effects.

California Housing Partnership is eager to enlist a Goldman IPA team to explore the efficacy of scaling up an emerging strategy to preserve affordable homes that holds promise as a potentially powerful new tool to address the housing crisis, but which merits further examination and refinement. This strategy is to acquire and preserve residential rental properties with low rents and no government subsidy -- what is sometimes termed naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAHs) -- before rents in these properties increase so much due to market pressure that they become unaffordable to low-income households. The results of this analysis will be used to inform a state legislative agenda in 2020-2021.

Background on NOAHs: Roughly 420,000 of the 2.1 million rental homes affordable and available to low-income households in California (earning less than 80 percent of AMI) are subsidized and deed-restricted (meaning they are required to serve, and be affordable to, low-income households). Although a small number of the approximately 1.7 million remaining homes affordable and available to low-income households are deed-restricted through land use policies, and others are subject to rent stabilization ordinances, the vast majority of these homes are unrestricted and unregulated. Consequently, low-income households living in these unrestricted homes - or NOAHs - are vulnerable to rent increases and their likely consequences: increased housing cost burden, displacement, and, at times, homelessness. The risk of displacement and homelessness is particularly high for residents in NOAHs located in neighborhoods with high rental prices or in gentrifying areas where rents are increasing rapidly. While speculative real estate interests may view acquiring NOAHs as a prime investment opportunity due to the promise of benefiting from rising rents, the California Housing Partnership and other housing advocates and policy experts see acquiring and preserving NOAHs as an opportunity to prevent displacement, permanently preserve affordability, and improve the habitability of a neglected housing stock. This approach is also quicker and cheaper than constructing new affordable homes, though both strategies are necessary.

IPA Research and Policy Analysis Tasks: Although acquiring and preserving NOAH properties as affordable housing holds promise and local pilots have yielded early lessons, key questions about how to scale this strategy to a statewide program remain. The California Housing Partnership hopes Goldman IPA students will apply their quantitative and policy analysis toolkits, drawing from interviews and data from our partners across the State to answer the following questions:

- What is the current stock of naturally occurring affordable homes (NOAHs) in California?  
Where are these homes located?

- What proportion of the stock should be preserved (subsidized by a public entity and deed-restricted)? How much will it cost to preserve these NOAHs?
- What new subsidies, incentives, or other policies should State and local governments pursue to preserve a meaningful quantity of NOAHs?
- What tradeoffs (or potential externalities) could accompany these new programs?

Answering these questions will help the California Housing Partnership guide local and State policymakers on the most effective, evidence-based approaches to acquire and preserve NOAHs throughout California. More specifically, we anticipate that this quantitative research and policy analysis will inform the Partnership’s policy advocacy for the 2020 and 2021 legislative cycles.

[1]See, for example: California Housing Partnership, 2019. “Who Can Afford to Rent in California’s Many Regions?” October. Website: <http://bit.ly/31YGW9m>; California Housing Partnership, 2019. “Rising Housing Costs and Re-segregation in the San Francisco Bay Area.” Website: <http://bit.ly/2q9267t>

**Organization Description:** The State Legislature created the California Housing Partnership in 1988 to help preserve California’s existing supply of affordable homes and to provide leadership on affordable housing policy and resource issues. The Partnership is unique in combining on-the-ground affordable housing finance technical assistance with advocacy leadership at the state and national level; what we have learned from providing technical assistance to our partners (which has led to leveraging more than \$14 billion to finance the creation and preservation of more than 70,000 affordable rental homes) directly informs our advocacy work to improve and expand affordable housing programs in the most effective way possible. This unique position in California’s affordable housing development and policy ecosystem enables us to make valuable contributions to policy debates around furthering fair and affordable housing goals at local, state, and national levels.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Lindsay Rosenfeld

**Email:** [lrosenfeld@chpc.net](mailto:lrosenfeld@chpc.net)

**Phone Number:** 8288510477

**Secondary Contact:** Dan Rinzler, [drinzler@chpc.net](mailto:drinzler@chpc.net), (415) 433-6804 x320

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Lindsay Rosenfeld is a 2018 MPP graduate; Greg Chin (another member of our team) is a 1988 MPP graduate

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Housing Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

## 20. A California Resolution in Support of Community Based Solutions to End Youth Homelessness

**Organization:** Point Source Youth

**Location:** Oakland, CA, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** Point Source Youth is a national organization dedicated to ending youth homelessness, with a special focus on LGBTQ youth and youth of color, in 50 cities. Point Source Youth's mission is to end youth homelessness in partnership with experts, policy makers, and local service providers. We help to fund, implement, and measure proven, scalable, and replicable interventions locally in order to effectively engage at-risk young people and end youth homelessness. We shape these interventions to address the growing needs of homeless youth, with a special focus on homeless LGBTQ youth. Host Homes are a proven intervention to end youth homelessness and a dozen California communities are implementing the program. Host Homes are a community based solution to youth homelessness that match a well screened youth experiencing homelessness with a well screened and matched person in the community. Point Source Youth is considering an expansion beyond technical assistance for programs aimed at ending youth homelessness. We want to explore options for pushing a statewide resolution that solidifies support for the use of homelessness funds for host homes.

In this project, we would like to receive your recommendations for:

- Coalition building at the state level for this resolution
- Policy windows for pushing the resolution
- The most useful ways to convince policy makers to sign on to a resolution like this

Some materials we believe could be produced as a result of this project:

- Landscape analysis of homes with unused bedrooms (potential hosts) in California
- Policy analysis of squatter's rights, tenant's rights, and other policy issues that could affect potential hosts in California
- Overviews of state funding mechanisms for reducing homelessness - proposed new state funding streams
- Proposed new bill for funding
- Comparative analysis of outcomes from host homes programs and foster care
- Analysis of funding intersection with foster care

**Organization Description:** We are a national organization that provides technical assistance and collects data and resources for host homes programs. Our reach is wide and we've seen success in several jurisdictions in California. We want to learn how to take the next step and begin promoting policy that further legitimizes our programs.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Elijah Wood

**Email:** [elijah@pointsourceyouth.org](mailto:elijah@pointsourceyouth.org)

**Phone Number:** 4159993518

**Secondary Contact:** Larry Cohen [larry@pointsourceyouth.org](mailto:larry@pointsourceyouth.org) 917-392-1018

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Elijah is an alum from the 2018 class, Larry attended UC-Berkeley for undergrad and has a minor in Public Policy.

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis/Political Strategy*

*Primary Policy Area: Housing Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

## 21. Welfare Discrimination in Federal Disability Benefits

**Organization:** Homeless Action Center

**Location:** Berkeley, CA, United States

**Project Description & Goals:** Homeless Action Center is a local non-profit that delivers free high quality direct legal representation for federal disability benefits to individuals who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. HAC is committed to equity and meaningful access to benefits for our clients and the community, including confronting and reducing barriers to benefits caused by discrimination and bias.

The system of federal disability benefits adjudication is very complicated and difficult to access for our clients. Exacerbating the lack of access to disability benefits is discrimination and bias by decision makers involved at all stages of the disability claim. This bias and discrimination facing our clients is not sufficiently studied, analyzed, or critiqued, or challenged.

Goals:

1. Through quantitative dataset analysis, identify statistically significant forms and types of discrimination and bias.
2. Through hybrid quantitative/qualitative analysis, identify specific systemic issues that produce or result in discriminatory and biased outcomes in the following areas of inquiry:
  - Social Security claim processing systems
  - Specific decision makers (Analysts, Medical Consultants, Consultative Examination providers, Administrative Law Judges)
  - Social Security rules and regulations
  - Service providers
3. Analyze policy options or best practices to address these issues.

See for reference:

Benefits Are Refused More Often To Disabled Blacks, Study Finds, Stephen Labaton, New York Times, May 11, 1992

Racial Differences in Disability Decisions Warrants Further Study, US General Accounting Office Report to Senate Special Committee on Aging, April 1992

**Organization Description:** Homeless Action Center is a local non-profit that delivers free high quality direct legal representation for federal disability benefits to individuals who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Daniel Homer

**Email:** dhomer@homelessactioncenter.org

**Phone Number:** 510-695-2260 ext 320

**Secondary Contact:** Alan Dunnigan 510-695-2260 ext 311

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Mary Gilg, Deputy Director

*Policy Product Type: Needs Assessment*

*Primary Policy Area: Housing Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Safety Net Policy*

## 22. Exploring Unauthorized Dwelling Units and the Preservation of Housing in San Francisco

**Organization:** City and County of San Francisco Planning Department

**Location:** San Francisco, CA, United States

### Project Description & Goals:

#### Background

Many San Francisco residents live in homes that do not conform to existing Building, Planning, or Fire Code requirements, and, as a result, are relatively affordable to rent. Many of these units are also subject to rent-stabilization. Legalizing these homes helps increase housing security and improve safety for existing residents. Unauthorized units (UDUs) are defined in Planning Code as one or more rooms within a building that have been used, without the benefit of a permit, as a separate and distinct living or sleeping space independent from other residential units on the property. According to research conducted for the dwelling unit legalization program passed by the Board of Supervisors in 2014, approximately 30,000 to 50,000 illegal or non-conforming dwelling units exist in the City.

City policy prioritizes the preservation of existing rent-stabilized housing as a cost-effective means of providing housing that is relatively affordable. These units were created without building permits and created homes out of flexible spaces in existing single-family dwellings or multi-family buildings. Since these units tend to be small and may not always be current to building or planning code, most tend to be relatively affordable or exist in older housing stock that is subject to rent stabilization regulations. However, the removal of Unauthorized Units (UDUs) from buildings removes housing stock that is relatively affordable from the market. The following summary reviews the existing UDU review process to find potential gaps in policy that can be addressed to prevent the further loss of housing.

The Planning Department is working with an intern in the summer 2020 to scope the implementation of a Housing Inventory (e.g. rental registry) for the City. We recognize that identifying UDUs as a part of the inventory may be challenging – property owners may be hesitant to recognize that there is an UDU(s) in their property.

#### Issues Related to UDU Definition and Legalization

To be considered a UDU, the space must be independent from other residential units on the property, which means that the space has independent access from the public way, and there is no open visual connection to another unit (such as an interior staircase without a door). A UDU must also be an independent dwelling space that is used as a separate and distinct living or sleeping space, though it does not necessarily need to have a kitchen. DBI's definition of a UDU is different in that it is dependent on the existence of cooking facilities and does not rely on occupancy. Planning determines that a space is a "separate and distinct living or sleeping space" if staff can find evidence of occupancy in the past. Both DBI and Planning use different methods of confirming occupancy. Planning usually uses resources including, but not limited to, San Francisco voter records and Rent Board records. The methods by which a UDU is confirmed as a separate dwelling unit are inconsistent across departments and lead to the potential loss of affordable units.

To legalize a UDU, a property owner must pay for the cost of bringing the unit up to code. The cost of bringing a UDU up to code may be quite expensive, especially when legalizing the unit requires raising the ceiling height to minimum height requirements. In addition to paying this cost, property owners also must get an updated assessed value of the property in order to include the newly legalized unit's square footage. This may increase property taxes paid by the property owner as well.

## Framework

Specifically, the Planning Department wants to better understand the number and location of UDUs in the city and the characteristics of the people who live in them. Additionally, the Department wants to explore small interest loan, grant, and technical assistance program opportunities to legalize UDUs. If such evidence can be collected and measured, the Department will incorporate it and ensure the Housing Inventory implementation will reflect it and Department policies to support new loan and grant programs to support the preservation of UDUs in San Francisco.

The IPA team will build on the IPA 2019 research project to answer the following questions:

The key questions for research, analysis and policy for this IPA would include:

What data sources are available and accessible to confirm occupancy to formally identify a UDU (e.g. tax records from local, state or federal sources; driver's licenses and address change data from the California Department of Motor Vehicles; school enrollment data; and, mailing addresses from the U.S. Postal Service)?

What are the opportunities to develop small low-interest loan, grant, and/or technical assistance programs for low- and moderate-income owners to legalize UDUs (or looking to convert to a condominium with a UDU)?

What do you see as potential incentives for landlords to retain tenants in UDUs (prior to and throughout the legalization process)?

What's the team's analysis and recommendation for how the Planning Department could regularly inventory the number of UDUs in the city?

What's the team's recommendation for how the Planning Department could proceed with a low-interest loan, grant, or education program?

By providing insight into the City's UDUs, students will be filling a valuable gap in understanding of the number of UDUs in the City and key strategies to prevent the loss of housing. The Planning Department is currently tracking several other challenges in our existing endeavors to preserve housing but understanding the number of UDUs and tools to prevent their loss is an area of policy and planning that the needs further research.

The students involved in this research should review policy concerning UDUs to determine improvements to both legislation and process to reduce the number of UDUs removed in the process of converting buildings to condominiums, thereby preserving existing housing units.

We recommend the IPA students refer to the resources below as starting points:

Building Code – Legalization of Dwelling Units Installed Without a Permit,

<https://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/ordinances14/o0043-14.pdf>

Community Stabilization Initiative, Stemming the Loss of Unauthorized Units (pg. 53)

[https://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/community-planning/stabilization-strategy/cs\\_policy\\_program\\_inventory\\_draft01.pdf](https://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/community-planning/stabilization-strategy/cs_policy_program_inventory_draft01.pdf)

Planning Legalization Program resources. Online: [http://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/accessory-dwelling-units/Legalization\\_FactSheet-091017.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/accessory-dwelling-units/Legalization_FactSheet-091017.pdf)

DBI Legalization Program resources. Online: <https://sfdbi.org/UnitLegalization>

UDU Screening Request and Affidavit: <https://sfplanning.org/resource/udu-screening-request-form-affidavit>

Planning Code Section 317

The IPA team is encouraged to study how other cities have addressed the challenges of similar nature. The IPA team could also apply their proposed evaluation methodology (in b) to one or more of the City's existing plans, policies, or programs to refine its results.

This research will inform the implementation of Key Priorities identified by the Mayor's Office, City agencies, and the community that will strengthen the City's community stabilization efforts. We would like the IPA team's assistance in determining policies, programs, and strategies the City isn't already undertaking to help mitigate and prevent displacement in San Francisco.

We look forward to working with the IPA team and faculty advisor to refine and better tailor the questions to the interests and talents of the team.

**Organization Description:** The SF Planning Department, under the direction of the Planning Commission, shapes the future of San Francisco and the region by: generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan and in neighborhood plans; fostering exemplary design through planning controls; improving our surroundings through environmental analysis; preserving our unique heritage; encouraging a broad range of housing and a diverse job base; and enforcing the Planning Code. We are guided in this work by a vision to make San Francisco the world's most livable urban place – environmentally, economically, socially and culturally.

The SF Planning Department is one of the largest in the nation, with over 210 people on staff—and growing. This project intradepartmental effort is led and managed by the Citywide Division of the Planning Department. The Citywide Division serves as the long-range planning function for the City & County of San Francisco. We are responsible for creating area plans that help shape neighborhoods and commercial districts all over the City.

The SF Planning Department recently completed the Community Stabilization Initiative Report and Policy and Program Inventory. The Initiative is an effort to provide City agencies, decision-makers and the public the comprehensive analysis and tools they need to make strategic decisions to stabilize our vulnerable populations as the City changes. The findings of the IPA will directly inform the implementation of a Key Priority to preserve existing housing serving low-income households.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Andrea Nelson

**Email:** andrea.nelson@sfgov.org

**Phone Number:** 415-575-8723

**Secondary Contact:** Svetha Ambati, Svetha.ambati@sfgov.org, 415.575.9183

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Miriam Chion, Housing & Community Equity Programs Manager, miriam.chion@sfgov.org, 415-575-9194 and Claudia Flores, Community Equity Team Manager, claudia.flores@sfgov.org, 415-558-6473

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Sheila Nickolopoulos, colleague here at Planning, 2007

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis/Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Housing Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Safety Net Policy*

# TRANSPORTATION POLICY

## 23. Transit-First Policy & Plan for San Francisco International Airport

**Organization:** San Francisco International Airport, Sustainability & Environmental Policy Section

**Location:** San Francisco, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** SFO's Sustainability & Environmental Policy team, in conjunction with Airport Planning, Landside Operations, Parking Management, and the Admin & Policy division, is seeking to develop policy guidelines and a roadmap to making SFO a world-class transit-first airport. Together with the City & County of San Francisco's goals of 80% sustainable (non-auto) trips by 2030 and 100% zero-emission transportation by 2040, SFO is seeking to understand the strategies, programs, partnerships, and infrastructure required to become a successful transit-first airport by international standards.

**Organization Description:** Sustainability & Environmental Policy is the lead environmental policymaking and sustainability program oversight body at San Francisco International Airport. This IPA report will directly lead to SFO adopting a policy statement around becoming a transit-first airport; developing a transit-first plan, adding transit-first projects to its capital and long-range plans, and implementing ongoing transit-first programming.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Ben Gould

**Email:** benjamin.gould@flysfo.com

**Phone Number:** 650-821-5061, 510-725-9176

**Secondary Contact:** Nile Ledbetter; nile.ledbetter@flysfo.com; 650-821-7742 Erin Cooke; erin.cooke@flysfo.com; 650-821-5065

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Ben Gould, MPP '17

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis/Strategic Plan*

*Primary Policy Area: Transportation Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Environmental Policy*

# ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

## 24. Regenerative Agriculture at the Federal Level: Recommendations for the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis

**Organization:** Mad Agriculture

**Location:** Boulder, CO, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** There is significant interest within the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis in the US House of Representatives around regenerative agriculture and carbon sequestration in agricultural soils. Leading national and international organizations have singled out soil carbon sequestration as a top priority for meeting our climate goals. There is growing interest across several US states to reinvest and restore the health of our soils. At a time when climate change is still a polarizing issue, there is hope that regenerative agriculture and soil health can provide common ground for bipartisan support and restore cooperation across the aisle.

“Regenerative agriculture” covers a broad range of new and old approaches to farming and ranching. Different strands include holistic management, “nature-as-measure” farmsteading, permaculture and agroecology, carbon farming, and the soil profits movement. While regenerative agriculture can be both organic and conventional, there is a common focus on soil health principles (minimizing soil disturbance, maximizing crop diversity, keeping soil covered, maintaining a living root, and integrating livestock) and conservation practices such as no/low till, cover crops, crop rotation, prescribed grazing, and compost application. Regenerative agriculture draws strength from its wide diversity of practitioners, which include conservative republicans and liberal democrats. A successful policy pathway will need to maintain this broad consensus.

This project will consider the best way forward for regenerative agriculture at the federal level by conducting a policy analysis of alternatives such as:

- Payments for ecosystem services
- Tax credits for carbon sequestration in agricultural soils
- Reforms to the crop subsidy and crop insurance programs
- Increased conservation program spending
- And other options

Students will need to consider how to quantify and compare economic, environmental, social and political outcomes. On the economic side, this may include estimating the dividend to farmers and ranchers under a payments for ecosystem services plan at different prices for carbon and comparing this to the benefits received through a restructured crop subsidy program, discounts on crop insurance for using sustainable practices, and increased conservation funding through existing programs.

Environmental outcomes include carbon sequestration in soils and other co-benefits such as improved water infiltration. In their analysis, students will also need to consider the regulatory burden on producers, socio-cultural impediments to change that could constrain the impact of a policy change, and the political likelihood of passage given the current political climate.

This project will culminate in recommendations that will be presented to (at least two) members of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. Ideally, students would recommend a suite of policy actions presented in sufficient detail that they could form the basis for several bill outlines. From these, Mad Agriculture will write bills that would be introduced in the next session of Congress and could find their way into future legislation.

**Organization Description:** Mad Agriculture is a Boulder-based non-profit committed to reimagining and restoring our relationship with the Earth with good agriculture. The main thrust of our work is Carbon Farm Planning (CFP). CFP was invented by the Marin Carbon Project, Carbon Cycle Institute and Fibershed and builds on Conservation Planning, a process developed by the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to help farmers and ranchers solve their resource concerns by educating, designing and cost-sharing (~50%) the implementation of conservation practices. CFP's leverage existing and trusted networks of financial and technical resources to de-risk the transition to regenerative agriculture.

Recently, Mad Agriculture has also embraced public policy as a lever for change. At the state level, Mad Ag organizes the Colorado Collaborative for Healthy Soils - a bottom-up and big-tent effort with 110+ members meeting monthly to discuss a way forward for soil health. At the federal level, Mad Ag has developed a strong relationship with our US Congressman that has already resulted in two bills introduced in Congress. It is through this relationship that we hope to introduce bills created from this IPA project.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Max Neumeyer

**Email:** max@madagriculture.org

**Phone Number:** (917)828-4887

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Phil Taylor

**Existing connection to GSPP:** MPP 2019

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Environmental Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Food Policy*

## **25. Analyzing the Climate Impact of Government Carbon Market Allowance Retirement**

**Organization:** Carbon Lighthouse Association

**Location:** San Francisco, CA

**Project Description & Goals:** The goal of this project is to provide a report that analyzes US compliance carbon markets (RGGI and several compliance REC markets). This analysis will focus on projecting supply and demand along with pricing. Students would support our organization in creating these models based off earlier modeling along with current legislation and policy for targets. The student would then use these models to analyze the impact (both in terms of price and supply/demand balance) that our organization can play in each market by retiring either compliance carbon allowances and RECs. This detailed and academic analysis is critical to our non-profit's ability to best target our carbon purchases along with communicate the value of our work to external stakeholders.

**Organization Description:** Carbon Lighthouse Association (CLA) is dedicated to driving collective action to take away the rights of the fossil fuel industry to pollute and contribute to climate change. Individuals and companies are increasingly looking for opportunities to address climate change, but the scale of the problem leaves them wondering how to have an impact in the face of special-interest money and power fighting to maintain the status quo.

CLA is the first and only organization removing carbon allowances from regulated carbon markets in the U.S. In a cap and trade system, the government sets a cap on emissions and companies must purchase an allowance for each ton of CO<sub>2</sub> they emit. CLA allows individuals and companies to offset their emissions and aggregates up these donations to bid against fossil fuel companies on government auctions to remove allowances and therefore their legal right to pollute. However, a critical element of driving impact is understanding the market dynamics to ensure we are purchasing allowances from compliance markets where removing allowances will have the greatest environmental impact. Therefore, the findings of the student team will be critical to our strategy and communications with donors. We envision using their analysis to develop a white paper that would be published on our website.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Adrienne von Schulthess

**Email:** [adrienne@carbonlighthouse.org](mailto:adrienne@carbonlighthouse.org)

**Phone Number:** 202 679-5057

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis/Strategic Plan*

*Primary Policy Area: Environmental Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Non-profit Management*

## 26. Skip the Slip

**Organization:** Zero Waste Commission

**Location:** Berkeley, CA

### **Project Description & Goals:**

**OVERVIEW:** Do paper receipts pose significant enough environmental concerns and public health problems to warrant a policy intervention by the City of Berkeley? In January 2019, California State Assemblymember Phil Ting introduced AB 161, which was nicknamed “Skip the Slip.” If passed, the legislation would have made electronic receipts the default practice when making a purchase in California (unless a customer specifically requested a hard copy). The bill did not pass.

The City of Berkeley’s Zero Waste Commission would like to know if a “Skip the Slip” policy would be a viable option for the City of Berkeley. According to the nonprofit environmental group Green America, “Every year, US receipt production consumes millions of trees and billions of gallons of water, generating large amounts of waste and emitting greenhouse gases.” A 2018 study by The Ecology Center estimates that 93% of thermal paper receipts are coated with bisphenol A (BPA) or bisphenol S (BPS), which are chemicals that have been linked to developmental, reproductive, and neurological problems. Employees who handle these receipts all day long are, presumably, at heightened risk due to ongoing exposure. Furthermore, this paper is not recyclable, and is possibly contaminating recycling (and possibly compost) streams in the City of Berkeley.

**POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The City of Berkeley’s Zero Waste Commission is seeking a GSPP consultant (or consultancy team) to do the following:

- (1) Assess the extent of the problem for the City of Berkeley related to:
  - environmental resources used to create receipts
  - toxicity to humans and animals due to chemical coating of the receipts themselves
  - litter due to receipts being dropped in public places, falling into storm drains, etc.
  - contamination of recycling and/or compost streams
- (2) Presuming an environmental problem (or multiple problems) exist, conduct a policy analysis and suggest policy alternatives to mitigate the problem(s)
- (3) Make a policy recommendation for the City of Berkeley that balances environmental sustainability, economic efficiency, social equity, and political feasibility. (Note that sustainability is most often defined as: meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.)

The consultant (or consultancy team) will have support from the Zero Waste Commissioners as well as the City of Berkeley’s Recycling Program Manager.

**BERKELEY AS A LABORATORY OF INNOVATION:** This project presents a unique opportunity for a student to get in on the “ground floor” of innovative environmental policy design and implementation. The City of Berkeley has a laudable history of being at the forefront of progressive environmental policies. The city was an early adopter of styrofoam bans, as well as bans on plastic bags and plastic straws. More recently, the Zero Waste Commission spearheaded an ordinance banning single use plastic foodware, and other cities are beginning to discuss enacting similar policies. Although AB 161 did not pass at the state level, a Skip the Slip ordinance could be adopted at the local level and serve as a proof of concept for other regions of the state, country, and world.

POINT OF CONTACT Ilana Golin is an alumna of the Goldman School (MPP '10) and would serve as the primary point of contact for the student(s). While at GSPP, she was the Course Assistant for Introduction to Policy Analysis class and, thus, has experience supporting student consultants conducting policy projects. More recently, Ms. Golin was the Director of Strategic Initiatives & Partnerships at the Lokey School of Business & Public Policy at Mills College in Oakland. She was appointed as a Commissioner to the City of Berkeley's Zero Waste Commission in April 2019.

**ADDITIONAL RESOURCES:**

- City of Berkeley, Zero Waste Commission
- Office of Phil Ting
- Green America
- American Forest and Paper Association

**Organization Description:** The Zero Waste Commission is responsible for making recommendations on City of Berkeley solid waste policy and goals, including commercial and residential garbage and recycling services, budgets, and other decisions relating to solid waste in the City of Berkeley. In February 2006 the City Council changed the name of the Commission from Solid Waste Management Commission to the Zero Waste Commission and updated its duties to reflect Zero Waste goals. Based on the IPA team's analysis and recommendations, the Commission is poised to develop a comprehensive "Skip the Slip" policy and propose it to the Berkeley City Council.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Ilana Golin

**Email:** ilanagolin@gmail.com

**Phone Number:** 510-479-5656

**Existing connection to GSPP:** MPP alumna - class of 2010

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Environmental Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Health Policy*

## 27. Analysis of Local Policies to End Gasoline Use

**Organization:** Coltura

**Location:** Menlo Park, CA, USA

### **Project Description & Goals:** Analysis of Innovative Local Policies to Cut Gasoline Use

Coltura seeks analysis of the political, economic, impact, and equity issues implicated by a set of novel policies to reduce gasoline use. (Legal analysis is being conducted separately.) The analysis will be used to propose new policies to progressive cities seeking to make a significant impact in addressing the climate crisis.

### **Criteria for analysis:**

- Gasoline Reduction Impact and Economic Effect-Analysis of policy efficacy in terms of motivating fuel switching, reducing gasoline use and disruption of overall economic activity.
- Equity analysis of how proposed policies would impact low-income persons and persons of color, and how they could be tweaked to maximize positive effects and minimize negative impacts.
- Political analysis of key policies and associated messaging.

**Policies for analysis:** Cities can reduce gasoline usage by targeting key elements of the gasoline usage cycle under their control, including regulation of streets, parking and gas stations, and leveraging government purchasing and contracting. Coltura requests that some or all of the following policies be analyzed.

### Street Usage

- Restricting ICE vehicle access to all or part of a city's street system
- Restricting gasoline vehicle parking on city streets and property

### Gas Stations

- Incentivizing replacement of gas stations with EV charging and other uses
- Moratorium on new gas stations/closing existing gas stations

Gasoline sales restrictions or local cap and invest programs o Increased zoning restrictions on existing gas stations

### Education

- Educating public on gasoline's harms to climate and public health
- Driving community cultural narratives about gasoline; counter oil industry misinformation campaigns
- Requiring/incentivizing schools, drivers ed, dealerships, and car rental agencies to provide education and information on harms of gasoline and benefits of cleaner alternatives such as EVs
- Requiring/incentivizing drivers ed companies and car rental agencies to use EVs

### City Operations and Licensing

- Requiring electrification of city fleet
- Contracting preferences for city vendors that use electric fleets
- Declining quotas for government use of gasoline
- Phasing out Transportation Network Companies (Uber, Lyft) use of gasoline

**Project Deliverables:** Written analysis of the political, economic, impact, and equity issues implicated by the above list of local policies to reduce gasoline use.

NOTE: If it is not possible to analyze 1) all of the policies, or 2) all of the issues related to each policy, a subset of either or both is welcomed.

**Organization Description:** Coltura Coltura is 501c3 nonprofit with the mission to advance climate, health and equity by accelerating the transition away from gasoline to cleaner alternatives. We will use the findings to educate progressive cities on the most promising measures and policies to reduce or eliminate gasoline use in their jurisdiction.

Coltura organizes the Yes Clean Cars coalitions in California and Washington State which focus on the phasing out of gasoline vehicles. Coltura staff recently wrote a law review article on state vehicle electrification policy and federal preemption which will be published in the Michigan Journal of Environmental and Administrative Law in 2020. We co-organized a 2018 convening with the Berkeley Law School Center for Law Energy and Environment on 100% vehicle electrification policies, and organized a seminar on international gasoline car phaseouts in conjunction with the 2018 Global Climate Action Summit. We published Recharge Required, a comprehensive analysis of public vehicle electrification in Washington State.

Appendix (Version with links available upon request)

Gasoline and diesel are the single biggest sources of human-caused carbon dioxide pollution (29% in the US, and 41% in California), and passenger vehicles are the biggest contributor (60% in the US, 70% in California). A complete transition away from gasoline-powered vehicles to cleaner alternatives is critical to address the climate crisis. Overall CO2 emissions must decline 45% from 2010 levels by 2030 to maintain warming within 1.5°C per the 2018 IPCC analysis. Given gasoline's outsized contribution to overall carbon emissions, it will be necessary to greatly reduce if not eliminate gasoline use by 2030 to keep within the IPCC-stated limits. The electric vehicle (EV) transition is happening far too slowly. EV sales are down more than 10% nationally in 2019 relative to 2018, and only one model of EV, the Tesla Model 3, is selling in volumes exceeding 3,000 per month. The federal government is not a reliable source of gasoline reduction measures. The current administration has renounced its historic emissions reduction role. It is working to roll back existing federal clean car standards and revoke California's Clean Air Act waiver for its Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV) and Low Emission Vehicles (LEV) programs. Even under a future, greener administration, a Senate filibuster or adverse judicial rulings may block federal action on gasoline. Cities may hold the key to impactful climate action. More than 120 million Americans (nearly 40% of the US population) live in incorporated cities of at least 50,000 residents. Many of the largest cities are politically blue even in red states. Seventy-five percent of urban residents "strongly agree" with the statement that "We have a moral responsibility to create a safe and healthy climate for ourselves and our children." The impact of local gasoline reduction policies may extend far beyond city limits. For example, if people living outside major cities find it burdensome or impossible to bring a gasoline-powered vehicle into the city, they may be incentivized to stop driving a gasoline car. An urban regulatory environment restricting internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles and gasoline sales may incentivize automakers to shift away from ICE vehicles and towards cleaner alternatives like EVs. Progressive cities are showing interest in novel gasoline-reduction measures. A key strategy for some cities is reducing carbon emissions from gasoline and internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. For example, Berkeley is considering restrictions on operation and parking of gasoline vehicles on its streets after the year 2045. San Francisco is working to ensure that all vehicle trips are emissions-free by 2040. Los Angeles is planning for 100% zero emission vehicles by 2050, including developing the first fossil fuel free zone by 2030. Cities' traditional police powers open the door to local gasoline reduction measures. Local government's powers bear on many of the key elements of the gasoline usage cycle. These powers may include regulation of roads, parking, auto-related businesses including gas stations, car rental agencies, private parking lots, and drivers' education schools. Cities also have control over the conditions of their contracting and over the vehicles that they purchase. Cities' control over all of these elements of gasoline usage can be leveraged to make

powerful policies disincentivizing gasoline sales and ICE vehicles relative to cleaner alternatives. Cities can act more quickly than state and federal governments. City governments, especially in smaller cities, can often enact and deploy policies more quickly than state and federal governments. This opens opportunities to test gasoline reduction strategies on a small scale. City measures can help normalize policies for widespread adoption. As the climate crisis accelerates, significant, urgent fossil fuel reduction measures are necessary. Cities adopting policies can demonstrate policy effectiveness and acceptance. For instance, Berkeley’s passage of a policy in July 2019 to prohibit fossil fuels (natural gas) in new construction was at first considered radical. But already 7 other cities have passed similar policies, and many others are considering doing so. Expert guidance is critical. Cities eager to move forward with progressive policies need expert legal and policy guidance to ensure they frame the policies in ways that will best withstand scrutiny while maximizing effectiveness. Model policies will help cities avoid legal challenges that lead to unfavorable legal precedent, and political fights that may impede other cities’ chances of success with similar policies. It may also help them avoid wasting time with ineffective or unnecessarily controversial policies. Cities may also lack sufficient staffing and resources to do original research and policy development. Even for policies that have already been deployed elsewhere, expert guidance in the form of model policies and analysis can help a city adopt those policies with more speed and confidence. Data on gallons of gasoline sold at the city level is not publicly available. As such, cities do not focus on reducing gasoline consumption. Accurate statistical data on gasoline sales is critical for policy design and progress measurement. Per management expert Peter Drucker, “If you can’t measure it, you can’t improve it.”

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Janelle London

**Email:** [janelle@coltura.org](mailto:janelle@coltura.org)

**Phone Number:** 415 250 2839

**Secondary Contact:** Matthew Metz (Founder and Co-Executive Director of Coltura);  
[mmm@coltura.org](mailto:mmm@coltura.org), 206 799 2795

**Existing connection to GSPP:** We are working with Ben Gould on Berkeley's policies on reducing gasoline use.

*Policy Product Type: Policy Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Environmental Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Transportation Policy*

## 28. Electrification of Trucking Industry

**Organization:** UC Berkeley Goldman School, Center for Environmental Public Policy

**Location:** Berkeley, CA

**Project Description & Goals:** Transition to electric vehicles in the trucking industry is essential to meet emissions reductions goals and address climate change. This IPA project explores alternative policies designed to increase this transition, which might include:

- Create state sales tax and federal excise tax exemptions for electric trucks
- Create space for parking and electric charging of trucks is a constraint on electrification of trucks at the Port of Oakland - research current CalTrans policies on parking beneath freeways and propose changes to optimize space for electric vehicle parking and charging.
- Streamline the process and assist applicants through a process of applying for state grants for zero emission trucks

Students will conduct a policy analysis of these and/or other policy options.

**Organization Description:** The Center recently organized a conference on electrification of trucking the Port. We have good working relationships with the principle Environmental Justice Group in West Oakland who in turn has strong positive relations with truck drivers and small trucking firms serving the Port.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** David Wooley

**Email:** dwooley@berkeley.edu

**Phone Number:** 4152711135

**Secondary Contact:** Simone Cobb cobb@d@berkeley.edu

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project

**Existing connection to GSPP:** David Wooley is a current faculty member

# TECHNOLOGY POLICY

## 29. Oakland Citizen Data: Understanding What's Collected and Strengthening Privacy

**Organization:** City of Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission

**Location:** Oakland, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** Privacy is a fundamental human right, and instrumental to Oaklanders' safety, security, and access to city services. Oakland is a diverse city with a history of active civic participation on issues of privacy and surveillance, and it is also a city whose public policies could benefit from analyzing existing administrative data and adopting new "smart city" technologies. As it evolves, Oakland must figure out how to balance potential benefits while protecting Oaklanders' privacy. Many City departments may collect personal information about Oakland citizens for the purpose of improving their services and public policy outcomes, or to meet administrative needs.

The City has not done a full review of what citizen data it has, but examples could include:

- The Department of Transportation uses vehicle-mounted Automated License Plate Readers--which take pictures of vehicle license plates and analyze them--to manage and enforce parking violations.
- The Oakland Public Library collects personal information from citizens who apply for a library card to help collect fines for overdue books.
- The Department of Housing and Community Development collects data on residents who receive relocation assistance.
- The City Clerk administers records of services citywide, including permits and public records requests.

In April 2019, the Oakland Privacy Advisory Commission adopted a set of privacy principles to guide City collection of citizen data. These principles address: (1) Equity; (2) Collection and Retention; (3) Management of Personal Information; (4) Third Party Relationships; (5) Public Records Disclosures; (6) Transparency; and (7) Accountability. The Privacy Advisory Commission would like GSPP students to survey City departments regarding data collected, assess the extent to which current City practices may align with the privacy principles, identify ways to improve alignment of current practices, and identify implementation practices for any new data collection via "smart city" or other technologies.

Departments of interest could include Transportation, Planning & Building, and others that interact with a large number of Oaklanders.

**Organization Description:** The Privacy Advisory Commission provides advice to the City of Oakland on best practices to protect Oaklanders' privacy rights in connection with the City's purchase and use of surveillance equipment and other technology that collects or stores our data. The Commission and its City liaison would facilitate connections to City departments. The Commission would use the outcomes of this project to 1) advise the City on how to implement the Commission's privacy principles, and 2) evaluate potential data collection that may fall into the Commission's scope, beyond surveillance technologies.

### **Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Brian Hofer

**Email:** brian.hofer@gmail.com

**Phone Number:** 510-303-2871

**Secondary Contact:** Chloe Brown, Chloe.f.brown@gmail.com, 202-297-1202 (Commissioner and MPA 2017; Brian is Chair)

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Joe DeVries, Assistant to the City Administrator / PAC liaison

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Chloe Brown, MPA 2017

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: Technology Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Privacy*

# INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

## 30. Intake and Case Management Best Practices for LGBTQ Shelter and Referrals Program: Middle East-North Africa

**Organization:** Rainbow Street

**Location:** Berkeley, CA, 94703

### **Project Description & Goals:**

**BACKGROUND:** People residing in the Middle East-North Africa (MENA) who belong to sexual and gender minority groups, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people, often face extreme challenges to their health, dignity, and autonomy. It isn't uncommon for individuals to experience familial rejection, violence, harassment, employment discrimination, extortion, arbitrary imprisonment, or a combination of these challenges. Rainbow Street is an international network of LGBTQ human rights defenders in MENA with administrative and fundraising headquarters in Berkeley, CA. Rainbow Street has operated a discreet shelter program for LGBTQ individuals in MENA since 2014. In 2018, we provided 2400 nights of shelter to clients in Jordan, Lebanon, Tunisia, and Iraq. Rainbow Street also regularly provides shelter clients with referrals for LGBTQ-friendly services related to health care, mental health support, migration services, community support, and other essential resources.

At Rainbow Street we recognize that the fundamental security of LGBTQ people must be a top priority in the movement toward a society where LGBTQ people are celebrated as integral and valuable. To that end, all our programming is designed in close partnership with LGBTQ people in MENA in the pursuit of physical, mental, and spiritual health for all LGBTQ people in the region. Shelter, peer counseling, and referral services that are timely and effective can have profound impacts on the lives of individuals and the community at large. Rainbow Street is making significant strides to professionalize our programming in MENA. In 2019, the organization hired its first full-time staff and attracted government grant funding to increase the number of shelter clients who benefit from our services. As Rainbow Street continues to grow from a small team of volunteer activists to a social services organization with a diverse program portfolio, we seek support in creating an outreach strategy that is both effective and safe for the communities we hope to serve.

**PROPOSAL:** IPA students will submit a final report to be used by Rainbow Street staff to improve outreach and referral procedures for LGBTQ clients in the MENA region. Report recommendations will provide long-lasting positive impacts for beneficiaries of Rainbow Street's Shelter program and the Helpline (referral) program by increasing the efficiency, reach, and overall quality of services offered. Students can choose to focus their strategic analysis on any of the following topics, or a combination of topics:

- Client outreach : Reaching more potential clients; streamlining the process of requesting assistance; reducing response time
- Client assessment: Relevant information to collect from clients; methods for soliciting this information safely; methods for evaluating clients' needs
- Data management: Recommendations for secure and easy-to-use case management software that facilitates documentation of client demographics and services provided
- Data analysis: Industry best practices for developing quantitative and qualitative success metrics to be used in identifying trends and opportunities for improvement.

Students will report to the Executive Director in Berkeley, CA and be given access to Rainbow Street team members in the MENA region to collect their input as needed throughout the project. All relevant existing practices and resources will be made available to students. Students will be encouraged to solicit information on industry best practices from related direct services organizations in the US and MENA. Examples of organizations local to the Bay Area that could provide valuable insights are TransLifeline, PointSource Youth, and Larkin Street Youth Services. Rainbow Street has an extensive network of referral partners in the MENA region which will be made available to students at the commencement of the project.

**Organization Description:** Rainbow Street has operated a shelter and referrals program for LGBTQ clients in the MENA region since the organization's founding in 2014.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Kevin Steen

**Email:** kevin@rainbow-street.org

**Phone Number:** 206-604-3936

**Existing connection to GSPP:** Previous IPA project host (2017): April Yeane, Courtney Colburn, Elijah Wood

*Policy Product Type: Best Practices Analysis*

*Primary Policy Area: International Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*

## 31. Building a Strategy for Growth and Impact to Drive Community Change in East Africa

**Organization:** Foundation for Community Development and Empowerment (FCDE)

**Location:** Berkeley, CA, USA

**Project Description & Goals:** The Foundation for Community Development and Empowerment (FCDE) is at a key point in our growth. We are a small, dynamic nonprofit organization seeking the assistance of an IPA Consulting Team to help us take stock of our impact on the development of local partner organizations in rural Uganda and to identify and assess alternative strategies for expansion to new communities. After pivoting away from an earned income/service learning internship funding stream in 2018, this year we embarked on a new path of resource mobilization focusing on project-specific grants. As we deepen these efforts, we want to ensure they support our long-term growth by providing opportunities to pilot and prove a well-considered strategy. Therefore, the goals of this project are to:

- 1) Examine alternative strategies, costs and trade-offs for expanding FCDE's organizational capacity-building model to new communities. As we look to expand our model outside of the two rural communities where we currently operate, different approaches we are considering include partnering with an established organization already working in a region to create an FCDE satellite hub or acting as a capacity-building subcontractor on a grant proposal with a larger international organization conducting development work in East Africa. We would like an IPA Team's support in considering these strategies as well as others they may identify in the course of the project.
- 2) Analyze the outcomes of FCDE's capacity-building model to help us articulate the impact of our work and examine nuances in what our key performance indicators may be telling us about organizational development. One of the big questions that we have pondered throughout the year is: "How do we accurately reflect the impact of our work and FCDE's direct benefit in the communities we serve?" We are keenly aware that 'institutional capacity building' isn't the hippest sector in international development. It can be a hard sell to those donors who want to see their funding translate into direct impact on individuals. However, we know that FCDE directly increases our local partners' community impact by helping them build efficient and effective organizational systems, design programs that are responsive to community needs, and acquire the resources they need to expand and accomplish their work (revenue, human capital, knowledge, skills and networks). To help us articulate our impact and build our evidence base, we are looking for analytical support to examine data from our partners that tracks 7 growth indicators over an eight-year period.

**Organization Description:** FCDE builds local capacity that drives community change in rural East Africa. Our philosophy is deeply rooted in and committed to positive sustainable development practices that uplift communities to make comprehensive and lasting change. Support for FCDE does not simply increase the capacity of a single organization. It directly improves the growth and community impact of over 50 local, grassroots organizations approaching sustainable development from multiple angles. FCDE builds the capacity of organizations already at work in the region so they garner skills and resources that strengthen their operations and programs, and ultimately increase their impact. We view organizational leaders as key community change agents whose knowledge is pivotal to promoting sustainable, localized development practices. Recognizing that interconnections in community development sectors will yield broad-based impact, FCDE's partners work in any of seven domains: small business development, health, HIV and AIDS, education and youth development, women's empowerment, environment and social justice. We draw upon a number of tools and processes to help each of our local partner organizations (LPOs) build their capacity to drive community change. These include: institutional self-assessments, skill-building workshops, one-on-one coaching and pro bono expertise, networking and partnership building, support to build and diversify revenue that includes

FCDE small grants, and the use of Resource Centers based in our two regional sites of Kasese and Rukungiri, Uganda. By engaging in this project with FCDE, an IPA Consulting Team will directly inform current decision-making on organizational growth strategy which will shape FCDE's future. Our Executive Leadership Team just concluded an annual retreat at which we collaboratively defined our “endgame” as model replication. As our Country Director Sylvia put it, “Sitting around one table working together was a MOMENT for me. I feel energised and empowered in the work I do.” We are now building the strategy that will take our organization to the next level. We kindly request an IPA Consulting Team to help us get there.

**Contact/Additional Information:**

**Primary Contact Person:** Ashley Orton

**Email:** ashley@fcde-dev.org

**Phone Number:** 202.415.1409,

**Anyone else with a key decision-making or supervisory role:** Rebecca Raymond, rebecca@fcde-dev.org, 510.501.3703

**Existing connection to GSPP:** I worked with three IPA Teams in my previous role at Asante Africa Foundation.

*Policy Product Type: Evaluation/Strategic Plan*

*Primary Policy Area: International Policy*

*Secondary Policy Area: Social Justice Policy*