



Chair
Supervisor Carole Groom

1100 "K" Street, Suite 101/Sacramento, CA 95814 / (916) 327-7531 / email: UCC@urbancounties.com

UCC Board of Directors' Meeting Summary September 5, 2019

Alameda: Supervisor Keith Carson, Susan Muranishi
Contra Costa:
Fresno: Supervisor Buddy Mendes
Los Angeles: Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Donna Seitz
Orange: Supervisor Lisa Bartlett
Riverside:
Sacramento: Supervisor Susan Peters, Elisa DeBord
San Bernardino: Josh Candelaria (Alternate)
San Diego: Geoff Patnoe (Alternate), Helen Robbins-Meyer, Erin Gilbert
San Francisco:
San Joaquin: Supervisor Bob Elliott
San Mateo: Supervisor Carole Groom (via telephone)
Santa Clara:
Ventura: Supervisor Kelly Long
UCC: Elizabeth Espinosa, Jean Hurst, Kelly Brooks, Grace Ferguson

I. Call to Order

UCC Vice-Chair Supervisor Kelly Long convened the meeting and called the members to order.

II. Roll Call of Counties

There were eight supervisors, two alternates and 10 counties represented at this meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes from the June 24, 2019 UCC Board Meeting – APPROVED

The June 24, 2019 minutes were approved and below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X			
Supervisor Kelly Long, Vice-Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa			X	
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			

Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles	X			
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside			X	
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman (Alternate)	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Fletcher (Alternate)	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg	Santa Clara			X	
Vote Total		10		4	

IV. UCC Ad Hoc Committee Charge - Update

Staff provided an overview of the background of the Ad Hoc Committee whose initial purpose was to develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit firms for state advocacy services on an interim basis following the departure of the former UCC Executive Director. In mid-August, the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed a revised committee charge that expanded its responsibilities to include the following:

- Make recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding options for an updated UCC brand.
- Provide input into the process for recruiting a new Executive Director and/or exploring other options for future organizational structure.
- Make recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding Executive Director recruitment and other potential organizational changes.

Supervisor Long thanked the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their efforts over the last several months.

V. UCC’s Future Organizational Structure – Action Item - APPROVED

V-A. Proposed Option for Future Organizational Structure

Staff provided a brief overview and background on the organizational structure options presented to the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Ad Hoc Committee met in August and considered two primary organizational structures, which were: 1) To maintain the previous employment model (full-time, in-house staff [Executive Director] providing advocacy and directing association management activities) , and 2) To contract out certain UCC’s functions to one or more firms.

The Ad Hoc Committee ultimately agreed upon an approach meant to achieve the dual objectives of (1) refining the UCC mission and focus, and (2) developing an aggressive, targeted advocacy strategy. The propose approach contemplates retaining the existing in-house administrative staff and contracting out to two lobbying firms with distinct roles and responsibilities:

Influencers – A select few lobbying firms that have top-shelf access to the Governor, legislative leaders and legislators.

Policy Experts – A firm that provides technical expertise on policy issues of priority to urban counties and county-specific advocacy services. This firm would also offer support with the association management functions of UCC and work in coordination with UCC’s existing staff.

The Board discussed how the two-firm approach – with the combined efforts of “door openers” and county policy experts – would benefit urban counties and amplify the UCC voice. Supervisor Long discussed the benefits the Ad Hoc Committee identified with a two-firm approach, believing that this model would better position UCC to drive results for member counties. She also noted the importance of continued collaboration with CSAC. Helen Robbins-Meyer, the CAO from San Diego County and the alternate CAO representative on the Ad Hoc Committee, emphasized the importance of retaining the strategic influencers who have access at the highest level and can make select and timely outreach to policy makers. Supervisor Ridley-Thomas from Los Angeles underscored the significance of relationships in advocacy work, noting that the relationships the door-openers offer should extend to UCC Board members as well. Supervisor Bartlett from Orange County offered that the new model would give UCC greater opportunities to control our own destiny.

Supervisor Carson thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for dedicating their time and efforts in developing the proposed model, indicating he is fully on board with moving forward with the next steps as described. He expressed the importance of urban counties having access and influence at the highest levels and encouraged continued efforts to expand opportunities to have direct dialogue with large urban cities.

Supervisor Long also raised the idea of creating a UCC Policy Committee composed of supervisors, county administrative/executive officers, and staff.

Supervisor Elliott asked about the need for two firms and wondered if there was a single firm that could cover both advocacy and association services. Supervisor Long responded that this option was considered, but the firms that offer the highest level of access typically do not have county expertise. Helen Robbins-Meyer noted that it is generally understood that there are only two or three firms in Sacramento that offer the type of access UCC is describing. San Bernardino County Legislative Affairs Director Josh Candelaria – who also is acting as the UCC Legislative Contract Manager – indicated that the RFP process would help articulate how the coordination of the two firms could work. Supervisor Mendez from Fresno County said that UCC needs to find the path to become more relevant. Additional questions were posed about payment/retainers for the firm, whether a similar model existed elsewhere among counties, and how potential conflicts would be worked out.

V-B: Preliminary Budget Impact for Proposed Organizational Structure

Staff provided a chart on that displayed estimated resources needed to support the proposed two-firm model. The preliminary budget impact assumed that UCC would expend up to \$30,000 per

month in lobbying firm contracts, beginning January 1, 2020. Staff noted that those contract costs could be lower and, given the modernization of the internal practices and adjustments, some of the Executive Assistant’s time could be freed up, allowing UCC to eliminate the temporary staff and associated costs (approximately \$30,000 annually). Staff believes that UCC could afford the two-firm model in the short-term, noting that UCC has a healthy trust fund reserve balance that can also be utilized.

Supervisor Bartlett asked if the two-firm model would require two RFPs or a contract with a single firm that subcontracts with a second firm. Staff responded that a single request could cover any model – a single firm if it believes it could provide the full scope of service or a two-firm approach submitted through a joint proposal. Josh Candelaria indicated that he believes the term of the contract should be longer than one year (at least two) to entice sufficient applicant interest..

Recommended UCC Action – The Ad Hoc Committee recommended that the UCC Board of Directors approve the two-firm approach and charge the Ad Hoc Committee with executing a process and plan to identify and recruit qualified candidates. The goal would be to have both firms on board by the beginning of the 2020 legislative year.

A motion was made to approve the recommendation above, and the Board approved it unanimously. Below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X			
Supervisor Kelly Long, Vice-Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa			X	
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles	X			
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside			X	
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman (Alternate)	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Fletcher (Alternate)	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg	Santa Clara			X	
Vote Total		10		4	

VI. UCC Branding Options – Action Item - APPROVED

Staff has been working with branding consultants to facilitate a remake of the UCC brand (logo and website). Several related recommendations were brought to the Ad Hoc Committee and then moved to the Board for its action, including the following:

- **Organization Name** – The branding consultants have recommended retaining the Urban Counties of California name as it is “clean, concise, and to the point.” However, the consultants also offered “Urban County Supervisors of California” as an alternative.

Staff recommendation: Urban Counties of California – **APPROVED**

- **Tagline** – The branding consultants have developed a “tagline” to go under or with the logo to describe the organization. Several tagline recommendations were offered:

- a) Providing Services That Matter
- b) Delivering Local Services That Matter
- c) The Voice for California’s Urban Counties
- d) Improving the Lives of Californians in Urban Communities

Staff Recommendation: The Voice for California’s Urban Counties – **APPROVED**

Mission Statement – The following mission statement was offered to capture the core purpose and mission of UCC:

To improve the lives of urban county residents by providing a strong, unified voice to advance policy and funding decisions for a broad array of vital public health, human services, behavioral health, public safety, community corrections, public works and other local services and programs that impact more than 80 percent of the state’s population residing in California’s high-population counties.

Staff Recommendation: Mission Statement as Drafted – **APPROVED**

A single motion was made to approve the three recommendations above, and the Board approved it unanimously. Below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X			
Supervisor Kelly Long, Vice-Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa			X	
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles	X			
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside			X	
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman (Alternate)	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Fletcher (Alternate)	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	

Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg	Santa Clara			X	
Vote Total		10		4	

VII. UCC Financial Review

Staff provided an update on UCC’s financial review underway. By way of background, staff reported that in April the Board tasked HBE with securing proposals from contractors to assist with an audit. During HBE’s outreach to various accounting and auditing firms, they were made aware that UCC is not required by either state or federal law to have an annual audit (given the relatively small size of its budget), and accounting and auditing firms were reluctant to recommend an audit for an organization of UCC’s size. Instead, it was recommended – and the Ad Hoc Committee subsequently approved – a broad financial review that would incorporate recommendations for improvements to UCC’s internal financial practices. The Ad Hoc Committee approved an agreement with UCC’s current accountant James Marta and Company due to their understanding of the finances and operations of UCC. The following efforts are underway to accomplish the following:

- Review of 10 years of financial data and preparation of a summary of income sources, expenditures, and how assets have changed over time.
- Documentation of operational controls, including billing, cash disbursements, payroll, budgeting and reporting.
- Recommendations on updating internal controls and efficiencies, as well as reporting to the board absent an audit.

Staff anticipates that the above tasks will be completed and ready to present to the Board at the next Board of Directors’ Meeting.

Supervisor Ridley-Thomas from Los Angeles County recommended that even if not required an audit should be conducted. Staff indicated that they would follow up with a request for audit services.

VIII. Legislative and Budget Update

An updated bill list of the measures that UCC is actively engaged in was provided, and staff noted that with a week of the 2019 legislative session remaining, outcomes on several key measures were still unknown. Staff will be sending out an end-of-session summary once the legislative session comes to a close. In the meantime, staff has been directly engaging with the Governor’s office on UCC’s remaining bills. A few bills that were occupying significant attention in the Capitol were noted, including:

AB 276 (Pan) – Immunizations: medical exemptions.

AB 5 (Gonzalez) – *Dynamex* Decision.

AB 1484 (Grayson) – Mitigation fee acts: housing developments – *This measure is not moving forward this year, and staff noted that there will be four public meetings/forums on developer fees coming up in the future.*

Update: AB 276 and AB 5 were both signed by the Governor.

XI. Public Comment

There were no public comments made.

- X.** The next UCC Board of Directors' Meeting will be held on **Monday, October 28, 2019 at 4:00PM**. This meeting will be held via conference call.