

CITY OF SANTA ROSA  
CITY COUNCIL

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
SUBJECT: COUNCIL DIRECTION TO VOTING DELEGATE TO  
LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES CONFERENCE  
REGARDING COUNCIL POSITION ON RESOLUTION  
NO. 2 COMING BEFORE THE LEAGUE GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY  
STAFF PRESENTER: KATHY MILLISON, CITY MANAGER  
CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE  
AGENDA ACTION: MOTION

---

ISSUE

Shall the Santa Rosa City Council provide direction to its Voting Delegate regarding a policy position on one issue that will be considered or adopted by Resolution at the Annual Conference of the League of California Cities Annual Business Meeting and General Assembly on September 20, 2013?

BACKGROUND

Policy development is an ongoing process within the League of California Cities for determining legislative and program strategies for important issues facing cities throughout California. Due to the changing environment in which cities operate, the League Board considers various policies throughout the year to provide positions and comments during the State Legislative session. Often additional policies are submitted for consideration by the General Assembly at the Annual Conference to be voted on by delegates from the cities. Each member city has one Voting Delegate at the General Assembly.

One issue was considered and acted on at the September 10, 2013 Council Meeting and one issue was held over with further information requested. New this year, resolutions submitted to the General Assembly must be concurred in by five cities or by city officials from at least five or more cities. These letters are included in the packet.

ANALYSIS

**Resolution No. 2 calling upon the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussions with the League and California Police Chiefs' Association**

**representatives to identify and enact strategies that will ensure the success of public safety realignment from a local municipal law enforcement perspective.**

This resolution seeks to outline the deficiencies in the State's current public safety realignment policy, as implemented in 2011 by AB 109, and it identifies policy changes that will assist State, county, and municipal law enforcement entities to cope with the expanded universe of offenders that are now being directed to county facilities, resulting in increased related impacts on both local communities and municipal law enforcement. *This resolution seeks to establish increased and constitutionally protected funding for city police departments but does not specify a dollar amount for the revenue stream. At a minimum, it would entail an annual revenue stream of at least the amount provided for cities in front-line law enforcement in the State's 2013-14 Budget, \$27.5 million, indefinitely – although that revenue stream has never been formally identified by the Brown Administration as having any direct connection to realignment.*

*The Police Department supports the language of the resolution as stated above, but has significant concerns regarding the supporting language contained elsewhere in the resolution. These concerns will be addressed by letter to be submitted to the League's Public Safety Policy Committee which will be meeting to consider possible amendments to the Resolution on September 18, 2013 prior to final submittal to the General Assembly for voting on September 20, 2013. The City's letter of concerns and recommendations will be transmitted to the Public Safety Policy Committee on September 13, 2013 and will be provided as attachment to this report at that time. The concerns include the general policy of Constitutional provision for budget allocations, the need for funding for rehabilitative services, exercising caution to avoid harm to supportive services now provided to local law enforcement by Counties and avoid causing cities to take on greater obligations for realignment services, the stated reasons for realignment, the general statements regarding the impacts of realignment without any supporting factual data, and how Santa Rosa has not experienced these generic impacts. Specifically, Santa Rosa in 2012 experienced a 7% reduction in Part 1 Crimes Against Persons and a 3% increase in Part 1 Crimes Against Property. Since realignment came into effect in October of 2011, much more data is needed to determine what influence realignment had on these numbers. Additionally, the Background Information on Resolution No. 2 includes only information from Los Angeles County which may not reflect the experiences for the rest of the State and does not reflect aspects of the successful partnerships being developed in Sonoma County. While more discussion to seek successful strategies is valuable, the concepts discussed here don't universally apply throughout the State and the Resolution should be amended to cover a broader range of topics and more accurately reflect the regional differences throughout the State. It is recommended that Council take a position of OPPOSITION UNLESS AMENDED on this resolution.*

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended by the City Manager's Office, that the Council, by motion, consider taking a position on Resolution No. 2 to provide direction to its Voting Delegate for the meeting of the League General Assembly.

Author: Liz Licursi

Attachments:

- 2013 Annual LOCC Conference Resolutions Packet
- September 13, 2013 letter to Public Safety Policy Committee (to be added)



***Annual Conference  
Resolutions Packet***

***115<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference***



***Sacramento  
September 18 - 20, 2013***

## INFORMATION AND PROCEDURES

**RESOLUTIONS CONTAINED IN THIS PACKET:** The League bylaws provide that resolutions shall be referred by the president to an appropriate policy committee for review and recommendation. Resolutions with committee recommendations shall then be considered by the General Resolutions Committee at the Annual Conference.

This year, two resolutions have been introduced for consideration by the Annual Conference and referred to the League policy committees.

**POLICY COMMITTEES:** Two policy committees will meet at the Annual Conference to consider and take action on resolutions referred to them. The committees are Environmental Quality and Public Safety. These committees will meet on Wednesday, September 18, 2013, at the Sheraton Grand Hotel in Sacramento. The sponsors of the resolutions have been notified of the time and location of the meetings.

**GENERAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:** This committee will meet at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 19, at the Sacramento Convention Center, to consider the reports of the two policy committees regarding the two resolutions. This committee includes one representative from each of the League's regional divisions, functional departments and standing policy committees, as well as other individuals appointed by the League president. Please check in at the registration desk for room location.

**ANNUAL LUNCHEON/BUSINESS MEETING/GENERAL ASSEMBLY:** This meeting will be held at 12:00 p.m. on Friday, September 20, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel.

**PETITIONED RESOLUTIONS:** For those issues that develop after the normal 60-day deadline, a resolution may be introduced at the Annual Conference with a petition signed by designated voting delegates of 10 percent of all member cities (47 valid signatures required) and presented to the Voting Delegates Desk at least 24 hours prior to the time set for convening the Annual Business Session of the General Assembly. This year, that deadline is 12:00 p.m., Thursday, September 19. If the petitioned resolution is substantially similar in substance to a resolution already under consideration, the petitioned resolution may be disqualified by the General Resolutions Committee.

Resolutions can be viewed on the League's Web site: [www.cacities.org/resolutions](http://www.cacities.org/resolutions).

Any questions concerning the resolutions procedures may be directed to Meg Desmond at the League office: [mdesmond@cacities.org](mailto:mdesmond@cacities.org) or (916) 658-8224

## **GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS**

Policy development is a vital and ongoing process within the League. The principal means for deciding policy on the important issues facing cities is through the League's eight standing policy committees and the board of directors. The process allows for timely consideration of issues in a changing environment and assures city officials the opportunity to both initiate and influence policy decisions.

Annual conference resolutions constitute an additional way to develop League policy. Resolutions should adhere to the following criteria.

### **Guidelines for Annual Conference Resolutions**

1. Only issues that have a direct bearing on municipal affairs should be considered or adopted at the Annual Conference.
2. The issue is not of a purely local or regional concern.
3. The recommended policy should not simply restate existing League policy.
4. The resolution should be directed at achieving one of the following objectives:
  - (a) Focus public or media attention on an issue of major importance to cities.
  - (b) Establish a new direction for League policy by establishing general principals around which more detailed policies may be developed by policy committees and the board of directors.
  - (c) Consider important issues not adequately addressed by the policy committees and board of directors.
  - (d) Amend the League bylaws (requires 2/3 vote at General Assembly).

## LOCATION OF MEETINGS

### **Policy Committee Meetings**

Wednesday, September 18, 2013  
Sheraton Grand Hotel  
1230 J Street, Sacramento

Public Safety: 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.  
Environmental Quality: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

### **General Resolutions Committee**

Thursday, September 19, 2013, 1:00 p.m.  
Sacramento Convention Center  
1400 J Street, Sacramento

### **Annual Business Meeting and General Assembly Luncheon**

Friday, September 20, 2013, 12:00 p.m.  
Hyatt Regency Hotel  
1209 L Street, Sacramento

## KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN ON RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions have been grouped by policy committees to which they have been assigned.

Number	Key Word Index	Reviewing Body Action		
		1	2	3
		1 - Policy Committee Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee 2 - General Resolutions Committee 3 - General Assembly		

---

### ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
1	Water Bond Funds			

### PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
2	Public Safety Realignment			

Information pertaining to the Annual Conference Resolutions will also be posted on each committee's page on the League website: [www.cacities.org](http://www.cacities.org). The entire Resolutions Packet will be posted at: [www.cacities.org/resolutions](http://www.cacities.org/resolutions).

---

## KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN ON RESOLUTIONS (*Continued*)

### KEY TO REVIEWING BODIES

1. Policy Committee
2. General Resolutions Committee
3. General Assembly

### Action Footnotes

- \* Subject matter covered in another resolution
- \*\* Existing League policy
- \*\*\* Local authority presently exists

### KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN

- A - Approve
- D - Disapprove
- N - No Action
- R - Refer to appropriate policy committee for study
- a - Amend
- Aa - Approve as amended
- Aaa - Approve with additional amendment(s)
- Ra - Amend and refer as amended to appropriate policy committee for study
- Raa - Additional amendments and refer
- Da - Amend (for clarity or brevity) and Disapprove
- Na - Amend (for clarity or brevity) and take No Action
- W - Withdrawn by Sponsor

**Procedural Note:** Resolutions that are approved by the General Resolutions Committee, as well as all qualified petitioned resolutions, are reported to the floor of the General Assembly. In addition, League policy provides the following procedure for resolutions approved by League policy committees but *not* approved by the General Resolutions Committee:

Resolutions initially recommended for approval and adoption by all the League policy committees to which the resolution is assigned, but subsequently recommended for disapproval, referral or no action by the General Resolutions Committee, shall then be placed on a consent agenda for consideration by the General Assembly. The consent agenda shall include a brief description of the basis for the recommendations by both the policy committee(s) and General Resolutions Committee, as well as the recommended action by each. Any voting delegate may make a motion to pull a resolution from the consent agenda in order to request the opportunity to fully debate the resolution. If, upon a majority vote of the General Assembly, the request for debate is approved, the General Assembly shall have the opportunity to debate and subsequently vote on the resolution.

## 2013 ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION REFERRED TO ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY POLICY COMMITTEE

- 1. RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE GOVERNOR AND THE LEGISLATURE TO WORK WITH THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING AND TO PRIORITIZE WATER BONDS TO ASSIST LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN WATER CONSERVATION, GROUND WATER RECHARGE AND REUSE OF STORMWATER AND URBAN RUNOFF PROGRAMS.**

Source: Los Angeles County Division

Concurrence of five or more cities/city officials: Cities of Alhambra; Cerritos; Claremont; Glendora; Lakewood; La Mirada; La Verne; Norwalk; Signal Hill; Mary Ann Lutz, Mayor, city of Monrovia.

Referred to: Environmental Quality Policy Committee

Recommendations to General Resolutions Committee: Approve

**WHEREAS**, local governments play a critical role in providing water conservation, ground water recharge and reuse of stormwater infrastructure, including capture and reuse of stormwater for their citizens, businesses and institutions; and

**WHEREAS**, local governments support the goals of the Clean Water Act to ensure safe, clean water supply for all and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has encouraged local governments to implement programs to capture, infiltrate and treat stormwater and urban runoff with the use of low impact development ordinances, green street policies and programs to increase the local ground water supply through stormwater capture and infiltration programs; and

**WHEREAS**, local governments also support the State's water quality objectives, specifically Section 13241 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, on the need to maximize the use of reclaimed and water reuse and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards and the State Water Resources Board encourage rainwater capture efforts; and

**WHEREAS**, the State's actions working through the water boards, supported by substantial Federal, State and local investments, have led to a dramatic decrease in water pollution from wastewater treatment plants and other so-called "point sources" since 1972. However, the current threats to the State's water quality are far more difficult to solve, even as the demand for clean water increases from a growing population and an economically important agricultural industry; and

**WHEREAS**, the State's Little Hoover Commission found in 2009 that more than 30,000 stormwater discharges are subject to permits regulating large and small cities, counties, construction sites and industry. The Commission found that a diverse group of water users – the military, small and large businesses, home builders and local governments and more – face enormous costs as they try to control and limit stormwater pollution. The Commission concluded that the costs of stormwater clean up are enormous and that the costs of stormwater pollution are greater, as beach closures impact the State's economy and environmental damage threatens to impair wildlife; and

**WHEREAS**, at the same time that new programs and projects to improve water quality are currently being required by the U.S. EPA and the State under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits and the Total Daily Maximum Load (TMDL) programs, many local governments find that they lack the basic infrastructure to capture, infiltrate and reuse stormwater and cities are facing difficult economic challenges while Federal and State financial assistance has been reduced due to the impacts of the recession and slow economic recovery; and

**WHEREAS**, cities have seen their costs with the new NPDES permit requirements double and triple in size in the past year, with additional costs anticipated in future years. Additionally, many local businesses have grown increasingly concerned about the costs of retrofitting their properties to meet stormwater and runoff requirements required under the NPDES permits and TMDL programs; and

**WHEREAS**, the League of California Cities adopted water polices in March of 2012, recognizing that the development and operation of water supply, flood control and storm water management, among other water functions, is frequently beyond the capacity of local areas to finance and the League found that since most facilities have widespread benefits, it has become the tradition for Federal, State and local governments to share their costs (XIV, Financial Considerations); and the League supports legislation providing funding for stormwater and other water programs; and

**WHEREAS**, the Governor and the Legislature are currently contemplating projects for a water bond and a portion of the bond could be directed to assist local government in funding and implementing the goals of the Clean Water Act and the State’s water objectives of conserving and reusing stormwater in order to improve the supply and reliability of water supply; and now therefore let it be

**RESOLVED** by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Sacramento on September 20, 2013, that the League calls for the Governor and the Legislature to work with the League and other stakeholders to provide adequate funding for water conservation, ground water recharge and capture and reuse of stormwater and runoff in the water bond issue and to prioritize future water bonds to assist local governments in funding these programs. The League will work with its member cities to educate federal and state officials to the challenges facing local governments in providing for programs to capture, infiltrate and reuse stormwater and urban runoff.

//////////

**Background Information on Resolution No. 1**

**Source:** Los Angeles County Division

**Background:**

In order to meet the goals of both the Federal Clean Water Act and the State’s Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, which seek to ensure safe clean water supplies, cities provide critical water conservation, ground water recharge and reuse of stormwater infrastructure, including capture and reuse of stormwater for their citizens, businesses and institutions.

Working with the State’s Regional Water Quality Control Boards and the State Water Resources Board through the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Programs, California’s cities implement programs to capture, infiltrate and treat stormwater and urban runoff with the use of low impact development ordinances, green streets policies and other programs to increase the local ground water supply.

These actions have led to a dramatic decrease in water pollution from wastewater treatment plants and other so-called “point sources” since the adoption of the Clean Water Act in 1972. However, current threats to the State’s “non-point sources “ of pollution, such as stormwater and urban runoff are far more difficult to solve, even as the demand for clean water increases from a growing population and an economically important agricultural industry.

### **Current Problem Facing California's Cities**

The Little Hoover Commission found in 2009 that more than 30,000 stormwater discharges are subject to permits regulating large and small cities, counties, construction sites and industry. The Commission found that a diverse group of water users – the military, small and large businesses, home builders and local governments and more – face enormous costs as they try and control and limit stormwater pollution. The Commission concluded that the costs of stormwater clean up are enormous and that the costs of stormwater pollution are greater as beach closures impact the state's economy and environmental damage threatens to impair wildlife.

Additionally, new programs and projects to improve water quality are currently being required by the U.S. EPA and the State under the NPDES permits and the TMDL programs. Many local governments find that they lack the basic infrastructure to capture, infiltrate and reuse stormwater and the cities are facing difficult economic challenges while Federal and State financial assistance has been reduced due to the impacts of the recession and slow economic recovery.

Cities have seen their costs with the new NPDES permit requirements triple in size in the past year, with additional costs anticipated in future years. Additionally, many local businesses have grown increasingly concerned about the costs of retrofitting their properties to meet stormwater and runoff requirements required under the NPDES permits and TMDL programs.

In Los Angeles County alone, reports commissioned by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District estimate the costs of achieving region-wide compliance for implementing TMDL programs in the NPDES permits required by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) will be in the tens of billions of dollars over the next twenty years. Additionally, failure to comply with the LARWQCB's terms could result in significant Clean Water Act fines, state fines and federal penalties anywhere from \$3,000- \$37,500 per day. Violations can also result in third-party litigation. Such costs are not confined to Los Angeles County and are being realized statewide.

Clearly, compliance with the NPDES permit and TMDL programs will be expensive for local governments over a long period of time and cities lack a stable, long-term, dedicated local funding source to address this need. Many cities are faced with the choice of either cutting existing services or finding new sources of revenue to fund the NPDES and TMDL programs.

### **Los Angeles County Division Resolution**

The Division supports strong League education and advocacy at both the State and Federal levels to help cities face the challenges in providing programs to capture, infiltrate and reuse stormwater and urban runoff. While Los Angeles County cities and other regions seek to secure local funding sources to meet the Clean Water Act and the State's water objectives, it will simply not be enough to meet the enormous costs of compliance. The Los Angeles County Division strongly believes that State and Federal cooperation are necessary to fund programs to secure and reuse stormwater in order to improve water supply and reliability throughout the state.

The Division calls for the League to engage in discussions on 2014 State Water Bond to assist cities in funding and implementing the goals of the Clean Water Act and the State's Water objectives. This resolution does not support the 2014 bond issue, since the League and individual cities will need to make this decision at a later time upon review of the final language. However, the Governor and Legislature have reopened discussions for the 2014 water bond and funding of urban runoff and stormwater programs has taken a back seat in past bond issues, such as Proposition 84. In May, Assembly Speaker John Perez appointed a Water Bond Working Group which recently outlined a new set of [Priorities and Accountability Measures](#) for developing a water bond that would gain the support of 2/3 of the Legislature and voters. One of the priorities identified by the committee included, "Regional Self Reliance/Integrated Regional Water

Management,” posing the question if stormwater capture should be included in any future bonds. The Division believes the opportunity to advocate for funding in the bond is now.

////////

### **League of California Cities Staff Analysis on Resolution No. 1**

Staff: Jason Rhine; (916) 658-8264

Committee: Environmental Quality

#### **Summary:**

This resolution seeks to call upon the Governor and the Legislature to work with the League of California Cities in providing adequate funding and to prioritize water bonds to assist local governments in water conservation, ground water recharge and reuse of stormwater and urban runoff programs.

#### **Background:**

In 2009, the State Legislature passed and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed a package of legislation that included four policy bills and an \$11.1 billion water bond (The Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act). The water bond included the following major spending proposals:

- \$455 million for drought relief projects, disadvantaged communities, small community wastewater treatment improvements and safe drinking water revolving fund
- \$1.4 billion for "integrated regional water management projects"
- \$2.25 billion for projects that "support delta sustainability options"
- \$3 billion for water storage projects
- \$1.7 billion for ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects in 21 watersheds
- \$1 billion for groundwater protection and cleanup
- \$1.25 billion for "water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects"

The \$11.1 billion bond also included nearly \$2 billion in earmarks. Projects slated for funding included:

- \$40 million to educate the public about California's water
- \$100 million for a Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program for watershed restoration, bike trails and public access and recreation projects
- \$75 million for the Sierra Nevada Conservancy, for public access, education and interpretive projects
- \$20 million for the Baldwin Hills Conservancy to be used to buy more land
- \$20 million for the Bolsa Chica Wetlands for interpretive projects for visitors

The water bond was originally scheduled to appear on the 2010 ballot as Proposition 18. However, due to significant criticism over the size of the bond, the amount of earmarked projects, and a lack of public support, the Legislature has voted twice to postpone the ballot vote. The water bond is now slated for the November 4, 2014 ballot.

It is unclear whether or not the water bond will actually appear on the November 2014 ballot. In recent months, pressure has been mounting to postpone the water bond yet again or significantly rewrite the water bond to drastically reduce the overall size of the bond and remove all earmarks. The Legislature has until the summer of 2014 to act.

#### **Fiscal Impact:**

Unknown. This resolution does not seek a specified appropriation from a water bond.

### **Existing League Policy:**

In 2008, the League formed a new Water Task Force to consider updates and revision to the Water Guidelines the League drafted and adopted 20 years earlier. These new Guidelines were formally approved by the League board of directors in Feb. 2010. Below are the most pertinent policy and guiding principles related to the proposed resolution. To view the entire water policy guidelines, go to [www.cacities.org/waterpolicyguidelines](http://www.cacities.org/waterpolicyguidelines).

### **General Principles**

- The League supports the development of additional groundwater and surface water storage, including proposed surface storage projects now under study if they are determined to be feasible, including but not limited to: environmentally, economically, and geographically relating to point of origin. Appropriate funding sources could include, but are not limited to user fees, bonds and federal funding.
- The League supports state water policy that allows undertaking aggressive water conservation and water use efficiency while preserving, and not diminishing, public and constitutional water rights.

### **Water Conservation**

- The League supports the development of a statewide goal to reduce water use by 20% by 2020 through the implementation of fair and equitable measures consistent with these principles.
- Accomplishing water conservation and water use efficiency goals will require statewide action by all water users, including residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural water users, local and regional planning agencies, state and federal agencies, chambers of commerce, and business, commercial and industrial professional and trade associations.

### **Water Recycling**

- Wherever feasible, water recycling should be practiced in urban, industrial and agricultural sectors. This includes increasing the use of recycled water over 2002 levels by at least one million acre-feet/year (afy) by 2020 and by at least two million afy by 2030.
- Increased recycling, reuse and other refinements in water management practices should be included in all water supply programs.

### **Water Storage**

- The development of additional surface facilities and use of groundwater basins to store surface water that is surplus to that needed to maintain State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) Bay-Delta estuary water quality standards should be supported.

### **Groundwater**

- The principle that local entities within groundwater basins (i.e., cities, counties, special districts, and the regional water quality control boards) working cooperatively should be responsible for and involved in developing and implementing basin wide groundwater, basin management plans should be supported. The plans should include, but not be limited to: a) protecting groundwater quality; b) identifying means to correct groundwater overdraft; c) implementing better irrigation techniques; d) increasing water reclamation and reuse; and e) refining water conservation and other management practices.
- Financial assistance from state and federal governments should be made available to requesting local agencies to develop and implement their groundwater management plans.

### **Financial Considerations**

- It is recognized that the development and operation of water supply, water conveyance, flood control and stormwater management, water storage, and wastewater treatment facilities is frequently beyond the capability of local areas to finance;

- The League supports legislation to provide funding for stormwater, water and wastewater programs, including a constitutional amendment which would place stormwater fees in the category of water and wastewater fees, for the purposes of Proposition 218 compliance.

**Support:**

New this year, any resolutions submitted to the General Assembly must be concurred in by five cities or by city officials from at least five or more cities. Those submitting resolutions were asked to provide written documentation of concurrence. The following letters of concurrence were received: cities of Alhambra; Cerritos; Claremont; Glendora; Lakewood; La Mirada; La Verne; Norwalk; Signal Hill; and Mary Ann Lutz, Mayor, city of Monrovia. A letter of support was also received from the California Contract Cities Association.

**RESOLUTION REFERRED TO PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE**

**2. RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE TO ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH THE LEAGUE AND CALIFORNIA POLICE CHIEFS' ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES TO IDENTIFY AND ENACT STRATEGIES THAT WILL ENSURE THE SUCCESS OF PUBLIC SAFETY REALIGNMENT FROM A LOCAL MUNICIPAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSPECTIVE.**

Source: Public Safety Policy Committee

Concurrence of five or more cities/city officials: Cities of Arroyo Grande, Covina; Fontana; Glendora; Monrovia; Ontario; Pismo Beach; and Santa Barbara

Referred to: Public Safety Policy Committee

Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee: Approve

**WHEREAS**, in October 2011 the Governor proposed the realignment of public safety responsibilities from state prisons to local government as a way to address recent court orders in response to litigation related to state prison overcrowding, and to reduce state expenditures; and

**WHEREAS**, the Governor stated that realignment needed to be fully funded with a constitutionally protected source of funds if it were to succeed; and

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature enacted the realignment measures, AB 109 and AB 117, and the Governor signed them into law without full constitutionally protected funding and liability protection for stakeholders; and

**WHEREAS**, California currently has insufficient jail space, probation officers, housing and job placement programs, medical and mental health facilities, lacks a uniform definition of recidivism; and utilizes inappropriate convictions used to determine inmate eligibility for participation in the realignment program; and

**WHEREAS**, since the implementation of realignment there have been numerous issues identified that have not been properly addressed that significantly impact municipal police departments' efforts to successfully implement realignment; and

**WHEREAS**, ultimately many of these probationers who have severe mental illness are released into communities where they continue to commit crimes that impact the safety of community members and drain the resources of probation departments and police departments throughout the state; and

**WHEREAS**, an estimated 30 counties were operating under court-ordered or self-imposed population caps before realignment, and the current lack of bed space in county jails has since led to many convicted probationers being released early after serving a fraction of their time; with inadequate to no subsequent supervision, leaving them free to engage in further criminal offenses in our local cities; and

**WHEREAS**, there is increasing knowledge among the offender population which offenses will and will not result in a sentence to state prison, and many offenders, if held in custody pending trial, that would be sentenced to county jail are ultimately sentenced to time served due to overcrowding in county facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, there are inadequate databases allowing local police departments to share critical offender information among themselves, with county probation departments, and with other county and state law enforcement entities; and

**WHEREAS**, local police departments have not received adequate funding to properly address this new population of offenders who are victimizing California communities; and now therefore let it be

**RESOLVED** by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Sacramento on September 20, 2013, to request the Governor and State Legislature to immediately enter into discussions with League representatives and the California Police Chiefs' Association to address the following issues:

1. The need to fully fund municipal police departments with constitutionally protected funding to appropriately address realignment issues facing front-line law enforcement;
2. Amend appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates (N3) inmates to include their total criminal and mental history instead of only their last criminal conviction;
3. Establish a uniform definition of recidivism with the input of all criminal justice stakeholders throughout the state;
4. Enact legislation that will accommodate the option for city police officers to make ten (10) day flash incarcerations in city jails for probationers who violate the conditions of their probation;
5. Establish oversight procedures to encourage transparency and accountability over the use of realignment funding;
6. Implement the recommendations identified in the California Little Hoover Commission Report #216 dated May 30, 2013;
7. Provide for greater representation of city officials on the local Community Corrections Partnerships. Currently AB 117 provides for only one city official (a police chief) on the seven-member body, six of which are aligned with the county in which the partnership has been established. As a result, the counties dominate the committees and the subsequent distribution of realignment funds.
8. Provide, either administratively or by legislation, an effective statewide data sharing mechanism allowing state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly and efficiently share offender information to assist in tracking and monitoring the activities of AB 109 and other offenders.

//////////

## Background Information on Resolution No. 2

**Source:** Public Safety Policy Committee

### **Background:**

In October 2011 the Governor proposed the realignment of public safety tasks from State Prisons to local government as a way to address certain judicial orders dealing with State prison overcrowding and to reduce State expenditures. This program shifts the prisoner burden from State prisons to local counties and cities.

When the Governor signed into law realignment he stated that realignment needed to be fully funded with constitutionally protected source of funds to succeed. Nonetheless, the law was implemented without full constitutional protected funding for counties and cities; insufficient liability protections to local agencies; jail space; probation officers; housing and job placement programs; medical and mental health facilities; and with an inappropriate definition of N3 (non-serious, non-sexual, non-violent) criminal convictions used to screen inmates for participation in the program.

Two-thirds of California's 58 counties are already under some form of mandated early release. Currently, 20 counties have to comply with maximum population capacity limits enforced by court order, while another 12 counties have self-imposed population caps to avoid lawsuits.

At this time no one knows what the full impact of realignment will ultimately be on crime. We hope that crime will continue to drop, but with the current experience of the 40,000 offenders realigned since October 2011, and an estimated additional 12,000 offenders being shifted from State prison to local jails and community supervision by the end of fiscal year 2013-14, it will be very difficult to realize lower crime rates in the future.

Beginning in October 2011, California State prisons began moving N3 offenders into county jails, the county probation and court systems, and ultimately funneled them into community supervision or alternative sentencing program in cities where they will live, work, and commit crime.

**Note:** There is currently no uniform definition of recidivism throughout the state and no database that can deliver statistical information on the overall impact realignment has had on all cities in California. Because of this problem we have used data from Los Angeles County.

The March 4, 2013 report to the Los Angeles County Criminal Justice Coordination Committee (CCJCC) shows a strong effort and progress in addressing the realignment mandate. However, there is insufficient funding.

The report also states the jail population continues to be heavily influenced by participants housed locally. On September 30, 2012, the inmate count in the Los Angeles County Jail was 15,463; on January 31, 2013, the count was 18,864. The realignment population accounted for 32% of the Jail population; 5,743 offenders sentenced per Penal Code Section 1170 (h) and 408 parole violations.

By the end of January 2013, 13,535 offenders were released on Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) to Los Angeles County including prisoners with the highest maintenance costs because of medical and drug problems and mental health issues costing counties and local cities millions of dollars in unfunded mandates since the beginning of the program. Prisoners with prior histories of violent crimes are also being released without proper supervision. That is why sections of **AB 109 must be amended to change the criteria used to justify the release of N3 inmates to include an offender's total criminal and mental history instead of only their last criminal conviction.** Using the latter as the key criteria does not provide

an accurate risk assessment of the threat these offenders pose to society if they are realigned to county facilities, or placed on Post Release Community Supervision.

Chief Jerry Powers from the Los Angeles County Probation Department recently stated the release criteria for N3 offenders “has nothing to do with reality.” He said initially the State estimated the population of released PRCS offenders would be 50% High Risk, 25% Medium Risk and 25% Low Risk. The reality is 3% are Very High Risk, 55% are High Risk, 40% are Medium Risk and only 2% are Low Risk offenders. He said the High Risk and serious mentally ill offenders being released “are a very scary population.” One of the special needs offenders takes the resources of 20-30 other offenders.

Assistant Sheriff Terri McDonald who is the county Jail Administrator recently stated the Jail has only 30 beds for mentally ill offenders being released – when in fact she actually needs 300 beds to accommodate the volume of serious mentally ill offenders being released that require beds.

Los Angeles County data shows 7,200 released offenders have had some sort of revocation. This number is expected to increase because of a significant increase in the first four months of year two of realignment that totals 83% of the entire first year of the program; 4,300 warrants were issued for offenders; 6,200 offenders have been rearrested; and 1,400 prosecuted. Data reveals one in 10 offenders will test positive for drugs during the first 72 hours after being released knowing they are required to report to a probation officer during that time. Only one in three offenders will successfully complete probation.

There are more than 500 felony crimes that qualify State prison inmates for release under realignment. They will be spending their time in cities with little, if any, supervision.

//////////

### **League of California Cities Staff Analysis on Resolution No. 2**

Staff: Tim Cromartie (916) 658-8252

Committee: Public Safety Policy Committee

#### **Summary:**

This Resolution seeks to outline the deficiencies in the State’s current public safety realignment policy, as implemented in 2011 by AB 109, and to identify policy changes that will assist State, county and municipal law enforcement entities to cope with the expanded universe of offenders that are now being directed to county facilities, resulting in increased related impacts on both local communities and municipal law enforcement.

#### **Background:**

This resolution was brought to the Public Safety Policy Committee by individual members of that committee who are increasingly concerned about municipal public safety impacts resulting from county jail overcrowding, a problem that has intensified with realignment, resulting in certain categories of offenders doing no jail time or being sentenced to time served. This has created a climate in which some offenses receive little or no jail time, accompanied by a growing body of anecdotal evidence that property crimes have correspondingly increased, with some, such as auto theft, being committed in serial fashion. Increased criminal activity has strained the resources of many local police departments already struggling to more closely coordinate information sharing with county probation offices to effectively monitor offenders on post-community release supervision.

In addition, there is growing concern about the criteria established for determining which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision (the non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenders). There is so much concern that a May 2013 report of California’s Little Hoover Commission recommended adjusting

the criteria to examine an offender's total criminal history rather than merely his or her last known offense, as a means of more accurately assessing the risk he or she might pose to the community.

Implementation of the realignment policy is handled in part by the Community Corrections Partnerships established by AB 109, which currently have only one city representative, compared to at least four county-level representatives.

**Fiscal Impact:**

Unknown impact on the State General Fund. This resolution seeks to establish increased and constitutionally protected funding for city police departments (and county sheriff's departments, to the degree they are contracted to provide police services for cities), but does not specify a dollar amount for the revenue stream. At a minimum, it would entail an annual revenue stream of at least the amount provided for cities for front-line law enforcement in the State's 2013-14 Budget, \$27.5 million, indefinitely – although that revenue stream has never been formally identified by the Brown Administration as having any direct connection to realignment.

**Existing League Policy:**

Related to this resolution, existing policy provides:

- The League supports policies establishing restrictions on the early release of state inmates for the purpose of alleviating overcrowding, and limiting parole hearing opportunities for state inmates serving a life sentence, or paroled inmates with a violation.
- The League supports increasing municipal representation on and participation in the Community Corrections Partnerships, which are charged with developing local corrections plans.
- In addition, the Strategic Priorities for 2012, as adopted by the League Board of Directors, included the promotion of local control for strong cities. The resolution's objectives of locking in ongoing funding for front-line municipal law enforcement, and increasing city participation in the Community Corrections Partnerships, are consistent with promoting local control.

**Support:**

New this year, any resolutions submitted to the General Assembly must be concurred in by five cities or by city officials from at least five or more cities. Those submitting resolutions were asked to provide written documentation of concurrence. The following cities/city officials have concurred: cities of Arroyo Grande; Covina; Fontana; Glendora; Monrovia; Ontario; Pismo Beach; and Santa Barbara.

**LETTERS OF CONCURRENCE**  
Resolution #1  
Water Bond Funds

**City of Alhambra**  
Office of the Mayor and City Council

July 1, 2013



Gateway  
to the  
San Gabriel Valley

111  
South First Street  
Alhambra  
California  
91801

626  
570-5010

FAX  
281-2248

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**

Dear President Bogaard:

The City of Alhambra supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. The City of Alhambra is anticipating spending \$24,101.96 this year to start the development of the Enhanced Watershed Plan and monitoring plan. Prior to 2016, the City anticipates spending \$1,169,000 for full capture device on our storm drain catch basins. In the future, it is estimated the city may need \$34 million dollars to finance the required infrastructure to meet the new permit guidelines. We also anticipate needing to hire additional staff to monitor and maintain the program. None of these costs have a dedicated funding source.


As members of the League, our city values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact Mary Chavez, Director of Public Works, at (626) 570-5067 if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Steven Placido, DDS  
Mayor

cc: Jennifer Quan, League of California Cities





# CITY OF CERRITOS™

CIVIC CENTER • 18125 BLOOMFIELD AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 3130 • CERRITOS, CALIFORNIA 90703-3130  
PHONE: (562) 916-1310 • FAX: (562) 468-1095  
CELL PHONE: (562) 547-1732  
E-mail: [bbarr90703@aol.com](mailto:bbarr90703@aol.com)  
[WWW.CERRITOS.US](http://WWW.CERRITOS.US)



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
**BRUCE W. BARROWS**

July 8, 2013

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**

President Bogaard: *Bill*

The City of Cerritos supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.


The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. The City of Cerritos expended \$866,000 in the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 for compliance with required stormwater programs. Future expenditures are expected to be over \$1.5 million annually, as the City will be required to begin construction of costly stormwater capital improvements.

As members of the League our city values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact Art Gallucci, City Manager at (562)916-1301 or [agallucci@cerritos.us](mailto:agallucci@cerritos.us), if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bruce W. Barrows  
MAYOR

cc: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division, [robb@lacity.org](mailto:robb@lacity.org)



## CITY OF CLAREMONT

City Hall  
207 Harvard Avenue  
P.O. Box 880  
Claremont, CA 91711-0880  
Fax: (909) 399-5492  
Website: [www.ci.claremont.ca.us](http://www.ci.claremont.ca.us)  
Email: [contact@ci.claremont.ca.us](mailto:contact@ci.claremont.ca.us)

City Council • (909) 399-5444  
*Corey Calaycay*  
*Joseph M. Lyons*  
*Opanyi K. Nasiali*  
*Sam Pedroza*  
*Larry Schroeder*

July 1, 2013

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

President Bogaard:

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Proposed Resolution for LCC Approval  
At The 2013 Annual Conference**

The City of Claremont supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.


The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond.

As members of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly and appreciates your time on this issue. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Tony Ramos, City Manager, at (909) 399-5441.

Sincerely,

Opanyi Nasiali  
Mayor

c: Jennifer Quan, League of California Cities



**CITY OF GLENDORA** CITY HALL

(626) 914-8200

116 East Foothill Blvd., Glendora, California 91741  
www.ci.glendora.ca.us

July 15, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**

President Bogaard:

The City of Glendora supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond.

As members of the League our city values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact me, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Joe Santoro, Mayor

cc: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o Robb Korinke,  
Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division, robb@lacity.org  
Jennifer Quan, Regional Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities –  
jqquan@lacity.org

PRIDE OF THE FOOTHILLS

Todd Rogers  
Vice Mayor

Jeff Wood  
Council Member

Diane DuBois  
Council Member

Ron Piazza  
Council Member

July 2, 2013

CITY OF LAKEWOOD

CALIFORNIA

Steve Croft  
Mayor

Mr. Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution - Support**

Dear President Bogaard:


The City of Lakewood supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond.

For Lakewood, the initial cost alone to prepare the Watershed Management Plan (WMP), Coordinated Integrated Management Plan (CIMP), and Reasonable Assurance Modeling for the three watersheds that Lakewood is a part of is estimated to be \$153,167. This cost does not include administration costs, monitoring costs, construction costs, or inspection costs, which are estimated to be in the millions of dollars.

As members of the League our city values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact Paolo Beltran, Senior Management Analyst, at (562) 866-9771, extension 2140, or email at [pbeltran@lakewoodcity.org](mailto:pbeltran@lakewoodcity.org), if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Steve Croft  
Mayor

cc: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division,  
[robb@lacity.org](mailto:robb@lacity.org)

# Lakewood



**CITY OF LA MIRADA**  
DEDICATED TO SERVICE

13700 La Mirada Boulevard  
La Mirada, California 90638  
P.O. Box 828  
La Mirada, California 90637-0828  
Phone: (562) 943-0131 Fax: (562) 943-1464  
www.cityoflamirada.org

July 15, 2013

**LETTER OF SUPPORT**

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**SUBJECT: LOS ANGELES COUNTY DIVISION ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTION**

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of La Mirada, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities, Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for local governments working to meet Federal and State objectives to protect water resources and storm water management plans. The resolution also provides direction for the League to educate State leaders and advocates for the inclusion of storm water funding in the State's proposed 2014 Water Bond.

Like many cities, the City of La Mirada does not have the basic infrastructure to capture, filter, and reuse storm water, and Federal and State funding to assist in providing this infrastructure has been reduced in recent years as a result of the economic recession. Compliance with the MS-4 permit and other storm water regulations could cost the City millions, and reduce funding for other vital City services such as infrastructure and public safety. The City could also face steep fines, penalties, and third party lawsuits if it is unable to meet the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit requirements. Receiving State funding could help alleviate the financial burden placed on local governments to meet storm water requirements.

As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact Jeff Boynton, Deputy City Manager, at (562) 943-0131 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

**CITY OF LA MIRADA**

Steve De Ruse  
Mayor

TER:jb:vdr

cc: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division



# CITY OF LA VERNE CITY HALL

3660 "D" Street, La Verne, California 91750-3599  
www.ci.la-verne.ca.us

July 2, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

## RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution

President Bogaard:

The City of La Verne supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. While the City is still in the process of identifying the costs associated with meeting the new requirements of the MS-4 PERMIT, it is expected these measures will far exceed existing local resources.


As members of the League, our city values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact our City Manager, Bob Russi at 909-596-8726, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

  
Don Kendrick  
Mayor


cc: Jennifer Quan, League of California Cities  
JR Ranells, Senior Management Analyst

U:\My Documents\CITY COUNCIL\DON KENDRICK\Support 2013 League Conf Reso.doc



General Administration 909/596-8726 • Water Customer Service 909/596-8744 • Parks & Community Services 909/596-8700  
Public Works 909/596-8741 • Finance 909/596-8716 • Community Development 909/596-8706 • Building 909/596-8713  
Police Department 909/596-1913 • Fire Department 909/596-5991 • General Fax 909/596-8737

LUIGI VERNOLA  
Mayor  
MARCEL RODARTE  
Vice Mayor  
CHERI KELLEY  
Councilmember  
MICHAEL MENDEZ  
Councilmember  
LEONARD SHRYOCK  
Councilmember  
MICHAEL J. EGAN  
City Manager



---

12700 NORWALK BLVD., P.O. BOX 1030, NORWALK, CA 90651-1030 \* PHONE: 562/929-5700 \* FACSIMILE: 562/929-5773 \* WWW.NORWALKCA.GOV

July 2, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**


Dear President Bogaard:

The city of Norwalk supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. The cost of compliance with the new storm water permit is in the millions of dollars. The Watershed Management Plan alone will cost close to \$1M. Implementation of projects in the near future based on that Watershed Management Plan could potentially cost the City of Norwalk \$5 - \$10 million annually.

As members of the League our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact Mike Egan, City Manager, at (562) 929-5772 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Luigi Vernola  
Mayor

cc: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division, robb@lacies.org



## CITY OF SIGNAL HILL

---

2175 Cherry Avenue • Signal Hill, California 90755-3799

June 27, 2013

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**

President Bogaard:

The city of Signal Hill supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. The city of Signal Hill currently budgets for \$755,000 annually for compliance with required stormwater programs, which represents over 4% of the entire General Fund. Future expenditures are expected to be over \$1.5 million annually, as the City will be required to begin construction of costly stormwater capital improvements.

As members of the League our city values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact Ken Farfsing, City Manager at (562) 989-7302 or [kfarfsing@cityofsignal.org](mailto:kfarfsing@cityofsignal.org), if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Noll  
Mayor

CC: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division, [robb@lacity.org](mailto:robb@lacity.org)



Office of the Mayor and the City Council

July 2, 2013

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**SUBJECT: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**

Dear President Bogaard:

As Mayor of the City of Monrovia, I support the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. The City is anticipating millions of dollars in stormwater permit compliance costs over the next five years – funds the City currently does not have available. Funding assistance is vital in order for the City to meet stormwater permit requirements.

As members of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact Heather Maloney, Senior Management Analyst, at (626) 932-5577 or [hmaloney@ci.monrovia.ca.us](mailto:hmaloney@ci.monrovia.ca.us), if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Lutz,  
Mayor

cc: City Council  
Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division, [robb@lacies.org](mailto:robb@lacies.org)  
Laurie K. Lile, City Manager  
Ron Bow, Director of Public Works



EXECUTIVE BOARD

PRESIDENT  
STEVE TYE  
Diamond Bar

VICE PRESIDENT  
VICTOR MANALO  
Artesia

SECRETARY/TREASURER  
GUSTAVO CAMCHO  
Pico Rivera

PAST PRESIDENT  
DIANE J. MARTINEZ  
Paramount

DIRECTOR AT LARGE  
JEFF WOOD  
Lakewood

DIRECTOR AT LARGE  
SANDRA ARMENTA  
Rosemead

BUDGET & AUDIT COMMITTEE  
MICHAEL DAVITT  
La Cañada Flintridge

BY-LAWS COMMITTEE  
LOU LA MONTE  
Malibu

CITY MGRS/ADM. COMMITTEE  
JIM DESTEFANO  
Diamond Bar

LEGAL/CITY-COUNTY  
CONTRACTS COMMITTEE  
NANCY TRAGARZ  
Walnut

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE  
SAM PEDROZA  
Claremont

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE  
ANDREW SAREGA  
La Mirada

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE  
BARU SANCHEZ  
Cudahy

SELECTIONS COMMITTEE  
LIZ REILLY  
Duarte

SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE  
JAMES R. BOZAJIAN  
Calabasas

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS COMMITTEE  
FRANK V. ZERUNYAN  
Rolling Hills Estates

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
SAM OLIVITO

June 20, 2013

Bill Bogaard  
President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Los Angeles County Division Annual Conference Resolution**

President Bogaard:

The California Contract Cities Association supports the Los Angeles County Division's effort to submit a resolution for consideration by the General Assembly at the League's 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The Division's resolution seeks to address a critical funding need for cities working to meet the State's water quality objectives and storm water management plans by providing direction for the League to educate state leaders and advocate for funding during discussions on the 2014 Water Bond. All of the 58 cities we represent can ill afford this increasingly expensive ongoing cost.

As members of the League our association values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. We appreciate your time on this issue. Please feel free to contact our office at (562) 622-5533 if you have any questions.


Sincerely,

Steve Tye  
CCCA President

CC: Ling-Ling Chang, President, Los Angeles County Division c/o  
Robb Korinke, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Division, robb@lacity.org

**LETTERS OF CONCURRENCE**  
Resolution #2  
Public Safety Realignment

OFFICE OF THE  
MAYOR



300 East Branch Street  
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420  
Phone: (805) 473-5400  
FAX: (805) 473-0386  
[agcity@arroyogrande.org](mailto:agcity@arroyogrande.org)  
[www.arroyogrande.org](http://www.arroyogrande.org)

July 17, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution**

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of Arroyo Grande, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.

As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact our City Manager, Steve Adams, at (805)473-5404, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*Tony Ferrara*

Mayor, City of Arroyo Grande



# CITY OF COVINA

125 East College Street • Covina, California 91723-2199  
www.covinaca.gov

July 17, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of Covina, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.

As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact Daryl Parrish, City Manager, at (626) 384-5410, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Walter Allen III  
Mayor, City of Covina



Mayor Acquanetta Warren



July 17, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of Fontana, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.

As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact Ken Hunt City Manager, at (909)350-7654, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mayor, City of Fontana

AW/ac



CITY OF GLENDORA CITY HALL

(626) 914-8201

116 East Foothill Blvd., Glendora, California 91741

FAX (626) 914-8221

[www.ci.glendora.ca.us](http://www.ci.glendora.ca.us)

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

July 19, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of Glendora, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.


As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact Chris Jeffers, City Manager, at [cjeffers@ci.glendora.ca.us](mailto:cjeffers@ci.glendora.ca.us) or (626) 914-8201, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

City of Glendora

Joe Santoro  
Mayor

PRIDE OF THE FOOTHILLS



Office of the Mayor and the City Council

July 19, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

**RE: PUBLIC SAFETY REALIGNMENT RESOLUTION**

Dear President Bogaard:

As Mayor of the City of Monrovia, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.


As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact Laurie Lile, City Manager, at (626) 932-5501, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Kutz  
Mayor

cc: City Council  
James Hunt, Police Chief

# CITY OF



# ONTARIO

303 EAST "B" STREET, CIVIC CENTER

ONTARIO

CALIFORNIA 91764-4105

(909) 395-2000

FAX (909) 395-2070

PAUL S. LEON  
MAYOR

CHRIS HUGHES  
CITY MANAGER

JIM W. BOWMAN  
MAYOR PRO TEM

July 18, 2013

MARY E. WIRTES, MMC  
CITY CLERK

ALAN D. WAPNER  
DEBRA DORST-PORADA  
PAUL VINCENT AVILA  
COUNCIL MEMBERS

JAMES R. MILHISER  
TREASURER

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of Ontario, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision; i.e., a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.

As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact Chris Hughes, City Manager, at (909) 395-2010, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

  
PAUL S. LEON  
Mayor



**From the Office of the Mayor**

Shelly Higginbotham

760 Mattie Road

Pismo Beach, CA 93449

(805) 235-6604

[shigginbotham@pismo-beach.org](mailto:shigginbotham@pismo-beach.org)

---

July 18, 2013

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814


RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution

Dear President Bogaard:

On behalf of the City of Pismo Beach, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.

As a member of the League, our City values the policy development process provided to the General Assembly. Please contact James R. Lewis, City Manager, at (805) 773-7007, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
  
Shelly Higginbotham  
Mayor



# City of Santa Barbara

Office of Mayor

[HSchneider@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:HSchneider@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

[www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov](http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

July 19, 2013

Helene Schneider  
Mayor

Bill Bogaard, President  
League of California Cities  
1400 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

City Hall  
735 Anacapa Street  
Santa Barbara, CA  
93101-1990

RE: Public Safety Realignment Resolution

Dear President Bogaard:

Mailing Address:  
P.O. Box 1990  
Santa Barbara, CA  
93102-1990

Tel: 805.564.5323  
Fax: 805.564.5475

On behalf of the City of Santa Barbara, I am writing to express support for the League of California Cities' Public Safety Resolution, which will be submitted for consideration by the League's General Assembly at the September 2013 Annual Conference in Sacramento.

The League's Resolution seeks to highlight a number of deficiencies with the current public safety realignment policy, and what funding and policy changes need to occur in response. The resolution specifically calls out the need for ongoing local law enforcement funding related to realignment, as well as modification of the criteria for which offenders are eligible for post-release community supervision, i.e. a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender criteria that focuses on total criminal history rather than merely the last recorded offense.

It is important to our City, that such state-mandated programs remain fully-funded and that the regulations do not impede our law enforcement officers' ability to use their professional discretion in protecting our community.

As a member of the League, our City values the League's leadership and policy direction on this issue.

Sincerely,

Helene Schneider,  
Mayor

cc: Dave Mullinax, League of California Cities



Please consider the environment before printing this letter.